

3/29/71

Dear Howard (Dick),

I now have as large a stack of mail awaiting answer as I can ever remember, for these two trips to NY have come at a busy enough time and before neither was I able to clean up the accumulation. I haven't even been able to open some. And I have been exhausted, really out. I anticipated your large mailing might contain questions about your project, so I glanced through it on getting home and found it does. I'll make hasty response, but when I'll be able to go over the rest, and the promising clippings, for which thanks, I do not know. There are serious Ray complication I must address, expectable when we make real progress.

This time, perhaps because I began with greater fatigue, partly because "have aged so much so fast, partly because of disappointments with the non-performance by the publishers, and for other reasons, I began in less good condition. I also had a sprained foot to slow me down and interfere in other ways, as with concentration.

I always trust everyone. If I didn't, I'd spend all my time worrying. In the back of my mind, based on the experiences of the past, I was aware this station could be dishonest, but I proceeded on the basis they were not and were dealing above board. When they told me that Foreman had agreed to confront me, and repeated it two more times, I believed them, even though I could not conceive that he had and had, as they also said, read my book. It was not until the night before the first show that I knew Hanes was to be on it to. This, of course, diluted the show even more. It had been my hope that they would, as they did, do more than one show. I suggested that the first be on the book and the second be the dramatic confrontation. After initial agreement they changed the format without consultation. I had no fear of Foreman, but I have much respect for his thorough dishonesty and his smooth way, so I wondered how he could appear, what he would be able to do to save himself. They had lied, and when he found out he'd be opposite me, he fled. Hanes was too easy, and there was no need to clobber him just to clobber. I wanted to get fact across, and to a degree, in its own way, that show succeeded in this. Hanes backed off fast, but the station, terrified that Foreman would file a spurious suit, the cost of defending which could be enormous, did almost no promotion, and then had but two days in which to do it a zany arrangement. Their normal one is a 10-day lag, which does give promotional time. The show went well, everybody though it was good, and all marvelled at my cool, how relaxed I seemed. What nobody realized is how much I got from him that helps advance the overall story. The second show, which took an enormous effort to get one, because the station had opposite intentions, was the dramatic one, but again fell short, partly because under the circumstances I felt I had to shelter that black skin, partly because he began it so well, and partly because those finks did so well in self-exposure I felt I had to give them limitless opportunity. However, it excited the studio audience much, and the wonderful young people flocked around me afterward. I tried to get a message to you through a girl who got off at 30th St Station. I didn't have your school number with me, so I gave her a dime, asked her to call your folks, and to tell you of the airing time and that there are places in "hila where Ch 5 is received. Don't know if she did it or you could. But in sum, the emotional drag of these two shows was great and it has wearied me more. I'm beginning to ease out of it.

Your 3/23: Khrushchev began by asking guarantees that the US would not attack Cuba. The end solution was this much more: the US would prevent any attack on Cuba, which means more than by the US. It meant that the US would defend Cuba against any attack. JFK's pride would not permit the abject withdrawal of out Turkish missiles under severe pressure, as Kh realized, and he also knew this was inevitable anyway, so he had that even more unacceptable ready as his second blow, which made the first much more acceptable. I think that when you have completed duplicating my research, you'll find that there were three occasions, not the one to which you refer, on which JFK ordered that the Turkish and similar missiles be withdrawn.

The quote from Sch is inadequate as a reflection of the change in JFK's feelings and attitudes. Read his American Univ speech, for one thing. You refer to Berlin, but you do not yet understand that, the speech at the wall apart. The reaction terrified JFK and may have been the beginning of his education if, in retrospect, Vienna wasn't. The reaction was so

he realized that with one wrong word, indeed perhaps one more word he could end the world.

You are correct on China, but do not understand fully. And you have found what you say I described as the "mind-blower" but again, have not understood it. I thought you would, and I thought you'd get a kick out of it, so I didn't explain. Before doing so, you have changed a formulation I must correct. It is not just this one thing I have given you in strictest confidence, it is the entire thing. Use it for school, use it for your own growth and development, but for no other purpose. Had I done this book in 1966, which perhaps it was a serious error not to, it would have financed me well. I still depend upon it to provide some economic salvation.

Your approach to "cash in the bank in West Germany" is too literal minded and reflects a still incomplete understanding of JFK the man and the uniqueness of his character. There was no cash with which he could bribe Khrushchev. Remember, Kh is the man who wore an \$11 watch and a cheaper hat. These things had no appeal to him and politically, as vs the US, there was no chance of corrupting him or of his swinging his own gang. The "cash" was the abandonment of the entire posture, turning West Germany loose as the keystone of what we called but what was not our "defense". Our military presence in Europe was never, really, to oppose the USSR or resist its military expansion. It was to prevent domestic change, and in that it succeeded. But JFK foresaw a larger problem, China, and to meet this as he considered necessary, he was prepared to give Kh what Kh needed, for he, too, had a similar problem. He empowered Harriman to make a deal against China, with KH's quid pro quo our abandonment of Germany. Those who understood this, and Harriman, for example, had to, have been totally silent. Others haven't understood. This may include Sch, who merely quotes the figure of speech, as he does so many of JFK's, a la Boswell. I haven't time for further explanation, but I think I recall more and can go into it when you are here. Remember, I did this work in 1965. Your "notion", which I now see on the next page, is but the beginning. He was ready to go much further, and he was ready to reorder the world. Unless I underestimate you, this should be enough for you to go further, I repeat an admonition: penetrate the semantics.

3/24 Ray hearing negative. Judge incredible. Ali: silence. (Elsewhere, beginning of change. I had a 1 1/2 hour call from a minor ACLC activist at end airing second tape, which precluded other calls.) Z: you are partly correct. I was giving the reading of another. On reflection, I returned to my own belief that he simply is wrong in saying that Willis reappears. I regard it as impossible and that he has taken another for W. What you say about the later Z frames is correct. I discovered this long ago when I also discovered by accident that, in reactions to PW, or was it WWII, they added 335-343 to the slide trays and then studied them extensively. This was circa 3/68. Without taking time to consult my clear print, I think the point on the spray is that it was missing where it would be expected (and the scalp thing you note can explain it) and that the dispersion is not what should follow the official version). It is not alone the autopsy which discloses the flap. Z does, too.

My hasty phrasing on Nix was of improper emphasis. There is little "upward". I can't now check to see if your reflection theory is correct, but my recollection is that this is too high for reflection to account for it, and I believe the verbal accounts, as you may recall I early used Hill, who saw. That car was so well shined it did reflect easily. I also think that differences in lighting and angles should suggest that what is captured of the same thing from different perspectives need not be identical. I have no time for more on this now, or for more on that aspect. I may, perhaps, return to it in later work, when I get back to PM. Again I suggest background can make a vast difference, too. I said Nix. I was in a hurry. It may have been a part of Muchmore. And it is possible to interpret a very slight forward motion by the techniques we used, repeating each frame 10 times. On the men, I am uncertain. I am certain of the one I early discovered on Willis 5, confirmed by Itek, by the way, and made nothing of by LIFE.... Dominating the little time I've had has been correspondence with ". I didn't think Dick would want all of it and I didn't have copies of all, but if he does, let him have.... Sorry I have to be so Brief and so cryptic about so many things, like Ray, but here I do not know who I am working against, I know only that someone is working with some effectiveness against me. I made real progress and do not yet know the degree to which it has been offset. how or by whom. Best.