

Return
Minnesota

MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455
Oct. 25, 1969

Dear Mary,
I should have included this stuff in the letter I wrote this morning, but was in too much of a rush at the time. Enclosed are those two pieces of green paper which were on your table the entire time I was there. Don't ask me how I picked them up, but they were in my large file box. I did find the letter from the legal investigator just as you suspected I would—it was also in the large file box. There are two things which I seem to have left, however: 1. Jim Schmidt's letter to me (I know that you copied it, or retyped it, so I wouldn't have to leave it, but I can't find it—is it still around?) and 2. that one National Esquire which you or someone else was reading in the living room—one of the ones Marguerite gave me.

Paul Hoch can get you copies of the Flink and Frazier testimony for about \$17.00 altogether, which includes 472 pages at 3¢ per page, plus 5% tax, plus 4th class postage and a mailing bag. I don't know whether or not I mentioned that to you.

You should get the Penabaz file in the near future. There are two different copies of CD 643 because there are apparently two different versions of it—one from the Penabaz file and one from the file for Dr. Frederick Curtis Fowler. Fowler is now in Texas by the way. My interest in Penabaz developed after ordering all CD's from the Minneapolis FBI office and coming across the interview with Fowler. I was fascinated by the detail in the description of the assassination remembered by Fowler. (My source for Fowler being in Texas is ~~the~~ Reverend Secret of the Christian Crusade.) Also coming with the Penabaz stuff will be a copy of my paper on Japanese flower arranging for your daughter just in case she's interested. I have a number of extras lying around and no one ~~is~~ who has any interests in those directions.

With the Lifton thing there is one thing which concerns me a great deal, and that is the possibility of the use of a name before adequate investigation has been done. A case in point would be any of those you mentioned to me or James Powell. I could get info on Powell at any time but would not want Dave to see it if I should send it to you. The reason for this is, of course, the likelihood of our really pinning someone like that down is negligible, and without pretty strong info I would not want to involve a man's name, even if quoting someone else. Arch and you have stressed with me the fact that you would not want to be quoted about someone, although you don't mind if info is used which involves someone else saying something. I think that it would be worthwhile examining this position, for while I agree on not spreading theories, the careless use of documents such as FBI reports can be far more damaging than any theories we concoct. First of all, the FBI reports I have followed up, or which are discussed in the testimony, are notoriously inaccurate. Secondly, they are not infrequently slanted, or at least consist of only part of the story. Printed just as they are they can really do a job on someone. Likewise with staff memos which were written with the idea that they would not become publicly available. The fact that James Powell is Army intelligence or was Army intelligence proves nothing as it is, and to publicize him without proper reason could be very harmful to him, whether or not he is still intelligence. Likewise with FBI agents. There is no love lost between myself and the FBI, but I would want to be very sure of myself before bringing charges on any agent in particular. You are the only one who might be able to screen such items out of Dave's book if they are in there. The reason I worry about this is primarily the Powell case where I can't imagine public use with what is in the archives, and yet I have gotten no indications from Dave that he has anything else, and others have failed to find Powell, so I assume that Dave probably has not found him. While you can show Fred the Crawford file, don't show him any others without checking with Harold's and he considers them his literary property—something I will abide by. Ironically, there are not too many such items, but I just can't sit down and remember what I gave you. Chances are that Dave and Fred would be welcome to most of what I gave you, since it was archived stuff.

If Dave's info is as good as you indicate, then he should have need of no more material and should be able to set the book down on paper as is. He could wait from here to eternity for more stuff from either his own work or other investigators. It kills me that he continually tries to get Weisberg's stuff from me and yet keeps all of his own secret. As I hope I made clear in Dallas, I feel that everyone should have all info available to them, excepting that stuff obtained in confidence with certain restrictions on it. But, I do recognize that certain people depend on this for a livelihood, such as Harold and Dave, and that there is such a thing as literary property. What amazes me is that Dave believes in it only for himself and has no qualms about "stealing"—his word—from others, meaning pumping others for Harold's stuff. So I don't care that Harold and Dave keep things secret, although Dave keeps everything secret except archives orders which are easily available, non-selective (representing no research, unlike something like one of our painstakingly assembled files, or your chronologies), and which bring him money. But, as I said in Dallas, the holding of something in ones files for 5 years without allowing anyone else the chance to use it as something to investigate when one acknowledges that it is an extremely important piece of evidence is hard to justify. It is worth noting in this regard that if a particular piece of info is that important, and if this assassination was a coup d'etat as many of us believe, then time is a very important factor, and the intervening deaths of witnesses or perhaps even problems in our society are only aided by such withholding. So, basically, I am now and have always been interested in helping Dave with the limitations that I cannot send him anything dealing with Harold's info nor will I send him leads which are under investigation or undeveloped for fear that he might use them in print.

A final note on this unpleasant subject is this: Are you absolutely sure that this gem of info could not have been planted by someone. Are their independent tests of its authenticity? The normal way of dealing with groups such as the critics, as you know from all those spy books, is the planting of phoney info. If Dave rests his case on something fairly singular in character, this possibility should not be overlooked. This is why I hope that he gives the ms to not only you but Sylvia (you can imagine from her writing her very critical devil's advocate stance) and perhaps Paul Hoch. If Dave really does speak to Paul on the phone every two nights, as he just told me last night, and knowing that Paul has done a great many things for him, Dave has little excuse for not trusting him. The more who read the ms the less chance there is of something being upset when the book is published. And, need I add, once the book is in ms form, there is little likelihood that someone could publish before him even if one of the parties he trusts gives the info to that demon Weisberg, that scoundrel Schoener, or who knows who else. In other words, Mary, it just isn't logical to worry about theft of material when it is ready to leave for the publisher. By the way, did you know that I offered to help Dave in any way with the book, including publicity in this area, if it turns out as promised. He still has an invitation here for a steak dinner which I intend to honor as I think he knows. I somehow feel that if the book gets out, no matter what the result, there will be a great deal of tension all around.

I just took a look at the carbon of the letter I hurriedly mailed you this morning and was appalled to find so many errors. It was early in the morning and an unfamiliar typewriter—sorry if it is hard to understand.

Well, I'd better close. Best wishes and warm regards to all of you.

PS: Dave confronted me with the claim that I agreed as Paul Hoch's words not to say anything about thought that John Nichols was an "odd-ball" and that when I asked him who told him that, he tried to cite it to what I had written Fred. I definitely did not write this to Fred since I do happen to have a carbon of that letter, and I did not write it to Paul Hoch, Jim Schmidt, or George Rennar. I have not had time to write to Dick Bernabei. That leaves only you. If you did mention this to Dave, take note of the dangers of such things—god only knows how many times that has been repeated now. For the record, I think that John Nichols is a bit unusual in terms of personal conversation, and that he could spook a witness who is easily spooked. You would have to meet him to understand, but what it boils down to is nothing negative, but merely something which might make it a bit harder to get a witness cooperation, and therefore I was a bit more apprehensive than I normally would be. As it turned out, John handled it beautifully. I am worried about such a statement attributed to me is being thrown around on the grapevine. If you did mention something about this to Dave, but if you didn't, you can appreciate the problem I hope.