

Dear Ian,

2/9/75

The Infection you suffer is not uncommon and I've seen no case from which there was complete recovery. I've seen many. Currently among several friends who have been getting much attention and have grown even crazier with each bit of attention to them and their insanities. The net and immediate results are a further destruction of credibility at a moment when credibility should have been enhanced with the wide showing of a good copy of the Zapruder film. No, no copies can now be made from it.

A by-product is to relieve the pressure on the CIA by making it appear much put upon. They'll now be taking tape and transcripts around the Congress and complaining with seeming legitimacy that they have been blamed for everything including Original Sin. You are not with it not to understand this. I know even who makes their tapes and transcripts for them....Can't type much. Bad-weather time here, I type hunt and peck, and I've three split fingertips.

It is this kind of zany way that ruined Garrison. I learned them that the surest way to become unpopular was to inject truth and fact. The more you are proven right the more you are disliked. He has barely talked to me (and not written) since I saved him from his greatest disaster.

Connick tells you what is essentially true. There was no need to transcribe the testimony. However - and he need not know it - Garrison did have some transcribed. I do not for a minute think Jim would have left them for Connick! The cost of replacement for me would be prohibitive. I'd have to pay the court reporter's price. The copy I have of what you want is a poor Thermofax made from a xerox. I could not copy it for you and I would not risk it save in a sale for which I would have no responsibility for the postal service and then only at the replacement cost, which would be the same as you'd have to pay for a good, clear copy from the reporting firm. Her name is Dietrick.

Interesting that Connick says ^{not} what is clear, that Garrison never had a case against Shaw.*When I learned the real situation I refused to enter the courtroom while I was there and refused to be his expert, as scheduled and even reported. And left the first week without seeing any of the trial. Connick says what is false, that Garrison put on no case of conspiracy. He did and I gave him the evidence and most of the witnesses. That part has no relationship to Shaw and Garrison did not allege that it did.

On those who have accepted your invitation: nut don't think they are nuts and don't recognize others as such. No argument for me. You are rabid to say that refusing to be associated with nuts some of whom may be worse than that is nutty. Your next graf says you have an obligation to deceive your readers because in your view some people have spent much time so having spent time their waste of it and their lying is immaterial. This is not "hypocritical" it is insane. You deceive people; I will not, not under any conditions...I do not regret publication of Oswald in New Orleans and I've no apologies to make for it or my "association" with Garrison, of which you know nothing. I regret the kind of editing the manuscript had and other mechanical things, like omission of an index and the needless long delay in appearance. My work in New Orleans was neither for nor with Garrison. It was my own and entirely in areas he neglected, centering around Oswald. And who he was and what he was doing. This is typical of you. You make these things up and they become instant fact. You will in time see what of this work I can use in a book five chapters of which were written years ago and for which I sued for that transcript. Each effort I make to keep people's feet on the earth comes from time that could be put to constructive use. If you want to pull what you are about to, I can only caution you that you will damage what you claim to be for, establishing truth. It comes not from wild dreams or self-seeking nuts or self-anointed geniuses but from fact....Your conjectures about popular reaction to serious work is also farout. You should see my mail. This is not to say they could not be more popular but there is only so much one man can do and I've made my choice. What you propose is deception, not popularization; manufactured evidence and non-fact fact. How by printing facsimiles I'm reclassifying and by manufacturing horseshit you are declassifying escapes me but you say it. So does the fact you could extract from so many worthless books. You do not confront realities and actually are unaware of them. Please try to get you self-concept under control or you'll regret what you are about for many years. Why else do you think I take time to write you? I could just ignore the whole thing....You don't know enough to discriminate re AIB (I would like to see what they send of themselves, tho....Your idea was tried years ago and failed...Yes, you can quote from WW IV what would be used in a review but no more. I'm trying to sell ancillary rights still and you can't do this in any sense that indicates I've made a

contribution to the book you project, have any association with it or any of those who may be silly enough to contribute to it. Believe me, I will not have any association with either these kinds or people your kind of approach or that kind of content. I would regard it as self-defamation. No photo for that would indicate affiliation. And be clear on this, I will not have a y of any kind, no matter how remote. Nor, please understand, can I justify to myself spending any more time trying to reason with you when you simply will not reason. Your letter makes no effort. It says only that what you want to do is right simply because you want to do it and because you have this yearning all else is immaterial. You have never displayed any mature understanding, possibly because you are the captive of so many terribly wrong printed words you are not in a position to evaluate. As even an ego-trip you project only a very childish one. And when you write the tiny few who are in contact with reality you'll not get my candor but you'll also not get anything of worth. Probably you don't even know who they are today and don't ask me because I won't tell you and waste this kind of time for them....For your own sake abandon this before you put out a permanent self-defamation. Very sincerely,

✓
59 Talbot Crescent,
Kooyong,
Victoria...3144

13 November 74

Dear Harold,

Thrilled with your news re the King case. Thank God there are indefatigable men like you around still, seeking justice. Provides a nice contrast to "All the President's Men":

Enclosed is an Australian ten dollar note - worth more than \$ 13 in U.S. I couldn't quite follow your instructions regarding cost on "Oswald in New Orleans". Was it U.S. \$ 20, or \$ 2.00? Judging by the unavailability of the book, I suspect that the former is correct - and I'm going on that assumption, so the \$ 13 is merely part-payment of what I owe you.

I am going on a visit to New Zealand on Friday - for about a month - and will attend to the last repayment upon my return. So expect a cheque or note before Christmas sometime.

Please send me a copy of WHITEWASH IV as soon as this is available. Payment will follow upon receipt. Very much look forward to this. Like you, possibly, I am becoming even more voracious for new information - Cutler plans a new book on the head shot(s) before Xmas, too!

Kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Ian MacFarlane

Ian MacFarlane

Sent III for total \$6.50 11/20/74

PS Look forward to hearing from you in not too distant future - once the task you're working on is complete (about 6 weeks, you thought)...

59 Talbot Crescent,
Kooyong...3144,
Victoria,
AUSTRALIA

29 Jan 75

Dear Harold,

Enclosed is a check for US \$ 24.70 - being \$ 10 outstanding on OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS, \$ 6.50 for the WHITEWASH IV you sent last November (which I got yesterday), and \$ 8.20 for the airmail copy which arrived earlier this week! Thanks for your prompt service...

Enclosed is a self-explanatory letter I received from the new New Orleans District Attorney, which may interest you. You will recall, of course, that Garrison (in "Heritage of Stone") quotes from a transcript of Louisiana v. Clay Shaw. Connick also evades mentioning Eugene Brading, although I specifically enquired whether any further investigation had been conducted into any New Orleans connections he may have had.

Meanwhile, I am BITTERLY DISAPPOINTED by your decision not to contribute to my book. I can readily understand your primary reason (overwork), but consider the second (the refusal to be associated with 'nuts') invalid. I thought I had made it perfectly clear that each contributor was free to present his own views - even if they were critical of the views of others. In fact, this could have been your prime opportunity to belabour the commercializers & distorters!

It might be interesting to note here that of those who so far ~~have~~ accepted my invitation, NONE have expressed concern about being 'associated' with you - despite the fact that they perhaps have every reason to do so in view of your attitude towards them.

This is not to say I don't concur, in many cases, with your appraisal of those I have approached. This revelation may at first appear hypocritical, but my stance is that everyone who has had the patience and endurance to spend large slabs of their lives studying this immense subject (whatever their financial interests) is entitled to comment upon it. If their work is weird or 'nutty', then the astute reader will readily recognise it as being such.

Let's not forget that ALL of us have made mistakes. There are times, I'm sure, when you have regretted publication of "Oswald in New Orleans" and your association with Garrison...So, you see, even you have not been free of an error of judgement. Therefore, is it fair to chastise others so?

As to your comment about whether my forthcoming book will contribute anything of substance, I can only stake my faith in myself. Unless I actually publish it, of course, I will never know if it has accomplished anything. I believe I have an ability to synthesize material, and re-present it in a readable form. Books like yours (and so many others) are fine for 'assassination buffs' who spend endless hours pouring over libraries of information - and are familiar with the cavalcade of names, events and places you describe. For members of the general public, such books must be the ultimate in mystification. Surely, we are in the business of de-classifying information about the assassination - not merely re-classifying it!

Because I'm 4000 miles away from all the action, I can present an objective view free of invective. In addition, I believe I have the largest assassination collection outside of the U.S., now totalling over 150 books (not counting film, tapes, slides, magazines, etc). From this resource, I feel I can re-present the facts (which are constantly being overlooked in the rush to find Watergate connections, etc...)

Harold, in the past I have thanked you for your forthright criticism and candor - a refreshing change from sycophancy that most people indulge in nowadays. I continue to thank you, but in this case I do feel you are wrong. The upshot of what I am trying to say is: I HOPE YOU'LL RECONSIDER YOUR CONTRIBUTION DECISION. If it wasn't important

...2/

to me personally, to include the work of the man I consider the foremost writer on the assassination, I would not have bothered with this letter.

To re-iterate: The anthology section I propose will contain short, salty articles - drawing on a wide-range of informed opinion. The AIB is to provide something on the forthcoming conference which, if you're right, will give some indication of their penchant for mind bending. Meanwhile, I have yet to hear from Jesse Curry, Lexie Allen (an investigator on the Ruby defence team), or from a photographer I hope will take a series of shots of Dealey Plaza as it is today - showing the changes that have been made to the area, and giving close-ups of the areas I think are important. I have so far contacted 15 people for contributions, and will contact more (like Sylvia Meagher and other critics of 'substance') as soon as I can find their addresses - can you help with the latter?

Co-incidentally, Bob Cutler mentioned in his letter of yesterday that Sylvia Meagher had once suggested a scheme similar to mine. Evidently she believed that a series of monographs could be collected and presented with good result. Personally, I find it astonishing that the idea has not yet been implemented, the results COULD be so beneficial (there IS strength in numbers....)

Once again, I hope you will review your decision (the deadline, by the way, is the first week in April - all that is required is an article of between 750/2500 words, accompanied by supporting illustrative material, plus a personal photo (like the one at the back of Whitewash IV). The rest, a mini-biography, quoted verbatim from Bringuier's "RED FRIDAY", I would supply!!! - I'm only joking, of course!

Thanks again for your help in the past. Long may it continue.
Warm regards,

Ian MacFarlane

Ian MacFarlane

PS ^{you} know how good! of all the folks who I have your permission to quote (especially the content and results of the 4 suits) ...