

Dear Madeline,

Thanks for your 7/30.

In my view it is never possible for any good to come from fakes, deceptions, misrepresentations or what is euphemistically called "boiling the pot." We now have this utter insanity of Downing dignifying all that Morrow garbage. The end is always the destruction of all credibility. On the way the decent ones in the media decide that all is insane. So does the Congress. The spooks are the only beneficiaries.

It takes no more than two paragraphs of Morrow's book to know it is not for real. Two chapters was more than enough for my stomach.

I do not know what you mean by "the recent Dallas indictments" unless you refer to those of the Hunt brothers, Foreman et al.

Of those you cite there is not one whose word I'd take without confirmation. With each it is a question of personal experience and knowledge.

Tatler that bad, yes.

What they carried that "was substantially true" also happens to have been stolen. They went under from bad management and crookedness.

I have seen no report of the Hunt suit against Weberman and company. Here again what I've been telling you. I'd appreciate copies of any reports you see.

There is no reasonable possibility the picture is of Hunt. The malice in this and the misrepresentation of the pictures in other ways - knowing misrepresentation because he spoke to me before publication and I told him - are enough to let Hunt, a convicted felon and within the meaning of case law a "public figure," win in a lawsuit.

The whole deal is and from the first was totally irrational, really insane.

Meanwhile, Weberman and his gang of thugs go around calling everyone else CIA.

This include me, not that I care personally, when I spoke at Hunter this past April. They had a disrupter present.

How these strange people conceive themselves is totally immaterial, as I see it.

What counts is not what's up from but that doing no real work they manage to be.

This taints all when it is least harmful.

I have never known of a single occasion on which they were ever right; none of which they were not harmful; almost none when their stories were within reason.

They manage to reach the partly-informed because there are so many people of decent concern who are anxious about truth and what has happened to our country, people who think it may "boil the pot," and people who have no basis in fact at all.

Not uncommonly they also stumble into material that can have meaning and ruin any possibility of rational, effective use.

Excuse the haste. I've had to undertake other work. I've not been able to do any writing on the book two-third drafted in more than two months.

Best regards,

July 30, '76

Dear Harold,

Will send along the Wash. Monthly ad for Betrayed if it shows up in the next issue, or a Xerox copy if not.

Thanks for clarifying on Roger Craig. Perhaps Penn will explain some day. I trust Molly and Rita completely, but over the phone there can sometimes be misunderstandings. I remember Molly told me a year or more ago that Roger had been shot at - at the time she seemed to think the woman he was interested in had done it. It was all another matter. I don't know, but under the circumstances I too feel suicide seems most likely.

There's some misunderstanding between us. My speaking of the (I think) foolish theory that Rose Cherami counterfeited Marina had reference to Morrow's book in which he embraces it. I pointed out that Jaesten had propounded a similar theory, in line with my opinion that Morrow specializes in picking up speculations from the critics and feeding these back as the known truth. I'm not wrapped up in the matter or even particularly interested (I'm inclined to think Mrs. Hunter and Mrs. Whitworth are lying and the whole incident a fraud), but I was simply finishing up my evaluation of Morrow's book. (However, I'm sure I've wasted time fussing over the unnecessary - hard to avoid)

The recent Dallas indictments are another matter entirely. It's a complex story and the fact that both Nixon

and Hwain are peripherally involved doesn't imply any direct connection between these two. But I do think Nixon probably had more of a connection with the Dallas assassination than has ever come to light. Penn, as I'm sure you remember, reported that Nixon, as well as J. Edgar Hoover, <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ at ~~the~~ Murchison party, the night of Nov. 21, 63 - and recently <sup>has come across a statement</sup> ~~Prooty discovered evidence~~ that Nixon was still at the Bottlers' Convention when news of the assassination broke, having changed his departure plan for some reason (of course the statement may be deliberately or inadvertently mistaken). Then - the tapes, the long gaps.

I do agree that some poorly informed self-promoters can raise a big fuss on peripheral assassination matters & that it's a nuisance and diverts attention from the important. But I'm more aware of this practice as a deliberate tactic. "They" love to pick up some sincere but mistaken bit of speculation mentioned by a critic, research it elaborately and expensively and to death, finally announcing as "wrong" something "they" knew was wrong all along. Simply to discredit the whole effort of the critics.

Are the National Tattler people so terrible? I think they were probably infiltrated by one or more deliberate spoiler who pushed the phony. Without going over the articles again, my impression remains that they published a good deal that was substantially true, along with highly dubious stuff which they probably were unable to evaluate. They were reaching an audience that books do not, and the fact that they went under, to me, speaks in their favor.

I see that E. Howard Hunt is suing Alan Weberman and Michael Confield & the publisher of Coup d'Etat in America for \$2½ million. I haven't read the book & know next to nothing about Weberman or Confield.

All good wishes,  
Madeline