

6/10/70

Dear Sylvia,

Glad to get your letter of the 6th. I've not read Newman's book because I cannot afford to buy any, especially when I know they are crap. I had my own experience with Newman without having met him. When he was trying to seal what apparently was an earlier version of this one and was asked to read WW in 1965 by a small publisher (Parallax) who had already decided to do it but, an employee knowing he had worked in the field asked him to read it for accuracy, he killed it by swearing it was erroneous from beginning to end. The only book I have these days are gifts, and they are welcome. There is one man in particular who sends me what he thinks I should have, and I'm grateful to him. Where Newman is congenial to what we believe to be fact, I want to check it very thoroughly, for from what I believe, his is a philosophy that tells him that what he wants to be true is what is true. The point about the timing of the order for the rifle following the alleged Walker casing by two days is very interesting. I also had missed this. I agree with your opinion the LHO we know would have been clemmoring had his order been seriously delayed. At some point in my own work in this area in the future I will return to this, and I had already started a similar file for that writing, when I get to it.

Before answering the other and no less interesting point, I want to remind you of an unpleasantness and of a request. There are those among us you evaluate differently than I. I can tell you only that you have never had the occasion to have had some of the experiences with them I have. And I remind you that when on some occasions and with respect to some of them, I have offered to tell you what I knew if you would not ever repeat it, you declined. There is nothing wrong with that, if that is your preference. However, in order to avoid further unpleasantness and problems (some of which are again current and again have to be coped with, again presenting certain problems to me that I can forgo, having sufficient without them), I must ask of you that you not repeat to any of us anything that I may tell you. I include the most innocent things. There is reason to include even the innocent, for there are among your correspondents, who I will not name, those who make other than innocent interpretations of and uses of the innocent. I know you do not want to be bothered by the specifics, and in this case I think also that it is best not to offer them. However, please leave it to me to report whatever I want to report to the other researchers, even if it is a public thing I report to you. This way there is no chance that with the best of intentions, as without doubt yours always are, you can cause problems the existence of which you have no way of knowing.

There is not now time for me to check all my files on the LHO-rifle pictures. However, I have a pretty clear recollection of part of it. That this is missing from the inventory is in WW, close to the top of a left-hand page, about 88. The index, under Stovall, will tell you. It goes into more about the timing. Now I have also done much that I have laid aside, for my own priorities, on the lists of property obtained, including the deBruyns one. I encourage you to regard him as both able and capable of the sinister. And there is no doubt at all that both negatives were said to have been obtained and at the same time. I believe but am not now certain that Stovall dated his list in his testimony. Perhaps WW at the same point will tell you, I do not now recall. There was other malfeasance with this evidence, and that part of the tracing I have, I think, completed. In time I'll get that all done and will then give it to you. I specifically do not want Fred to have this for an assortment of reasons all good to me. I started him on this aspect, even giving him original photos. Some of his work is good, some unpardonable and inexcusable. He is imaginative and at the same time capable of the utmost irresponsibility. I know of his work on these pictures only what he reported

to me to begin with and what he published in "Probe". At some point he decided, as he had every right to do, that instead of doing this work for me and permitting it to be fitted in with the relevant, as he had agreed to, he would do it on his own and for himself, to use as he saw fit. This transformation in his own mind and attitude is something I cannot explain and think it not worth the effort anyway. In any event, he didn't even send me the "Probe" writing, which has the most serious defects in it. And he has missed the most significant internal evidence of all. This picture was also touched up on various ways besides those used as an official ~~xxxx~~ diversion and those Fred reports. Because he suspended the work in the area I wanted it done, I am having another expert attempt the analysis I think necessary, but that will take some time. He has prints made from the negatives rather than the reproduced copies or even the prints, for these are what I provided him. I also have them and when you are here as, hopefully, some time you will be, there are some things I will show you. For the moment, I think it is not an exaggeration to say that everything alleged about these pictures and their history is either established as false or at best dubious.

While on Fred, let me also report to you that it is I who started him on his Willis 5 and related work. He had begun some of it having correctly understood what I was getting at in WW. This was before I was there and stayed with him. He went much too far and his "last rain" stuff is seriously flawed. For example, if you will look at Curry about 31 you will see the actual position of the two cars and their relationship with each other. But he doesn't check his work out as he should. The number of people he misinformed and persuaded about this is rather large, and he persuaded some of the better ones to the point where they wouldn't even check themselves.

Like all of ~~this~~ us, Fred has his own hangups. These are such that we present each other with problems. I include myself in "we", for without doubt I also present problems to others.. It is unfortunate that this has become a serious handicap to constructive work, but the fact is that it has. In what I regard as the interest of all of us I have cut myself off from some. With others I maintain the closest contact and take great time to inform them of what I have and believe. If this is remote from your report and inquiry, it is motivated by the desire to caution you, to keep you from being misinformed where the source of the information does not so intend. This is not, however, to say I do not hope Fred will continue with his work in this area. However, I hope he subjects whatever he decided and reports to more testing than he has in the past.

I've been trying to get this done before lunch so that afterlunch I can get to other things. I hope I have not been as disjointed as I fear, for there have been interruptions, including with endless phone troubles that may all be innocent but, coming on the heels of what I regard as a threat, are less easily assumed to be only coincidental.

Sincerely,