

3/5/70, early a.m.

Dear Gary,

Picked your letter of the first up at the P.O. yesterday on the way to DC and read at P.O. Glad I did because I took time to look up representative of British Independent TV, phoned him and, in absence, left message. Read letter but not YAF material enclosed (glad to get-will read this a.m.).

I think you now know a little better why I am so apprehensive about some of our brethren, notably John and the potential of his ego trip, Dave's, etc., for they can well disrupt the worthwhile things that can be accomplished. I think my yesterday's meeting was quite valuable, that it has already had very good results and that more can be anticipated. If you have read between the lines, you have detected an optimistic feeling of the kind of collaboration that just might eventuate.

Palmer: agreed. But I did talk to him (have not gotten the telegram to Brewner that he promised) aware of this and the possibility he called me for some ulterior, not honest purpose. He'll have to take anything out of context to accomplish this and I'll be able to prove it.

Do not be too disappointed at the Betzner, Towner things. Expect them.

Perhaps I leaned over too far to be fair to Mark. I know I try to. But I think we all went to try and keep our disappointments at what some of our small band (if they are still part) have done in balance, with an understanding that perfection is not a condition of men. I cannot, honestly say that it would have made a big difference in Jim if Mark had not been the first there, if I had, or if none of us were. I have no doubt Mark's attitude was hurtful. I do not think it is the major thing.

Medical: maybe some time there will be an interest in the King/Ray think that can lead to interest in a speech so I can be there for the tests you mention. I've heard nothing more and am no easier about any of it,

As I try and evaluate the JN-DL thing, aware as I am of what you say, I still think it possible and there has to be an explanation of DL's knowledge, which was close enough. The distortion we got could have been his addition to one of which John is capable. Remember, he had the basic information few had: that I had given John much more than he asked because it could help. What John told me came rather late and after his lawyer gave him a favorable interpretation.

Bonner's book is available (no responses) in NYC, where a friend got and sent. Most undependable, real crap. I'm in Bringuier's, with an increasing sense that it couldn't be.... Uncle Charlie: I've heard nothing from them since the last carbon I sent you, long time. Nor from Mary about hers. You know my offer. ... Russo: I think Moo now agrees but asks himself, what can we do about it? He then tells himself nothing.

The day is beginning to lighten. What a joy to find out ducks back, looking like they intend to nest, with the pheasants within 30 feet of them! Ah, nature! This is the first morning since Thanksgiving the pool hasn't been completely frozen. That have stayed at the city lake, where they are more protected from predators (there largely gogs) because they cannot take water protection and where there is water when there isn't here because of the greater warmth and the strength of the inflow.... Nothing new from Mary, others. Roffman had an excellent interview with a pathologist, about which more when there is something.

Best regards,

March 1, 1970

Dear Harold (cc: Paul Hoch)

I sent a carbon of my letter to Nichols photographer to you airmail, and I assume that it arrived Saturday. I hope that you didn't worry when they sent you that bill by mistake. I agreed some time ago to pick up the tab. The photos aren't as useful as I had hoped, and I think that the photo work could have been better. I got a copy of PM from Paul which arrived in OK shape. When I get Paul and Jim's stuff on the Ferrie doc's, and look at your work on it, and our collective interest in it, and then realize how little Garrison did on it despite the fact that it was all conceivable central to the Shaw case if nothing else I get angry.

Glad to hear that Dick is finishing up his thesis. I suppose that Paul is hot on his. I am a bit worried about mine, since I don't have good ideas yet. I will work full time at the clinic this year, and hope to continue working there half-time next year, for both the experience and the money (especially the former), but can't unless I can get my dissertation set up. Our Walk-in Counseling center, which aims at the poor and disenfranchised, handled some tough ones this past Thursday and Friday, and I am still resting up emotionally from the experience.

I smell a rat in the Joel Palmer thing. I would give my right arm to spend some time chatting with him after all that has happened. By the way, it would appear that Shaw's suit is a surprisingly crazy thing to come from his corner, and that he wouldn't have a chance. For that reason it is worth considering under what circumstances he could win. It would seem that he would have to have testimony from more than one person inside the office who could testify to frameup plus malicious intent. If he loses the suit, of course, he will look worse in the eyes of the public, and such a suit is nigh on impossible to win, unless he has substantial inside witnesses who can testify to things said by big Jim.

I don't agree that the Curry picture is conclusive on this point, although your observation is a keen one and should be taken into consideration along with any evaluation of this confusing subject. The different elevations explanation is not, in my mind, sufficient, based on my rough calculations. Bear in mind that the train was definitely there based on the Bond photos and the Itek analysis of Nix and the Bell film. Why, then, didn't it show in Willis and ~~Towner~~ Towner. Betzner would be a key photo, but even the original is hard to tell from.

I do not agree with your defense of Mark Lane. Time and time again in public I have had to face statements he made or stories he told. He more than anyone else got me into this case, and he was my hero for a long long time, and the word he did was quite valuable in the early phases of the case. But the nonsense of the past three years has created a credibility gap with which the rest of us, who are still active, must deal. I agree that Boxley is not exculpated by the indications that Jim himself was responsible for the rot that went on, but as you have always been the first to point out, those with emotional problems can be the most serious threat--even beyond that posed by "agents." As you know, I have no file on "agents." My file is "agents and nuts," because I think that it is only on rare occasions that we can be sure one way or the other.

Glad you agree on John. We all often forget that we are all people, and very different types of people at that, and often miscommunicate or misunderstand each other even when we agree or nothing is wrong. My own views have changed many many degrees on people like Boxley based on getting info much different than I got from my original sources. Often, had I been more cautious in simply correcting for the bias of the source of the info, I would have been more cautious in drawing conclusions.

The 4 hour sugar test should have been pretty close to conclusive. Most reactions occur in a much shorter interval. Don't worry about the hyper-ventillation EEG--this new doctor sounds OK and he will check it after he has had time to observe you if he has questions. Head X-rays should not be necessary. He will do a neurological after he has had time to observe if it seems indicated. If you were out here we would run you through our battery for neurological conditions. I think that it is the finest in the world--at least in the Western world--and better than a neurological exam in terms of thoroughness.

I doubt if JN and DL have been in much contact. They are the two most unlikely people to trust each other, especially given that Dave distrusts most everyone, and, as Mary points out, seems to always be looking for reasons to break off relationships with people. It really blew her mind when he started in on her.

Paul Tress is just a Cornellian who was there when I was.
The destruction of the notes by Fisher et. al. is incredible. That will make good reading in Post Mortem.

Masterman, with whom I have been out of touch for some time, and with whom I am exchanging articles, books, etc. (he can get the European and I get him some American stuff including such readily available things as some of LIFE which he doesn't have), wrote that London independent TV may be doing more on the assassination. I suggested that he put them in touch with both you and myself. It would be a good way to insure a more factual series and help set the stage for perhaps foreign interest in your books. If you could get foreign publication then American publication would have to follow. (Or, am I overestimating American publishers?) I assume that Bonner's book is available now. The Alexander stuff sounds interesting. Wade's words on Alexander always echo in my mind, as does his continual lending of a helping hand to the young struggling mugger and thug, Ruby. He really put Ruby on his feet by keeping him out of jail. On the radio logs, what ever happened to Uncle Charlie's tape. It's about time we sat down and did some comparing of the many versions of that tape, including Mary's stolen Dallas police version.

Don't yet have an address for guy going to Washington, but glad that you agree on Forestall.

No need to credit my account with you for the \$6 (your letter of 2/25) paid to Morey. He will, I assume, send me back \$6, since I paid him \$24, assuming that you were being charged \$12 like I was. It's too bad we couldn't have used Patsy for this, but we were lucky to get any copies at all. I will be writing Fearless Fosdick about those "errors" in the Betzner affidavit. I have held off doing a memo on Betzner until now, because I didn't want to jeopardize the deal with the photos. His father confirmed to me, in the presence of John, his son's original story as suggested in his original short affidavit. Hugh III denied this to me in writing, and I so noted that fact in my Ivory Tower article (after giving the original account in my newspaper series). Just as I suspected, Hugh III is just another witness who will change his story to back the official view. Once I hear from John I will get a memo done. I will take care of the letter to Betzner and ask about the mistakes in the affidavit. I avoided asking him about the affidavit explicitly, but rather elicited a complete account of what Hugh III had told him, thereby, I assume, eliciting a more accurate account. Like Lane's interview of Orville Nix: that day the shots came from the knowl, but now they came from the TSBD because the WR said they did.

Your points on Russo are well made, and I have been aware of your suspicions. I find them reasonable and agree with your pursuit of them. I have been aware of your concern about his story from a very early date. I agree also with the possibilities that you suggest, and feel that the best way to break someone like Garrison would be to give him plenty of stuff, knowing that he would only check it superficially. I see Moo as more of a Boxley in a way than anything else. He is not that bright, and is lazy. His lack of dependability, to me at least, has always been a kind of New Orleans syndrome, rather than specific to him.

Glad to hear that the sugar tolerance test was normal. (If it wasn't they would have let you know.) That rules out a metabolic problem of the type I suggested as one possibility.

Well, I'd better close now. I have a researcher up here who is free for the next two weeks and want to give him some more projects on the military since that is one of his big areas of interest. He has just quit his job and will be going back to school next term.

Best wishes.

Gary