

1/26/71 (2)

Rb (Mr. Hill),

Glancing at your letter to Mr. before filing, it only looked familiar, and is not the elevator you sent me.

There is nothing I can add to it save the comment to you that I enjoyed it.

And, of course, it is comforting that you can understand pictures. Where you may have failed is in not securing him when we not have to be in living color!

Best
RB

1/26/71

Dick (Sylvia, Howard),

Your 1/14 and 1/18 arrived today. With the continuation of my legal education, which really meaning learns that there is virtually no such things as an honest lawyer, I have a few minutes before a hasty lunch. Aside from the enormity of irrelevancies the government just heaped on me for the clothing/pix suit, requiring considerable checking and research, I've just spent the morning responding to an indecency by a liberal lawyer who represents a bastard who is trying to beat me out of \$1,000 he owes me. It does not leave me in a good mood, but it also does not leave me in the proper frame of mind for thinking and working.

I think you'd earlier sent us a copy of your 1/17 to Heck. Paul was here during the summer recess, to attend some scientific function in DC and to remain to work at the Archives. Knowing he planned to come, I'd arranged for him to be able to stay with Bud. He did. He undoubtedly met Sprague there.

Sprague, as you and Sylvia both agree, is a real nice guy. I suspect you also agree that he is as extreme and far-out as one can get. He also confabulates more than most, as I know from my own experiences with him. One of the larger drains on my emotions and times was his total treatment of the "tramp" pictures and the impression he made on Garrison and others. Now this I learned that to this very nice guy truth is what he wills it to be, not what it is. So, while admitting that I am entirely without any one explanation that satisfies me about Bill's recent past, I am also not willing to take what boils down to Sprague's interpretation of their conversation. Mary may have been right in asking me for trusting just about everybody, but I remain unconvinced that Paul has joined "the other side", and I can present arguments nobody else has to say that he has. I just don't believe it. Because I am so unequivocal, you'll have no trouble chiding me if it turns out I'm wrong.

Speaking of accounts, I've had to let my N.O. subscriptions lapse, for both time and money. This a.m.' post says that Willis Robertson says he borrowed \$30,000 for Jim and that it has been neither repaid nor accounted for. I believe both, but if not accounted for, it is because he didn't use. That money was in a separate account and Jim was not the one who drew credits against it. I suspect I can pretty well account for its uses, which makes me interested in anything anyone may see in any papers. If I do not believe that Jim was an agent of any kind, a charge that can be supported by reasonable arguments by those who do not know that strange cat personally, and I do not believe Boxley or Turner were, + nonetheless know that he is susceptible to certain kinds of influences and I do not regard the entire matter as closed. I do not share my suspicions, which have no factual basis but are not, in my opinion, irrational or unreasonable, and I ask for all information, no matter how seemingly inconsequential. I heard from Louis even last week, rather I phoned him and he said he was about to phone me about a personal as distinguished from what he regarded as an office matter. As of then, for the current proceedings, these accounts were being audited. That money cut off, by the way, about the time of the HCU/ CBS agagup.

On your monograph at the time he had a draft of the bastard suit, I encouraged Ray Marcus to enlarge, improve and cleanse it, even offering the services of my own artist and printer. I was then for publication of every such item study that could be made. I recognize that I may be wrong, but I believe that today our best course is to not do one-shots, that even things we publish should be in either a context of to a special audience. If you seek publication in a journal of guerny (and NTA should be approached), I'm all for it. But in the general press, I'll probably have misgivings. I think that today we need something overwhelming or should be silent. Thus my own silence, and I could still get radio time whenever I seek it. But, you do your thing. You are quite right in not rushing, and very not must be advance-picked. I find it, as you know, persuasive. The only court case I could make I should make explicit: I plan what I call a "panel" suit. I'd have filed it a year ago if Bud had kept his word(s). Now I'm not hurrying and thing there must be certain other work done. I'm in even less of a rush than you on this. However, the use I think I had in mind is perhaps the best possible: with the mediwhores on the witness stand. ...Right to let PH cool for a while and observe. Hastily, HW

17 January 1971

to Weiskopf
Paul Hoch
Berkeley

Dear Paul:

I found your letter of 17 November several days ago and re-read it, but I delayed writing Bartly because other things commanded my attention in a way that would not allow me to answer except in haste, and partly (more importantly, really) because something revealed in your letter caused me ~~in~~ such consternation, such bewilderment, that I was not then sure whether I could issue a controlled response. Even now I wonder what to say. But, although I am no less bewildered, my feelings now, at least, are more temperate.

I refer to certain clear indications in your letter disclosing that you had the book, Wound Ballistics, virtually at your fingertips when you wrote to me then. What troubled me is that you did not refer me to that book, even though you surely knew that it would interest me to read such thorough and authoritative discussions which bear so directly-- and, it appears, so favorably-- on my assertions about the minute fragments. Perhaps I am at fault for professing such utter ~~in~~ ineptitude with mathematical formulas that you thought the mathematics would be meaningless to me. If that's the case, you were right. But I did understand the passages in which the formulas were ~~xxxx~~ summarized in words, for, as I previously indicated with inappropriate bombast, I can read several languages, ancient and modern, including English. Even if you supposed that I would not understand the words, you might at least have referred me to the pictures. Considering that I failed to comprehend your melon-choly, you may have supposed that the verbal descriptions would pass me by, but you know that I am not blind, and that the pictures in the book are not meaningless.

I have been involved in exchanges that contained a measure of abusive vilification that would make my recent letters to you appear as Valentines, but never, never did I cease to regard my correspondents as anything less than friends, persons whom I could help and who could, and did, help me. Nor did I ever cease to regard you as a friend, in spite of what my letters may indicate. I thought you knew that. If I thought wrong, then I sincerely offer you my apologies. For what little my word may be ~~worth~~ worth to you, I assure you that I intended nothing but good, both for you and for me.

I continually ask myself whether I was being too sensitive about a thing that may have been ~~xxxxxxxixixix~~ no more than an oversight. The makings for oversensitivity were there, for sure, since I had put out a lot of effort to secure the couple of references that I used in my monograph, and even now I am not sure whether they are appropriate, whether I have used them honestly and properly. I was at first indignant because, by reference to Wound Ballistics, you could have saved me the time and trouble of verifying my assertions through recognized authorities, and you

18 Jan 71

Harold**

I did not send to Sylvia your letter to me concerning her, nor will I.

In referring to Hoch as ~~fink~~ fink, I did not mean agent. That was a bad choice of words. I meant no good prick.

Sylvia's most recent letter to me (11 Jan) describes conversation with Sprague re Hoch: "Incidentally, I had a phonecall the other day from Dick Sprague-- a terribly nice and well-motivated guy who nevertheless [this word, coming from ~~many directions~~ many directions about well-motivated guys, is beginning to sicken me-- RB] does immense harm to our position by wildly irresponsible articles and lectures-- and we talked briefly about Hoch's melon paper. Sprague told me that he had met Hoch in Washington in late July or early September 1970 (I had not known that Hoch was in the east at that time) and was flabbergasted to realize in conversation with him that Hoch had "done an Epstein# and become a complete defender of the WR." Cute, eh?

Still,

Dick

P.S. I just spoke with Sprague on the phone. He is lecturing to some computer group in Toronto on Wednesday re the assassination. It's at 3PM so I probably will not be able to go and see him.

14 January 1971

Sylvia, Harold, Howard

From each of you I have gotten comments pertaining to the possible publication of my monograph on the fragments. This note outlines my present thinking-- probably it will not change until the monograph is complete to the satisfaction of all of us and others.

I have put the matter of publication out of my mind for the time being, for my intent is first to establish a complete and convincing record in the monograph. Once that is done, I shall then consider establishing an abridged version for publication. I understand that the monograph is long, and that its technical orientation makes it less desirable as a publishable item, but at the moment I am not concerned.

Another draft of the monograph, probably close to the last draft, is a considerably revised version of the one that you have-- revised in the sense of wording, overall presentations of certain sections, and rearrangements of passages. There is one important addition. If what I assert holds true (I have not yet found a proper reference that it does, but it makes sense), then I can answer why fragments formed from a bullet that burst on the right side did not penetrate the left side of the brain. Morgan, in his letter to me, caused me to think about that problem. The solution knits beautifully with all the rest that we think.

I am working steadily, but do not feel rushed. It will be some time before publication becomes a serious prospect, so I don't want to consider it for now. But I will, eventually.

Harold mentioned the possibility of using this material in one of his suits. I have no objection, but I will not delay public disclosure of the material to wait for the suit. Whichever comes first, suit or publication, is the course the monograph will take-- I don't favor one over the other, but will be content to let the timing of events decide.

Still,

Dick

Bernabei

Harold -
I just received your letter
re Hoch. I have not yet written, but
planned a moderate response - I know
not why. I'm content to let him stew
for a while. I'm not even sure whether
it bothers him that he has exposed
himself.
Mel -
Dick