

Howard, your 3/3/ Oswald-Psych HW 3/14/73

Your concluding sentence, which repeats thoughts expressed earlier, is a fair summary of purpose in this session with the shrinks and in consulting them. You have, of course, read only those pages I selected. You can read it all if it interests you. I do not think it is worth the time. They wanted the sanction of "science" for that for which they had neither proof nor reason, the supposition that LHO was capable, and they wanted their pre-ordained conclusion to seem more than tenable, as Redlich put it less delicately.

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ All your opinions are justified by the whole thing, so these pages were representative enough to give you a proper understanding. You offer a general opinion on "how worthless psychiatry is as a science". While all the shrinks I've ever met seemed to me to have gone into to save their own couch bills, I have had no close relationship with any, never taken therapy from any, so I don't really know. However, I do not think it is really a science and I do think that as an art it need not be worthless. This is one of the better self-condemnations. To think that they would or could lend themselves to such a thing! They could not have had a valid basis for any opinion on which other conclusions were to be based but like most of their calling, they could not resist the temptation to play God and to attract attention to themselves and their business. I really think the original intent was to have and use a summary statement of "scientific" opinion from the shrinks, and that the shrinks, or some of them, got a little worried about the reaction.

Cameron is not always as rational as in the pages I sent, so your interpretation of his inspiring respect, as on p. 8060, is excessively kind. It is only when they got to where they might worry that they spoke in this way.

You assume the shrinks were briefed. Correct, in tow way, with an advance memo I have not troubled to get and at this very long proceeding, throughout. Some of the more interesting are these parts, where some of the staff forget themselves and argue against themselves. It may be that they also disclose what they did not go into in some of the testimony. I suspect some of the Thornley references are to what he said at lunch or elsewhere, not what he said on the record.

You say the reference to threats vs the President is irrelevant. I think it is a bit worse. For one thing, that shrink had done his paper and was seeking support and attention for it. For another, that is an entirely different type and further is not a parallel because LHO didn't talk, from the official account, he is the guy who did instead of threatening.

When you say Dulles' record contradicts his statement of agreement on the limitations to the use that could or should be made, you ignore something, that at this session he learned two things: they could not safely do it the way they'd planned and that they could accomplish the same purposes another way. So, naturally he agreed! Not bullshit, learning.

Redlich is as devious as you say, and it is here that he felt he did not have to hide his true liberal principle. He was and probably remains one of the problems we have with some "liberals". They hold him in great respect. I have friends who are friends of his and continue to hold the highest opinion. Or did as of four-five years ago. Remember, he is the one the right considered a "red", the one staff member over whom there was a fuss. Somebody knew what he was doing! I get the impression that he is the red-baiting kind of "liberal" civil-libertarian. Say red and everything is justified.

I practise a bit of my own shrinkery with this. All these lawyers knew they had no case and that they had to manufacture one, so this is one of the means they sued for more than part of the fabrication. They were all seeking self-justification. They hoped to find it in the "science" to which they turned. They'd never have gone to all this trouble for nothing, beginning with the time required to prep the shrinks. Like Linus and his blanket. Without intending it, they also disclose they knew better than they did and said. This makes me tend to credit my original hunch on how they could all have done such unprincipled things. Each felt that if he part of the case was weak, that was compensated for in other parts. And they had a prosecutorial attitude, building only a prosecution case. Being one-sided is o.k. for a lawyer. He is a partisan, an adversary. Only here there was no other side, no opposing adversary. In my experience there are very few good intellectual crooks, These were not exceptions.