

Michael Spring  
P.O. Box 218  
St. Michaels, Md. 21662

6/28/78

Dear Mike,

Your juvenile effort at Philadelphia lawyering is of such a transparently self-serving nature that it isn't worth the time for detailed response. Besides, I have no interest in such controversies when I can't do serious work I want to do. I wrote Howard Bray to begin with because I had and have reason to believe he was imposed upon and I have a high regard for him and believe his work is important.

It is clear that it is not possible to converse with you or Holdea as one normally converses so there will be no further opportunity for such mischief.

Most of my conversations of this nature, where my views are sought, are with those who understand and respect confidences and with whom I don't have to begin every word I say with "off the records." Most of the reporters with whom I speak do not share my views but only by accident has confidence ever been breached.

There is no appropriate comparison you can make with any of the other tales and fictions and Willie Weisberg and me because I am alone among those who do not theorize conspiracies and your associate is the only one who could have launched that mischief. I accept your word that you didn't. It is an indefensible evil because Holdea has an indefensible and unfactual contraption he has to defend. Unable to do that he launched what you very well know will be widely misused because I debunk all such disinformational concoctions as yours and his. This is precisely what the FBI did and does. Unable to confront my fact it defamed me, most with fabrications, the rest with distortions. I have enough copies to be without any doubt.

You don't know it and this I don't care if you do repeat, but George Lardener once exclaimed to me, "Why you are defending the FBI!" It wasn't quite that was by intent but in fact I did defend the FBI against totally baseless charges, as I now recall "ans's, but say another name. Unlike others, while I am willing to defend the FBI to defend truth and deter further disinformation, I also have them in court all the time and lay pretty serious charges against them, under oath, or with my head on the block. I've done the same with the CIA and would have no reluctance at all, if asked to, to defend Marcello and Truffante against your disinformations. You might regard this as my defending the mafia, which it would not be, but how else could you face your own failings? Do you for a moment think that I believe the Ray brothers to be pillars of society?

I have no clear recollection of what I wrote about the Holdea-Sheridan relationship. Holdea said he wanted me to read the book and would send it but he didn't and I ~~didn't~~ feel no loss from it. As best I can now recall it came from his piece in Playboy.

If you/Holdea have from Sheridan what I referred to as the project of that time, only part of which was a very inaccurate ax job on Garrison, you have an inadequate description of what he was then doing. I have personal knowledge. Of some, not all.

(I do have that NDC transcript. Our xeroxing is costly and my wife does not have time for it. Locally it is 15-17¢ a sheet so I'll lend you the copy when I can dig it out.

While within a short while Garrison and I were in strong disagreements that does not blind me to the dishonesty and intended dishonesty of what he did with the NDC show and also with Bobby Kennedy. When I saw what he had written about me, which approaches perfection in the totality of inaccuracy, I wrote him. He never responded. And can't.

But I have learned from you and Dan that it would be just asking for more turmoil to give you any details. Especially when Dan describes Whitey Partin as one of the

finest humans he's ever known. The 26 charges? Well, only two were capital offenses, one of them was well motivated and the others were mere felonies.

Should you appear to interpret from my quoted "intended protection of Walter Sheridan and his then associates" I think you are the one who does the distorting, either way. But I think I was referring to Sheridan's then associates, a few of whom I knew.

It is not even juvenile to say that the disgrace to journalism that Sheridan aired "exposed the Jolly Green Giant." What little that might be called fact was unoriginal and well known. The kind of thing he did with the defenseless homosexual Leo Davis is an outrage. (I don't know the outcome of the libel suit.)

Your comments on what constitutes public service reminds me of the line I used to hear from bank prisoners I guarded. Whatever the government wants is right, whatever it is or leads to. I regard rights as indivisible and I believe the same standards of justice should apply to all. One does not have to be a Mafia lover, as I was not, to have doubts about the nature and extent of the effort to get him. You don't recall how common this was with labor leaders and political liberals. The principle is the same.

When you asked me what I think of Lifton I had no idea you were trying to make a cheap trap so you could say that in responding to your request for my opinion you can say I was doing what I was not doing, spreading gossip. However, I am prepared to stand on the factual nature of what I said, which distinguishes me from what you and Dan did. With Lifton it there is relevance. With Willie Weisberg, for example, there is not.

You say we will each maintain our views. Mine are based on fact, yours are nutty theorizings. Where you alleged a factual basis it does not exist. Even the details of what has no real relevance, the bonding of Oswald, is not as you said. Based on prior experiences I have no intention of telling you more. (Picture of a mafia chieftan hiring an assassin who doesn't have \$25 to bail himself with and then cuts up the bail!) Which is not what happened, despite what you said. Do you suppose they got all the capos together to decide on risking the \$25?)

You apparently did not learn a lesson from the Braden affair. How any ordinarily intelligent high school student could have read his book without having the deepest doubts I don't know but you cut for it because it suited your preconceptions. You deserve the trouble of the libel suit.

I give you the same caution about the transcript of the Sheridan show. You are asking for trouble in uncritical repetition of it and you are incapable of making a critical examination of what you want to believe.

I make no charge for my time, to respond to what you said about paying me. If you want to pay me something for the time it will take to get the transcript out of old files, package and mail it and then refile it when you return it, fine. If not, it's also OK.

Infants generally learn from the first hot iron. You have not. It is no credit to your years, education, experience or judgement. Moldea may have ruined the credibility of a worthwhile book by the extra stretching for the commercially acceptable, what had promise of talk-show promotional time. You guys have to live with what you have done and there is no phony attack you can make on anyone else that enables this. It merely lets you hide from yourselves.

Sincerely,