## 2/20/72

in. Wrea Grahan
Tho dew York thues
1920 L St. . NW
Washington, I.C. 20036
Dear ired,
Lingerins trouble with the thumb makes inadvisable use of that hand for extracting files from over-jaruted cabinets, s I I'Il roply to your 8 dity $2 / 17$ from memory. I did understand you to say your call was to tell we that you would respond to the questions I wrote, and I took thase thingss you did 50 into to be illustrative of tho cundor you intended. Chose responses wert helpful and $i$ have an adequate record of then. However, as I thirk you realize, you did not aduress some that i think anong the wre important. Here I dean not onl ior fiy own writing, but I take the liberty of su, esting for your tininking and in your interest. In particular those questions I asked about your satisfaction, at the time and in retrospect, about your on professional performance: did you treat this as all other stories, did you do as you would have with an onánary story, thinge like that. Hy own view 1 have made clear to you in our conversations, I beliove in advance of Lattiner' 5 secine anythinge This is the idnd of thing I feel I must address, and I would prefer not to eduress it without comment from you. unless you wake comment, I'li have to be litited to ny own neve experiences of the past and my observations of present practises.

Your gecond graph is a ropetition of what you told ne. I not only do not doubt it, but it wates perfectly good sense. That is no new developaint in rewapapiring. In the 30s my own editors kept ticklers, and I maintained ny own. If I did not ask if you inquired into the basis for sciectinc Lattimer, as I think I did, if you diti ask end are under no constrainte, I'd like to bnow the answer. Frankly, it nystifies me, as does tio decision to lot enyone seu this stử now, at a tino of least interost and no public wemand at ali. Even after the ininor sensetion you Btarted, I how of no single second-day story -angwhere. Some major papors did all out ignore it. I ciow or one that followed your piece ith a call to Whoads and between the two carries less than two sticks. so, with no popular or henaedy interest to serve, I elso find myself.wondoring if the original idea was itarshall's. 'There is no reason to presure and I do not pre wne a pro-existin: rolationship botweon hin and Lattiver, aud my own hunch is that politicelly they are wide apart. as I think of this I regard it as nore likuly that sonwone he felt he could trust gave harshall the idea, and if this is correct, the field is pretty limited. Hiarshall is so urinfurada and so humgup I dount he really igows what he is into, and the lat thing he' 11 do is telk to somebody who does or oon lonow end holds a vieu contrapy to tho of icial line. I doubt hie selfrespect irf, indeed, hia reputation, survives what he has and has not done. In what for me is a considerable cost in time, and sowntines in exasperation, I have tried to inform him, but he jast refuses to think, dependine, I would suppose, on those in his past in whom he then had comidence. phere ore none so blink as those who will not see. anyway, tilie is an area in witich, if you have non-confidential rowledict, I woulu welcoue it.

If you cannot or will not take the tiae to anner the unanswered questions in writin, I have this suefertion: I heve 4 consultation ith an or thopaedic surgeon within walking distance of your of ice at 9:30 a.m. The conaultation itself should not take long. I cannot forecast whe ther new Juraye will be indicated, or theraphy, or beasuring for a brace (I nuver knew they cask for thumbe), out any ons of these things could detain me. If you ure thon
 the li,ctory for rupirs is back by then, l'll brine both if you would like one for yourself. If you would and I have only the one rachine, I'll make a dub for you. This is to satiafy you, If you hive any question, awout fidelity of quotation, airect or indurect. isho:id you like, I an quito wil ing to further, a you ha wo in part k om all along. I' if whlcome a visit irom you here. It is at hour from your office, lesw from northwest or suburbun mayland. There nay be mone things you'd like to buow. Leponding on what, some would have to be in confidence.

Showld you elect this, there way be sumo other sidu-benefits in it for you, il you have a family. I know only the once roference you nade in 1966, that my uilliswinh cane bctweon youxaid your wife in bod, whon you both wantod to read it (acomplement not reflected in your subsequent brici coment on it). If you have kids, thay aight enjoy the countryside. Ir it is cold enough, w have a pond on which the neighborhood kide ice-skite.

I take another liberty and sugeest you nijgt want to thini: further of your sentonce: "There may be some tricky business afoot herew but I's not imowingly part of it, so I don't mind telling anythinge" If I thought you were consciously part of any buch thin, do you sup ose I'd have made some of the offars I have made to you? sut there is no coubt in my find that both things are true, that there is "some tricky business afoot" anc that you are part of it. I have more than once indiceted to you that in my opinion you were used. You enjoy no monopoly, and I cail show you how this happened from alinost the first day with the JFK asoassination wid is hapemini even today with that xaf of king. (If I forget to come back to this, rumind me, for I can establish it with ease, an it nay, in time, interest you.) If I an leas than hay, y with some of your roportine, knowing tho Tines policy ani the problems of reporting so many things that one can't become export in any, tinis ooes not lead to the deduction that your are dishonest or anythin ${ }_{E}$ like that. I also krow the degrec to which a man covering a beat coras to depend upon and to trust some of his sources. The one trouble I have here is indicated above, which led to hy questions ebout the professionalism of your handling of the story, for here is where I think you hurt yourself and were responsible for the wholesaling of fiction as roality, and I know others working in the field hold a hersher view then I. It will take time for you to ruach your own indopendent judgoment.

The tricky-businese part also leads to ap rehensions about the normality you plan, "If Burke dr gs his feet much longer there will be a story in that." $I_{t}$ is only natural that you carry this further, for that is a reporter's obligation. Hy concern is with some of tho consequences, and the probability that there are those who well know that it is predictable that you will soon bo asking questions, as others, surprisingly, hre not. I consider it nut anlikely that there bay be some who want this, some in ofilaial positions. I do not think Larshall does. And, I can also think of a ready answer he can ive you: "I have let one expert sec it. He has reported what he saw, and his ruporting cot wide attention. Anything else would be no more than the ansational and undignilied use the gontract was desjened to provent." would you regard this unreasowable without prodding from me? Or, would your editors? Without siy knowledge, I would not. And I think Narshall has no reason to. Hy apirehensions lie elsowhere. Hy concem is with the further prostitution of truth, in the very broadest sense. You might want to consider if thu future records that you were one of the instruments used for such purposes, as you have been scveral times, I do not by the remotest indimection sugest with your knowledge or desire, you will then be content.

As $\begin{aligned} & \text { You lenow, I can't dual with this wothout doaling with you. As you have no way of }\end{aligned}$ knowing, I have to do it trice. Your explanations avout the one you do not know more than satiafy me and justify an account I think you will not resent. So you can understind how open ay intentions are, I will be happy to show you both treatments in rough draf't and if you have any objuctions of sutiestions, will be clad to consider them. 執 quest is not for goats. I sook truth and the baking of as complete and accurate a record as I can on what I have come to regard as onewof the major turning points in history as well as a unique study in the functioning of govermient. Thu. forx example, answors to questions I inight not find necessary to une in this epilogue to a completed book asy have a furure value as part of an archive. I have humdreds and hundreds of hours of tajed interviews I think will serve future inerests that I nay nuver use in any writing or have or will use oniy in part. Une of the great satisfactions to me has ben the willingess of so many ecnerally regarded by "critics" as "the other side" to trust we cand in many cases to provide roal help. "his includes public officials, Clay Shaw's friends and lawyers, who rogard ny treatment of hin as erinently fair and privately say directly op osite what they alloged in court (you way recall they Luver subpenaed ne as a witnes in that proceedinis), even the most extreme of the very far richt. iside from assuring.

Thus there i an added reavon for deniring angwers to those questions 1 heve asked you and others that may occur to you. The form is imaterial to we.

Lattimer's answer to questions I asked hin may interest yout he will sond me a reprint of whatever he writes.

Lou use a phrasine that interests me, although it way bo without neanine. I have been writing this while resting from bursts of digeing out. Wo have had the worst storm in years, with winds, I'm sure, close to hurricane Btrongth. The thought occurred with the shovel, not your letter, in hand. You say that Lattimer "received a letter from farshall that the arohives didn't consider a final approval." This reminds me of one of my exporiances, where liarshall twice told me that it was olay with hisi if it wore okay with the arohivist which, need I tell you, it was not? If something liku this happened, it would have the net effect of letter ithoads, not Harahall, make the final decision. That is what happaned with me.

I also bave heand from Cyril recutly. He then had had no apiroval. No word is no approval. He asked me if I would consult with hin prior to his going in if he wore approved. Nh response was that this would depend on conditions. Uhless they change, I do not approve his seeing this stuff now because of the conditions the context. On this I seem to be a minority of one. Howevor, everything that has happened convinces me that my understanding and my position are correct.

Barlier I referred to the Ray case. If you have interest in the point I was meiding, get the current issue of Esquire and read what I do not believe you can be in a position to evaluate, Bymum Shaw's piece, "Are You Sure You Know Who Killed Kartin Luther "ine?" There are several easily comprehonded pointsat which it becone apperent that, assuning Shaw to have been of honost intont, he was used. Whether the dishonesty is his or that of another or others, the consequences can be quite serious and evil. Ray's unsuccessful eflort to escape six days ago may be one. That he was not lilled in that efiort is a fortunate accident.

