

5/18/71

Dear Mary,

Your letter of the 13th, with the welcome enclosures, came just in time's nick, almost. I had been writing, had just gotten past the point where I needed them it was fresh in my mind, I did the add right away, so, same as time's nick!

Should you ever need it, I have much more on that. But since I'm now writing it, you'll get the package anyway. I did about 6,000 words from before daylight to lunchtime. From then on I did little because I felt too, depressed is not the right word, but something short of that. Dispirited, perhaps. Too many things are piling up on me. I've brought too much work to too good a point, and I see jeopardy to it for no good reason.

Jim did a very good job on a reply brief in the spectro suit, where they had been too much needless messing up. Fortunately, he phoned me this time before doing the final draft, everything keeping him too busy, so the few major things in it that would have been error were caught in time. If it could have been better with more time, it remains a first-rate job, and he, this time with Bob's help, did win a fight with Bud to get to do it. I do, very much, fear what Bud's ego in this matter will yet do to him. It is all-consuming, and he doesn't understand it. This experience again tells me there are too few of us who really know even the basic fact that is beyond question. One of things I find so distressing is that, despite our condition and my desire to do my own work, I am always available for such help and to the degree I can catch them, do get these errors. In the court papers, so this point, when I've had the time, I've caught every one.

We both wish you had said something about Arch and Buck, but we decided that your saying nothing meant things were okay. Hope so.

Let me correct your recollection on Hudkins. He attributed it to Sweatt. Secret Service report from Bertram, Houston. Sweatt's original source was Bill Alexander. O'Leary is Wash Star. I think this is a simple confusion between two O'Learys. The one on the Star has been there as long as I can remember. But I think with Hudkins, the key is in an earlier report. He also said no other agency. He appears to have had a personal relationship with Bertram or someone else in the office and to have been without trust in the FBI. I can't disagree with him.

I have started to write AGENT OSWALD, with an eye toward giving two chapters to a publisher. I have an editor interested, but the prevailing attitude seems to be old stuff. In part this comes from the endless picaresque publicity by those who know nothing and about things that are either wrong or mean nothing. Whether or not this publisher goes for it, I plan to finish the book. It will show you what I think you alone except those who have known me for a long time can understand, that I am not agin everybody, certainly not agin Dallas as such. This book, to a large degree, will be a defense of Dallas and Texas against many slanders and injustices. The stupidity of one of us right now endangers an unofficial source with good information, to the point where I've told this one out bait. People can get hurt, and I'll not be part of it. But this is one of the books in which I can show that Texas was had as, to a degree, I do in FRAME-UP with Fenn. I do believe it. I have had brief, preliminary discussions with a few officials there. My chances to continue them were cut short by one of Garrison's nutty things, he insisted I return to M.O. I would like very much to be able to get down there again after I complete the draft, for there are people there with knowledge the meaning of which they do not have. I'd like to do two things: find out what this is and be in a position to treat them justly, meaning better than the official record does. I'll be doing this to the degree I can anyway. As I once told you, often what is termed the Establishment is short-sighted and doesn't know where its real interest lies. Many thanks, best to everyone,

May 13, 1971

Dear Harold:

I am enclosing Xerox copies of four pages of CD 320 (SS 705) regarding Alonzo Hudkins. Also enclosed are two pages of CD 349 (SS 782) regarding Hudkins. Somewhere else (I believe in the volumes, I can't remember) it appears that Hudkins was the one who revealed that Henry Wade said immediately after the assassination that LHO was an agent and had Code Number such-and-such. My main interest in these documents, the ones I am enclosing, is the reference to Jeremiah O'Leary. He was first described as a member of the Houston Post's Washington Bureau (on the second page of CD 320) and then on the first page of CD 349, he is said to have been employed by the Washington Post or Washington Post Star... On the third page of CD 320, O'Leary is said to have died in New Zealand while accompanying an Antarctic expedition and was buried in Dallas some few days before the assassination of President Kennedy.

Then, in the Volumes, you will find several statements by Jeremiah O'Leary of the Washington Evening Star after the assassination. CD 2052, CE 2053, and CE 2276... Volume 24, page 467 says, "Washington 'Star' reporter O'Leary sees Jack handing out cards by the elevator at 9 p.m. on November 22nd"... and Volume 24, page 471, says "Washington 'Star' reporter O'Leary sees Jack in the City Hall while Oswald is being taken to and from homicide noon November 23, 1963."

I am curious as to why this supposedly dead man was not to be contacted or apprised of the questioning of Felton West in any way (per page 2 of CD 320).

This has just always been one of the many, probably silly things, I have spent too much time puzzling over... Perhaps you have a logical answer (as you often do.)

Love,

