

Dear Thomas,

3/6/74

I suppose it is easier to give a man hell on a first-name basis. And you give me no alternative.

Were blind persistence a virtue you'd be a man of great merit. But in this persistence you have also persisted in not accepting means by which you could check my word while protesting that I ask you too, all the while oblivious of the fact that with absolutely no basis you blandly ask exactly that of you, that I take you at face value.

Well, it is not only that I won't. It is now that I can't because, as I've tried to tell you without insulting you, you are far out of it. Because you are oblivious to so much you are unaware of the small indications of the state of your knowledge (what interests me more in this context is the lack of it) that you continually provide me.

Now you have told me that Jackie is "involved" in her husband's assassination. You and Marguerite! Yup, each of the reasons you give for alleging Burkley's involvement fits Jackie (and others- including some who filed in revulsion over the fake investigation) as well. Now this tells me you are in the paranoid camp of so-called "critics" almost all of whom, having done what they could with what they could read at home, degenerated into navel-contemplators and some of whom now lust to get back into it without offering anything of value to what has been developed or having the remotest capability.

When I responded to your last arrogance I told myself I would write you no further because the reality is, whether you find it congenial or not, each minute I spend with you is a minute I could put to some constructive purpose. Frankly, I really can't conceive of your either catching up or dropping the paranoid view which may proceed from your political concepts. I have no argument with them but I do argue that your assassination views are a logical step from them.

However, we suffered what for us is a disaster. We lost our water supply and had to replace it. This meant and means an extraordinary amount of shovelling for me. I keep at it until I am as weary as I dare get and then rest until I can assail the tasks once more. This to you diatribe is one of my rest periods, maybe more.

I read your letter four or five hours ago and I can't take the time now to reread and go after you on each point. You are able to follow your own course as I am mine. You have failed to address whether you are ego-tripping, self-indulging or any less uncongenial designation you prefer. I gave you the names of two of those who find no secrets here so that you could get an independent evaluation of the weight I believe my word to you is worth. I am not going to tell you what you want to know for you to gossip it all around and let the dang fous nuts blow the whole thing. One of these men is a lawyer who began as a historian. The other is a historian who is also becoming a lawyer, both, I am satisfied because of this matter of the handling of the assassinations. Both are expert as you will never be in the subject. When you toy with words and my time in the face of this obligation you toy with me for the last time. I can't let your curiosity intrude upon the obligation I assumed when all those better able to face what it means quit instead and have since pontificated and proclaimed ourity while wreaking havoc with everything, including everyone else's credibility.

And then you demean yourself by twisting, as you do again on the matter of editing. The essential point is missing, making the rest a deliberate distortion. And what you do not face is that you have established by this correspondence that you lack either the dispassionate judgement or the factual basis for that task. But you are so arrogant! You ignore what I said about the need of going over what you would do, if anything, at least two times. For what? Have you that concept of your own wisdom, knowledge or anything else relevant in all of this? Political intelligence denied mere mortals, perhaps? Come, now, Thomas. You do belittle yourself as I think you underestimate me.

You are so twisted on what you seek I can't give you a reasonable explanation without a tome and I see nothing for the common purpose in straightening you out. Again I do not mean to offend but you are so far in the past you can't possibly do anything by going over

the new work of anyone who persisted in digging. I am talking about years of work, man, not some sophistry you invent to comfort yourself.

I have an measure of your sincerity of purpose when you do not take me up on the suggestion that you take an area others have not and explore it. There are enough of them.

So, you have disclosed enough of yourself to me, if not to your own comprehension. I am truly sorry to have to seem to castigate you for there is nothing I want less. But I simply can't have you badgering me over and over again on that which I have addressed with sufficient point and emphasis. I do not want to address an older man in this way either. But her persistence leaves no alternative, as does your incredible self-concept. Years alone do not merit that. r either.

I do not have all the New Orleans transcripts. I do have that one and I cannot spare it. You can get the significant parts from the New York Public Library for the transcripts in the New Orleans papers were in considerable detail on most things, particularly that which interests you. Or from those who really no longer do any original work and got the New Orleans papers. Here again, I can't need that transcript for a few minutes and have to await its return from you. Assuming it does not get the treatment accorded some of my mail. Too much has disappeared over too long a period of time.

But you are twisted on this and abysmally ignorant if you can't identify the name of the prosecutor. Among others.

Your view of Burkley is utterly irrational, as I am confident you will not consider. I simply will not answer if you ask explanations. In taking this entirely irrational view you obfuscate the role he did serve. And you clobber the man for the deficiencies of the Commission in not asking anything of him. I will tell you that the Commission did not have what I dug up. The members had no knowledge of it. It is my belief that the staff saw to it that this stuff was not before anyone for consideration. It was not withheld by the military. It was not withheld by anyone for that matter. Those lawyers just did not want it. Part of a context for you, a tiny one.

The entire transcript of the Shaw original trial only costs about \$3,000.

You display ignorance in saying "Let us clear up the mystery surrounding Dr. Burkley." There is no mystery. Ignorance only. Please try to understand this too, and that it is not intended as insult but as further explanation. If you prefer paranoia, what can I do? But all those things you touch on, including Lattimer and much of him of which you make no mention I have done at such length and depth that I am eschewing the much more I have for it is de trop. The fact is you also appear not to understand his work. Here I also tell you that I did all the original work on the panel report and know of nothing anyone has added to it. That was written before the Halleck hearing, for which, in fact, I wrote it.

You are totally insufferable when you undertake to hold forth on what "critics" have not done. There is a new if small generation unknown to you. I work with them, which is not only the need for accomplishment but the obligation of age. Make this personally in making a comparison because I am not that far behind you. More, I am now working with an entire college seminar on this. So drop your fictions. They are no more and they ill suit a wise man of 70. It is conceit and you should face it.

You should also face what you will confront me with if you do go ahead despite my expressed objection and as I consider it steal my work as those I trusted did and then misuse it for you have no other capability. There came a time when I had to address myself to this sick lust among those considering themselves experts and I have addressed it. Of one I did an entire book. Of others I have begun one titled "Lemming." If nothing else it will be in university archives, a permanent self-defamation by you if you do this.

None of my books lack indexes. The first edition of the first was without it but one appeared in the subsequent five. I also had extras printed at a cost of 50¢ to me and sent them at cost to those who sent me an addressed, stamped envelope and this slight cost.

The index did not appear in the second book because the printer went ahead before time. There is no version of the third that lacks one. The fourth the publisher left out but I have no spare copies and can't take time to make one but you should be able to get it from others, like Sprague and Berkeley. Frame-Up has the index printed in both editions. And quite the contrary of your sneaky imputations, I am currently engaged in consolidating all the cards of all these indexes to facilitate retrieval of all my work. This includes the unpublished appendix to Oswald in "New Orleans and all the completed work I have not been able to print.

I can't justify the time to make meaningless response to your dissertation/questions about Oswald and the book on if he was an agent. I'm sorry, but you should understand if nothing else that a ~~xx~~ man writes books to inform people not letters to substitute for books.

I can't make you over and you are too hung up on yourself to consider that on what you are up to you require it. I have assumed you are a serious man and not one who intends dishonesty or I'd not have taken a minute for any letters. So I have spent all the time I will trying as best I can to tell you that you are about to do harm to that which you says means so much to you while at the same time holding no possibility of doing any good. If you will not believe this there is nothing I can do to prevent it. But I will not accept it in silence, much as I would prefer to. At some point all this unintended evil by the self-annointed must end or we'll never survive it. Your intention are not the question. The inevitable results are. If you can't now begin to understand it is simply that you refuse to, self-indulgence and self-concept mean more to you.

What ideas can we ~~xxxx~~exchange about what you know nothing about? You go into all this kind of childishness never beginning to show a glimmer of the tremendous amount of knowledge that others have accumulated while you were sitting back in ease or the slightest inkling of any awareness of anything except this unusual talent you attribute to yourself. The plain and simple truth is that this has passed you by and it is unconscionable of you to even think of asking those who have devoted themselves to this to drop everything and ~~xxx~~ answer questions less informed and less intelligent than the college kids are asking me when they know only what they are reading. BUT, they do do some work that can have meaning in return. And I did not have to ask it of them. Consolidating the indexes is one. Indexing thousands of pages once suppressed that I have is nother.

Except for your personal longing to steal what I have for no good use you would see that I go what I can in striking the necessary balance with what I have that is new and that I am doing extra work to permit retrieval both now and in the future. Only not to and for dilettantes now, as you should understand with your background. Only your personal involvement and self-concepts won't let you.

I'm sorry I can't address anything I've not recalled. Or that I can take the time to read and correct typing that I know must be worse than my usual bad. It is not contempt or anything like that. I have undertaken an enormous task. It has taken all my personal life. It has guaranteed I'll spend the rest of my life without income and with debt. When I pay for the work I do with this kind of cost and more, my wife does, I can't justify any more time in trying to open lies scrunched permanently closed and a mind that simple will not permit itself to be opened. You may not accept the assurance that I have no personal insult in mind. You may take it this way. However, you have required bluntness of me and honesty, with you, with myself and with the work, have eliminated any other alternative I could see.

Sincerely,