

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 led to naught but futilities, with their tremendous yearning to come up with something of significance of their own, buttressed 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 martyrs. This John explores my "errors"-and were they there, imagine the enmity on that aspect! But by all means, as I asked, explore these 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 it and, 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 inexcusable 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 has 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 A 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 Tinsk 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 firm by phone for me to respond, esp. since a) I have done most of the IHC writing and B) Gentry consulted me.

What interests me most and why I respond immediately is the incomplete references to KT and SM in your letter to Rich. How much of this about KT 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 it can't be doubted, it is real, Sylvia gets hung up on those young men, kind of like frustrated maternity feelings. Need I recall Apstein? I've offered her what I have on KT, 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. Dad 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