[^0]Dear Mak,
 great biandez an our pat to pu Dotara in contact yith LiPton for any reson. It was ajen more serinusly bai juagement when you the thet iften was busily ongaged in a rather leage n eftan-succeffful ocnionage camoign gei ast me, asiae from tia endess defametions vare de dered tusm, and that I trusted Loward aite sayting de wanted to see.

Thia businese with Hichols is just toomuch, Im demnéa in in coing to heve wo mory about everyone I try to help biebbine what i let him

 legt tio ae no here, fil the ggos wo en accompingh nothiag are set on




Whetuer you of he fins the urrea ondile ar not netther wy tian nor














 - beveroate the cositica em in uils brok no aud ne dless riske, for mothis


 to wither public uniretanding on our escentiol comedeg fitier iolin of lifton










 doce glready witanot reallzine it, ifout oy initiol truct of tohn, whin is


 Hestily.

$4 / 22 / 70$

Dear howard (ce Dick),
$\bar{I}$ think thst yesterday I complained I beve to waste an enormous time countering wrong things. Today is an example, on sêvence for any undue breatity in my response to your mailing postmarked 4.20. I got started at $5 \mathrm{~g} . \mathrm{m}$. to complete revieion of the complaint I have repared to be filed against Skolnick et al if the oprortunity can be arronged. I finished it at mill time, reed the mall in heste not yet indudine the carbon of your letter to Dick, did some necessary outaide work, and heve now about $s$ quarter of an hour before lunch. IIll finish this thereater. I am gning into town tonicht before the last mail ond will send it tuen.

Birst, your letter of the 17th, re rchives. There are some ting in it I beve asked joup please, to leave slone, or heve you forgot en? I sinwed zou What - hed bean doing on them and sme am close to fruttion. I'd nete, as you woula, for anytaine to nappen to them. Some are as far back as tuat part of my archives file you went over. Others are not in the cetegory. I'll separate, nerhapa without explenetion, and 1 f you do not recell or object, write.

I alsn esked for the thues memo but cerried it no further, deciding the other aspects on mifch inge atarted are more imortant to me. I think it would be gond if ynu carried tais forward. I will, if you'd like, counsel with you on 1t. I offer, to begin with, taking them up on the uee o the word relevant", wich I presume they bracketed with "files of the crion Commision". In this event I suggest wast taey will recoenize, tast you asix if tisis in very case means every flle tay nave of matever description, source or content. You might, for examie, alude to the executive order of $10 / 31 / 66$. But do not glude to what I ara naving forced there since that was issued. You night go furtag $r$ and agk it they have searehed wayt wis turned over subsecuent to the ending of the Comiscion and tue transfer of its files (sey both). This woy you heve a definftion ou can almeys cite.

Please leave the memo of trensiar alone. You bave oniy duplicated mat I'd alresdy told you. Thi: $1 a$ a techncelity they a ve given you, sn evesion. I'd rather pat no more in witine, but tais is importsnt an if it ie not advisable to write further before you are here again, Ill tell you tae entire tale. I've bern morking on tais since 1966. For the moment, let me tell you it is not really as described in the panel report. You should recall what I've already told you of tiis. If not, please let it rest where it is. For tue moment, wo not sen me copies of your correspondence on this. If you have not already written Mershall, don't wasie the time or bother him, fir I have just given him somethine much nore serious to morru about ane he should not te driven the arone wey. I have written him ebout the mem. I thought you'd seen that correspondeace.

If they do not send you a copy of the uildines re $C D$ 434,451, I will. Leve giso carried thic business of the givernment (involunterily, I ascure youl macing material available on salective basis to a certain point with them on several things. I think i forced Beamer's retirement on one. The other deals with Jerry Ford's book. But puch them gni get them on paper, but do not antegonize them. They did not give it to Epstein. Ticbier did. They ere required to ablde by the regulations, so taey mey well be gulltless here.

Many other thinge are nom on mind. I stop eating to ask mat I do not went to forget: why do you cover the same ground you know I aeve or am where there is so much thet doee not duplicste to be done: You kno. I show you whet I have. And, by the way, I beve more to show gou beeides the picture.

Further, on tals, berore 1 return to the colorieless salad, intend carrying as neny as deasible of these for ard in court actions, as you connot. I expect to meil the last letter needed preparatory to filing the panels' reporte suit todey end em working simulteneously on the othere. The list you started for me is, as I told you, preperatory to oxhausting edministrative renedies and fingl determination of that for waich I will sue.

Untre $t i$, se $I$ once asked ynu asiler, $I$ belleve (or was it Dick) two copies of the lichols kase photo. Here I mould like coples of tour correspondence, for I inve had extensive correspondonce on it elso. As I told you y sterdey, his copyright of en frcaives picture is bibberish. Only the use, an thet must be a specisl one, can be. If I should ever mint to make any use of hie picture, and Iplen none, I'd turn get one in my onn name and, should you get it, sould be

Lour 4/18 on John: te dian't even auve a copy of it until I atade it in i .0 . and give the xeroxes to Garrison' $\underset{y}{ }$ people to rail 1 , to te myself the ootage. If you should ever see his copy, you'll flnd the marks I mede on ft beginning milanght of the moming ot tie firctanleck be ring. The trage is that none of the patiologiste on "our side" underatosd it. Techt must have razd It in too-grest asete ( $I$ sent him a copy, too), for i had to tell aim what it satd and meant. I taink I bave some ideas of John's to-you shaten interest in the Ms, but I'll swait any entegestions you ons Lick may ave to noce as thage unfold. But if ne missed w, uch in 7 RIII , boes this give ynu any ideas? It cannoy be becauce he foesn't underatand the languege. Anslyze it. Whether or not 加u core up $n$th sn enswer, it will be a gand intellectaal exercise.

You soy the nas been in Thily fnce tas 13 th " 6 I presume is told you tais. I'm glad to know he was the for a moting. But I think you should ponder my Laving te telegram from hin from Jashington (no mord since) dated the 15th, he was in hila the 18 th to see you, and ae had bean in paila beiora thet. In euort, he left and returnect to hila, the difierence belug twot before seeing you he sew the two boaks in the copyright oftice. Dove tife sugrest myoning to you' Here I quote you:"Sonetimes ne wo ld just ait ent 11 aten to me...end rimost go into s daze."

Re his search for t e madologiats report: It be bean nt least a year since I asked the Navy for everythin and got told they do not heve it. It is I who firet told and showed John they have to coep everything, belicy it or not. I have not yet decided whether to include the layy in my auits, but I tove laid the basie if I decide to. So, there is nothine confidential tere. do wever, since you recall my recent letter to $h \pm m$, I thint you'll rether enjoy het would have been one of the first thinge had ne responded 12 ke e nensch. I will be saying littol about my quest for some of this meterial, but as I aave been, wifetly, as I tilnk it nust be done, I shall be continuing. Heanmule, I hope he enfoys the trail of the diairals...te is "very proud of 'his' mork", as you say, and to him everyone else'g work is also "his", ss you should recell from that art of a conversation ant the lettry you overheard and aq bere. If wat is reelly his consists of a sinele mojor ontribution to tie se se, I forget it or never knew 1t. I do not think it fxists. doesn't mow onough, brito zet me to go there to turn on the men he manted to bo his lawyer (andit weo very costly trip, that being the one on wich the Feobees decided to give thobeat at tention to my lugege!).

As with all of those with whom tae serinte of us asve unpleasant experiences, taeskey to John is an ineufiersble ego. There in evi ence of this in your letter thet you sem not to bsve underatood: "io complimented me once by soying we kight know more tonky if everyone geked the kine of questions i did". or, you are a fine lad wio sits, respectully, at the pot of the nisht on a the all-wise, drincinc in every gelden word.

Everyone who has met john uses the same word lamong others in some coses) to describe John, "ecoentric". But by now ynu should be berinnine to ret nther indicetions.

So it is from John $t$ at you learnec twe gutopsy room wes cleared? he never nev tais until ne rabi it in PN. i geve it to Garrison to use in the
 Lveryone wiscel this in S-2, ons beceuse of the misuse by Epstein, who got it only becsuge one $I$ d directed to it forgot I osked him to reen it quiet, I decided to holi it beck from inII. out I gpotted tuet in gariy 1966 gad it is one of tae firgt thage to confirm my oarlier thinitag. Dogs this tall you also of John's honesty? ith your sentcnce, "i couree, that ia all who sould have been there all blone" I taice strongexception, und this wa fother the deaire nor the expectation of tue hite ionse, os I beliave I once told you. If not, remind me when you sre tera. In this cose, since John underatands only what be
 mill Eo over tire psrt of Py agoin wen you ore aers, jou will find thet tase who were put out and kept out by militery gur rds mere not that "ell personnel gete the dree fud those nsoued to tere tspex were ejectec. It is all civiligngy mecessary militery personel ramaned. The exutions merc miy tre 35 gechte reopince on eye on tio corpse an tue Fil sgants reeping on oye on tu se men.
 correct, as 1 sesure it is anse 1 heve ales sesumed fos ther resons, ts ny
 motter for eralysie ana it need not be visitie in p pleture.
 Ita in your $4 / 17$ to gickj. I tank 1 eugected one* further fregnentetion of framect.

Thie coment on chest inciston mises mate sehse tisn your earlier ones and is quite dnesistent with my emibecis on tom mising in ant X-rsye, ese of the ereas other than mere the wounds arebloneten.

Hers you sey, "I hope to develop this with John". I em eorry. Howerd. but I will run ne further risk. If ou bove ony firther interonrse ofith bin ebout medical thivgs, there will be no more betwen you fut me. Tamply cenot risk it. And I mill be left nith the feeling I trueted you too man. Besides. heve you not alreedy learned the dopthe of hie ignorance, evan on ospects in his own discipine? I canot tind the inervortent isclosure of wat i haw brusted
 your om moterich, the luaz damge. You agy conisar me unreaeonoble, but I just
 ans other cost i've has eleuning up aseseo nost of wion originatea with tre best intentione, Im not soinc to start goinc into it now. I h"me raciry
 after ell I*ve tried to dell you and ell the time I've taken wita it, you soy if Eifton only thet he is "brillicnt" ond fodney", Fhich is naroly edequete, gas tien with ili-beconing celf-asourence esy, "I beliove I hove a lever pith his 1 1th the teoe he ments", well, it's juct to much. Levar for what, for Chriate seke? To mike more trouble and worry for mef It in not fust dispppintmert. I've run out of time with the gace. Sincerely,
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