3/12/71

Dear Gary,

If Ned is interested in an appraisal of Roberts and of his role and depednability asa critic of "critics", that touted Newsweek (3/1/71) piece prowides a good measure.

What a childish Epsetinism!

To know something about the U-2 a radar operator, with crypto and at least secret clearance, with intiminate knowledge of even the thenunknown height-seeking radar, had to have access to the hnagers? What did he do with his radar, scratch his crotch.

Wothout checking the quotes, I think LHO's statement about giving away secrets was more specific.

This is not to suggest that he had any purpose connected with the U-2, for I'd never believed that and thought I'd talked Powers' ghost out of it.

But what kind of repertirial genius is it that lets itself be conned by that access-to-hanger bit? And for a radar operator, to book!

Didn't the U-2s also fly aut of Santa Ana?

No less a diveraion is the suggestion that LHO might have "compromised" the U-2. Russian electronics were not that primitive. It was no secret. And there is little doubt their other intelligence told them all they needed to know. I may be wrong, but I think some had downed in China by then anyway.

From what Roberts says (I haven't seen the file yet) there was never any reason for withholding to begin with. I'm not uninclined to believe there is what Roberts didn't understand.

In its more elemental form the reporting is amatuer. Example: not 85 "documents" were declassified but manh more documents. Files called documents were declassified in two ways: all and part. So, even if is is okay to confuse the word "documents", taken by most to mean a single paper of one or more sheets with the strange use of "Documents" to mean files, not all of each was released.

I don't meanx this is anitpicking. With all I'm into now I write only because I like Ned much, he seems both serious and very decent, and I hate a guy like that to be conned by finks. He is like I began, I guess, trusting everybody. But I don't want him at some later date to be asking himself how did he let himself be suckered by the slickers. He might feel badly. Roberts is not the first smooth, polite, sometimes interesting whore, of any kind.

Aside from new legal work, have a non-face-to-face confrontation with Percy Foreman in NYC next week, and a couple of shows (radio). Jerry is doing great pr things, which the publisher isn't (he doesn't even have a bio or pix)....Another letter from Eiderberg. I'll answer...I've not heard from Rennar since before you last did...Except in what he wrote you, there has never been any change between Paul and me, not from the corres. You have everything I sent him,sso you can estimate that way. I don't think that to criticize him means to write him or anyone else off. He didn't like it and he undoubtedly took it hard. But that melonry is not out, is it? Gotta rush,

Best

, and thanks to you both for the effort at the papers