

Dear Sandy,

10/7/78

I'm very glad your index came today. There was rush and important FOIA work I'd planned only those records, coming by special delivery, didn't come. So I used the time to go over all of your index and it is quite valuable. Many thanks.

If you have done no other Sections then you'll not need this record. But if you need a record what you sent me is 62-109060, Sections 100 through 131. If and when you do the rest I'll be anxious to get it.

When you do, if you can, I suggest that having the referrals at the same point can be helpful. I made a separate list of them as I read your index.

Too bad we could not have been in touch when you were reading these records. What may not have seemed to have significance to you might have triggered some of my recollection of the New Orleans days. Without reading the records themselves I can't be sure but there does seem to be a pattern and there is at least reason to suspect that some of those in whom Garrison were interested may have had CIA links.

I found a few references to me other than those you were kind enough to take the time to flag. When I can I'll be going over them. I have separate copies of some from my ~~PA~~ PA request. My major interests in these are what I didn't get under PA and the fabrications they released after I invoked PA.

Some of the Lab records may be of value in one of my suits. You've flagged a couple.

I would like to know if you are going to do more like this because I want to plan on how and where I'll keep them. If there is going to be enough to bind then I'll find some way of starting that way.

If you did not keep a carbon you asked what I think about the future of the JFK case and the future role of the critics. It was kind of you to realize that I am pressed for time but I've changed today's working schedule and where young people are serious and ask reasonable question I do try to be informative. While this does take time I think it is not an unproductive way of spending time. What I don't like is silly questions.

I wish I had a copy of a speech I drafted for a meeting at the NYU law school the end of April 1975. I never had a chance to read and cut the draft and I got sick and couldn't read the speech. Jim Lesar read it for me. I anticipated what was coming with both the committee and the so-called critics and I tried to inject some reason and sanity, perhaps also caution, but among those who hungered for a committee - ANY committee - it was not well received and among none was it heeded. The result is that nuts and self-seekers begat nuts and irresponsibles. There was no way any committee under Downing or Gonzalez would be responsible. With that beginning complicated by the appointment of a gung ho! prosecutor type to run it disaster was certain. And it has come under Blakey, who had the same mentality and past but is a different, quieter type and a proficient coverup artist. There has not been a serious investigation under him and there would have been a different path to the same place under Sprague. The committee has not brought anything really new to light. It did us no good for them to identify the nuts and belabor them because they were careful to make it appear that the wild ones represent all of us. So we are tarred with them and in varying degrees will continue to suffer this.

Ordinarily I would try to answer about the critics by separating those who were so bad for this committee after the kind of committee it is was clear enough and those who understood. There are so few of the latter I can't make that distinction. For practical purposes all the other critics are in the first group. And I can't speak for them. What I hear them saying for themselves is unpersuasive. I think also unwise.

When as AIB and Hoch have said they did some good, I disagree with saying this. Our remarks should be addressed only at exposing them for what they set out to do and did do, not appearing to be grateful for a few inconsequential crumbs. Those who profess the committee did good are not real subject experts or have strange ways of thinking. Some are both.

I don't see any good coming from speaking well of those who have been dishonest because maybe they were dishonest only about 95% of the time. I'd rather say they were dishonest than say they were honest because 5% of the time maybe they were.

While the committee's report, the effect of its hearings to come and those held

and the popular and opinion-maker attitudes to all of this can't be predicted, my hunch is that among the major media and the official people the committee will be accepted as the commission was.

What anyone can do expect point out flaws and continuing to inform himself accurately I cannot now say. I will speak for myself.

I am pleased that you do not now emphasize theories about conspiracies and instead speak of the effect on the country. This is right and important. It is the correct and proper way to think and speak about the subject, although most do not.

I guess I am also saying that as I seek it the role of the critics should in the future be as it should have been in the past. I put it this way because I believe that most of those who received attention in the past were not responsible.

For myself I will try to do as I have been trying and doing.

The amending of FOIA and the campaign to create this Frankenstein coincided, as did Jim Mesar's having some time for the FOIA suits. For me these have been the right way and will be. There is no substitute for fact and we have suffered no greater liability than from all the idle and usually wild theorizing. Almost all these theories were irrelevant but they attracted attention and for most kept the attention alive and the money coming in from exciting speeches that ripped of the minds of a college generation. There is no way we can undo what these people have done and no way they can escape the responsibility. I doubt any of them will see it this way.

I don't know what the AIB people will be thinking and doing. Jeff sent me what I take it will be their next newsletter and I've expressed my disagreement to him in a letter I mailed yesterday or today. I am aware of their financial problems. I think their present approach will magnify these. While I'm not really familiar with what they did during the hearings I'm sure it kept them busy and that they did what they thought they should do. I've not spoken to any of them.

We may not have discussed it when you were here with them but last May I said what I thought should be done for and at the hearings, to them and to Fensterwald. I also offered myself for this. They did not want it and I remained at home doing my own thing and leaving it all to them. We could not have stopped a determined committee but we could have made a vast difference. They could have been exposed and with any kind of competitive situation in the press we did have a chance of some of it getting attention. That now is past. I won't do this now because it can't succeed now. I wouldn't do it in the Kinf hearings in any event because as long as Lane is Day's lawyer there will be added and serious problems. I will stay aloof. And by the time they hold their next JFK hearing their report will be written. Validating it in the media and popular minds was one of the purposes of the show they put on.

I distinguish between Jeff and Bob as people and thing they are good people and what has happened. All I could do with them is say what I think and this I did. I really did not hold what I regard as a bad AIB past against them.

You refer to a frustrating battle. Don't let it frustrate you. Nothing that is politically good ever comes easy. Be prepared for this reality. What is important is that we try to improve any such situation. This is not impossible. What is impossible is an absolute and I would encourage you not to expect it because that can be frustrating and very discouraging. It is not easy not to expect and want what can't be had it is important to strive for the most but try to see and accept the world as it really is.

Again thanks. I hope you find school interesting and rewarding and that you do well. When you are near here again please stop off.

Best wishes,