

7/5/69

Dear Dick,

A phrase I've not heard in years recurs these days: bejiggered. I do not know if it is precise, but it comes to mind nightly, through the night, and very early in the morning, when the bidders that have so great an affinity for me make sleep impossible. If I walk outside and go near anything, I have a new supply, and they are a frightful nuisance. Application of Nupercinal give temporary respite, but despite earlier resolutions about longer sleep, etc., by the time 4 a.m. arrives I'M up again.

After daylight I have to go to town and the post office, which reminded me I have several notes for you that I haven't sent- I saw the envelope yesterday- hence this one.

I presume you are deep in your thesis work, as I am in the writing of the addition to COUP D'ETAT. What I have done is longer than either of Einstein's books and is far from complete. I began with an introduction explaining, which may, in the end, go before the first part and deals with what can and can not be published on this subject, from which I pick up with Vleir and Julie and with them Ray in England and back in the United States. They I deal with the events leading to the trial with Hanes. Next, with Foreman, the prelude to the micro-minitrial and the indecency itself, which is where I now am. From here I will be going into an assessment of the evidence, which is the immediate purpose of this letter. I may wind up with a chapter on black eddications. The longest single part will be on the evidence. Until I get into it I do not know how long. I can, with little difficulty, equal what I have already written.

One of the items of evidence I'll be analyzing is the effect of resting the rifle on the windowsill. You will recall I had but a rudimentary knowledge of the effect from our local store and that you gave me a scientific explanation of the vibrations which made sense of it for me and enables me to offer a much better explanation (I hope!). However, you were also going to try and get for me some pages from a standard text on this. If you haven't, okay. But if you have and have been too busy to send, I'd appreciate this now. I can always go back and add, which is a big enough drag because inevitably there are those things forgotten that are recalled in reading. However, it is possible that when Lil retypes the draft she will do it for the camera, which makes any addition enormously difficult, requiring much time and work and often, because of this, making the desired addition impossible.

I am more or less in touch with one of the brothers. As I put together what I had accumulated, the interest they had held in my thinking got greater. There is an open case for deep interest in both, as involved if with nothing else, with knowledge. If I knew more I might dismiss this. But in the back of my mind, beginning with the remarkable coincidence of John having seen James the day before he broke jail, this suspicion has lurked. I have written the brother with whom I am in contact, a man who obviously is not comfortable writing, asking certain information of him. I have done it in a way he will not find congenial and I have done this not by accident, for unless he has positive willingness to be helpful he'll merely waste lots of time for me...The one thing of Darnay's I recall using is the letter he got from the Yard. That is quite valuable because it is official and I have a directly contradictory and also official US statement. My own file of clippings was adequate on the rest. Of course, I credit him fully. But this, too, reminds me: you were going to send me a brief memo of your interview with Sneyd. I could still use it and I'd like to. I will not try and recall what you told me for that is to prone to induce error.

As I have gone over my Foreman material, it is utterly incomprehensible to me that he could so conduct himself. I think what he did here should get him disbarred. It looks worse assembled than it did in happening.

One other thing before I get back to work. I dropped you a note asking about Lifton. I believe I did not tell you why I asked if you are in contact with him and the nature of your relationship, if there is one. As time passes and I have not heard from you, I think I must tell you why, if too briefly. If you want longer explanation, and if you have had any kind of intimate contact, you should, please ask Gary, who lacks the personal involvement and can be accepted as more detached.

Until he began to wage what now seems like a fairly extensive campaign against me, proselytizing and all that, I had almost entirely ignored him and his nastiness. I was content with the explanation of my first and I believe only personal encounter, in December 1966, when I came to believe he has mental illness of some kind. I'd have avoided him then for other reasons would it not have been a personal embarrassment for my host. In October of last year I was astounded at the absolute manufactures he had fabricated and give wide distribution. Someone I was then visiting put them in my hand. He promised me a copy, as did Dave, but neither has sent them. I want them only as a matter of record. He apparently started the same thing with Gary. At one point he challenged Gary to challenge me. To answer I had to go over many files, going way back. But because Gary, for whom I have the highest regard and the warmest feeling, staked his integrity on his defense of me, I felt I had to respond with positiveness. I therefore made photocopies of what was relevant and supplied them to him with the restriction they not be circulated, which, right, with a nut like Dave, result in injury to others. Gary finds the exact opposite of what Dave alleges, as I think anyone would. However, aside from the wholehearted evil intent and total dishonesty this fastens upon Dave, it also reminds me of much I'd forgotten. For example, months before we'd met and before we'd had any contact, Dave was then doing precisely this same thing against me in Calif. and I found letters from others I'd then never met warning me of it. When I compare this with what Dave wrote me about my work, they entirely inconsistent. And when I add to this what he did to break up a scheduled, organized and disciplined debate I had scheduled with Liebeler, tailoring the rottenist liberals to accomplish it and blame it on me, I cannot ignore the possibility he was, at the very least, acting as Liebeler. I also found a letter from a friend of his telling me that he was helping Liebeler against Lane-almost three years ago. This cannot be explained in terms of Lane's character. And there are many other things. He has, for example, undertaken to cut off my contact with a number of people who had, in minor ways, been helping me. He succeeded. He not only had this intent but he has articulated it. And he was within his right in forming an instant dislike for me on hearing my name, for at the time he did so had nothing else to go on, I deny he has the right to interfere with our work and what cooperation we can achieve, little as that is for so many of us, and still be regarded as one of us.

The record makes the kindest comment I can summon describe him as sick and thereby dangerous to all of us. I think it warrants a more severe statement. Because he is bright, persistent, and of accomplished deviousness, a wily skill the natural endowment of which he has considerably enhanced with practice, he is both more persuasive and more hurtful. And because he is of a lack of character of afflicted with a sickness that causes it and is capable of the most open and complete misrepresentation, he has been able to do this evil with more success. When one is undeterred in manufacturing evidence to suit an argument, one can erect an imposing argument.

What he has done and what he has let slip makes me anxious to get to the root of certain aspects. This is why I want to know if you have been in contact and whether or not you have ever indicated to him the content of any of my

unprinted material. He seems to have had some reflection of this made to him. I am aware that it could have happened accidentally on your side or from whomever he learned. Of course, I am not suggesting what I do not have, any lack of confidence in you, not am I suggesting that you consciously did wrong. It is that I have come to know him and how he does what. He is quite bright and quite adept and in some cases he has not really hidden what he sought. In others he has bragged about achieving some of his end. If I were not concerned about what he has done and what I regard him capable of - and most of all of what he may yet do - I would not lavish this time upon it.

When I was in California toward the end of last year, it had been my intention, as on previous trips, to avoid and ignore him. Paul and Hal asked me to talk to him. We had a two-hour phone conversation. Because + had been told he takes everything, + also did. It is a shocking thing. This man is raving mad to suggest some of what he insists he not only believes but claims he has "proven" and will publish. It will do remarkable harm if he ever does. I cannot believe he will ever be able to do this commercially, it is that very bad. And he can be no more than uniquely sick. He was, for example, quite sincere when he phoned me the summer of 1966 to tell me he had absolute proof that the assassination was committed from papier mache trees in Dealey Plaza, and that access and escape were effected through tunnels in Dealey Plaza dug without detection, in the night, by Brown & Root, Johnson's friends. He was no less sincere, or so seeming, in October of last year when he assured me he has in his possession the certain and irrefutable proof that for the week before the assassination Johnson and Bush were meeting and plotting secretly all around Texas, forgetting that he had said precisely this about Johnson and Dulles with no less positiveness.

I must return to work. I hope you can find time to answer, for the potential for evil that lurks in the mind of this man, if not in his heart, is great. We must prepare ourselves for it.

Best regards,