

HW:

Return of the Waif, your 1/2/77:

She may never be heard from again, but the odds are against it. Quite the contrary. The things you noticed and the inferences you drew all point toward further attentions, and not from her alone. She is valuable to them because she has unfailing entree into certain areas of your consciousness and attitudes not otherwise accessible. Her call may well be the first sprout in a springtime of reawakened interest and concern. Of proven daring and intelligence, she now is probably as fully under control as a person of her volatility ever can be. The control is of great power and influence, because cop-killing is the one unforgivable sin and it must have taken great gobs of it to spring her. That consideration alone makes her resurfacing of unlimited potential importance. You probably have no choice but to play along. Just keep in mind what it must have taken to get her back out into circulation, even under the most ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ restrictive probation imaginable.

jdwl4jan77

Dear Jim,

1/22/77

Your two notes of the 14th are of wisdom I appreciate. If the caution about the waif turns out that way then the two really are related, a possibility I believe I recognized from the remarkable timing.

You are absolutely correct where you refer to entree. Moreover, anyone who knew of this and knows anything about me would assume, correctly, that I am very curious to know the truth of eight years ago - was she more of an agent than I was able to prove?

You underscore what Waldron told me recently, that I am too trusting. Actually I did not question her account of how she got out, through another decision. Maybe. But if not you do not exaggerate the heft required to lift these gates.

The Burnham article was a dupe. D expect one tomorrow. I think you'll want it. JL and HR may both get the paper. If each does I'll have a will send a dupe. Otherwise I'll make and send a copy. I had not thought this through. Of course it represents the policy decision, that no chances be taken on even accidental disclosures. Any truths, no matter how distantly related or even if not related, can be hurtful.

Of course the real danger here is from the work I have done already. The danger exists. There had been agreement on use of some at the outset, to lay a proper basis. This has been turned around. Now it is not possible that a lawyer did not know this was the correct and the necessary way. What it means is that knowledge of what was available was withheld and those who knew turned around, were turned around or never meant it. All supposedly factual stories to date have been disinformational. It all fits.

Your suggestions about the issues to which Rev. Sun Moon and his movement might be put remind me of one in a position to know and his writing. From the other side politically it is integral in much of Hunt's fiction. And it would not be new in the history of religions.

Your appraisal of Agee's importance in this period of disclosures coincides with mine. It will be interesting to see where he winds up. I suspect they are trying to force him to a place they can call red.

Getting him out of England does not really interfere with his publishing. There is another purpose.

Even't read the clips yet but they appear valuable with only one dupe. Particularly glad you spotted the Schiller piece. Nothing of that sort around here. He is a terrible person and a story. I've put a lead in on him at the Enquirer through a friend there. If the story idea is approved they write it.

I've read the story. It is helpful in several ways.

Rest,