

Dear Mary,

7/28/72

Years past my thinking time was my driving time. Now I drive less, so my thinking time is my walking time, grass mowing time, etc. While walking this a.m. it occurred to me that my failure to respond to your nice complement about POST MORTEM may seem impolite or unappreciative. I didn't intend it that way, and I do appreciate it.

I have come to tend to disregard these things, especially from those I believe mean it, for a number of reasons. These compliments come from people who break sharply into two groups, not counting strangers: those who mean it and those who, while probably meaning it, use it as a cover for back-knifing and are secretly envious or dislike me. And I fear that if I pay too much attention to this kind of thing, my problems will magnify by my getting an exalted concept of self.

As of now, what can truthfully be said of my work is really less a complement to me than an indictment of others. The big mouths have nothing behind them. They talk but do nothing. They won't even help legitimate work when they can because of carefully-hidden personal feelings. And the effort they expend at best duplicates what has been done. If you want an independent appraisal, ask yourself what Bud and the CIA have accomplished, for all his travelling, all their work, all their money expenditure. I don't know, for example, of even a single really important paper retrieved from the Archives. The suits they have filed are abortions. Victory in them means nothing. What more do we know from the latest, production of three also-cropped duplicates of CD237/Odvm Exhibit 1? Of all the suits that could be filed, this was juvenile. And if one were to sue on CD566, the other pictures had to be considered more significant. But the whole thinking behind this kind of approach is Bud's unthinking bullheadedness and approached the paranoid.

There are suits of mine that I will not file and decided against filing long ago because of the danger of counter-productiveness from success, not failure. There are others that are and have been ready and can have significance. He'd get all the public credit for them, but that is not what he wants. He wants to feel that he has done something significant on his own, and he would not get this feeling from filling a cooperative role. There are two simple ones I can think of immediately, one vs the Army and one vs CIA. The Army one is open and shut. It would take enormous corruption to defeat it. It has been ready since the Irwin Army Intelligence hearings. And in the other, I have in my possession enough of what I'd be suing for to have a reasonable prospect of press attention for it circumvents the traditional hangup.

He has never consulted me in advance in the suits he has filed in his own name, so they are flawed as they need not be and as clear, non-legal thinking would have shown. On the other hand, I have stayed entirely out of my own spectro suit because he said to begin with he would take it to the Supreme Court, and I don't doubt it will go there. One of the consequences, aside from approach, where whatever any lawyer did could be criticized, and I am without criticism about his approach although I differ with it, is that there is simple, factual error in the complaint, which alleges dates on which nothing was recovered and the recovery of bullet fragments in Dealey Plaza. I corrected this twice and it went uncorrected in the final papers. From this I have to take a reading on attitude toward me. The Flammonde disgrace compounds this even more. So, to the degree I can, I detach myself from these things. I cite them as samples only. My purpose here is to illustrate why I think my own record has been exaggerated, that it looks better to those who are sincere because there is nothing since the first books with which to compare it. Lane and Garrison, for example, were all mouth and personal attention. The few who have done genuine research, and you are few, have not had publication in mind, except for Howard, who is revising his book now.

Those few doing any genuine work get along rather well, and where there are real frictions, they are external. For example, I sent Hoch a rather sharp note yesterday, but it was over the Wecht thing and his unthinking attitude, his immaturity reflected in divorcing it from context and politics.

Our real problem is that those with the means to help won't. They long to have achievement but are either stingy or consider that they alone should benefit from their means. Bud has written a book, but from the parts I've seen it is terrible rubbish. These parts have been in Computers. He never told me he had done a book. It is like a beehive. Each bee has a different role. When each doesn't serve his, the hive is nothing. I have addressed this before in other ways.

Anyway, Jim is to be here soon, and I don't want to seem unappreciative. Thanks,