

hw letter filed ess., 1975 attention of by date

5/28/75

Mr. Ted Gandolfo  
511-51st.  
West New York, N.J. 07093

Dear Ted,

Your letter dated the 22d was not postmarked until 5 p.m. yesterday. It came today.

It reminds me either that I had not written about the medical bill<sup>1</sup> incurred at the NYU meeting or my letter has had no answer. While I regard his charges as outrageous, I had no choice but to send the doctor a check and ask that he return it if you people paid him. He has not returned it so I presume you (p.) have not. That was for a mere \$105 for a relatively short period of time. Since then there has been a bill for \$18.00 for lab work that wasn't even done until after I left NYC.

The understanding was that all my costs would be paid because we simply have no income and can't engage in anything that entails costs. Had I not gone there would have been no cost because my insurance would have covered it. It did cover those extra examinations required after I returned and later X-rays and examination. (The concern was lung damage. Negative.)

If the doctor has been paid I should get this money back. If he has not been, I do hope I will recover these expenses.

Your letter of the 22d worries me because it tells me that I failed more than I thought I would in the speech and because it tells me there is no answer I can give you that will satisfy you. You have learned nothing from that speech and from the things I told you in person or you would not have said and asked what integrity and responsibility makes impossible. There is no number of repetitions of falsehood that makes truth of it. There is no way indecency can become decency. I can and will have no public associations with those you have in mind without naming. There is nothing in that speech that was not understated. Those named and not named have yet to make a single protest to me of unfairness or error nor have I heard of even the pretense of refutation at the meeting. There has been no change from any of these people except that some have been bright enough to break public association with others and some of these have been clever enough to adopt some of its wisdom insofar as their new public positions are concerned. However, I know of no public act or statement by any of them that is not tainted and some of the private ones are obscene.

All of you who are of decent motive are like children of yearning. You see what you want, not the reality. I have lived with and in spite of this reality for too many painful years to abandon my integrity and the chance of accomplishment in a way that after that speech would also be dishonorable and disreputable. I told the truth, if less than I should have, and I'm not living other than by my own standards.

This, of course, leads to the Church committee. If they want to hear from me - and they do not - I'll testify to whatever I can testify to. If others want to testify about what they really don't know anything about, that is their affair. But I strongly encourage you to await the potential of the Rockefeller Report, of which I warned you long ago. I feel I can predict some of its content with fair certainty and that you are asking me to become part of a singular self-destruction by asking me to publicly associate myself with this utter nonsense of the same self-servers, commercializers and plain nuts. This is unthinking, insane, really.

You appear not to be aware that the man you denounced, Burke Marshall, is an adviser to the Senator and committee to which you denounced him. You also are obviously unaware of some of the staffing and those pasts and records and complications. Not it happens that one of the members of that committee knows me and my work well. We have not seen much of each other in recent years but we have been good friends. It also happens that another committee where I am now spoke to one of the staff and asked me to get

in touch. The man in charge of this area of the work is against it, as I knew he'd have to be.

If this committee were to devote itself intensively to its major responsibilities, of which this is not really one, it could hardly begin to do the also important job that it should do and no other committee is likely to. Therefore, any intrusion into its major responsibilities, the illegal and improper acts of the CIA, FBI, etc., diminishes by that much what it can do. Its record to date is entirely unimpressive. I will not succeed but I discourage you from diminishing this further with efforts that for political reasons the committee does not dare reject but exactly those about which it has already said it will do nothing.

Almost none of you people know how these committees work, how the minorities can misinterpret when it serves political purposes and the other inherent dangers. They are supposed to restrict themselves to what is relevant. Therefore, the enormous and valuable work you have done in collecting all those tapes is to them remote hearsay and a waste of their time. Moreover, they can use it to claim that when they heard witnesses those witnesses had no solid material of evidentiary value to provide. If there are those who do testify accurately (as Lane can't, for example) to the well-known fact, the immediate answer of the unwilling is that it was all looked into long ago and found to be unpersuasive or wrong. There is no means of answering this kind of thing.

A simpler way of looking at it is would you like them to do as much as possible about exposing the wrongs of the CIA, FBI and others? If you do, leave them alone. If they want testimony of any assassination, they do not have to be told where they can get it. Unless any committee is willing enough to take the initiative on a matter that at best is as politically controversial as this, it is to court disaster to seek to push it. I have lived through too much of this and I have seen the kickbacks. Moreover, if you stop to think of the things I said in New York and can come to realize how far short of full exposure they were, you can also get an idea of what will be fed about those characters that will set us back and defame the honest and decent.

Especially when there are the Marshalls on the inside with their own parts.

There are other ways and insofar as I can I use those other ways. People from Congress have had me in at their request, not mine. They have also come here and spent hours with what can count, solid evidence, hot talk or what most is, plain crap. I am in court, and that holds more immediate promise.

The current USNews piece, by the way, is a consequence of my press conference. They had a reporter there and he got in touch with me, after which we had long talks and several from there have been up.

Please come to understand that all this public attention to what for the most is irrational puts committees like Church's on the spot. To date all their record says they are not serious about this. Until there is tangible evidence to the contrary I have no reason to believe otherwise, especially with my own connections being what they are. However, I would welcome anything you gets that says the opposite. Perhaps when and if Church writes that letter can have meaning now not apparent.

I've taken this time because there is no doubt of your sincerity not because I think you'll like what I've said or will heed it.

Perfection is not a state of man. We can't any of us always be completely accurate no matter how hard we try. But please don't expect me to associate myself and the kind of work I've done with those whores and pimps you have in mind. You don't know anyone who is publicly known as a Warren Report critic except Sylvia whose work is substantial and you don't even know who among those who get the attention did what part if any in some cases of his own work. This is not criticism of you. Your own work and experience are not of the kind that would let you know. Please believe,