

3/12/72

Dear Jerry (HR),

As I told you, we are both physically and emotionally quite weary. Lil carries her usual burden of this time of the year with more oppression because of her successes, which overload her, and I face the emotionally-exhausting task of preparing certain papers for the helicopter suit. That is a drain none of our present friends can begin to estimate, for it is not possible for one who did not live through it to be able to comprehend, in any meaningful way, what its toll was. So, Lil is as she sounded when you phoned, and if I sounded that way, to a lesser degree I am also, despite my efforts to get more rest.

You did not really understand the early correspondence between Ned and me after that incredible night here, when he revealed to himself (which hurt worse than revealing it to me) what lies deep inside him. The justification of the establishment as it is, not as it should be, is only part. I addressed that early that night by giving him to understand my view, that solving the many questions of the assassination within the framework of the Establishment fortifies it, does not subvert it. In addressing this, without naming him, without giving any clue, as a matter of fact, that would enable any not already knowing the story to guess who it is (subject to the easiest change should developments warrant!), I used the simplest explanation of the many all of which are true, and I believe I restricted it to that. This was written long ago, so you know it is not any recent belief. What surprises me is the parallel, which will become clearer when this is read by others. It is in the hands of one of the two critics - have asked to read it before Lil can get to retyping. Not that there is any prospect of raising the money to print it. But I do anticipate evil developments, believe I have delayed some, and do not deceive myself into believing that I can continue to do this, at least not for long.

The development is one of the very first I anticipated. I discussed it with the Senator when I spoke to him, in a bit more detail with his administrative assistant, with whom I had more time. If you will reread (and I do not recommend taking the time - take my word instead unless you can suspect a reason for not believing it) the letters, all of the early one of which you have copies, you will find that after a decent interval I began asking for the assurance never give. Why? The agreement is enough, why ask assurances in addition? But none of you thought of that. I believe this might reach him in two sensitive areas, his own concept of ethics (you call it morality, I use his word) and what I have reluctantly come to believe is characteristic of almost 100% of the well-off almost 100% of the time, his pocketbook nerve. I think I did not send you my last letter to him, but it makes quite explicit my intent to sue if he overtly breaks his word or hurts me in any way. He understood explicit obligations when he accepted the materials and the restrictions.

There is an area of this you have not considered or have not indicated considering. He summed up my refutation of every argument he advanced, in each case but one with his concession that it was refuted and in that one with the concession that all except him would probably so consider it, with "I have never been so put down in my life!" This is a rather rich formulation, as it is not a logical one for a rational man. So, I think that whether or not self-recognized, one of the things bugging him is "getting" me. He will dignify it, rationalize it, twist and torture it, but his considerable ego will drive him to more than he has already done, and ask he guiltily knows, there is nothing new, nothing of any real probability, the disclosure of the film can add to what I have and it can't, by itself, disclose what I already have, which includes it and much more, an allocation of fault. HR can offer an independent appraisal of this short opinion. So, one of the things he is determined to do is ruin me. The hazard he runs is his wealth and with a diversity of citizenship and with the contract having been engaged in here and then committed to writing by mail, I can file in this state, which will escalate his costs no end. Believe me, I have been through it. Dell docket me more than \$5,000 for defending a spurious lawsuit, where they found my treatment exemplary, to use their word, and that case was thrown out of court. It never came to trial.

I have planned to use this interlude between the end of the evening news and an

educational program Lil thinks it might relax us to watch to write a memoir from my past (called to mind by ITI-Chile) that might entertain some of my younger friends and would serve to make a more specific kind of record for the future on whether those of us who take the basic position we do are per se anti-government, but with this fresh in mind I pursue it a bit further so you can understand me and how I will behave and react better.

I have a varied past. As a kid reporter I was good enough to make it possible for another man to win the Pulitzer Prize. That was in about 1933. I had the imagination and I was able to improvise the facilities, and although as recently, I was denied the use of my left hand, I worked for more than two days and night without sleep. I was the trouble-shooter in the Senate Committee on which I worked. I did things in cartels even the entire anti-trust division of the Department of Justice was not able to do. And I was all alone, a one-man staff. In intelligence, I was a trouble shooter, too. When analyses couldn't work out in the various divisions, in the course of time they were bounced to me. I know this sounds like bragging. Perhaps it is. Counter-intelligence used me often, never ever except under the gun. I did special jobs for the White House. The man then in the position in which Hilsman was during the Cuba Missile crisis used me, although I was not in State. In short, in an unpublicized way, I did what others couldn't and what was often considered impossible. I worked entirely alone. I was then but a year or so older than you. One of the more spectacular performances was analysis, not investigation. If I never mentioned it I had the already-sustained convictions of four innocent OSS men, framed by the MPs, undone. Such legal luminaries as Arthur Goldberg and the Bohovan of the Powers swap were among OSS'S lawyers, and through all the channels of military justice they had failed. If this is an abbreviated, you may take it as boastful, accounting of my experience, is it at least enough to convince you that in my own thinking I have a basis for trusting my analyses and adhering to them firmly.

In the current dispute, nobody has made any challenge. When all eschew confrontation, should that persuade me others are right and I wrong? So, I have left others alone, despite the essentially harmful (and largely selfish) thing some seek and done what I can, without troubling them.

I don't think any of you has ever done any real thinking on this besides Howard. But let us simplify this. Begin with Marshall giving Mattimer exclusive access. When he is capable of that, what basis have you for even conceiving that he can be capable of anything good, anything other than what is designed as harmful to at least us?

The version you were given involving the Times is sufficiently tortured to make him to the one to whom he spoke and in his own eyes seem like a man of honor. The initiative was not with the Times. This is but one of the factual differences. Think of this one aspect a bit. In short, however, as you conceive of a man who has already done this permitting anyone with Cyril's impeccable credentials see any of this stuff except for purpose of evil? I can't, not now, and I do not anticipate voluntary change on his part.

Think also about the one he considers his real client and compare that with his official client. The conflict is irreconcilable. And what indeed is not characterizations but fact that I can use, that confirms or seems to dispute my analyses. There can come a time when we can convert all this to good purposes. I would like to be able to see it as early as possible and be in the best possible position to make the effort.

I look back on a record that includes mistakes in judgement. But I also look back on one in which I'll compare my judgement with any <sup>with</sup> which you care to make a comparison. I will do this in any area, from people to finding things to opening sources-any aspect of the case. Now this is what I have to consider when I contrast my judgements with those of others, plus an important factor, how much of the totality does any other one now know. Those who now have the best knowledge are the least known. Don't kid yourself on this.

Ned is not alone in his hangups. We all have some. I didn't detect his early enough. I also didn't detect those of others as early as I should, although in some cases it

was earlier than it seems. Ask Gary, for example, about N.O. He was there.

So, I do look forward to your call next week, if it is possible. And I won't pump you for what you do not want to say. What I would like you to do is think over what you think you can say and what you think I have not understood that is significant and what I should know to fend the coming hurt off.

If a guy told you, "I'm telling you this in confidence, but I've just killed a 3-year-old with an abyonet", would you be morally bound to honor that confidence? This is not, of course, a close comparison, but I'm raising the ethical and moral questions we often face in such matters in exaggerated form so that you can see that for each there must be his own personal determination.

When you see the epilogue to PM you find a few apt (I think) quotations from the saints to Lincoln, to King to R.K. They are, essentially, on this point, although note used to address it or in that sense. The question is not new. What does one do when faced with evil? "Lincoln said ten angels swearing wouldn't make him right.

Don't be disappointed at rejections. And don't be conned by nice letters. They are more often to make the writer feel good and clean when he knows he is bad and filthy. In this business there are many men who can't do what they would like to and they are not happy about it. Until they come to realize they are whores.

Best regards,