

1/9/71

Dear Jim, your letter of the 6th fills me with dismay and frustration. It pretty much limits what I can or will do and its reflects an arrogance and a stupidity I am, frankly, astounded to find in you. So you can better understand what follows, I make this explanation:

Yesterday I was 53. I feel like a very old 58. I still keep hours, after seven years of it, that I know no young person even thinking of working, and yet I can't begin to keep up with what I must do. The interest on my to me considerable indebtedness is now due and I do not have it, simply because people who owe me money and promised it in time haven't delivered. I am physically exhausted, emotionally drained, and I just am not going to engage in futilities. I have no time for them and I'm not going to overburden my nerves or my guts with them. It is that simple.

You have two good sources of information, and you have jeopardized them both and may already have ruined the information you have gotten and certainly have, with consummate stupidity, done everything a man can do to guarantee its misuse. You did this knowing you should not have. And after it is too late, you tell me about it.

I knew that you had seen Sprague before your letter reached here and whatever it is he got from you, including a picture or pictures, is already in the wrong hands and I have been informed of it. Because I was informed by phone I cut it all off. I'll find out when I want to, but in person, and soon.

It was at the very best irresponsible of you to talk to anyone when I cautioned you against it. If none of us is immune to error, none the repository of all knowledge or flawless judgement, I have had more experience with this kind of thing and more knowledge and experience by far than anyone else on this subject. I drew upon this to counsel you. So, the first thing you do it exactly the opposite. Hvain then told me of this I told you to stay away from Sprague and above all to keep G away from him, so you arrange for both of you to go to his meeting, for what you now must know is the shovelling of what is generally reserved for the barnyard. That you would even dream of doing such this is with an to G is beyond explanation of excuse. That he didn't go is irrelevant, for these flap these flappased paranoids have a sufficient identification, from what I was told.

Now much as I want this information, and important as it can be to me and my work, I simply will not be part of anything that can in any way hurt anybody, C or M, or anyone. And if you can't keep your word or take advice, the same applies to you. I recognize I have no right to give you orders and I do not assume or exercise such a right. But when people work together they do have a right to expect each other to be rational, responsible, and to keep their words. I will not do what I criticize the government for doing. If it is wrong for them it is wrong for me.

I don't know how you can undo this awful mess you have made, how you can take out of the mind of the irrational Sprague what you have already put there, how you can withdraw the copies of whatever he has distributed that he has, but if you want to come out of this with any self-respect you'd better figure some way out. That man is, as I told you, no better than a raving maniac on this subject calm, rational and decent as he seems to be in all other ways. He blows everything he comes across, has no respect for the rights of others to their materials,

is utterly incapable of correctly understanding any genuine evidence he might see, and can be depended upon to spread everything wholesale among all the irrationalists with whom he maintains close liason. If you will but think a moment, you will see that I have told you what you did not write me, and this should be all the illustration you need of the speed with which he does what I say.

Your explanation is not credible. If your sole purpose in corresponding with Sprague was to get copies of picture, then all you need have done was write and ask for those pictures, no more.

And after I warned you, you have told the whole fucking world that "all material from 'a friend who once knew Hosty' was being given to you", meaning me. If you gave him none of it, why even mention it? Now there is no possibility of keeping this as it had to have been kept, and if it is not all blown, it will not be your fault. I had a long letter from Sprague yesterday, written after his return. He made no mention of this. But he did to another, or others. How blind and stupidly stubborn can you be?

I did take time to write him a four-page letter, trying to straighten him out on other things, but I knew it was a futility, and I was trying to keep him from serious misuse of something of somebody else's he had snaffled.

I am sorry to have to write you so bluntly, but it would be dishonest not to, and no service to you or what we all seek. We must practise the highest morality, the highest ethics, or we have no business doing what we do. This means, among other things, mutual respect and trust and the strictest protection of those from whom we seek information. How much trouble do you think it will be to pinpoint former friends of Hosty? They sure as hell aren't going to think of Walker's pal with whom he played bridge!

Frankly, much as I want to know what he can say, I think C has to be out of his mind to talk to you further, and if I knew how to address him, I'd so tell him. He has to survive all of this, and you on top of it. I would like to hear from him directly, but I have no way of reaching him. With what you have done, I can't honorably encourage you to talk to him again, based on what you have admitted, and I can but wonder if there is yet more.

Do you think Sprague will pay any more attention to your telling him he has things turned around that, say, to me? I've spent hours developing proof of his error, so he simply ignores it. I'll never recover from what one of his incredibly many obsessions cost me, but had I not frustrated that one, there'd be no point in all this work now.

You have every right to do things your way. When you are ready to keep your word to me, to do things my way or discuss them first and understand the reasons why do you can avoid the kind of shameful and self-destructive thing you have just done, write me again. And if you want to avoid the possibility of never forgiving yourself, try and find some way of getting Sprague to never mention what you told him and to return to you every copy of whatever you gave him, whatever he wrote about it. I regret very much that you have so lowered my spirits. Sincerely,

April 6, 1971

Dear Harold

The delay in corresponding after your 3/29 was to look back; to take stock of my activities. Data given to me was given in trust. I broke the trust as a tactical error.

My whole rationale for corresponding with Sprague was to obtain certain photos. C and I planned to attend his lecture, but we both couldn't make it. I suggested we could meet him enroute to view the photos. C balked, suggested we not bother. I wrote to Sprague anyway. I met him the 29th alone.

I told Sprague that all material from "a friend who once knew Hosty" was being given to you. I was interested in

seeing his photos to see if I
could spot the man in the negative
I had sent him. I did, but
I didn't tell P.S.

It's going to be hard for
Sprague to forget me, unfortunately.
He called me up Tuesday to
tell me that the ONI man we
discussed was in the lecture
hall and asked if Sprague knew
about the "No Name Key Group".
I don't know what that is, but the
outrageous thing about the whole
tale is that Sprague described
the ONI man in detail, much
more than I had given him.

I'm going to write a letter
to Sprague and frankly tell
him he's a nice person, but
he's got it turned around. (for
example: he had Powell
totally misplaced - near Willis
in Z-183-189.) See hold
off, in line of advice from you.

You will get the whole story about Moore as soon as I get it all down. I'm sending a registered envelope with photos, description etc soon.

I would like to have any copy of any Moore memos referring to Eva Grant. Also anything he wrote up about a photo of the TSSD area. I will pay copy charges. Moore gives me a chill - his hiding a lot. He worked with an agent on Larry Crawford, and never filed the report. His various tales about San Francisco on 11/22/63 lead me to believe he might have been watching Shaw. He saw two slides of the head wounds in Jan. 64. He maintains that there was a set made up.

The ONLY man is real he is in
the following photos:

1. Jack Weaver
 2. Hughes - frames
before car turns in
front of TSBP.
 3. Jina Towner.
- and
possibly Willis #9.

I will sent photos - describe fully.

I will consult you
before I do things
from now on.

Jim.

P.g. C doesn't know about Atlanta.
Apparently, he got alot of
shop talk about Ray's "escape"
but what I gave you is all
he has really spoke up about.

Has Ray leveled about his
escape. I get hints from C
that the KC feeds thought of
was a remarkable ~~thing~~ ^{time} for
such a "jerk" to do