

5/10/70

Dear Dick,

Two straight 90-degree days, two more forecast, and I've not been able to deleaf the pool yet! I've had other outside things I've had to do, like planting 85 narcissi today, which sure worked up a sweat.

Thanks for the clips. You are confused. 1984 began in 1983.

Have you heard from Mayhew? Do you think you should write him about me or I should for me?

Tenn gets more incredible weekly. Now he improves on Skolnick, whose "tireless" work began sometime after 2/7/70, when he didn't ~~even~~ know the names of the books that had been published official of the Report. And Golden was assigned to watch Vallee, a name of which he never heard until the past month or so!

There was no Boston Globe story enclosed, but don't worry about it because I haven't time to follow it up. There will be another Orwell, US model.

Handwritten letter: Bow St notes are British Press Assn copy.

I've thought much of Ray's denial he said, "Oh, God..." and finally decided we'll never get to the bottom of it and am inclined to attribute ~~to~~ to either unclear recall on either or both parts or Ray's jailbird's concept of law. Had I been in his position, I'd have felt trapped-by my associates and the situation as well as by the authorities.

Despite everything, I think the man arrested is Ray, the real one.

The inspector, by the way, has passed on to his reward.

If you want, we can explore the "Oh God" bit more. At the time he was picked up, however, do you think it possible he felt someone had tipped off the police or instructed him to do what would cause his apprehension?

No matter how much we do for him, I do not expect Ray to open up at least for a while. Thus, I'm not pressing anything. I've been silent about winning the suit, about which I also ask you to, for there are special reasons for which there now is no time. And they haven't delivered the stuff yet. When they do, we do have some plans-not for the release of all of it, however. Incredible as it may seem, since I didn't have it, the essence and most of the detail is already in COURT. (Bows to left and right)

Hurriedly,

4 April 1970

Harold:

I don't have the full story on the following, since it appeared on the back side of a clipping that deals with another matter. I thought you'd be interested in this much, anyway.

The ~~xxx~~ story is from the Boston Globe of 29 April 70. It is part of an article treating the presentation of an award to Earl Warren by the Chevy Chase chapter of B'nai B'rith. The award is the "Profiles in Courage" award, and was presented for B-B by Teddy Kennedy.

I thought 1984 was 14 years in the future. I was wrong.

Here's one paragraph of the article: "Kennedy said that 'all of us must speak up for freedom. All of us must be advocates for justice,' in the footsteps of former Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren."

I'll write to the sender later and see if she can get me the whole article. Perhaps, though, it would be better for you to write to the newspaper in Chevy Chase and see what they wrote, for that is likely to be more ~~thorough~~ thorough.

Sometimes I believe that this is not truly the real world. This is one of those times.

Still,

Dick

To:

Date:

Re:

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

30 May 70

Harold --

I received the Bow Street "notes" today from Bud. I see nothing here that is not available from newspapers. Indeed, it's possible even to suggest that these "notes" were derived from press accounts.

I may have mentioned this to you previously, but consider it important enough to reiterate. I call your attention to "Sneyd's" statement that Butler's account of Butler-Sneyd confrontation is false: no "Oh, God, I feel so trapped", and stuff like that. In effect, "Sneyd" called Butler a liar. Why? Sneyd's assertion served his interest in no way whatever; he had nothing to gain by this, and everything to lose.

Suppose, after all, that both Butler and

To:
Date:
Re:

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

"Sneyd" were telling the truth; that the confrontation did not occur between Butler and the Sneyd who appeared at Bow Street Court, but between Butler and "the other Sneyd", who did not appear at Bow Street.

Considering other factors which indicate two Sneyds (and maybe two arrests), I think this court statement gives added support to the notion of two Sneyds.

The court statements make no sense to me otherwise. Either Butler or "Sneyd" lied, or else both were telling the truth. And I cannot figure why either one would lie over this seemingly pointless matter.

To:
Date:
Re:

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

It boils down to this: Butler said,
"I confronted a man known to me as
Sneyd, and he did such-and-such";
"Sneyd" said: "Butler did not confront
me."

If you think that this ~~idea~~ suggests
something other than two Sneyds, then
can you reasonably explain why Butler
or "Sneyd" would be over this unimportant
matter?

Still,

Sick