

8/13/67

Dear Sylvia,

Because you misread my letter I reply immediately, ^{and} ~~how~~ with less drain on the time neither of us has. The ~~essence~~ ^{you missed.} ~~significance~~ and none of it was personal or intended as recrimination, for I love and respect you as a person and respect your work. What you believe is entirely your own affair, as is what you do and elect not to do.

We are all humans, each with his own share of the failings common to all and each with a share perhaps uniquely his own. We should understand this and not have to apologize each ~~for~~ his own, nor should we criticize each other for those we see or imagine we see in each other. I certainly had no such intent.

Perhaps I can restate it more simply: you do not have a single standard. On the personal level I tried to show you that where people you respect, as I am sure you should, behave in a wretched way toward me (and I am immodest enough to believe that in what they did they hurt us all, especially because of the timing) you were silent and would not become involved. Here, where you had personal knowledge, your principles did not compel expression from you. With Garrison, where your knowledge is less, this is not the case.

Now I have been silent about this, save to indicate my disappointment at getting no reviews from those journals from which I had expected them, and they were, in February and March ~~if~~ 1966, ~~was~~ essential to me- and us. I enclose part of this correspondence, so you can judge for yourself. The carbon of my letter to Arnoni is unclear. I'll retype it if you want, or send you the copy I have, or you can get it from him. Put yourself in my ^{place} with each, Arnoni and Vince. This is the shabbiest kind of behavior. I have never assailed either. You in particular know how utterly false their nasty accusations are. Arnoni is stubborn. He has never apologized, and he did review all the other books, as I have heard, perhaps incorrectly. (This is not a complaint based on vanity. I had serious financial risks and problems no other had. I was then bankrupt, save for the filing against me, and it cost me several extra thousands to get ~~rid~~ of that debt. The

reviews were essential to me, personally, and important to all of us.)

You yourself checked out part of Lane's manuscript for me. You know, as you personally know the date of my own work, at least the early date you saw it, that he lifted two parts of my book and put them in his appendix. I have told you of other evil things. I never mention them publicly. I went out to California to defend him when asked to, not to defend him, as you understand, but to defend all of us. I was then still thousands in debt and never got paid back, as I was supposed to. If I released my correspondence with Lane and Holt I could sell a lot of my books, hurt him (as he deserves), and I will not do it. It tell you this not to assume an heroic pose but to give you some examples of the kind of thing I have had to take in silence.

Perhaps sometime we will have the opportunity for a long discussion of the Epstein book and its proper place. You know nothing about that Washington Post story of May 1966. I had arranged it. Their getting a copy of the Epstein book when they did was little short of a disaster. You have no idea what the alternative was, what we lost by its arrival and the formula it gave the finks, until then a minority on this subject at the Post. Nor do you know what was backstopping Epstein at Viking. For the many things I did for him and them, disliking both as I do and did. Nor the abuse of me and my trust by Viking (not Epstein in this case) and the money it meant for Epstein and what it cost me. Some day I'll show you my correspondence with Viking and what I did for them. Not for them, not for Epstein, but to fend off the pending attacks on fact, especially his quite serious error. There is an alternative you have not considered: suppose the Epstein book had not been published? Mine was then out, if not in ^{wide} circulation. Lane's was contracted. Look back, on what you now know, and see if you are certain his had either the importance you attribute to it (and I then did, that it achieved commercial publication) and has been a good influence-or he has been with what it did to him.

My complaint was not that you did not mention my book (I had forgotten about the mention in Studies) but that you took no initiative when you could have

and where you did have influence, using your efforts instead where they really were not needed (and I haven't changed my inner belief, not warranted). This is not a personal complaint against you. What you do or do not do is your own affair. As long as you believe what you do, no one has proper right to complain and whether you are right or not is not really material.

I have no personal complaint about you or anything you have done.

This is a difficult letter to write, for I fear again being misunderstood and I am deeply disturbed that it has already happened. Let me skim through your letter.

My publishing and financial problems are related. I am the victim (and I reiterate, through me, all of us) of a concerted campaign to suppress. It has never ended and is stronger now than it has ever been. Pressure is now being put on wholesalers, as it was on Dell. It really hurts. With all of this, some of which is obvious and known, not one of my colleagues has, to my knowledge, helped with any of the media or tried to. There has been individual help with individual books, and little as it is in toto it is helpful and it has a beneficial effect. It is peanuts compared to what has not been done and what I have, voluntarily, done for other books, with the media, bookstores and wholesalers.

My poth was not to complain that you ^{have} ~~have~~ an income. It is simply that I am alone in having none, which has put a disproportionate ~~share of the~~ burden on me. Nobody did this to me. I assumed what I assumed for myself. But I had hoped for those efforts ^{for} ~~there it could~~ help that were never forthcoming, until it was on behalf of Mark Lane, and then his friends pitched in. I never said I alone work hard. We all do, and we all sacrifice. I have just turned down a beautiful offer of regular employment, with a fine income. That is my decision and I deserve nothing for it. But I cannot think of any of my friends arranging for a chance for me to sell my books, my doctrine and beliefs, or arranging for a review of my work. Do you realize that I never have had a review of any of my books that I did not share, although mine was the first book and, normally, would have been

Full-time work - of this.

reviewed alone. Nor can I think of even a letter that anyone wrote about any of the injustices to me. I go through this so you will understand what perhaps makes my mind work as it does and shapes my attitudes. Now for me, this was a burden it was for no one else. There have been many things written about what I did first or did alone. They were attributed to others. I have yet to see a letter on this.

My current financial problems derive from Dell's crookedness (I have yet to get the accounting due in April and I expect to be in New York soon to see about suing them), my determination to continue my work with no financing of it (and no income because of it) and my determination to publish what I think must be published. I hope my weakness in having Parallax do the New Orleans book is something I do not eventually regret more than I now do. It is not a good deal. I got no advance and share their loss if they do not do a good job or do not sell the book well or it doesn't sell through no fault of theirs. It also comes from my determination to get my wife out of the unfinished house in which she has suffered all these years. As I knew when I made my decision, if I had quit with WHITEWASH, I could have had a greater return from it. I have not made money on it and the others are losses. That I got no help at all on WHITEWASH II is less than comforting.

I never complained because you did not identify Epstein's book before publication. That you could not do. I had heard of it earlier but did not know Viking was doing it.

Do you think I could honorably not help your book all I can be cause I disagree with part of it, when I have done what I have for Epstein and Lane, both of whom I loathe? We need not agree on everything. If we are honest, we cannot. I think you erred to add anything on Garrison when I doubt if you know enough, aside from your dislike of things you may or may not know enough about to have a valid opinion. That, however, is your affair. It is, however, a standard you did not earlier apply that you now apply to him.

I know you tried with Collier. I know you wouldn't give your book to him. He wanted one not as tough.

On the credit, recall I offered it to you, even though on the important thing, the missing frames, I had earlier detected it and simply forgotten it. You didn't want it and told me about Lillian. I wrote her. She wanted no mention of her name. She was then afraid. Except in the one case, where I felt I'd have to attack Vance if I mentioned his articles, and the one thing there, that he had seen the FBI report ahead of me for, perhaps wrongly, I had let the archive alone hoping thereby to encourage more declassification and fewer thefts, I have sought to give credit to others, to the extent that I have given it where it wasn't due. I have tried to behave honorably. What I have had that others I trust wanted, I gave it to them. Where they asked me to get things for them I had not located on my own, I did not use this material. I do not seek to burglarize others. I am not happy, however, at having this happen to me to the accompaniment of silence.

You are absolutely wrong in saying "Garrison has no case" and I doubt if you have personal knowledge of that part of it sufficient to justify an opinion. I speak from nothing of Garrison's that I saw or he showed me but entirely from my own work. Whether he can get a conviction is something else, especially now, with the campaign against him. I am not Mark Lane. I did not go down and pick his brain or steal his material, as you will eventually see. I went down to help. If you could understand that there is a prima facie case there, I think you would be less ~~xxx~~ troubled. Tell me what kind of evidence it takes to convince you and I'll see if I have it (On this, I must regretfully say I shall just not be able to afford a private printing of the New Orleans book to include all the documents. I may turn out by photocopy and for a few hundred dollars and several days of time a copy of the appendix to protect my rights, but that is about as much as I can dare risk with the present state of affairs. But I do have documents, and they do prove Oswald relations with the anti-Castro groups and an FBI-Secret Service coverup of it, and they do prove that Ferrie did threaten the President's life and that he directed the investigation of him, and many other things. Is this enough to convince you that possibly there might be some kind of a case? All of this, I add, is my own. Somebody is worried enough about my New Orleans book to

keep it from ever being delivered except when it is registered. Clark has already issued an answer to part of it. Oneman quit a publishing house because of what happened to it there. The copy mailed the London Times by my agent more than two weeks ago (he forgot to register!) has not gotten to Washington from New York, nor has any of the other eight ms he then mailed been delivered. Just bad service. This may be what caused Dell to break their contract (an cost me \$30,000!).

We are without disagreement about LIFE.

I do not believe I ever said that I alone discovered everything that has been discovered. What I have claimed is priority of publication. Need I refresh you mind on how this was applied against me.

My personal feeling about you is unchanged, as is my respect I wish you could understand this. I do regard your attitude and more, your action, against Garrison as hurtful to us all and unwarranted by any fact in your possession and not consistent with your previous record. This is what I was trying to establish and get you to understand. The man is far from perfect (which of us isn't. I have personal complaints of which you have never heard). But do not judge him as you do not and have not judged others. There are those you know whose intellectual transgressions have really been greater. You know them and do not complain. For exactly the reasons you specify you hurt yourself and what you seek in your present position.

You are right in saying I perhaps have some fault in the things that bother me. I am no subtle and I say what I think, sometimes in too great haste and unclear expression that can lead to ^{mis}understanding. And you do misrepresent my belief and writing about the members of the Commission. Read it again.

I must get this chaos in the mail and forget it and get back to work. Because some of the parts relate to what I am writing, I'm making notes in answer to the CBS specials. If you have any suggestions, I'd appreciate them. Do you understand what I seek in the letters I have sent you copies of? I see an opportunity for something and I'm going for it. More detail when we meet,

which I again say I hope will be soon. I'm waiting to hear when I should plan to be in New York.

I have seen Joesten's Oswald The Trust. He uses the word like Roberts. It is a horrible book, shot through with errors and the wildest conjectures. I think he does not have the 26 volumes. If he has them he hasn't used them. He hasn't read the testimony he quotes. I suspect he quotes it and the few exhibits he quotes from secondary sources. His book on Marina will be published in England soon-may have been by now. He is working on a New Orleans potboiled. His imagination plus the New Orleans papers, and has a publisher waiting.

Since e ly,