10/15/67

Dear Sylvia,

I had written Shirely and she replied with a card merely telling me of Vickie's death and that it was a terrible accident.

We are temporarily without electricity while some work is being done, so my normally bad typing will be worse. Hope you can make it out.

It now looks as though I will be in New York soon-within the next two weeks. Parallax tells me the book is being bound. About 11/1 I expect to be leaving on the trip, not yet fully planned. I expect it to last about two weeks but really do not know. When I am in New York, depending on how long I am there, let us talk about what can be done with the documents I have and what can be done to get those of which I know and will not be able to dig out myself. There is no immediacy on this, for I plan the revised concept of the Manchester book, where many will be appropriate, after I publish POST MORTEM. That, in turn, confronts me with financial problems. It may not come out immediately. We are in great chaos having moved in haste and being far from moved in, with a tremenduous accumulation in the cellar in boxes and a considerable amount of work, previously undetected, to be done on the house, and trouble with some of the craftsmen. Some bad work, some non performance, etc. But the house and the environs are wonderful. Even if I'm only five minutes from Dt. Detrick.

You need not have explained about your tax situation (for you once did), but I thanks you for the declaration of solidarity. Frankly, I feel that nothing will be done to use, for there will be too many. However, if there is an action, I simply must have completed TIGER TO RIDE by then, for I have much in it that would be very appropriate. It is researched, but the research must be updated. That will be the 7yd.

Right now, you and Maggie are the only ones to whom I would give this material. It is not because we agree on everything (we do, on almost everything), but because I have no doubt about the integrity of either of you. I do not, for example, doubt your sincerity and conviction on Garrison. I merely think you are wrong and I fear I now detect emotional involvement that is altering the things you say, things I am confident you cannot justify. For examply, in the conclusion of your Playboy letter, you describe the New Orleans investigation as "an archpfantasy or probable irrelevant events in New Orleans."

There is much in your letter to Srnoni of 1010 that I think you will in the future believe with me is really little and quibbling. There is no comparison between the destruction of an original and a "copy". I have found some of the copies not identical. I have found some altered. I have other non-existent. For example, a statement Ferrie gave the FBI. No original. Baker, for example. Arnold for another kind of case. There are other similar things. To me, they are not at all like your thinking and writing as I know it and they trouble me because they are not.

Arnoni sent me a marked copy of the issue, presumeably for comment, and I took the time. If he gave you a copy, you know that I did not tell you Gurvich was chief investigator. He was conspicuous by his absence when I was there. I knew Ivon was chief investigator 1/1/67, and everyone I met so told me. No one ever told me Gurvich was. The papers called him a volunteer. I now think he was a plant. If he was not he was reached, for he has said things he could not know about and I cannot imagine Bobby Kennedy, without outside influence, taking the time to consort with a man of this

background, especially on a subject on which he has declined to speak to almost anyone. The fact is that I was picking up leaks from inside Garrison's office in February and was in touch with Lynn Loisel about them. He confirmed their existence. Schiller, for example, was getting this kind of information.

I wish I thought this cause of dvision between us would pass over soon. I think it will not for the case will not be tried soon.

The first copy ofm my New Orleans book arrived this morning, having taken only 10 days from New York. I've not really examined it, but a glance at the prologue indicates that it was cut heavily. I what I regard as important was removed from it or xoxhex parts of the book the responsibility is mine, for I gave them the right to do what they considered necessary if they did not alter fact or doctrine. I'll try and read Garrison's introduction tonight.

I look out the window and find the beautiful fall landscape conducive to writing, imparting a kind of tranquility that has been lacking, yet I cannot tell you the number of interruptions since I began this. I hope it is comprehensible.

I have heard nothing more about Bobbs. Merrill and their plans for your book, but once again I encourage you to keep an eye open and, when you can without antagonizing them, trying xhem to encourage them to promote. You cannot imagine the extent of the present effort to suppress. Yet I feel that we will soon make a breakthrough on this. Perhaps it may seem strange to you, but one of the things I fear is Shaw's murder. Not Russo's; Shaws. Another for whom I sometimes fear is Sylvia Odio. I have a little new on her. She was to have been one of the first deposed and wasn't.

Best regards, and the best of luck with your book if it appears before we are again in touch.

Sincerely,

13 October 1967

Dear Harold,

Last Saturday I received a note from Shirley with the horrifying news of her daughter's death. I called her at once, deeply concerned about her state after this awful tragedy. Vickie died on September 12th, after lingering for four days in great pain. Shirley was extraordinarily close to Vickie, I don't know how she will endure this blow.

Thank you for clarifying what you had in mind with respect to your unused material. The possibility of immediate use (so far as I am concerned) would depend, of course, on the nature and contents of the material. I would be inclined to think that I would be [illegible] be able to at least try to put the material to good use; certainly, I would like the opportunity to study it.

Let me make this suggestion: If Maggie does not accept your offer of the unpublished material, you could ship it to me at my expense, or perhaps send a sampling of it from which I could indicate whether or not the remainder would be of interest with a view to "good use." If Maggie does want the material, on the understanding that I would receive a duplicate set, then she and I could share the cost of xeroxing a second set, and of course I would still assume any other costs of the material I receive, whether mailing or other expense.

Whatever is done with this material and whether or not my suggestion is acceptable to you, Harold, I do want you to know that I greatly appreciate your expression of confidence in me in terms of my ability to use it and the fact that I would not misuse it. I think you know the extent to which I have always striven for strict accuracy and the importance I attach both to accuracy and responsibility in any pronouncements about the evidence. I would certainly make every effort to use the unpublished material in a thoroughly responsible way, and it goes without saying that in any use of it I would make it clear that the material had been placed at my disposal by yourself.

Incidentally, about the Vietnam tax: I find myself in a very peculiar position. I would like to withhold mine also, but I pay taxes under an arrangement peculiar to the international civil service, with which you may be familiar. I am stationed in New York, where I am liable to city, state, and federal income tax. Other WHO staff members who may be called my "opposite numbers" (in that they are doing the same kind of work at the same grade and salary) are stationed in Geneva or other cities where there is no income tax at all due (because the host country has signed the Convention on Privileges and Immunities, which the USA has not signed, exempting UN and the agencies attached to it from such obligations as tax). Consequently, to avoid the inequity which would result if I paid out of pocket 20% of my salary for income taxes while my colleague in Geneva kept her whole salary, the WHO pays the tax due on the salary I receive. And I am unable to withhold from the Government a tax actually paid by WHO. That is why I was unable to sign the form I received from Ramparts. But I am certainly with you and Bob Ockene in your feelings on this issue and have great respect for your decision. Thanks again for offering me the unpublished material and I want to emphasize again that if we come to any arrangement, I do not want it to entail any expense whatsoever on your part. All best regards,

Sylvia