

7/11-5 I now feel I should sent this, but please keep it in confidence or send it back after reading.

After finishing the first two pages I jumped into the pool for a couple of lengths to cool off (physically-over 85) and had the first chance to think. I wrote as I read. Before getting to Bill's, it now being lunchtime, I tell you that while I was ~~was~~ charitably inclined to Jerry, considering that he is immature and has unrecognized or unacknowledged if recognized emotional problems. I have tried to address some of these with him. But he is now self-disclosed as vicious and dishonest in ways not completely explained by these allowances. I now believe he is really beneath contempt. He is, strangely for one professing his political views, littlebetter than a moral and ethical III. You will note that he has abandoned his lie about not having seen this stolen stuff here. And it is quit also that everyone has the right is government files. He has the right to those he finds and uses, not to those of which he knows nothing. Jerry also knows that this work is published, despite his lie about it to you. He has copies and has made copies for others of the first two parts and knows when the third was copyrighted and skimmed part of it here.

Will hasn't finished the salad. For your understanding and future self-protection, are you coming to see the bankruptcy within what is called the critical con-unity? And the causes of some of the galling and lies? Sylvia's, for example, with so magnificent a work that was dated when it appeared, not only by having been fairly thoroughly covered earlier by others but because our knowledge had swept past her. She has done nothing good since and it hurts her. Who, really, has done any work since the very first book appeared? Do you need more than a hand to count? and has one of these caused any real problem? Do they not still get along, if, as between Hoch and me, with harsh exchanges freely made and freely accepted? More and more I come to think this is really what drives too many. Jerry seeks only a little self-importance, something he is not satisfied to get here he has earned it, in his professional work, which he apparently dislikes.

If you do a memo on Cyril, I'd like a second copy to put in my file on him. Be certain to mark if you want confidential. Otherwise, those who come here may read, like Gary. There will be fewer! Or Dick.

#### CONFIDENTIAL

Sylvia did not tell me that she has been on amphetamines for 20 years. I don't think she said she suffered withdrawal. Nor do I think this prescription was for physical reasons, not for that long. I'd be interested in knowing how the prescription coincides with the end of her marriage, whether for the reason she gave you or the one I seem to recall, not a dependable recollection, to be sure. The remarkable thing is the coincide, receipt of my first letter. No response to second. Don't expect any without change in her.

Graph 2: while it is unlike I would have consulted with Cyril, I did not close door entirely and he has yet to inquire about what I regard as hazard. This also indicates that Cyril has seen the stuff. Where Lifton got the money to fly to Pgh is an interesting question, as is the possibility that he remained. He didn't fly across the country for me. I hope you and she carried this further, esp. how she thinks she is going to help him in any way he can or will accept if he has seen the stuff. Or what good it has her to have doubts now when she could and should have explored earlier. I am not particularly happy to be in the -told-you-so position. I can read this sentences any other way that that Cyril has seen: "She also told me that Jerry had told her that Lifton told him he met with Cyril for an hour in Pgh before Wecht got access." Nor can I imagine what good an hour would have done anyone but Lifton, whose ambition has been equalled only by his sickness and lack of any scruple.

Gary did not tell me he had sent her a carbon. I don't care, but had I know it I'd also have sent her a copy. I have no objection to your volunteering to her that Jerry's source of duplication my work was in confidence and from me more than two years ago. If you desire.

How can she rationally now admit that "of course the government must have some plans to damage to the whole truth, but that ~~inconspicuously~~ we had this opportunity now and we should make the most of it" and I don't mean the internal contradiction alone, how can we "make the most" of a design to hurt us when we have no power and they have all? I can't imagine a more complete vindication of my position or a more thorough self-condemnation of her refusal to engage in a dialogue about this. But what is lacking in even this irrationality is any description of "this opportunity" except the possibility of disaster, or as you certainly know, how little probability there is of substantial advancing of what I've

gathered and put together. Does this possibly in your present understanding begin to give you an idea of what we could have done so long ago if all the others were unselfish, were willing to use some of what they can't take with them, what kind of work I could do if instead of all the tinselly futilities on which she wasted time I could have edited it, and if Cyril had not only gone over it and my other material with his expertise? Carry this a bit further and ask yourself if we did not have a real opportunity if to this you add his acceptance of my offer of a safe way to bring it open, by formal charges, and with this book available to back it all up -and in the right context? In considering this, you should also understand that there is no possibility of repayment if the book were to be what under the best circumstances it couldn't be, a best-seller. What we have in this is beyond compensation, beyond repayment in cash or recovery in any way. And in a great oversimplification, can you not now ask yourself where all the real selfishness really lies?

Why does she NOW find "perfectly reasonable" your position that my "material not be mentioned"? I presume you meant used. How is it now reasonable and unreasonable all the time up to now?

"she has always tried to stop Cyril from making such statements"! MY God, Howard, that Nobel stuff was not NEW to her? I think you should do some really deep thinking on what this says of her, her judgement, and probably unrecognized intents, for which I suggest you have ample context for what can't long be ignored as a possibility of not a probability. How much worse this is if she had to call in on the show and correct him, and has so firmly held to what now can't be better than an absolutely insane position if after each of the apparently unstoppable irrationalities and irresponsibilities "she writes him detailed letters afterwards pointing out his mistakes". And she would enter into no dialogue with me when I envisioned disaster and she knew this and I didn't? I don't spy on these people, so I had no such knowledge. What is in the Epilogue you read didn't become as clear until I reread the file for the writing. Can you try and give me a dispassionate explanation of all of this that in your opinion, not mine, can be considered anything from reasonable or rational to responsible or irresponsible, to anything but ulterior motive on her part?

You talk about trying to "save him". If what can be used against him, which must be much worse than I know, is used, please tell me who can try and "save" and how and who can think of the effort without recognizing the needs of his own destruction and that of any shred of integrity? I think you now have to answer this to yourself, quite separately, for if he has seen the stuff, you can't now "brief" him. And this, too, is what you'll have to live with if not, indeed, survive.

Here you refer to the future, "details to look for", seemingly inconsistent with the Litton/Pgh hour's meeting "before Wecht got access".

On response to her changed position after reading my second letter, aside from its lack of genuineness, she is factually quite incorrect. I can show you a rather large effort besides what you know of of arrange use of this material, including her (she could see no more than a rag piece in The New York Review, in the Garrison case, by Cyril in court-all with at best a corrupt and inadequate press; with showing to a TV net and two large newspaper syndicates; efforts at LOOK; LIFE, a number of publishers. Not just talk, a real effort. And there remains what she must at some time confront, the refusal of those with the means to make it possible for the whole thing to appear. Do not mention her or Cyril, but include Ned and ask about that whole shabby thing about which she kept her mouth closed on all details, and Arch Inbrough and Bud Fensterwald as only a beginning. I think it is time to start blowing on the coals of personal guilt, penny-pinching self-serving and self-deception. It may be the only inner purge possible. When to her knowledge I have two of the three parts away, one to Cyril, who used what he could comprehend in court, and the other to Garrison, love coming from the mouth of a worn-out whore is more genuine than any allegation that I have been "suppressing this info from the public" (your paper).

On confidentiality this is as big a lie as she can utter. There is, first of all, nothing not traditional in my position, and the total refutation is above. Her record on Epstein and Forman is more than enough, and it is but a beginning. Because she was uncritical both hurt us. But she DID keep both entirely confidential. What a comparison when she makes such a complaint. I think you should know that from the first, except for the contents of LW, she refused to accept anything from me in confidence that I can remember, including what her own interest required. She preferred a gregious error that would gnaw at a decent, rational mind. In no sense is there any difference between her getting the death certificate from

me directly or from me with an intermediary, knowing it is from me. I hope you warned her about context and full comprehension, not yet indicated. It is past time to tell her how far out of it she is, most of all by refusing to think, not by refusing to work. She is better equipped than any of the others to do this thinking.

Before she is moved, your word, to have Wecht hold a press conference and release it, aside from the pre-existence of a copyright that is valid and precludes use without my permission when everyone involved knows of it, I now have a chain of possession proving a deliberate reconstruction of my work from my materials given and accepted in confidence. It as I doubt there was anything genuine in her claim that she would have been "torn", a claim amply rebutted by confidences from Thornley, Lifton, Epstein, Tink, Foxman and it seems Wecht to begin with, she had better realize how "torn" she will be if and when I can get to doing something about this. One of the more promising opportunities will be if there is the potential disaster.

Next graph unworthy of combat. But when she gets her fat ass of a soft chair and does a little balling of her own, with or without sleep, any criticism will come with better grace. Again I point to the record, Liebel's subsequent total silence and withdrawal of his UC project and his book. As far as mopping up the floor is concerned, that cheapens her a bit too much.

She is a deliberate liar when she says what is in any event irrelevant, that she had a bound copy of Epstein before she saw W. Read my files. She had W before Epstein finished and returned it before she ever heard of him. Ask yourself why she should lie now. Although W had then been done for about a year, she then evaluated it as infinitely better than her own, so I presume she spent the next year improving her own with what she learned for it. There was little to learn from Ep or Lane. I have no objections. I offered her everything I had. My sole objection is to the initial dishonesty and its reproduction after she was caught in it in time to change it, and there chiefly as a subconscious reflection of what galls her and make her hate, calling it love. And respect.

It is a deliberate lie to say she "forgot" to correct this error. It is this about which she got furious about our US lunch meeting. She then said that so far as she was concerned the limited edition had no standing (it was 1965 and the one she read) and I then reminded her that the general edition was two months ahead of his still. This is deliberate effort to con you and preserve some internal self-respect. There is no possibility of accident here, none of "forgetting". I emphasize this because of what it means, not what it costs me, which is nothing except in her mind. Can you understand what it then told me about her?

Howard, reread the graph in which you quote her in some shock as saying "Then Specter knows the whole story!" Forget about my telling her this (and I think she or Vince or both leaked it to Tink is late 1966 or early 1967 and that she read it EMI. Forget all that should suggest itself to you along those lines, and ask yourself several things: first whether she does not lust to pin the whole thing on the Kennedys, any and all, and the hell with exculpation of the guilty; ask first how she can say "this can not change things" and have any sincerity in it. "Somehow the Kennedy's or public should be informed that the Kennedys did not suppress this material." Like Teddy stopped beating his wife? She and Ned have been in on just the opposite, together, for a long time. It doesn't, by the way, "tear" her to keep Ned's work against me/us in confidence, does it, as long as it is get-Kennedy work, or get-Harold. Can you believe this shit? And if you do, can you believe or trust any of that cabal. What is next is ever worse: "she said that she genuinely was not aware before tonight that this material was really in the hands of the Commission." First, obviously, is for no other reason, because she refused to discuss it with me in any way. Second, lie. I told her about the excess part long ago, in the Specter context.

That her thinking has not changed with 20 cents will get you a cheap hamburger. It is too late, except for making it worse and inhibiting any possible counterattack or rectification, and she bears heavy personal responsibility on that, not beginning with but including Ned and Cyril and Jerry and Gary and Lifton and many, many others.

What does reform of the coroner system have to do with Cyril's activities here or with the nonexistent risk her runs. Can she be so insensitive to the not potential but real ones of ours of which she has known enough for seven years and only adds to?

How noble it is for everyone to "work together in the interest of the case" to help the interloper/fake/self-seeker Cyril, but how ignoble it would have been for this to have

been done with us when we were the only ones really working full-time on this, really going, after and getting new things, really offering them to everyone who would look. Somehow there is no cheer in helping work, but decency in helping what she no adults has to be part of government dirty-work. I fear I suffer the liability of having been formed in my ethics and thinking before the days of what I think you will remember, "The New Math and The New Sexuality".

If there was this genuine interest in doing something, why did 100% of those in a position to a) quit work entirely and b) not help ongoing work in any way and c) do what they could to destroy it and its effectiveness?

From this memo of this conversation you have much more thinking to do. Please also clarify me on whether or not Cyril has actually seen this stuff.

You are wise and mature to ask the questions with which you conclude. They are not now for you the important ones. I don't care what her motive, for enough are clear. I don't care what she says she thinks of me or Cyril, for her actions leave nothing but their meaning and words have no way of offsetting or changing. You now know more and worse. I repeat, it is a matter of indifference personally to me, you do or you don't. It is not a matter of indifference to you. Think of yourself only, of whether anything is now possible and honorable, for anyone. At this point, egotistical as it may seem, I have no doubt about your intentions, but on the record, mine seems to be the only honorable record. This does not mean you have been dishonorable. You haven't done anything. I mean compared with those who have. Kick them off and ask yourself, on any and all points, in retrospect I feel much better than at the outset I thought I would or could. Not at being hurt, abused, insulted behind my back, or having my wife live as she has. But about having seen clearly and adhered to a correct and principled position. We can't always look back with as few regrets, and this was one of the tougher decisions, one of the harder things to see clearly, to understand. You know I was all alone. Matter of fact, this is also very bad for me in another way. If in the future there is disagreement, honest disagreement, between those few with whom I will have any intercourse and me, this experience more than perhaps any of the earlier ones like it may too easily convince me to trust my own judgment and not that of others who may well in specific cases be correct and I wrong.

I have already copied and enclosed her letter of 7/4 to me. I can't make a better copy without the waste of paper I can't afford. If you later want a better one, when I am using the machine and you are here, you can make one if you can't from this. I am going to have to ask - and I do no more than ask - that you be responsible with this. You are not to use it in any way to hurt her. I have no interest in any defence of me. It is irrelevant to the problem and the situation. I do not have the reluctance I had earlier because she has told you about the pop pills. But I have no reluctance in repeating to you, keep your mouth shut about this unless you absolutely have no other choice. It can be refused to destroy her, and despite what she has done to me I neither want it nor want anyone else to do anything that might contribute to it. I don't think you do, but in case you get bitter about this, so if you make a copy, attach some caution to it. This is important to you, Mr. 19, as it is to her. This is not a new thought with me. You now know better and more about her and Cyril. You also know how I handle them in the Epilogue, making it impossible for any but a very few of us to even know about whom I'm talking. My interest was not vengeance but an honest, accurate and complete historical record. Events may compel me to change this and add identifications, but as of now - have no such intention. If I do, I'll have to identify them. We never help ourselves or principle by hurting others. Sometimes hurt to others is unavoidable, which is different. But to do it deliberately is wrong and hurts those who do it, too.

I have not read Mr. 7/4 and don't intend to unless you have questions. I've spent more time on this than it would have taken to complete what I should do on P. and I've not been able to get to it. And I am into other things about which I've not cautioned you because you have not been into them, and they take much time and thought. I may write Mr. another letter. If I do, I'll carbon, and it will not breach confidence, unless you would regard reference to diffen except not mentioning his name a breach of confidence. It may be necessary. I don't want to. Besides, we are also in a political time, too.

If you go to the library and have some time, there are these things you can do for me. Howard Hunt is in Who's Who for at least 1965. Hear to, and there are contradictory bios. He promised copies but hasn't delivered. They should be in hand. He is more important than

has been indicated or disclosed. His listing for the year 1965 is supposed to include employment at Littaur and Wilkinson, 500 Fifth Ave, NYC. That is at 42nd., nw corner. I know. If you can see the NYC directory for that year and 1966, please get all the names listed for that office and if you can go further, see when that office changed names and if it continued in the same business and with any of the same people. Also, it would be good to know who then was in that office, what business, what personnel, etc. If I haven't filled you in on this, it will have to wait until you are here. Also a list of his works, if no great sweat, and when published and by whom. I don't have time to go to the library congress on this and others will only talk about doing it. One of the more interesting possibilities is the book about the assassination of a President Castro of Panama. He also used pen names I can supply. If I get to responding to some accumulated mail before I send this, I'll enclose names, titles I have.

If you continue to be troubled, you can now recall without reading how Ecclesiastes begin, with vanity, the sun rising and setting with the earth abiding forever, and all the rivers running into the sea yet not filling it. The ~~guy~~ old boys said it like it is.

Best,