

3/6/72

Dear Paul,

Your letter of 3/2 infers I have or infer you have breached my confidence. This is not the case. So you will not have to get your copy out, I quote the other part: "Your 2/4 complains ~~that~~ about Gary's disclosure to me of your dealings with Fred Graham. He told me absolutely nothing substantive that you had not already informed me of; he did ~~indicate~~ indicate some opinions of his own."

The question is not what follows, "Both Gary and I respect your demand for confidentiality as much as we would even if we thought your attitudes on such matters were always reasonable." (I do not resent this last crack, I admit they may not always seem reasonable, and I would be willing to admit they sometimes may, in fact, not be -but is is a crack, and you do not really know what is either involved or afoot.)

So, now that I do not have to worry as much about digging into over-crammed filing cabinets, I have gotten out my letter of 2/4. I will add emphasis. There is none in the orig.

"Gary tells me he has done what I regard as a foolish thing. He told you of my dealings with Graham and some of the results. Coincidence or not, I have heard nothing since from Graham, nor have I gotten what he had promised. [He had promised written answers to written questions. When I then wrote and said I'd be in on a certain date and at a certain time, after he did not send what he promised, he not only did not appear at his office, but his home phone did not answer and his office had not heard from him. I waited until after 11:15 for him.] I thought that often enough in the past I told everyone with whom I correspond that I am perfectly capable of telling each whatever I want him to know and that I correspond on the assumption that I am dealing with a bunch of babies and idle gossipers." I did omit the "not", but I think you understood I meant it.

My work has developed to the point where it is dangerous. I represent now a certain degree of hazard to powerful and unscrupulous people. This is one aspect, perhaps I am wrong about it. But it is my life, it is my work, and I have made clear my exclusive right to both and to decide what may and may not be done with both.

On the other side, this is an ongoing thing. There has been much more than you know. I just haven't been able to tell you. Until Wednesday, I was not able to use my copy machine except with one hand, and that is just too much damned trouble. Besides, for other work, I have it blocked off. There is a stack of stuff on top of it for copying and distribution. I may now change my mind.

On this entire Lattimer thing, of which I did know in detail before it happened, I have been all alone. Nobody has agreed with my view and until long after I asked a number to give it independent thought I never got any response. I don't think any one, not a single one, made the effort. Howard, later, after knowing the essence of my views, thought it through and came up with a similar formulation. And nobody has done anything to help minimize its consequences or to abort what was planned even before Lattimer saw anything. I am not going to give you details, and it is not because I do not trust you or because I think you will blab. But I have been coping with real things. The future will disclose, perhaps, the success of failure or the reasonableness. But I assure you that something was in the works and after two months it has not happened. It would be worse than the Lattimer thing and it is not Cyril.

As I have not hidden, I am beginning to feel my years and this enormous effort. I do forget, and I let you know I forget. One of the few good things that can be said for the accumulation of years is that it provides the opportunity for learning and for experience. One of the disadvantages of not having accumulated so many years is that one does not have the experience often necessary, most often among the brightest, to evaluate the experiences of others.

Several times and in a variety of ways I have told you and others, of whom Gary is one (and if you do not know, I feel of him as would of my own son), that my knowledge of not our collective knowledge has advanced to the point where it is essential to proceed on the spooks' basis of need-to-know. You do not have to agree with me. Nor need Gary. But with my stuff, I have and I assert and I have for a long time asserted the right.

There may be no connection between this looseness, which I had kept out of any mailing to any critic and Fred's sudden clamping, but the coincidence is one that can't be ignored. It has happened, for whatever reason. Now you tell me one constructive purpose served by Gary's

gossiping to you. You yourself say he told you nothing I hadn't. Not knowing the opinions, I can't comment on them. But the plain and simple fact is that there is much I have not told you simply because I did not want to put it in the mails. Mine have been periodically undependable again with certain people, so overtly in some cases that the local postmaster is watching for evidences of intrusion. He has samples. Except for Ray, there is no sign of any interest in any of my mail not with critics. The last letter I got from Ray was very roughly intercepted, and not at the jail, where it is handed in unsealed. I correspond with non-critics. Their mail is never delayed, never shows the slightest sign of tampering. You know I go to trouble to inform you. On my last trip, did I not write you while I was on it? Did I not send you carbons when I was able to type notes? There are some areas in which I am without concerns. There are others in which I do have concerns. I have what you do not have, an experience in intelligence to draw upon, and the same is true of Gary. I ~~have~~ also have had personal experience with the FBI, I have lived with them, quite literally, for four months. This was when I was about your age. There are some possibilities I do not have to stip and think about. I use the word "possibilities". That is strong enough, for there is never any needless risk with sensitive stuff that can be worth running. If there is a need, that is different.

If I did not tell you, returning to the Lattimer ploy, and I think I did, I had Burke Marshall's word, through a Senator, that he would not under any circumstances do precisely what he did. Now, why did he do it? And in doing it, why did he accredit the one man totally and completely disqualified by the contract? Can you regard this combination as accidental? Or any part of it? I do not. What you may not know is that they went much further and made a clear case of perjury against Rhoads. Do you think this kind of risk is run for nothing? Do you think Rhoads, for example, is unaware of it?

How I'm not going to spend any more time on anything like this again. My wishes, rational or not, are going to be respected completely and literally or nobody is going to have a chance to impose his own judgement over mine on my work. If I am dealing with babies, they can go back to the pl.ypens. But I have too many serious problems I cannot avoid, too many day-to-day ones, too many pressing ones, to have to give any thought to this kind of chickenshit, childish stuff. And after all these years! Intelligence may be beyond your ordinary's experience, but Santayana ought not be: he who does not learn from the past is doomed to relive it. The last thing I want to do is not share. The first thing I now have to consider is ending sharing. It is that simple for me. I simply can't run risks with undependable people, not without good and serious reasons.

To return to the beginning, I have not made accusations against you and I here do not. Now for the rest of your letter. As you acknowledge, my vague<sup>ness</sup> was explained and deliberate. It is because something else in a different area may be in the works. I have done what I thought appropriate and I'm not taking out ads. This is a more than usually sensitive time for such subjects with the government because hearings on the effectiveness and compliance with the FOI began today. Need I say that without telling or even consulting me, Bud has arranged to be a witness on my cases? He doesn't even begin to understand them, but he does understand that he can promote himself. I did not find out from him. This is known as lawyer-client relationship.

You did tell me of your appeals. One duplicated one of mine, one of much longer standing. I didn't press it then for special reasons. I think that with all the material to be covered, it would be better if we did not duplicate.

~~His~~ <sup>Vatter's</sup> letter to me will not be enough. It is one of the things I couldn't copy. He then phoned me, after which I wrote him again. But one of the things you did not want me to press is one of the things he sees clearly, showing that he has been lied to. It is quite comprehensible to him. He said he would ask for the covering letters with what he had been told I had been sent when I had not been. His long silence is ample confirmation that they do not exist. I had to make this point outside the Archives, and I have. What may eventuate is something else. Perhaps nothing will, but one has to try, no? I have caught them lying, I have caught them in flagrant violations of the regulations, and it is now known outside Johnson's den and Rhoads' office. Vatter promised me prompt response to specific appeals. Three weeks have passed. Not too prompt.

There is a question I think you should have asked yourself long before this, for aside from my experience, you have your own. You know they are lying, suppressing, doctoring, violating laws and regulations. Do you consider this no more than some kind of special

3

sport by bored bureaucrats? If you do, I do not. I think it has meaning and purpose, and that belief is part of what dominates my thinking and reactions. I can also read things into it, as you might if you try.

All of this coincides with other disappointments. I left Dallas 3 1/2 months ago with two new archives opened to us. I was unselfish. I left them for MF to go through. ~~for them~~ It was specific and it was arranged. I not have only not gotten anything, I have not heard anything and I have wasted time writing unanswered letters.

So, try once to look at all of this and more with which I do not burden you, as a very tired and very broke man of not 25 but 59 next month must. Is it not enough to have to anticipate the next chicanery of our enemies and try and cope with it or at least minimize it without having all this crap on our side to live with and, in other areas than what you mention, prevent or minimize the damage from that, too?

It is nice of you to counsel "take it easy". I know you mean it. But one way of helping me try that close-to-impossible is for a bunch of well-intended young people not to pile needless burdens and problems on me. This does not mean not to tell me about them. It does mean not to create them. There is much you do not know. It is puerile to assume that what you (p.) do not know does not exist.

Your 2/17 on my notes you can't figure out. Maybe you didn't get something. I finally got the five pages of CD1408 that ~~from~~ some incomprehensible reason they did not and would not send. I asked you to send me the rest of the file. I have, as I said, pp. 10-11, 30-1 and 26-8. You gave me other pages. I gave them to Wade. Of the pages above, I'd appreciate a set of them and of any of the rest of this CD other than what I have given him to send Wade, so he'll have everything that relates to him from that file. I have no record of the pages you gave me that I did give him. They are the Ainsworth/Life pages on the diary, dealing with Alexander. For myself, I'd appreciate all except 10-1, 26-8, 30-1, which I have. Unless they are unclear, for me as for Wade, 2 on 1 is ok. To cut this another way, I have only these listed pages. Wade has them plus the pages you gave me earlier that I gave to him. So, what I'd like is the balance of a complete set for him and the balance of a complete set for me, with what is for him limited to what relates to him, his office or his interest. That need not be every page. If you do not want to exercise this judgment, then if you'll be kind enough to complete my set, I'll send what I think I should have to him and will then ask you to replace whatever I do. OK? Thanks much.

It is now going on 4 p.m. I have had to spend most of today writing letters, all dealing in varying degrees with imaturities, stupidities and other things that should not happen. I'm just going to have to stop it. If it means I become a hermit, I'm in the right place, the mountains. I don't need a cave. I have kept going at such a pace that I haven't been able to file my Dallas-trip notes yet. Not for coping with what should never happen. It simply has to stop or I do. This is not personal. I am not blaming you. But it is wider-spread than this one utterly pointless thing Gary did.

I guess there are a couple of other things I can tell you, but it is not to go any farther under any circumstances. After making up his mind not to let anybody see anything, before the expiration of the time limitation, Marshall did not change it until after he came back from a vacation to the Virgin Isles. I did not try to learn the ~~first~~ exact day. It seemed and still seems less important than what I did seek and learn. He then told Graham before Lattimer knew. Lattimer learned from Graham. The Archives was not satisfied with the first Marshall approval and insisted on a different formulation I do not have. In the course of all of this they violated their regulations. They then changed them, after the fact, in an effort to hide the violation. You might want to ask yourself what caused him to change his mind and to violate the contract more than once, as did the Archives. They have what to them is an out in one violation. One way of addressing this is by asking what intervened. I have some ideas on this, but your own thinking is better for both of us. I do not think it was an idle whim. If unrelated, it is a parallel of Bobby's blowing his cool at San Fernando, and you know what followed that. I have now caught the Archives in so much that they and GSA have both practically begged me to seek access in an evasion both outlined for me. I have refused. Without basic changes, I will not alter my position. But you might also ask yourself why, when I am the first to have asked and been refused, the first of November 1996, they give me a formula they will accept. And why I won't go for it. In time, you'll get the letters. There is one corrupted version that is going around. I'd appreciate in detail any version you might get and a tracing, if possible, to whatever is

the origin. I hope you can come to understand that all the baby stuff and all the zany stuff closes up sources faster than I can open them. Sprague is an example in a couple of cases. There has been, without any doubt, some interception on this Lattimer thing, for I know what was closed and what was to have happened. My source is an original source. Take this to mean someone involved, directly.

Lattimer's press conference was given him by CBS. He did not stage it at his office. The Archives did not leak the Lattimer story to Graham.

The Archives did practically force the GSA-family contract on him. HE DID NOT ASK FOR IT. You have all my correspondence on this. I know who did it and the circumstances. You know this and their reasons for refusing me can't be reconciled.

None of the three pathologists who applied but someone else was to have been given access to the same stuff. This was before Lattimer saw it. It is one of the things I may have aborted. And it would have been more damaging than Lattimer. That really laid a p.r. egg, but I don't think the real reason was p.r. in the normal sense.

Lattimer is even more stupid than his published stuff shows. He is probably a Bircher. Unless he lied to me, he will not be writing anything on this right away. He and his sons are doing more on the "ballistics". I don't know if this means more squeezing or what. I have a couple of guesses. I suspect they'll misinterpret what he has seen as validation of their earlier irrelevancies.

Please believe me, this remains what is probably a very hairy business. Stay out of it, if any opportunity of getting in provides itself, but do keep me promptly informed.

Reverting to another subject, I did not get the wrapper on the SS copy of the WDSU footage until I reOibvolved the Secret Service. Then I got it promptly. And the fact of post-assassination editing has been confirmed by more than one person, including Ed Planer. Jesse Core is in whatever footage was removed. He was in it as that film existed 11/22/63. Two sources on this, and they both saw it at WDSU. This tells me we are going the right way on that. Johann may yet provide the missing link, if only after you finish your thesis or somebody has me make a speech out there.

I hope you have a better understanding of my thinking and my feelings.

est,