10/28/69

Dear Gary,

Miles seperate us, but we seem to have a way of reading and anticipating each other. You should find, if you read the eletters I have written you recently, that your experiences re: Lifton are clearly anticipated in my ellipsis, made more so by your ecstatic comments. The key, it seems to me, is in the part of a letter where, if I recall correctly, I say I have yet to get a single thing I asked for and was promised.

On your question, who could I have written, I have checked my correspondence with Mal back to the first of September. The only thing that could be tortured into anything of this sort is in connection with the possibility of my going out there. I said I was not interested in radio-TV time in vacuuo but would prefer to get together with him, Paul, Jim, etc., and "this means that unless you and Paul were to have strong contrary recommendations, No Lifton, No Newcombs, No Jaffe, no Turner", which is not even positive, for I permit them the ultimate decision (as I did a year ago). For the most part, and always except when it is inappropriate, I send you and Paul the same thing, when I send you what I do not send him (as on Lifton, and a recent case comes to mind). Note last sentence in my 10/23 re Bradley, which is not at all this. 9/26 there is a reference no subject to this interpretation at all. You have it. 9/11, 3rd paragraph, ditto. Read last long par. 9/3, which might be so misinterpreted. But this is not the past couple of days and is for specific reasons, given. It is not only in connection with litigation, where secrecy is essential, but, were I to chose to argue, this qualifies as my material for I located it and made arrangements for it to be made available to those who I think can now put it to constructive use. This is certainly my right, whether or not it is what Dave told you - and it is less than that.

In short, it appears to be false. Which would also appear to be typical.

However, as to who got Finck and Frazier: Sylvia and Bernabei, besides you and me. Sylvia got hers the night of the 21st, when I was with her. I do not recall that we discussed Dave. Perhaps we did. And I know of no reason why either should have told him they were getting it, given the relationship each has reflected to me in response to specific requests from me for an accurate reflection (at the time of the Nichols flap, you may recall, where Dave was close enough to the truth).

It is not only that I want total disassociation from Dave. I also have horrors of the kinds of distortions with which he conjures. We can survive few more. I recall what you may have thought of: he is devious enough to have gotten word and to have presented it to you this way for his own sneaky purposes. However, if one were to be really paranoid, he could have learned from those who learned from interceptions. ...Long time ago I told Paul, Mal and Bernabei, as well as you, that I want nothing I send given or indicated to him. This is not mere reciprocation, not merely self-defense because of his unending efforts at theivery which he doesn't even both to call anything else, but because, as I have made clear to you, there is his long record strongly suggesting he is not, for whatever reason, stable or necessarily without wrong connections. In this connection, please note carefully my yesterday's or enclosed memo on that Liebeler memo. It may be a giveaway,

Are you not yet at the point where you've learned everything connected with him is a losing thing? If he has something good, he'll not give it to you. If he brings it out and it can help, that will be without you. He has nothing he could give, and what he has he doesn't. Why persist in futilities and the waste of time for which there is so much constructive use? I also suggest you pay close attention to the postscript to your 10/25 letter to Mary....And what I am more concerned about is the use to which I put material, what I find it in that others haven't or do not. I do not want it misused.

If there us anything unreasonable in this attitude, please refute me by telling me what of value you have gotten from him, anything more than a crumb to accredit him? Even his dishonest book, where he hides my having discovered and two years earlier published the essence of the Waring transcript, which is how he got it, or of my having written a bonk-length but partical analysis of theex. sess. and sent it to Paul because he had told me it was nothing but old-women trivialities (hence Dave could have learned of it this way), there is nothing new in it. He pretends otherwise. The Liebeler memo was known from Epstein on.

I have yet to change my mind about Fred/,arlyn, and by now you are seeing I am right, for therei is reflection in your letter. These people have minds that do not make possible what they want, so they do irresponsible work or take that of others and pretend it is being stolen from them. I started Fred on his Film work, as he told me, with my writing. He went into little I didn't indicate. I told them of the character of the JG Z film, and you get the opposite. These are intellectual bankrupts.

You must do your thing. But I wish it did not involve association with such characters, for you waste yourself and despite your best efforts, inadvertently you tell them what we cannot benefit from their knowing. But as long as you persist, I'll take the time for responses.

Of course, I'm delighted at the MMPI reading. However, suddenly and fo no apparent reason the apprehensive feeling increased Sunday a.m. It was when I was at the top of the steps and suddenly felt faint, weak. Not like I was about to faint, but weak. I sat down for a while, and my legs felt very heavy. Until that moment, if anything, I'd been feeling a little easier. Since then it has been worse. I cannot be certain, but I believe the continuing and real deterioration of my knees may be the cause. The diagnosis is arthritis. The doctor is so certain he didn't even re-examine them Friday. This troubles me more than it otherwise would, aside from the existing condition, because with the back injury I need and use my knees more. The substitute for what others use the back for, with me. The back injury is very real, not psychosomatic. I hurt it in a boating accident in 1939 and it rarely deters me. I do what I would whether or not it is bothering me. I have never had difficulty with it doing hard, heavy wokk (since the initial injury), but only from a careless moment in too-rapid picking up a light thing, like a sheet of paper. In mys own thinking, perhaps the absence of meaningful help in combatting-even understanding and analyzing the condition causes the aggravation. However, the New York trip may have caused this increase. Perhaps there is more of a feeling of frustration, some depression. I just cannot separate myself enough to analyze, which I presume is not unusual. I also think that the best possible medicine would be some good news for a change.

I'll say nothing of what you hint re: Dave to anyone. I would not without your request. I rarely mention him to Paul, believing when I had the real hassle I said all that was necessary. What I'd like to do, however, is hear tapes of his comversations with you. The tapes everything. I think I might find the missing link in this way. The Receda thing is a dead giveaway except on motive. You have, I think, recognized that from what I sent you. If not, compare it with his charges. For your own protection, keep yout ape recorder by your phone and ready....I just ntoice, you misunderstood. I do not have "persistent lower-back pain". Most of the time I have no pain at all. It is just some kinds of twists, etc, that bring it one. Manipulation can sometimes end it immediately...I also wonder is what I think I can without paranoia say is a rather large effort against me from various sources is part of the cause of this? People do not pay money they admit they owe and I have none; publishers will not touch the subject; people borrow and do not return materials; Dave's bit, with so much lusty collaboration, (which in time is close to the recognition of it, but I now realize I've had "anxiety

for a long time, and there is no doubt the symptoms, if not the diagnosis, is in my medical records), and many other things with enough of which you are familiar may have combined. Penn was hard for me to take. I was really shocked at the rottenness of Fred's claims, and, I believe, deeply hurt at Dave's representation of Maggie's and Bill's statements, at the failure of the San Diego committee to pay me what they owe or to answer at least a half-dozen errors. Continuing my own analysis, the realization I must do this work at a slower pace disturbs me not only because I regard it as important, but I want to get most of it behind me. Also contributing is the conviction that no one is doing any of the writing I plan and only you, Paul and Jim and Dick are, to my knowledge, doing any meaningful research. When to this is added the financial strain and its measureable consequences, I can understand why. Probably what makes it worse is my inability to alleviate it or to isolate the precipitating cause(s). Perhaps the secret beliefs some of them may be personal is the answer. I do not know. I have never discussed any of this with you and now cannot.

I've rambled long enough. I've been working on my notes on the Finck testimony, which I'd read on the train last week. It is almost lunchtime, and I also want to get that over with. Until I learn more I think I'll not trouble anyone but you with a copy, to go no further, in any way. When Bud is back from England I'll have to go over it with him for the suit.

I hope I haven't overlooked anything.

Brst,

UNIVERSITY OF *Minnesota*

MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

Oct 25, 1969

Dear Harold,

Sorry that you spent money to send back the MMPI test booklet--I swiped that one so you could keep it and avoid postage back. I have scored the test but will wait for a day or so before mailing you my impressions. In brief, my initial eyeball impressions are that you are clearly not crazy or paranoid or anything like that, and that you are basically in pretty good shape psychologically, with a profile at least as normal as mine. Much of your present distress probably has to do with realistic problems and it is noteworthy that you are holding up quite well psycholggically. I was pleasantly surprised. Most college kidg taking prelims are in very bad shape compared to your present trouble.

On Betzner I will try to arrange so that you can see them, but you are wrong about the negative. These are beigg made from the original negatives and so John's man won't have one. I will try to get him to blowup the faces in the crowd in Betzner 2. To be very frank, Betzner 1 is useless but I wanted it for the record--it shows the car on Houston. Betzner 2 shows the crowd at the corner of Elm and Houston and that's all that is worthwhile in it. I am going to try to anticipate what I want and get the proper blowups made by John's man.

On the Body chart, I haven't had a call from Henry yet, but will act as soon as I do. Meanwhile I will try to find this old Mlps. number.

Thanks for your letter of 10/18 with enclosures. I just remembered something I forgot to ask you--Do you have persistent lower back pain? If so the MMPI can tell whether or not its psychosomatic with accuracy approaching 100%. As for individual items, there is nothing I could discuss about your answers since there is little or nothing we know about individual items responses. A week from now if you were to retake the test the profile, unless you had undergone a marked change due to anxiety, etc., would look about the same, but the individdal items you answered might be quite different. The test was put together entirely in an empirical fashion. In brief areas of psychopathology were decided upon as important, and then items were devised which were felt might tap these areas. Then, groups were assembled who were high or low on these traits, such as a depressed vs. non-depressed group for the D or depression scale, the # 2 scale on the test. Through long and careful items analysis prodedures, the best items were chosen and scales were made. Then studies were done in reverse to determine whether or not certain scale patterns, or profiles, indicated certain things. In other words, a certain score on 2 means many different things, depending on where the other scales are. This gets back to the basic point in my memos on the Sirhan psychiatric testimony: that the testimony about what items on the MMPI Sirhan failed to answer was pure quackery. In fact, to be very frank, while I sent you this test in order to help if I could (it's frustrating to be at a distance when a friend is having problems and overwhelmed by work), I also felt that it would serve a dual purpose of teaching you a bit about the test. Then perhaps you will realize why I feel that the psychiatric testimony is very suspect. The reason I feel this is so incredibly important is that it strongly suggests that one of two things is true: 1. Sirhan is normal or 2. Sirhan was trying to fake insanity and is normal. Either one, particularly the latter, is damning.

Your analytic approach to the test was very refreshing, although your analysis, as I mention above, goes into areas which we do not understand. Thus far we feel fortunate to have a good empirically derived test that is useful. Undoubtedly if we could further understand how each item works we would know much more.

After seeing your MMPI I have decided to tell you something which I was going to keep from you and investigate on my own until I informed you. I ask you to do nothing in the way of writing people about this until we have discussed it fully, although I realize that I am being very presumptuous in asking such a thing. From what I know of guys my age, bringing this subject up without careful thought and checking could be harmful.

What it boils down to is this. Lifton called last night at 10 PM, the first call (or letter, etc.) in a long while. He was raving as usual. One never knows whether the purpose of his calls is to pump for something specific or pump in general with a scattershot approach. I think that the visit to Mary shook him th the care, because he undoubtedly has the minimal insight necessary to realize how he affects people. In addition, he projects his own coniving and double dealing on to others so as to be constantly paranoid. Well, in any event, my tape recorder wasn't set up and I had had a few beers, so my recollections may not be 100% accurate, but here they are: First of all, he was hot under the color about my alleged backstabbing of him. There were two facets to this backstabbing, the first being that I had told people, or someone, that he was serious about the guys in the trees add that it would be in his book. I pointed out to him that I had never believed that the fake grassy knoll was ##### for real until he had assured me that it was, and never dreamed that he would use it in his book, until he assured me that he had proof and that I would eat my words when the book came out, and that he convinced George Rennar and others that he believed it, and that he told me he dictated the story about it to Esquire for their compendium of assassination theories. He became quiet, but started up later. Now, Harold, this could only refer to one person--Mary. What ## I suspect is that she mentioned that my distrust of him had to do with the fake knoll theory, etc., and that he got worried as he well should have that she would think him a nut (my being a psychologist must have increased his paranoia). I have written to Mary about this and expect a bit of an explanation since I suspect nothing improper on her part. (This may serve to show her how way out Lifton is, if things happened the way I suspect.) This is not what worries me, I will get to the worry below. The second alleged backstabbing is the craziest thing from Fred yet--that I allegedly told Fred not to give his "Last Train" stuff to Dave, and to give it to me and Sylvia instead so that we could do a monograph on it! This I allegedly wrote him in a letter. I asked for a copy. As I pointed out to Dave, it makes a lot of sense other than for the following details: I barely know Sylvia and the last time we spoke on the phone she was raving at me; it would have been a foolhardy way of doing it if that was my objective; it is totally out of character for me, even as they know me; Dave was far closer to Fred than I when this must have happened; and Fred was already accusing me of theft, etc. at the time. Well, on to the trouble. Dave seemed very interested in getting the Shaneyfelt and Zapruder testimony and felt that I might be able to do this for him. He claimed that he got two letters from people yesterday telling him that you had cautioned them not to let him have the Finck and Frazier testimony. Therefore, I would like to know who got copies of that testimony, and who might you have told something of that sort, or something which could have been distorted to that when third hand. I am not absolutely certain that there are two, but he did say or suggest it at one ppint, and there is definitely one involved. Dave does have copies of both person's testimonies, and in fact is trying to make money by selling some extra copies of it if he can, since he can get xeroxing done for free. For myself, it pains me to see Dave profit from something which he did everything in his power to fight--the Shaw trial. But for the present, anything which can increase the probability that he will finally publish that damned book is for the best. I wrote Mary to get her to push him to get the book out. I don't have a copy of my early morning letter handy, but will try to find it before I mail this. In any event, enclosed is a copy of my afternoon letter. Please return it, or both if both are enclosed.

By now you know that Bradley called because I suggested it. I don't know whether it will be of any value, but certainly might. You might get him to get off the backs of a few of the innocent parties such as the San Diego Committee, etc. Perhaps he knows something, although from what Mary says he doesn't know much of anything of value. In any event I felt that you might like to meet him. I talked to him about our mutual distrust and dislike of Lane and Turner, and of our questioning his arrest, etc., so that may have something to do with his pleasant attitude.

Well, I'd better close now. Best wishes. I hope that you and your wife are feeling OK when this letter reaches you.

Gary