Dear Paul, June 30, 1969

I am sorry if I caused you embarrassment by sending you copies of my most recent letters to Dave Lifton and the Newcombs. Dave made a big thing out of it in his most recent letter, including the sentence: "You're the one whose esteem will go down in the eyes of others if you act recklessly regarding my long relationships with either Fred or Paul." Whether or not Dave is projecting his own motives or attitudes, or just over-reacting I don't know, but I had no such intents. For quite some time I have been defending Dave to his many detractors, while at the same time corresponding with him in hopes of keeping lines of communication open. I have offered him help with a number of things, and in areas, such as the archives, where his knowledge is very incomplete. No matter what the grapevine was saying when I first made contact with the critics in 1966, or what it has said since, I was determined to try to promote cooperation. The next thing I knew Dave was making all sorts of vicious charges about Harold, including charges that he was a liar, a thief, etc., and then he went so far as to question my judgment for even associating with a liar and a thief. So, I began a time consuming reply (of which Harold was unaware for quite some time) to his charges, and also charges made by Fred Newcomb which were quoted from Dave, or which suddenly developed, almost out of the blue, after his close association with Dave began. Next, charges of a spurious nature and theories were constructed about me, and Fred and Marlynn sent cold hostile letters for some time. So again I foolishly wasted time in replying. Since Dave involved other critics such as Bill O'Connell and Lillian Castellano in this, and even attributed things to Maggie Field, and finally attributed comments about Harold to unnamed"close associates" of his who had read his manuscripts (which I found hard to believe), I decided that my long replies to them, although typed off the top of my head without concern for sentence structure, should perhaps go to a few other people who had been drawn into this, at least by implication. Dave, for instance, has cited the fact that you take him seriously as proof that he is OK to new buffs who are critical of his fake grassy knoll theory, etc. Ironically, I too take him seriously in terms of the fact that he has done some hard research work and has been with the case for a long while, although I am a bit unsure of what the final result would be. I did not intend to draw you into this in any fashion, and in fact, would consider it a trajedy if you were to waste time on this for any reason I only meant to leave a bit of a record around in case Dave's slanders were being spread far and wide, as some of them have in the past. In addition, I have been quite disturbed by his mention of the fact that he has helped people like me out of the"bag" we're in--confused, misdirected, and "immature" in our logic as we are.

The secretary just brought in the mail with a package from you, so I guess that I'll read through it in case there is a letter from you.

Thanks for return of the stuff. In the future send it as printed matter since there is no rush. I will try to manage to package more of the stuff for you. From the first two lines of your letter I guess that Dave made more of my sending you copies of those letters than you did.

Thanks for checking for 1330. I am sending for it again (I think forthe 3rd time!). I will send a copy when it arrives. A guy in NY is doing some checking for me which willl help in preparing the memo. You probably remember that CD 1373, the classified doc. which I got, dealt with him. Do you know anyone in West Germany who could help with him. He could be an important character.

I don't know yet whether or not Forman has changed his ideas given the Panel report. His analysis as far as I am concerned suffers from the fact that he accepts the autopsy as truthful in terms of its descriptive data, which I don't, and which the facts suggest can't be done with the certainty with which he does it. I am planning a reply to him, but first should put all of my work on the autopsy into a memo--something I never find time to do, even though it was originally supposed to be the medical appendix to Tink's book. I promised it to Ray and to Sylvia some time ago, but just get bogged down in work.

I have always disagreed with Tink's locating of the second rear gunman on the Records Bldg. and contest his angles, except the vertical alone, althoggh Forman's points on that are corredt and show that the 27 degree angle isn't absolute. Furthermore, given slight mistakes in the ~~a~~ angles positions of the neck and back wounds his analysis is not absolute in terms of the lateral angle and the Commission could be right. I find his analysis more of a reply to the Commission (like Mark Lane) than a reconstruction of what probably happened. So, although many of the observations he makes are very good and very useful, I am not acdepting of his final conclusions. The Panel report, of course, changes a few things.

I don't think that the N.O. trial transcript is worth $2500, but what do you think of the Ford Foundation offering something like $50,000 to tape the trial? Unfortunately, some of the testimor is wanted by I'm sure all of us; like Finck.

My N.O. stuff does have limits, but when I get time I will try to send large packages. I am hampered by my usual work on the case, trying to get my committee working, speaking engagements, and of course, school work. The latter has been neglected a bit, and given that my PhD prelims are coming up in the early Fall, that is a matter of some concern. I should also be getting my dissertation research set up, writing a paper, and pursuing some worthwhile research. One of my pet theories about autistic children has suddenly found some corroboration, and I should be pursuing it, since it has much relevence for treating them. Right now I am working with a 3 year old girl, who was about 2 1/2 when I started. Autistic kids are very withdrawn, and unless you can somehow breakthrough, they will spend their entire lives in institutions.

Fredd mentioned getting a copy of your analysis, and is working on a reply to your letter. At the time he sent it to me, his relations with me were so strained, and Dave and he were so busy trying to give a sinister interpretation on everything I wrote him, that any constructive criticism from me would have been viewed as nastiness on my part. So I hoped that others would write him questic since I thought that while his work and ideas were good, they should have received devil's advocac from other than Dave and Marlynn prior to publication. It was bad, for instance, to impeach an important witness like Bowers, without careful thought.

Your ideas on exchanging documents look OK to me, although I fear that I will never find time befo next fall to catalogue my stuff and see what I have. So much of my stuff is filed by name, and not cross indexed, and much is not even filed. I am just far too over-extended and really can't see anyway to alieviate the situation.

Do you have info on Larry Crafard. I now have a woman on my committee who knows the volumes about as well as I do and who shares my interest in Crafard. She is preparing a long memo on him and his family, but thus far is constricted by no knowledge of the archives--something I hope to correct soon. But I have not done a full archives search on him, and have been concentrating on other areas. From what we know and have discussed, he is more of a suspect than I originally thought, and I hope to do some field work once I get some current addresses. Also, do you know anyone who has interviewed Carol Jarnegan. He is an old interest, and like Crafard, is another guy who Lane expressed interest in, but never did anything about, at least as of last Spring. I would like to interview Sterling, and also share your idea about old ex-cops. If you get any more ideas, or there is anything I can check for you there, or photograph, please let me know.

Well, I'd better go now. Best wishes.

Gary

cc:Harold