

5/12/67

Dear Hal,

If I have been too brief in the few notes of recent months or not said thank you for the things you sent as though I meant it, I really did and I have been really busy. We have finished supper and I'm to take my wife to her sister, which I haven't done for several months, but she is so tired she had fallen asleep sitting up. Until she rouses, I'll explain a few things.

I'll know Wednesday about CIA WHITERASH: OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS. My agent (I have one now) liked it so much he read it a second time, immediately. He is so impressed with the overwhelming evidence that he told me not to bother to bring with me when I go to New York next week and refutation of the Phelan and Aynesworth sex jobs (and I know of others I have every right to expect). I have a good deal for it, but if there is anything I have ~~learned~~ learned about publishers it is that you have no deal until the cash is in the bank.

The book is more than 150,000 ^{words} long. On my return from N.O. I wrote a brief epilogue for it. I think I was able to help them.

Because of the things that have happened, I think I'll get back on WWII immediately and let the Manchester book, the draft of which I could finish in three hard and uninterrupted week, wait till after this is done. I think it has to be done, whether it is profitable or not, and I'll do it. I think III can be very important, especially now. My schedule until after the middle of June, is broken up. I'm clear from then on, as of now. But much time will be taken by a radio series I'm doing, commercially, telling the story of the first book in 39 weeks, each of 10-
three minute shows. I've got the first five weeks done while working on CIA WW. It takes a day a week, even ad libbing.

The Dell announcement of WWII has killed my sale for it. I hope they get it out soon. I've not been able to promote it as I did WW. It had to carry its own weight. I'll know pretty soon how they did with the first, and I hope there is some dough with it. To get the royalty on the first 100,000 and paid ourselves close to out of debt (if the money was ever collected to pay for my plane, my situation is that I can use it). Probably by the fall we'll have some dough.

Joe Dolan called me the other night and talked to me about the Phelan piece. He apparently was not satisfied by my belief that Phelan's was an are-job and my belief that his mention of Fermie without reference to Marcello when ^{on} Phelan, was the expert on New Orleans vice is a touchstone. I have reason to believe that Russo did tell Sciembre that there was this party (he did not call it a conspiracy) even if Sciembre did not have it in the memo. I am certain that if he was involved in any funny business on this he'd never have given Phelan the memos. I returned from N.O. without taking the time to write a single memo. I don't think Joe knows how long and hard the work in this field is and how those fellows, all of whom have families, work. In any event, he did not mention it on the air, so I didn't when he phoned the next morning. The show was brief. I have been given to understand that after it was over he assaulted my integrity. I find this hard to believe. I hope to get a tape from ~~me~~ someone who is supposed to have made one. What do you know about it?

If this was Joe's opinion, I do not know why he called me, or why he didn't wait until he has a copy of my own book on the subject. Also, whether or not it is

convincing to Joe, Russo's story was believed by the panel of judges and the grand jury. I'm satisfied to wait for the trial, which is the proper place now that Phelan has had his say. If Joe had had the experiences I've had, he'd be unwilling to say more than I would.

He should know what Aynesworth left out of his piece! But those not intimately familiar with the subject matter have no way of knowing what the truth of the evidence is. Aynesworth could not have spent five weeks on that story and made any effort to learn any of the fact or he wrote a deliberately dishonest piece. I know things about those he mentioned he'd have had to try hard to learn and he said nothing about these things. Unlike Phelan, he's supposed to be an expert on the subject. His is the publication that used the infelicitous phrase that Ferris had been "picked clean". I use it!

I do hope this report is untrue. If it is not I will not fight with Joe, nor will I argue with him. He has been very good to me and I appreciate it. I have him favorably in the new book and will not take it out. He deserves it. You can guess the context. I did a lot with that beginning, even establishing the existence of the classification "crypto". And I will still send him one of the first copies when the book is printed.

I have heard little from the others that you don't know, including the latest Lifton exploit. He sure makes trouble. Too bad he is sick. He is bright. But not bright enough to cope with Liebelar.

Hyle Stuart is coming out with an FBI book that I've heard is good. It is in galley and he seems to have been plagued with strange mechanical troubles. We are not friends.

Yesterday I went to Washington by mistake, to deliver a speech I'm supposed to make this coming Tuesday. To give you an idea of what I could be doing if I were not so busy writing, I made two tapes, saw five correspondents, spent an hour at a TV station showing materials they'd never seen to the news staff, and was home by three o'clock, in between visits making arrangements for the display of both books in the editions I published at the American Booksellers' Association convention. Ah! to be your age again!

Again, thanks for everything and my regards to those you know I'd send them to.

Sincerely,

2/14/67

Dear Hal, Your letter of 2/11 with enclosures arrived this morning. There have been a few changes in our situations and conditions that I begin with, first congratulating you on getting a job, and with great tact and delicacy I'll not mention your failure to describe it.

First, the Dell book is doing well enough for them to have paid me the royalty on the first 100,000 copies and we have already spent it getting half way, perhaps a bit more (I avoid discussion of the unpleasantnesses with my wife, whose life has been too many of them) out of debt. I think we have enough she held back to finish paying the printer for II. We have paid him for I and part of II. Were the wholesalers to finish paying we'd probably be out of debt and could devote some time (were it to be found) and money to moving from the basement in which we have lived most of our married lives!

I'm having a bit of trouble apparently with bursitis. Slows me down a little. Had to go to bed 9 o'clock one night, but I was up and going at four. Just finished a short New England tour on which the honoraria will about pay expenses but on which I got several radio and TV shows.

And I'm going to do MANCHESTER MACHIAVELLI: THE UNINTENDED UNOFFICIAL WHITEWASH. I actually turned down an offer of a \$35,000 advance Friday because it would have required I do a Manchester on Manchester, which I will not do. A small publisher may do what I want, Manchester on the assassination and in the perspective you have often heard, now, I believe, more than amply confirmed by the terms of the settlements. I've done 12,500 words on his second Look piece, distinguished by having not a single factually correct statement about the assassination. It is in New York and causes this interest. However, I feel that if I do not do the slush and there is that much available for it, I'll have to pull all stops and rush to beat it out and keep this thing in a real perspective.

It seems to me inevitable that this may get us allies, if not in people in some power and influence in DC, quite possibly in Texas, which is hurting and both are in a much better position focusing on M than on the WC and the govt. There is Texas money available to improve the image. It does not interest me and I can and will not approach it. I have met a former Texas newsmen who was offered a job by Hunt to do the job.

If you have any suggestions, please make them. It will be a short book. I do not like the word "Machiavelli" because I feel there are too many who will not understand it. I fear Manchester alone because of confusion - people wanting this book may get his.

I am delayed on III by continuing researches, quite fruitful, and the business of my artist, who cannot give up the accounts on which he lives to do this. I fear to paste the documents up myself. It is a tricky job, not as simple as it seems, and I have only one copy of most. Some may not reproduce. So, with the additional chapters I intend to write, I'll have to wait for him. Meanwhile, within three weeks I should have the rough draft of Manchester, bursitis, mail and other considerations permitting. I'm going over my files on M now organizing them as I'll write. Sorry I left some of the Calif papers (especially the ones that point out M is in accord with the Commission's conclusions) out there. I left one with you, if you can still find it, and one with Bill, to whom I'll write.

Interest in III continues excellent, but with the increased size there seems to be a certainty that unless I charge more than \$5.00 for it, which yields but \$2.50 if the wholesalers pay (you'd be astounded at what is still owed on I) and even that will not pay the actual costs! In the few minutes I can find I'd like to locate a foundation that might help. Meanwhile, whenever it seems like it can help, I think I'll release some of the less important documents, for I think they can attract attention.

Now for your letter: Steve wrote me, but in less detail. I told him I'd like a transcript of the Liebeler thing very much, for some day he will not be able to avoid me and I think you know it will then not be like this "debate". I want everything I can have on him for them. If the college in British Columbia pays my way out I'll be on the west coast and can, perhaps now, challenge him. Bell hasn't answered my last letter, answering his plea that we needn't be enemies by telling him not to act as one and his plaint that the Times was not faithful to what he said by saying the course of honor then dictated a letter to the Times, copy to me. I enclose, in confidence, the rough draft of my first letter to him. It is the only spare copy I have. I'll use it when I want, when it will mean something. These guys, led by Burt Griffin, are trying to arrange a TV symposium under their control and I'm working on the people they made the proposal to. This is but one possibility. The other is for when I'm in Calif again or when they go after me again, when I'll release the entire correspondence. Same with Liebeler, with whom my correspondence goes back to 2/66. It has been hard for me to learn patience, but I am now in a situation where I have something new and fresh for every conceivable circumstance. Liebeler lied very much and often in the debate. Only Lane would let him get away with it. You will learn as time goes on that Lane really knows much less than he is credited with. His TV debate with Nizer, from which I was bounced after eviscerating Nizer on WOR radio, is only fair according to our partisans who were there, and the only thing he had going for him in England was the crudity of BBC.

I have reason to believe the picture Liebeler used was made for him by Schiller, formerly a professional photographer. I have prints of the two exhibits and they are now being analysed by professional photographers for Sage in New York, which will want to use them if they seem faked. I should hear very soon.... While on this trip I also let WAC-TV make slides of my pictures and a few of the documents for use when appropriate. I think the time has now come for this, not alone to promote III, but I want to control it so it can be for a constructive purpose (one of the newsmen there has confirmed from a friend formerly in mil intelligence that there was a classification "crypto" and that it was above top secret). I think it best to leave the man who phoned in on the Joe Dolan show alone for a while. I'm much more interested in the man who had pictures of the scene but not the assassination and the jail before Oswald was shot, who phoned in on Mergan.

Let Liebeler whitewash until I can get to him, but please keep me posted on everything he says. It may be very important. Next time I'm in NYC I'll phone an editor of the SEPost about the Spring 64 Lovelady story. I have more on that now, too, including the original FBI report from which Hoover quoted. The picture was taken in the FBI Dallas office. I have been in touch with Harris, who asked me to make a study of the shirt for him, and I did, and he has made no mention of writing any story himself. Sylvia is unhappy with him and suspects he has connections we would not particularly like.

Saw Manchester on Meet The Press. More than ever I'm convinced he is not sane. I am happy when these people lie. A friend made a tee for me and I'm getting a printed transcript.

I'll check further on Similes when I can, which is not now.

5

Had you meet the man who phoned in on KCBS and he has pictures, I promised to preserve any property rights he had in them and I'll like very much to see them. Harve said they'd make copies in return for the use when we make sense out of them, if we do. I am particularly anxious to see pictures taken from the island toward the Depository, but cannot imagine why anyone should have wanted to make that shot that day. He says he did. Even the unaltered landscaping might be important, or Willis, or other people in them.

The only enclosure makes no reference to Thornley and is quite interesting because of things other than the very interesting slip, if that is what it is, that you point out. Please recall that in Whitewash I say that Oswald went through the motions of renouncing his citizenship but didn't when he could have, and that the sensation imputed to his Connally letter was used to divert attention from his claim to connection and continuing connection with the Embassy, which he repeated in this interview. The tape in the in the archive, but I've never taken the time to listen to it. Can you get the identification of the station making the release and the date? Quite literally, Oswald, as an American citizen, was "under the protection of the American Embassy", which is a defect in any legitimate speculation about the significance of his slip. The editing is what is very interesting, and for that reason I'd like the source, if possible, and I'd like to use it with the "Oswald is all right" stuff in III. I'll write for a copy of the record.

I'll also write the Canadian professor, but I'll wait until I hear from you on what time, after four weeks from now, you think would be best for me to be out there. If they want me to speak, it will get me on the west coast. Perhaps by then you'll have heard from him. Typing is a little painful now, which will encourage me to postpone writing though I'd like very much to go out there. I'll have to mail this without reading it for typos in order to make the mail. I'm looking forward to the other Xeroxes. I wrote Carl Young asking for a copy of the Patsy tape but haven't heard. I'd like to be able to use it. From whom did you get it? I think I referred you to Bill, but I do not recall now. It is one of two such things, the other being the press conference, that also I do not have.

Thanks and regards to all,

Feb. 11, 1967

Dear Harold,

After a long search I finally managed to get a job and now I can devote my spare time to keeping up with the case. Excuse the delay in answering your letters but my reply will, I hope, tell you of the things I have been looking into. I'll also answer all the questions you raised in your letters.

First, our Citizens Committee here met last week and will this coming class session (my course on the assassination) work out the material to appear in the first issue of our newsletter. You can look for this soon as soon as we run it off and get it out to the mailing list of names I've built up. The Los Angeles group seems very ambitious and has put out a lot of informational leaflets and we are in close touch with them. They know of our plans to put out our newsletter and have sent us suggestions on what to do.

In his letter to me from the L.A. group Steve Burton, the chairman, wrote me that Lane in his debate with Liebeler last month "was not brilliant". Burton said that "there was little conflict between the two and both appealed more to the audience than the issues." Liebeler referred to the current tuition crisis, etc. and Lane praised the youth for their daring in criticizing the Warren Report. A resolution that "the conclusions of the Warren Report are invalid", Burton said, was won by Lane "hands down".

Burton also said that Liebeler, in a press conference before the debate, stated that he had conclusive proof that no shots at all came from the grassy knoll. In his debate the two points which Liebeler presented that were new, according to Burton, concerned the head shot and the photo of CE #135A. The first "proof" consisted of Liebeler's statement that a physicist he talked to said that the head moves forward in the first instance after the explosion and therefore the shot came from behind. He did not refer at all to the violent head movement backward that is apparent. In his second "proof" Liebeler dramatically presented a five foot photo of one of his students that was supposed to duplicate the conflicting shadows in CE #135A. As Burton pointed out Liebeler did not show the Oswald photo side by side. An article I'm enclosing says Liebeler was showing this "merely to illustrate a point." He said "it hadn't occurred to him" to show the other along side of it.

As Burton notes in his letter the only valid similarity between the two photos is that both men are holding guns. Incidentally, Burton says the reporter in the enclosed article misquoted Ray Marcus in the last column.

Such a shoddy affair for Liebeler to have engaged in and it's becoming more and more obvious that he is using his students for another coat of whitewash.

Before I forget I wanted to call your attention to something that may be of help to you concerning Lovelady. Note that in your book (WW2) on page 137 you cite the report in the Herald Tribune where Krakower says that "my client was thinking of writing an article" on the Lovelady affair. I recall that back in 1964 around spring Mark Lane had stated that the Saturday Evening Post had received an article on Lovelady that would show Lovelady did not resemble Oswald. No more was heard about this and a reference to this did not appear publicly or in print. I do, however, have this tape of Lane and I know it appears in it. No

names were mentioned by Lane. Perhaps you can get in touch with the SatVeePost and find out what happened on this. Maybe Richard Whalen who wrote that piece can help you. It could be a lead that might tell you something about Lovelady and I do think it is worth tracking down.

Now for some other items: You asked about sources of Cuban refugees in Florida and Dallas. I have none on this but will get to work on doing further work along these lines. I hope to come up with something very soon.

About anti-castro literature in New Orleans: Of this the best possible source on this would be V.T. Lee who used to be the head of Fair Play for Cuba Committee and who before he became the head of it was active in organizing a chapter down in New Orleans. Since the FPCC has folded I don't have Lee's present address but friends tell me that he is still in the New York City area. Dave Dellinger, the editor of Liberation, who was in town here last week says he believes that Lee is with the Harlem Unemployment League in NY and said he would try to get his address for me. I suggest that you contact Dave although I will drop him another note and see if he has located him. Lee is the best source I know of on anti-Castro groups operating on the Eastern and Southern areas. His contacts are many and probably the best in the New Orleans and Florida area.

Make sure you catch Manchester on Meet the Press this Sunday if you haven't heard it. I'll be watching him at a friend's place.

Hear anything more on what Greater Philadelphia will be doing on the Liprit murder?

I did come across some more information on Similas, which I'll pass on to you. That investigator who spoke with him said that an article on him appeared in a Canadian publication known as "Liberty" which has since gone out of print. The article appeared July 15, 1957 and appeared on page 13 ff. This was, in fact, the very last issue. I'm now trying to locate a copy. Perhaps you can trace one in the New York area where it is easier to obtain copies of magazines that are out of print. The best source might be the Canadian Embassy. Chances are that the mag was published in Toronto but this is only a guess.

What was the date of the NY Times story on Joe Ball which you referred to? I can't locate it. It had something to do with a speech he made but that is the only note I have on it.

KFFA told me that the two tapes of interviews you did with Bill O'Connell will be aired in March.

I know nothing more about the phone call on the KGBS show in which you said that a man had called in saying he had assassination pictures. I missed this part of the program and am not sure of what it is you are referring to. Can you refresh my memory - nobody has a tape of this show.

You may be interested in knowing that I have a lead on someone (it may be the same person who called in the KGBS show) which I hope to check out within 10 days. I'll let you know all about it in my next letter. I'm to meet with him soon.

For your info: I heard from a professor who teaches political science in British Columbia. He had written me trying to get in touch with Lane. I asked him to reach you and gave him your address. He was interested in having Lane speak at two Canadian colleges and he would pay a fee. I suggest you write or call him at: Gordon R. Pollard, 415 - 1029 Douglas St., Victoria, British Columbia.

You mentioned that you had some confirmation in Thornley on that other matter. You might be interested in knowing that I've been in touch with him. The copy of his letter is self-explanatory. (See enclosure).

Incidentally, Dolan never heard anything more on that call. About the only way to track this down is to check on the names of Thornley. One other way might be this: If you'll recall that per on said he was

going to be in Washington, D.C. for a convention in Sept., 1967 concerning his business. Can you get a list for me of the conventions that will occur in that month and I'll (by process of elimination) track him down that way. It's a long & tedious way to do it but so far the only way. What do you think? About the best way to get the list of Conventions would be to contact the Chamber of Commerce or the Convention Bureau which most major cities have. Then leave the rest to me.

Other items I noted which may not have come to your attention: Oswald and his use of an alias while in Mexico (see Vol. 18 P. 539); a suspect for the Tippit murder was arrested in the library near the scene (See the radio log in Vol 17, P. 410).

Something else I came across that you'd find of interest. Refer to Volume 21, page 579 (Oswald's reply). Recently I managed to obtain the original manuscript of this entire discussion which was released by a radio station (KBC, most likely). I compared it to the one that is in the volumes. This is what this transcript reads, as follows:

Oswald: "Er, well, as I er, well, I will answer that question directly then as you will not rest until you get your answer er, I worked in Russia er, Is was er under the protection er, of the er, that is to say I was not under protection of the American government but as I was at all times er, considered as American citizen. I did not lose my American citizenship."

You'll note that the one that appears in the Volume does not contain the words (excluding the ers) "I was under the protection of the..." If the Commission asserts that this is the actual words of Oswald why did they edit these words out? They may claim they did this to improve the sense but I contend that what happened here is that Oswald had unintentionally uttered a Freudian slip and tried to recover. The one who edited the version that appears in the Volume must've picked this up and edited it out because it would have shown that Oswald had almost blown his "cover". The Commission wasn't interested in showing that - even in a slip - Oswald was or could have been an agent of the U.S. government who indeed had the protection of the American government as an agent even if a minor one. Do you agree with my analysis?

Incidentally, I have the actual words of Oswald on record. A recording of this debate was put out by Billy James Margis & his crew entitled "The President's Assassin Speaks". I listened carefully to what Oswald had to say & how he said it and I noted when I heard this that he had said exactly what the transcript which I obtained said he said. When I heard it I remember saying to myself that I'll bet they censored the above if they printed this. I turned to the volume some time after that and sure enough found that they had. It wasn't until recently that - thanks to some wonderful people - I was able to get the original transcript. If you're interested in getting this recording you can write: Key Records, 7720-Sunset Blvd., L.A. 46, Calif. Is there any information on this debate in the archives? Perhaps you could include this in your list of documents and I'll enclose here the copy of that transcript (the relevant portion).

I have some other material I'm xeroxing which I'll send shortly. It concerns that fake agency I discussed with you when you were here.

Well, that's all for now. I hope this will keep you up to date with what's happening here.

Regards to you in the meantime. Let me know how you're doing when you get the chance. Hoping to hear from you soon.

Best,
Hal
Hal