

12/27/67

Dear Both,

Hope you are having a good holiday season. We actually took a day off and went to a Walden wedding anniversary in my family, seeing friends unseen for years, with "il getting a cold for her reward. With her, this usually means a kind of laryngitis and I say she is unseeable.

My reference to the San Francisco reporter was to the man credited with making the worst out of the homosexual story.

My own feeling, for some time, has been that Sylvia is bitter that a good book could not appear when it was ready, that she was denied her right (as she was), and that she is bitter. However, although I have had time to just barely begin it, when she deals with others she is in factual error of a kind that cannot be accidental. Example: dating WHITEWASH as appearing after Inquest, when she not only knew better but it bears the publication date of 1965. I have ignored it and her after telling her what I think of her then-latest tirade against me, another falsification that is entirely unlike her. I not also that it was deleted from what she sent Aronson and he did print....You are, apparently, right about the errors in the index as they relate to me. Others have said the same thing. However, that is quite understandable, for errors do come up in editing. However, there was ample time on her book, and they should not have...Her personal problem, on which you touch, is, I think, more tragic. I understand that after a long-delayed marriage her husband died young...It has come to the point that Vince asked me Sunday "What is Sylvia up to?" He told me that she and Thompson are making joint appearances. She cannot but know that Thompson has made deliberate errors to evolve a formula that the government can live with. She and he have been running around together on their work since the Summer, to my knowledge. His is perhaps the most sinister book of all because it has the mark of a CIA job, the pretended criticism that really seeks to authenticate all the major official conclusions.

On Penn's 12/21 editorials: I gave Jim the Redlich letter. It also says that Liebeler had a picture with him, although this may well refer to the mark on the curb. I was in New Orleans after the story broke. I got a young radio newsman to phone and question Walthers. He got Walthers to say what the deposition showed: that he had not been asked about the bullet. Where the government is hooked on this is: if it wasn't a bullet, it was most likely a piece of the President's brain, and that, in itself, is destructive of the report...You will recognize most of that story as having come from Al Chapman. I have given him a missing picture of the series, showing a hit on the concrete nearby. I've asked Chapman to check back and see if he could get this and others that may exist...and on Robert, it is even worse than Penn rightly says. I have the SS investigation. Robert "protected" Merine from the exploiters by setting up a 35% deal. He got 10% of her gross in return for nothing else. No prize cow was ever milked as thoroughly. The first thing he did was separate her from Ruthaine, the only woman with whom she could communicate.

Hope you all have a good year coming. Our best,

# THE MIDLOTHIAN MIRROR

A TRUE REFLECTION OF LOCAL EVENTS

PUBLISHERS • COMMERCIAL PRINTERS • JOB FOLDING • LITHOGRAPHING

DIAL GR 5-3322

P. O. BOX 70

PENN JONES, JR., EDITOR

MIDLOTHIAN, TEXAS

ZIP CODE 76065

December 7, 1967

Dear Lillian and Harold,

Really, Harold, you are the best damn guy to write to your friends. I don't see how you do it, but it's wonderful. I get ashamed of myself, and since Penn never gets ashamed about anything I have to be ashamed for him too.

Your letters are always so lively and interesting. And of course the letter I had from Lillian was beautiful. . . . I get up early too - sometimes I work from 5:30 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. In the great part, doing reading for Penn that he simply doesn't have time to do. . . . But I never get ANYTHING done. . . . Bound to be something wrong with my system.

Re-reading your letter: No, there's nothing naive about you. I think these people turn to you, and want to communicate with you, because you project a quality of honesty. Glad things are breaking so well for you. . . . Don't you think most of us\* have a built-in disinclination to talk freely with the fuzz? And that's too bad.

Neither one of us knows anything about "the fellow responsible for that obscenity with Reagan and the homosexuals." All that we have read is about Reagan's press secretary talking to reporters (off the record? off the cuff?) on The Cruise.

Good Gracious, you certainly have been getting around and into such a lot of happenings. That's great.

About Sylvia: After I read her book, I wrote her and expressed tremendous admiration for her accomplishment. Because I really felt this and wanted to tell her. She wrote me a very sweet note, most appreciative. She knew I meant it, and wasn't just buttering her up.

I do feel - but of course I didn't say this - that Sylvia sacrificed the "element of time" - her book would have been a super-blockbuster a year ago - for polish, triple-checked accuracy, and a high quality of

\* most people, I mean.

writing. You, Penn and some of the other critics might find inaccuracies, because you have much greater knowledge about the whole subject than I do. *But I found none.*

I did a lot of jumping around in Sylvia's book (reading it all, but not in page order) and I used the index a lot. Do I remember correctly that the index refers to you once or twice when you do not appear on that particular page? And that other page numbers referring to you are correct? I could be mistaken. I've read such a mountain of stuff.

Of course I can't go along with her interpretation of Garrison. But that's just the way she feels and obviously she's not going to budge.

It seems to me that the writing of each of the critics is bound to reflect in some way their personal happiness, their normalcy, their sense of achievement or non-achievement, their whole personality, in fact. (If this is true, then of course it is true of all authors.) But more especially, the picture of the critic is reflected sharply in their letters to each other.

Now this analysis is trite and not expressed very well. But I think that you and Maggie especially come across as well-rounded people. And I don't say that Sylvia doesn't come across like that. But one senses a loneliness there, or so it seems to me... Too, Sylvia has been divorced which is bound to leave some scars, and her health is far from ideal.

The TMO "Garrison and Warren" blast at some of the Garrison supporters is incredibly revealing. And if Sylvia said she didn't write it, I believe her. Arnoni honestly and actually could have picked up her thoughts and ideas by osmosis. He could. He really could.

Well, Old Buddy, this seems to have turned into an intensely personal letter. And I know you'll so regard it.

With friendship,

*P.A.*