

4/25/70

Dear Gary,

Your 4/18 letter, enclosing 4/16 to Rich and John's 4/12 to you, postmarked 4/21, arrived this a.m. We have company, so I may not have time for long response. And I do expect to get into town to mail this.

Of Course, the John thing is interesting, reflecting part of what I have long suspected and addressed in various ways, including a still different one to Hal this a.m. early, my belief the incompetents with good intelligence, those whose labors have lead to naught but futilities, with their tremendous yearning to come up with something of significance of their own, buttresses by their inordinate egos, develop strange rationalizations by means of which they steal and justify this to themselves with more acceptable rationalizations. By the time their minds work it over the victim becomes the villain and they are selfless mabbys. This John explores my "errors" and were they there, imagine the enmity on that aspect! But by all means, as I asked, explore this errors, real or imagined, and do not be embarrassed in learning John's own estimate of them. This may be helpful. If I did err, in no matter how minor a way, we should know an end, if possible, record a correction. If not, as I think more likely, it may be worth knowing what John comes up with and the time value he places upon an effort to undermine my work. Kind of like Lifton's wrong conjecture about what Barrett was really after, blended with an analysis of the operation of the wrong camera, to justify inexcuseable FBI error, ignore the very real 30% timing error in the reconstruction, resulting in a scholarly work among the recipients of which, naturally- and for such scholarly purposes - was the NYTimes.

By now you know the latest developments in the Nichols campaign, save one. While accusing me of lying about garbling in the wire, he has, as you have seen, asked WU for a refund. As I told this demon investigator in this so-typical example of the workings of his mind, all WU in Washington had was the original copy and, depending on the kind of equipment, the copy could be obtained only from the Frederick office. Well, they apparently use tape and I apparently have the only copy! He is bothering the hell out of WU, so I'll make them a copy and they can send it to him, etc., probably with the refund he wants. In the reading to me over the phone, the garbling was unclear. Two days later, when I first saw the typed version, an educated guess was possible. As I wrote you, there was no doubt John wanted permission to have the two PMs. Had I not other reasons for declining, his peremptory tone was sufficient. Now that you know he is ignoring my offer, I think more than generous and perhaps stupid with his history, and with the character of his letter I sent you, I think the one I wrote him will end any communication between us. I hope he is only sick. Your word, bizarre, is hardly adequate. Incidentally, if you read his letter with care, I think you may assume he copied PM, the real reason he asked to keep it for a "second reading" (I have the letter), hence he doesn't need another copy if I made no changes. You'll also note I didn't respond to this in any way.

Powers: that was not Paul's contact but mine. I asked P and H to contact Gentry after Gentry phoned me. The errors you cite are those against which I warned him. He promised me galleys but I never got them. I carefully explained no useful purpose was served by having Oswald in "link to get Powers shot down near Sverdlovsk when the radar picked the U-2s up anyway, that the summit was ruined by the overflight alone, with only the 4th decibel level varied by the hard evidence. I've not seen the book, received first (small) slip this a.m. No local attention yet. But if your stations air this, ask fairness-doctrine time by phone for me to respond, esp. since a) I have done most of the HQ writing and B) Gentry consulted me.

What interests me most and why I respond immediately is the incomplete references to KF and SM in your letter to Rich. How much of this about KF being a critic is recent? I'd like to go over all of that with some care, if you have it. Despite her brilliance, and if can't be doubted, it is a real. Sylvia gets hung up on these young men, kind of like frustrated maternity feelings. Need I recall Apatoin? I've offered her what I have on KF, on her word to keep it to herself, and she declined. I've assured her it is grounds for the deepest misgivings at best and is entirely separate from and independent of the JG case. If, in the face of this, she can continue with that rotten bastard on any level, worry for her as well as about her.

With summer coming, if you get home, I hope you can also be here. There are and will be other things I'll not now mail, cost being only one of the factors. I think you should see them. I expect more by then and there should be some trials by then. And others in the works.

Mary would like to come here in early August and I'll look forward to it. She is in Hawaii but on her return she'll have the invitation. You should make it a different time, if you can. Paul's plans are uncertain, but I have no doubt we'll be together. Bud will put him up, or I will here, or I can arrange free lodgings in DC and he should work over some of the areas in which he is by far the best.

Hurriedly.

HW

April 18, 1970

Dear Harold:

I got a letter postmarked the 12th from you yesterday, and one postmarked the 16th today. Pretty inconsistent mail service.

Your letter to John Nichols of 4/12 was excellent. Your letter to Fortas was an interesting idea, although I think that it would have been better to have been a bit more direct. The prospects with the baddie sound like they are getting better. I would feel more confident if I didn't think that he and his brother were so unstable and unpredictable.

From your 4/15 to Dick, it sounds like John Nichols behavior becomes more bizarre by the day.

Your comment in your letter to Russ that "spilt milk is for cats" is clever. I think I'll add that to my repertoire of phrases for trying to talk patients out of being concerned about water under the bridge and the past in general.

Moo sounds like he has grown as some have claimed. It's never too late to get to work on that enormous investigative potential in the N.O. end of the case. Right now his motives may be a bit purer also.

I don't have anything of great insight to add to the discussion of Quiroga between you and Paul. Both of you know more about this area than I do and besides seem to have explored quite a few possibilities. I think that the most important thing we can do in such cases is to keep open minds. When we wander through the WR, volumes, and archives, we are wandering through a large assortment of sense and nonsense, food and garbage. Some has been sorted and processed with people like us in mind, some contains the truth inadvertently, perhaps because the author had no vested interest, and some is straightforward. Our ability to process this mass of stuff and understand it is quite limited in many areas. We are dealing with an exposure of a large # of records which were never meant for public exposure and with federal agencies and individuals who cannot stand on their records and know it. Then there are some who think they can stand on their records and shouldn't be so deluded. But basically, I guess I feel that everyone was covering up their own little sins and that much of what has been learned of govt. agencies and certain people may relate more to those agencies or other things than to the assassination. So, we are always in danger of making our own red herrings but also in equal danger of failing to see something important because of the great mass of nonsense. As long as we keep the balance even, and work hard on any and all clues, and yet keep an open mind, we will hopefully one day be able to see the forest for the trees.

The powers book is out, and the serialization of it (Operation Overflight, by Gary Powers and Curt Gentry) Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.) by the Mpls Tribune begins with good old Lee Harvey Oswald and the hypothesis that it was his knowledge that brought the U-2 down. He persists, like Garrison, in calling Document 931 by the wrong title, ignoring the important modifier "classified" in the document title. By the way, what ever came of Paul's contact with him.

There are some other things I would like to write, but between the last paragraph and this one was an hour and a half call from a patient who just had an emotional trauma and has been feeling suicidal. Then Ted Hammond, one of my more promising people, who is now doing public speaking, called for some help in preparing a presentation and filled me in on an interrogation of him by an "ex-CIA" man who was present at one of his talks. I will followup by checking the guy out--his ex-CIA status comes from a friend, but from the sound of the interrogation (I use the word advisedly) he may not be "ex." Well, I'd better close. Best wishes to you and Lil.

cc:Paul

Gary

April 16, 1970

Dear Rich: *Edelman*

It's always good to hear from you. Glad to hear that things are well with you. I dropped Pat a letter but still haven't heard. She is the poorest correspondent I know, although a few other ex-girlfriends are strong competitors.

I'll see what I can do about a copy of the Thornley book for you. Glad to hear that you got the 103 page transcript. Legal difficulties with Garrison would not have interfered with Thornley's being in touch with Sylvia. For one thing, she sent him some money to help defray costs, and he has not been in court or anything like that most of this time. As far as I am concerned there are still many unanswered questions in the Thornley thing, and Sylvia's treating of him as a critic is unjustified in any event. If Thornley called her and told her he did not believe in Oswald's guilt, then she has ample reason to suspect him, since he has written a magazine series naming Oswald as the assassin and branding him a Communist, and even giving an account of the assassination through Oswald's eyes as he fired. If I haven't already sent you copies let me know and I will. It is some of the worst and most disgusting frameup material which has been written. And Sylvia claims he is on the up and up and that he doesn't think LHO was involved?

Glad to hear that you got to speak with Sylvia in regard to the critics. I would be interested in what she said since I think that many of her opinions have been shaded by the Garrison thing. You have to hear about the critics from a number of them to get a good picture, since Mark, for instance, gives a very distorted picture with his own slant in Citizen's Dissent, and everyone else distorts a bit. Paul Hoch is one of the few who has not been involved in factional disputes and it is a shame that you do not live near him. I used to stay out of the in-fighting but made the mistake of getting lured into it in the past 2 years and have regretted it ever since. My own objectivity suffered a bit as a result.

I know of the Liebler thing. Paul Hoch sent me a West Coast clipping. I'm afraid that a tragedy is in the offing.

Sylvia I think told me that she didn't think Bolden was important either, but I never knew whether it was because Garrison was working on it or because she really thought that. Way back she was hot on Ferrie, and after Garrison began, she poo-pooed both N.O. and Ferrie as having any importance. No matter what I brought up, even if it was something the critics had been hot on for years, if Garrison was doing something on a particular subject she suddenly considered it not important. There is much more we need know about the Bolden story before we accept or reject it, but what purpose is served by deciding that it is not important before one investigates it?

Well, I'd better close now. Enclosed is a brochure on our phone emergency service in the Twin Cities (I work there). I will send one on our free counseling center when they are made up. Best wishes.

cc:Paul, Harold

*Gary*