12/28/71

Dear Gary,

Glad to hear from you, as was Lil, who sends thanks. I'm responding to your 12/23, which just came, right away because you will be having to make plans.

Let's get the unpleasant over with first. Your general comments on the desirability of editing, etc., are irrelevant to the problem that we faced. In general, I am in accord with this, as you know, and you should recall my efforts, at Matt's suggestion, to get some help from Vince on it. If we disagree on how I can best spend my time - and I feel that with nobody else spending full time on this I must not spend it in the fruitless quest for literary acceptability - there is no dispute that editing is good. I want it, solicit it, and agree that any other mind can come up with something. With regard to what I had already done of PH, others had gone over it and, as you know, I had asked you to. Howard, Bernabei and Hoch, I am confident, did it with some care. So it is not that I had not subjected this to testing. I did incorporate most of the suggestions.

What Ned proposed was acceptable, and I did accept it. He then started making unilateral changes in his concept, including of himself, his judgement and knowledge, and finally of his role. In every case that comes to mind his judgement was wrong, his understanding of fact too limited, leading to wrong judgement, and he blindly insisted in not only imposing his over mine but that I acceed to his because his was superior, for various immature reasons. In the end he had gotten onto what he may not realize is a get-Kennedy kick, and that I cannot be part of. My chief concern with the editing was that it be faithful to the work. I think that is a minimum. Other than that, with so much that had to be left out anyway, I wasn't really concerned. Now when he got far past that and then actually believed that all the whores would fall down and beg for mercy as soon as he appeared (only because he has wealth and "connections"), this whole thing got past being just too great an assault on my integrity, something for which Ned has had no concern that he has reflected. It got rabidly insane, presented new and unnecessary hazards, and became an overt breach of the original agreement, that no use be made of my work or the evidence I had gotten. You are one of my authorities for saying I'm not paranoid. But some of this new stuff hurts powerful people. I have to be crazy not to be aware of that, their capabilities and recent history. So I made this stipulation, to which Ned agreed. There was but one exception, if he could reach Cowles through Harder, and to that that one use, if it could lead to a publishing contract, I did agree. I gave him copies under this restriction. To date I have not gotten them back and have not gotten any answer, and whether he is working on his disertation (as his wife always wanted anyway) or otherwise busy, there is no reason consistent with integrity of purpose or decency that I can think of that can explain his refusal to return these things, <u>without</u> keeping <u>any</u> copies. Again I ask you, busy as you are, to try and see to it that this is done <u>now</u>.

On your trip here: I am supposed to go to NYC to do a TV show 1/15. While it will not surprise me if this is cancelled, as of now it is on. I am planning to do another necessary thing at that time. I may, in fact, go there 1/14. I'll return 1/16. With your DC conference scheduled to end of the 17 and your return due 1/21, I think the best plan would be for you to come here from there. I can get you and I can deliver you to the airport 1/21. You can then both visit and rest. I'll be taking Lil to work a.m.s, and you can sleep at least until I return, which will be about 9:30. Thus, should we bat the gums until late, it need not come out of your sack time, and I think you'll want a bit of recuperation before returning to Mpls. On a cheap hotel: I'm out of contact with that these days. I think Bud would provide quarters for you, as he did for PH. He generally goes into DC to get there about 9:30 a.m., but when he is busy can get to his office by 7:00. I have a friend in Takoma Park, George Abbott's father, who would probably have a room for you, too. The bus trip from there would take close to an hour, though it is close to Walter Reed, not really far out of downtown. Currently Jim Lesar has a house guest. Let me know if you want me to try and arrange something like this. Other-

wise, what may ultimately be cheapest is getting or sharing a room in the hotel in which the conference will be held, for if the room rate is higher, the saving in cabs and time may more than offset it. When I speak to Bud and/or Jim, I'll ask about a cheaper hotel. But until you hear otherwise, don t expect any constructive suggestion.

Jaffe:I'll send you redrafted copy. Time has dimmed your recall. What you here says really gets back to the Ned problem. Vince's paranoia took a different form, the suspicion that this was a contrivance to foist off fake film on Carrison. It was not the weakness and stupidity of their case, for we anticipated that as a matter of law they could have no case. Otherwise, there'd have been no participation by me and probably not by Bud in that case. The very simple fact that no amount of savvy could circumvent that Vince just persisted in ignoring is that once we had the reading by the panel it was not possible to produce any film at all different. How could they? They were hoist on their panel petard. For what Vince did in this he ought never be forgiven.

With all the things that can be done and should be, I think pursuing the young Jaffe angle any further is not worth what can reasonably be expected from him, if, indeed, anything can be. Fosher's reasons for doing what he did may be complex or they may be simple, but I see no reason for conjecturing when at some point he may have to face his record, what he did and didn't do.

So, I suggest that you come here by way of NYC and Phila, going back to Mpls from here. That will give you less travelling, lower costs, and a chance to rest. Unless I hear otherwise from you, that is what I'll expect. Jerry will be here day after tomorrow and I'll discuss all of this with him.

One request: you can t begin to imagine how painful to both Lil and me both Vince and Ned have been. Your's is an academic concept. We had the realities. So, while I am willing to discuss with you anything you may want to (and I have no particular interest in discussing either), it would be better if we avoided both when Lil is present. She can't forgive Vince for what he did to WHITEWASH, so what he did thereafter was really disagreeable to her.

Best regards,

Dear Harold,

Dec. 23, 1971

Sorry to take so long to answer all those letters. I dropped you a post card from SF to let you know that I was just too overburdened to write. I took a cold with me to SF which got worse, and ended up with bronchitus which laid me up for a week. The conference in SF turned out to be sceduled from 9 AM to about 11 PM practically every day, so I saw Hal and Paul only once. I did enjoy my brief visit with them.

At present I am more overextended than usual, partly as a result of having finally gotten someimportant committee positionships. Unfortunately, when such opportunities come along one must grab them or the time is lost. I wish uthey had waited a few years, however, to be frank. The most imposing problem at present is my dissertation,which I have still not begun. It is suddenly very important since I am considering leaving my job at Mpls. Clinic of Psychiatry and Neurology. I am under much pressure there and am having trouble dealing with the crazy way the psyghiatrists run theplace. Our Psychology Dept. is just not giving me the support I need, and as low man on the totem pole, when anger is acted out against psychologists it is usually against me. If the psychiatrists would do somethinking and stop playing God it would be easier to live with them. So, as the new year approaches my future is a bit uncertain. I hope to be able to start full time at Walk-In this July, but that depends on our getting refunded, something which will be up in the air for months. Otherwise, I am in trouble. Some of us are still thinking about setting up a group practice outside Mpls. Clinic.

I will be in Washington during the middle of January for the National Free Clinic Convention. I plan to come for extra time and spend that ### with you and Lil as we discussed before. I also plan tovisit my parents, and Jerry in New York since I want to see some of their clinics anyway. With so much to do, I haven't been able to nail down my schedule. During the convention (14th to 17th) I should stay somewhere in Washington so that I can attend the heavily scheduled event and also be able to go to dinner with a spend evenings with others attending. One of my main reasons for going is to make contacts and meet other free clinic people. I was hoping simply to set aside a coupla of days, either before or after the conference, when I could stay at your place. Any ideas about an inexpensive hotel to stay at inside Washington? That seems like the best idea, despite the expense.

In your letterof 11/13 you detailed your need for experts to testify in court. I strongly suggest# that you find someone in the East because of the expense involved otherwise. I really don't know anyone to suggest for that type of case, and strongly suggest that you try to get help through Ralph Nader's group. They should know the right kind of experts. One thing I think you will have to keep in mind here is that there may be some sort of statute of limitations, and furthermore that the most important expert to have testify, to the best of my knowledge, is the doctor(s) who attended both you and Lil at the time. Their testimony would be necessary along with the medical records. Those records would be essential I think. With Nader's growing interest in both ecological issues and mental health, he would probably know who to consult. I can tell you for certain that Meehl would not be interested in that he is very busy and tends to stay away from such issues. We can discuss this further when I visit, but I doubt that I couldhelp in termsof locating experts. Ned did fill me in on this stuff, apologizing for having forgotten.

I was glad to hear that your Dallas trip was so rewarding. The only way to get things done there is to go yourself. Mary still has not done those small errands she promised 3 years ago, and I have given up asking. Those memos may remain undone indefinitely given my shortageof time. Mary sent a Christmas card and said that she enjoyed your trip.and visit. Your work never ceases to amaze me. On this same subject, I would like to reiterate a point I have made a number of times but which does not seem to

get understood between us. It comes up continually with regard to references to Ned. I have great respect for your work and ability, and for you as a human being as well as a Warren Report critic. This is not changed by# the fact that you, like the rest of us, make mistakes and misjudgements, or that I disagree with you on some issues. Much of this case has no absolutes, only degrees of belief# and strength of argument. You never need to prove to me that you are a considerate or concerned person, or that you are able to do amazing things# investigatively. But this does not mean that others cannot be of help or be correct, even if they are neonates in the material dealing with the assassinations. Paul Meehl, for whom I worked for 3 years, is considered one of the brightest psychologists in the world, and has made sig. contributions to statistics, psychology (in several subareas, ranging from learning theory to clinical and applied areas), law, etc. Yet he shares the same experiences I have had with regard to novices providing us with new insights or ideas, or correcting some of our own. I, for instance, sometimes challenged his modeof presentation or argument, or the examples he used, in papers which were far beyond my ability to conceptualize or really critically examine. He had me read them for just this reason. When I wrote articles for the Star-Tribune I had a number of people read them who knew little about the case, and then asked some particularly rational# thinkers and a lawyer to go over them. With their help I changed my style and some of the content and I think the articles benefitted. I personally feel that the final presentation may outrank the background research in# importance, and that your massive work on the assassinations would have had far greater political and social significance had you stopped investigating at times to edit and re-edit. This is an old point of debate that I don't care to redebate, because it is impossible to reach a solution. I merely want to state that I do feel that, especially at this late date, the manner in which such data is presented is crucial to it's having a real effect.on many people. One no longer has to convince people that the government, at the highest levels, is corrupt. Most seem to believe it. Demonstrating some specific paths of action to begin undoing the problem fromthe assassinationon vantage point does seem quite useful. I am not against just writing an accurate history of this, but I guess I hope that we can get more mileage out of what has been discovered.

As for the thing with you and Ned, I presume that both of you were at times excessively rigid or sensative, and that both of you were, on some points unreasonable (as I would have judged should I have been there). I am likewise sure that I have been the same myself at times, and know of many instances in this case to which I look back with regret in termsof my own carelessness, rigidity, or even stupidity. Without reconstructing this, it is good to remember that as human beings we have lots of needs and some of them are wrapped up in this case. While I would like to think that my involvement is just a search for justice and the truth, I'm sure there's a bit more to it. The whole episode was a painful thing for all parties involved, and wasted much time. What more can I say. And again I would like to reiterate what I said at the time of the initial agreement between you and Ned--that it would have to first stand the test of seeing how it would work in practice with Ned actually doing what he wanted and both you and he judging whether you could live with it.

I have no contact with the group called "The Process" although I know that there is a group which considers Manson a Christ-like martyr. Much of the counter culture has at one time or another construed it as a "political cation" (the killings that is). Thanks for the clippings. I don't believe that pot causes brain damage--Wecht was on TV the other night and did a nice job refuting it. The other clippings were interested.

While not seeing Ned very often and not really knowing him# that well, I sincerely doubt that he plans any sort of public use of your material. He is now back at work on his dissertation and not doing much on the assass.

Reading more recent letters from you, thanks again for offers to stay at your place. But that just doesn't seem like a good idea given my schedule, the importance of meeting with other convention delegates, and the imposition to you in terms of driving me into Washington each time. I would rather arrange to spend a coupla of days with you and Lil exclusively. I do need recommendations for cheap Washington hotels. The conference goes from the evening of Friday the 14th of Jan through nnon on Monday the 17th. I want to spent a short time visiting the Washington area free clinics also. The problem is that I have to decide whether to visit you before or after the convention, since I plan to travel east beforehand and don't have to be back until the 21st or 22nd. I have, basically, to decide what meetings I can miss before coming east--that will determine my date of departure. The total span is the 9th to the 21st in termsof what is possible, and the time I am most likely to spend with you are the days adjacent to the convention. While the idea of renting a car is a good one I had not thought of, given the travel time and my need to meet with as many otherfree clinic people as possible in a short time, it would not be advantageous.

On Patsy, that WDSU footage did turn up several years ago, and I wrote you about it and you suggested that I keep it for the time being sinee you might want more work done on it. All those prints I sent you and Paul came from it after he found it. I still don't understand that episode and have to admit to some lingering distrust of Patsy, although he's a hellof a likeable guy personally. I haven't seen him in at least two years, probably more than that in fact. Theprints you have cover everyone on that film. If you have any further ideas please let me know.

I disagree somewhat with the wording of the page of PM you sent me. Without further contact w/ Jaffe, I would wonder about dropping the line "they were troubled by the weakness of the medical evidence" to something like: Uncertain of the medical evidence. After that sentence I would add a comment about the likelihood that some had questions about the general din of battle surrounding the medical evidence in the case, and at least one (Jaffe) knew of Wecht's questions. The last sentence in that paragraph should read "at least one of these lawyers" rather than "these lawyers" since we only know about Jaffe. I would add also a statement to the effect that it is likely that the JD walked into court assuming that it had the case, and that the lawyers had no idea they had no case. In fact, the stupidity and weakness of their case caused two critics (Vince S. and myself) at the least) to suspect that this might be a ploy to get the critics in introduce their evidence before a federal judge who then could say that it was not convincing and thus submerge our case in propaganda. At the time both you and Bud were incredulous of the stupidity of their case, although you reached different conclusions about where to go from there. Fisher's talk is the explanation, although that leaves us with a new mystery--why did Fisher have an ax to grind? I still wonder about recontacting Dan Jaffe (I have heard he is a law student at Georgetown U. Law School) to go over this stuff again for more details, and to see if there were subsequent discussions. I think Fisher's role is still one of the biggest unsolved problems--it was a lot easier to think the JD set it all up.

I'll write as soon as I have my January schedule figured out. Sorry for all this inconvenience. The Mental Health, Ment. Retardation, and Inebriety committee is having a number of January meetings as is the Drug Dependency council whose final report is due at the end of Jan. Fortunately the latter is ending. But the former promises much workif I am to have input to help change the inequities in the system. I have important Walk-In meetings early in January, and we reapply for funding by the end of January. And the Mpls Clinic stuff is all coming to a head. So this is no holiday. I really need a rest. Hope to see you people soon.

Warm regards, Gary