

Mrs. Peggy Adler Robohn  
45 Lawson Drive  
Madison, CT 06443

3/16/93

Dear Peggy,

Shortly before you phoned last evening I collected some records for some writing I had begun, intending to resume that work this morning. Your call remained on my mind to the point where I was looking at the evening TV news and not paying any attention to it. When I retired at my usual early hour, having gotten up before midnight from sleep apnea and other causes, it remained on my mind. As it was when I awakened during the night. So, I write in the hope of helping you straighten a few things out.

You said you were concerned that I am angry with you. I am not. I think that should be clear to you from my Saturday's call. I had told you that I would take no more initiatives in the Baltimore police matter and I think I explained why in some detail. I also told you that I would nonetheless help in any way I could. Having been given some of the information you told me you want, I called and gave it to you. As you also learned, the suggestion I'd made earlier, that Detective Adams speak to Gary Mack, yielded exactly the kind of information you had said he wanted. There was nothing unfriendly in my call or as I <sup>am</sup> sure you can recall, in my manner. Or words.

I have no doubt that you had the best and most unselfish of motives and purposes. I never did. I did and I do question your judgement and I think you made a mistake. Perfection not being a human characteristic, your making a mistake, reflects no more on you than my mistakes reflect on me. My, when I think that I believe Garrison when he said his excesses were "fighting fire with fire" until his staff asked me to try to prevent another of his atrocities because they have been unable to do it, which with some luck and effort I was able to do, I have no reason to be proud of my judgement before then and I've freely admitted that it was a serious mistake. Most importantly and first, to myself.

I think I suggested that you back off and take stock. Not easy sometimes, Let me try to help you do this a bit.

You wanted to help Mary in particular but all of us against whom Harry Livingstone is campaigning. You believed, as I did not earlier, that a good way to do this would be to inform the Baltimore police of the improprieties of Richard Waybright and Marco Miranda. Although I did not believe this would result in any benefit to us and do <sup>not</sup> believe that it can have the opposite effect with me, I helped all I could. Harry, remember, is not rational and lives near me, and I am unable to defend myself at all.

To accomplish your purposes all you need do was inform the Baltimore police. Once you informed them all you needed to was respond to anything they asked of you, including referring them to others who had information, if they asked for any help. The rest should have been up to them. Moreover, leaving it up to them would have given you and us a reading

on them and on their intentions. Police can and do have their own interests and if you have not had the experience, I have known their interests not to coincide with those of others and to go in directions other than those who give them information desire. As you know, I reached my own beliefs about this. As I told you, I saw and see no police interest in Harry, who is the source of our problem, and I do not see how whatever they do to Richard or anyone else can make any real difference in what Harry writes in his book. Only time will now tell.

When you told me that you cannot really afford the phone calls I told you I've lived through that and when you recalled how badly your father was treated, of which I remembered some, I told you I'd lived through that kind of experience, too.

My living through and surviving those experiences <sup>was</sup> ~~were~~ educational. Not only will I never forget them, I learned much from them, including what officialdom is capable of when it has its own agenda. So I tell you a bit of my past that the FBI refers to as "nefarious."

When I was a young man - so young I was not able to cast my first vote until a year after beginning that work - I was first an investigator and then the editor of the U.S. Senate committee known as "the Civil Liberties Committee." After some spectacular and successful and informative hearings those who did not want that work to continue that way were able to worm their way onto the staff and to start changing the course of the committee's work and reports on it. They found me an obstruction and they phoned up a case against me that got me fired. <sup>The chair man wanted the committee to end.</sup> My reaction was to lobby through the ~~State~~ Senate a continuation of the committee's life for a specified investigation, of corporate farming in California. My associate in this was a professional labor lobbyist who was an alcoholic. His wife and family were away for the summer, he stayed drunk. I told him what to do and he did it remarkably well. He did all the actual lobby<sup>ing</sup>, at least all that I can remember that was important. FDR was opposed to that investigation so we had to overcome that, too. How we did that was my associate's idea, as was implementing it, and without going into it I tell you that I learned much ~~for~~ from it. FDR did not dare oppose it publicly so he was asked by a reporter at a press conference. It was that simple. Remember "Grapes of Wrath?" That was the investigation.

Once I had no employment I decided to do a book on the Dies committee. Somehow it got wind of it. Those ultra-reactionaries were virulently anti-labor and they were not at all happy about our success in continuing <sup>"my"</sup> that committee's life for the investigation of California's corporate farming. So, they arranged to set us up. They did this through Drew Pearson and one of his legmen. Then they came after us. I did the investigation I got the results of which used on the floor during the debate on extending that UnAmerican committee's life. They could not be defeated but they sure as hell were embarrassed. They were forever tainted in history by it. As by some much else. They wanted vengeance. So

they demanded that the United States Attorney indict us. He, Dave Pine, knew me well. I saved him when he had filed against a Harlan County ("Bloody Harlan") coal operator who had threatened a Senate witness inside the Senate Office Building. There then was only one. Dave called me, a kid, "affidavit face." When he did not proceed <sup>with</sup> the Dies demands the Texas gang and their pals succeeded in holding up his confirmation as a district court judge. That gang also got a law passed making it a crime to interfere with the proper functioning of a Congressional committee to have an ex poste facto basis for demanding that we be charged as felons. Pine did not handle the grand jury himself.

When my associate sought counsel for us all his fine and important friends refused to represent us. (He was so well connected I met Felix Frankfurter through him and among others, Dean Acheson, whose law firm was one that refused to represent us.) Drew Pearson provided us with the services of his law firm.

His connections were reporting to my associate that the fix was in, that there was no case against us and that there would be no indictment. For a number of reasons I did not believe that. It turned out that my wife was able to be and was a remarkable Mati Hari. I was away, she phoned me with what she learned, I returned and got the truth straight before testifying before the grand jury. Day after day after day! The forces of evil kept telling my associate that I was ruining the fix that was in and I kept doing what I started to do, fight vigorously against the frame-up. In the end I took the grand jury, of government employees, away from the assistant DA. It refused to indict us and at the same time it did indict the Dies agent, charging two felonies. Dies copped a plea for him.

It was a real learning experience for me! I do not know that in that pre-McCarthy period (it began in 1939) anyone else ever did that or anything like it. It was not easy or pleasant, save for the night the grand jury issued its indictments, when a number of liberal Democratic Congressmen threw me one helluva party! One even made songs up to sing to me! One was "The Dies of Texas Are Upon You!" Another, after the committee's vice chairman, Joe Starnes of Alabama, was "Starnes Fell on Alabama." You remember the song, "Stars Fell on Alabama?"

And one of the amazing things is that those two bastards, Dies and Starnes, when they saw me on Capital Hill, got on a first-name basis with me, even put their arms around me!

Years later, again by those who wanted to change policy and did, I was one of ten fired on "loyalty" charges by the State Department. I was given no charges and no hearing. A "McCarren Rider" gave them that authority illegally. The others were genuine scholars. I worked with three of the ten. Two were proteges of Margaret Mead. Fine scholars and fine men. I did not know the other six but it turned out that one of them was mistaken for someone I did know with the same name. My friends were going to return, they thought to their academic careers. I knew that would be impossible. I was able to convince them to let me get us counsel. We were represented by the firm then Arnold, Fortas and Arnold. I did not then know Abe Fortas but I'd known Thurman Arnold when he was an assistant AG. I

took him all I developed on Nazi cartels when I was an investigative reporter writing a series of articles on <sup>cartels</sup> it. One of his assistants suggested to me that I work for British intelligence and I did. I was what <sup>INC</sup> I was never charged with being, an unregistered foreign agent! I'd known Paul Porter after he was no longer an FCC commissioner and was in private practise. In the course of defending us successful they even arraged for a fine reporter to question J. Edgar Hoover about us. He had nothing on us and had to admit it. <sup>the reporter</sup> He was the Washington bureau chief of the old Herald-Tribune, Pulitzer Bert Andrews.

We not only won - the State Department issued a public apology! Ever hear of that in any other such case? And we were the first major "security" case, too.

Of the many other experiences of a long life that included so many adversities, to indicate what influences my thinking, understand<sup>INC</sup> and what I do<sup>INC</sup> and do not do, I add two more. Well, <sup>first</sup> I'll tell you a story, too.

My second FOIA lawsuit, first for JFK assassination records, was defeated by the FBI with overt perjury. We lost all the way to the Supreme Court. Jim Lesar did the legal work. And then, in 1974, without my saying a word or lifting a finger the Congress amended FOIA's investigatory files exemption to open FBI, CIA and similar files. Teddy Kennedy is the one who saw to it that the legislative history is clear: my unsuccessful suit cause<sup>d</sup> the amendment.

When I worked for the Senate as its editor I had the best knowledge of the abuses and crimes in "Bloody Harlan." The DJ borrowed me from the committee to use in helping draft duces tecum subpoenas. I was then about 24. Soon I was being used for much more. There was a detail of FBI agents with us. I got to be friends with them, a good friend of the one in charge, and even rode shotgun with him when no agent was there to do it. (I had to learn to take his automatic pistol apart and reassemble is blindfolded before he would let ~~me~~ me have it to use if he needed protection.) I knew FBI agents then as I have not in my work on assassinations and the litigation. The man in<sup>INC</sup> charge of that detail remained my friend when he became the assistant attorney general in charge of two different <sup>divisions</sup> parts of the department. And after he left the department and entered private practise he was one of the lawyers who would and did handle and fight "security" cases well.

But of the official party I was the only one who made local friends. I had many. Including the clerk of the federal court.

The coal-operator defendants were able to fix the sequestered jury by a simple means: they bought up the mortgages of the jurors who owned their own homes, let the wives know, and when the wives were permitted to visit their husnads, husbands, who were guarded by the United States Marshals, they told their husbands. Who told the marshals. Who did not trust the FBI or the DJ lawyers. They told the clerk of the court, who also did not trust the FBI or the lawyers. He told me. I told the assistant attorney general in charge of the prosecution. Later, as a Senator, he fathered the atomic energy act. He trusted me

well enough to give me his official armored 1933 Buick so I could be the party's rumrunner in that <sup>d</sup>ry county but he would not believe what I told him. So, I arranged to return to my Senate work. The one good thing, other than education from the reporting, that came from that failed lawsuit in which a sequestered jury was fixed despite the presence of the FBI is that six of the 30-some deputized and indicted gun thugs killed themselves within a week of my leaving.

Maybe you can see how and what I learned from these stories, maybe you can't. But each represents a different kind of learning and understanding.

The other one I said I'd report has to do with a nephew who was ~~was~~ a nice kid but who kept bad company after his father died. He called me once when he was told that the police wanted him. I went with him. One of the detectives, knowing of my work, told me that the CIA had shown him and others of that police department the Zapruder film during the good-guy part. Then, while I was talking to the other detective, he took my nephew aside to talk to him. Soon we left. And soon thereafter about a dozen charges were laid on my nephew and the kids he associated with.

I went to court with him one day. Nothing happened on that case but a deputy sheriff who had been in the audience when I spoke came up to me, introduced himself, and took me to where ~~we~~ <sup>we</sup> could talk in private. That is when I learned that the police, faced with so many <sup>6</sup> crimes they could not solve, dumped all in an area on those who had to resort to the overloaded public defenders. With so many charges, ~~overworked~~ <sup>p.d.s</sup> overworked as the <sup>p.d.s</sup> were, they counselled plea-bargaining because, with so many charges, there was a good possibility that although <sup>with</sup> no case at all the police could make <sup>one charge</sup> sticks. So, their clients were better after entering guilty plea when they were innocent. *and all the crimes were "solved."*

Before that case went to trial I spoke to my nephew's lawyer. I asked him to tell the detective who told me that the CIA was training his police department and showing it the Zapruder film - to teach assassins or to teach them have not to get <sup>caught</sup> caught I asked and to tell him that if my nephew ~~was~~ went to trial I would go public with what he'd told me. *and embarrass them all.* *(and I've been publicly silent.)* The case against my innocent nephew was dropped. But the cases against the other kids allowed the police to claim to have solved a dozen of so unsolved crimes they'd laid on the kids who'd had nothing to do with them.

I've had your father's experiences and I've had yours. I was broke and in debt <sup>for many years</sup> from the work I do until I won a lawsuit against the federal government for the ruin of our farm by low-flying military helicopter. That got us out of debt. (More of a story than I now take time for.) We were no longer broke when the county condemned the farm to include it in a park. In recent years I've been financially cautious because at my age (I'll be 80 4/8) and with all my medical problems we do not have the resources for a <sup>long</sup> nursing home stay. That with no children at some point my wife also may face.

I've rambled a bit. This is almost off the top of the head. I don't know if I've

the points I intend clear to you. I hope I have.

In varying degree I'd agree with all the others known indiscriminately as critics but I get along with most of them, too. Some I like, some I don't, some I've kept from doing what would be hurtful (not nearly as often as I'd have liked) and despite my disagreement with them they've all had access to my files. <sup>None</sup> has spent any real time working in them. Including Harry. Richard spent even so much more time in them. Come to think of it, I can't recall that Harry ever on his own looked for a single record. I know the media is going to do what I will not like but it also has access to my work and sometimes to me. When I am certain of some things they'll do I refuse to be part of it. Thus I declined to be hired by Thames TV a year or more ago and refused to be on the trial of James Earl Ray show it is doing with HOB/Warner but readily agreed to be on Unsolved Mysteries, to be aired 3/30. Thames would have paid me. Unsolved Mysteries didn't and I knew wouldn't. This is to say that for me I have my own concepts of what is right and what is wrong.

Nonetheless I've done what is wrong. My biggest mistake of recent years was to relent after the third time I told Harry to stay away and that I'd have nothing to do with him. I hoped to be able to keep him a little straighter. I'd considered him only paranoid. That was a separate mistake, as he's recently demonstrated.

Another mistake was to trust Richard. He can be pleasant and thoughtful and he was in many ways. So we regarded him, my wife's words, as only a boy in a man's body. I should not have trusted him when he said he'd like to borrow the records he stole so he could take them to Baltimore where he could xerox them free. Don't tell Adams what he can make as another or ~~two~~ more charges. If he asks me for more and indicates interests in that direction I'll tell him.

This reminds me of some considerations of which you reflect ~~no~~ awareness that I'll tell you after this is all over.

I learned years ago, Peggy, that seeking vengeance for vengeance only is not good and I've not done it. I've learned, too, that hatred can be a corrosive emotion and I do not in the usual sense hate.

I've learned, too, that what is right and what is wrong varies with the situation and with conditions. Thus I was a conscientious objector to compulsory military training in about 1932 or '3. The kids of the 60s thought they invented it. They didn't. I was also a believer in what was known as the Oxford ~~oath~~, after the English college where some students swore not to bear arms. Yet I hastened <sup>NEB</sup> my induction in World War II despite a clear conscientious-objection history. Hitler made a different situation. And after that I was on the earliest of Viet Nam protests. The conditions and the issues varied and were different.

I have no complaint whatsoever about your reporting to the Baltimore police. I believe, however, that you did not think it through and that there were emotional elements you did not and still do not perceive. I do think, <sup>two</sup> however, that once you reported it, you should

have done no more, have left it all up to them. They have their own interests, interests that can always change with the environment. Right now there are many scandals in Baltimore, many complaints, and it is not impossible that they would like the Brownie points they can make of all of this.

I think you misread and misunderstand Harry if you think that losing the help of his cops will make any real difference in his ms. and in regarding him as a coward because he is bullying. I have yet to hear of anything of consequence he got because of the cops. And knowing what he told me about his book, I do not think it exists. What he has on Mary is only his own invention. That cannot be supported by any fact the cops could get for him. What he thinks he has on me and indicated he believes he has does not exist and is also pretty silly. The cops can't help him on that. He has Mary and me in two conspiracies, with those he says conspired to kill and with his imagined conspiracy to keep him from solving the case. Harry's arithmetic consists of adding 2 and 2 and getting either 3 or 5. There is no help for that.

Once the internal investigation had an adequate case on Richard, normal procedure would have been to call him in and question him. They could have expected to learn much from him that perhaps in the end they'll not be able to now. That they did not question him when they had a case indicates that they had their own reasons for not doing that. They show no signs at all that these reasons do or can include Harry. For that they surely would have questioned Richard as soon as they could lay a real case out to him. If it did not occur to you, he has more than being fired to worry about, like being charged with a crime or crimes.

You told me that Adams' reason for being so upset about my accidental and unthinking telling David that Richard was under investigation was to prevent covering up. That is not possible. There must be other reasons none of which ~~we~~ can do us any good with Harry's evils.

It likewise is abnormal that Adams had no interest in even the contents of my files on Richard and Harry, especially ~~now~~ when the investigation was just beginning. Of the explanations I can think of none relate to either Richard or Harry. This is one of the reasons I told you that while I'd take no initiatives but would give all the help I could if asked. You saw before you got my letter that I did that. You should also, I think, have realized that when I phoned you this past Saturday I was not only not mad at you, I would also help Adams where he had indicated he wants help. That is not the same as following a blind path with him while I'm blindfolded.

Harry has committed crimes. I am disturbed that Adams et al reflect not the slightest interest in that, particularly not when they have more than they need on Richard and Miranda.

This has grown longer than I'd intended- a little before 4:30 a.m. Come daylight I'll be leaving for my yesterday's blood test and a little walking before it. We are no longer snowed in. But the roads may not yet be safe. Any indication of this here that may be informative to you elsewhere is that ~~school~~ school for today was cancelled. In fact, that

decision was reached by yesterday afternoon. The explanation is simple: the country does not want to be sued over a bus accident <sup>from unsafe roads</sup>. So until daylight I cannot see if the roads are icy. We live at the bottom of a short, steep, S-curve hill, too, and it is <sup>ed</sup> shaved. It freezes when the rest of the road doesn't.

I've <sup>taken</sup> ~~made~~ this <sup>'</sup> because I do care for you, not because I'm as you <sup>o</sup> thought mad at you. I am also concerned about your state of mind and your emotional condition. I think that what you have done is not what I'd have ~~be~~ expected of the you I thought I'd come to know, that you did not really think it through, that you'd acted on impulse and with complicated rather than simple motives. Maybe I'm wrong. After all, we've never met.

My belief, my fear is that I am not wrong.

We can't undo what we've done, either of us or others, usually. But we can learn from it if we've made mistakes.

I've suggested that you try to stand off and examine this. I meant as though you were not involved, to try to make an ~~independent~~ independent, unemotional, impersonal assessment. Perhaps if you can you may see what I see, or part of it anyway.

One of the things I'd hoped to be able to do is to show the postal inspectors that there is a pattern to what I showed them Harry has done.

I'd also hoped <sup>it</sup> that is and when the time came I'd be able to show Harry's publisher who long before this became mine that his money has been used in Harry's evil, giving him another worry to overcome. *(Paperback reprint of my thing books)*

And as I told you I would not impose on local friends in seeking their help only to have to take their time over and over again in going back to them and to any to ~~whom~~ <sup>that</sup> I'd like to be referred *to repeatedly, either.*

That I am not able to do these things, not prepared for it by the secrecy of others, is another reason I said I'd take no ~~initiatives~~ initiatives.

I am inclined to agree with your reading of the Maryland statute but I can also see in it excuses that could be invoked for refusal to do anything. This is one reason I wanted to be as fully informed as possible before taking any step in that direction, to be better able to overcome <sup>any</sup> that excuse <sup>they are</sup> before it is made. Changing decisions is always more difficult.

While I do not know Mary's reason for telling you not to give me a copy of Harry's March letter I am confident that it has nothing to do with what he said in it about her or me. She has, of course, the right to withhold it. I think it was a mistake but she also has the right to make mistakes. I've not chided her for it or even asked her for it. I have tried to <sup>my</sup> make her feel better. Especially of the time, if it comes, when she realizes that doing something about the cops does not do a thing to Harry and his insane hurtfulness. Or his book.... So, please try to relax a bit, to not feel under attack because you are not, and to do what is never easy, try to think dispassionately and impersonally along the line I've suggested. I think it can help you in a number of ways. With hope, and best wishes,

*Heald*