

6/17/69

Dear Gary,

When I had to write Hal anyway, I decided to go into what I believe is required by the friendship we have had and my feeling for him. You are the only person getting a copy of this letter, and I give it to you in strictest confidence. You are not to let anyone know either that you have it or that you are aware of its existence or content.

Hal is a great guy. He is getting so much flak against me I can understand the position he may be in. I think a careful reading of my letter will indicate he cannot read my sources and I have let him know what the others will in any event, that you have asked me questions.

Part of his hangup is Turner. Yet he has had reason not to trust Turner going back to early 1967. He took me to meet Turner in December 1966 and heard me tell Turner what no one else said, believed or understood and in strictest confidence. He then saw this appear as fast as physically, over Turner's name, in Ramparts. That would have been enough for me, but for him, with his radical background, there is an aura around Turner he cannot disappete. He was present when, although I was so best I couldn't stand to speak, I forced from Keating the public admission I was leBoeuf in their spoof. I was to have gotten a tape of that appearance. I have never gotten it and I have asked Hal often. At least two tapes were made that I know of. He also knows of them and knows the people who made them very well. I do not know the address of either. (That night was my first experience with an FM bug, not used by his friends.)

Part may be his own embarrassment (for example, when he tried to get me interested in Broshears long, long before he surfaced; I found excuses not to do it -and the end is now clear).

Part may be proximity -like bums are close and persistent and I am far.

In any event, coinciding with the beginning of this campaign and possibly attributable to other things is a remarkable reduction in communications from him.

If his name has been invoked without cause, he can so tell me. If he wants to face me on the fact of what has been alleged, I have challenged him. This is where I shall leave it unless he responds. I still have a warm feeling for him, but it is tinged with disappointment from his silence, for I would never in silence listen to what he has been told of anyone I regard as a friend. It is a keen disappointment to me. Yet I think it this is to be properly read as signifying a real hangup on his mind and thinking, not as a character defect. And Hal is essentially a timid man (by this I do not imply cowardly), tending to recede, much more able than he seems to regard himself, quite bright and sensitive. And he has been enormously valuable and helpful to me.

My Hal file is one of the larger, perhaps the largest of correspondence. I have not thought of consolidating it into the reorganized ones, for that will take more time than I have spent at any one moment. However, all of this has caused me to take a look at it. It may be out of order, so in going to that early period, I may not have seen all that is applicable. One of the first things I notice is his reporting strange things about Lifton to me, back in the summer of 66, any my encouragement, as an older man, to let Lifton alone so that he may work things out himself. Rather a switch, isn't it? Then on my trip out there (and this may also be a hangup, for he has not yet repaid the

actual expenses, and he organized it and was to have made it financially possible), if you understand what I have told you, of the original request from the LA people and specific on Liebel, there is ample confirmation here, aside from what was by phone and hence is not on paper. On 10/20 he asked me to go to SF and on the 22nd I responded that it coincided with the LA request and I would. There are a number of letters dealing with the details (and I let them know everything else that related), My 11/15 makes it clear that I was to focus on Liebeler. My 11/15, which must relate to a phone call, reports that LA had backed out on paying my expenses ("they say they are now without funds!"). My 12/2 goes into the various challenges to Liebeler, specifically what Bill had arranged on the Lomex show, a real confrontation, with my, as it turned out accurate forecast, that "I doubt if Liebeler will show". There were four challenges and he failed to show up for any of the confrontations, aside from written challenges. What I had also forgotten, I apparently was responsible, in all or in part, for the reactivation of the CCI in LA. This is in a 1/9/67 letter, and I recall now getting together with Burton and several other students and agreeing to be their counsellor.

How I wish I could get someone local to go over my tapes. I used to make them merely as aides memoire, for so much was happening (and I was not adjusted to it) I was afraid I'd forget, so I recorded these things. I may have one or more of the LA calls on tape. But, I used both sides of the reel, and that is six hours per tape, with slips of inserted paper marking places but nothing else, save a slip listing what was on each reel. I'd like to be able to dub one side off each, in pieces, cutting up the other, and having a regular file. Some of the things do have other values. I think it is likely, because I would have wanted to do precisely what they asked on Liebeler, that I did this after the call began. It is without significance save as a measure of the integrity of these people. I do have the various Liebeler tapes Bill sent me so I could do this, and I still have the notes I made on auditioning them, but that is under "Liebeler" and I am not now going to take the time to look it up. I did write Bill extensively on it again, I am confident, reflecting that their request was for me to go out and take him on and shut him up. When you are again here I think you may want to hear those tapes anyway.

Again, the time this internecine war takes! Again my apologies for the typos. Let me report that by bulk, I have now gone about 60-75% of the files, which is some progress. I could have written more than one book in the time it took, though, and another in what it will yet require.

This brief glance at the past, I suppose, should have made me bitter about the impositions on me. The LA people couldn't have kept their word on paying my expenses, yet they threw all the big parties for Mark, who failed them, for Sylvia, who would tackle noone, made arrangements for so many paid appearances for Mark and not one for me, and now I know that they had more money than the rest of us together and how they spent so much of it. Hal would not have led me into this financial drain on purpose, but the fact is he did it and has not, in the years since, been able to make it up. The Hal file shows my awareness of the cost to WW II of going out there when they asked me to, of the disadvantage of going so close to Xmas, etc. But the files also show that in both cities I succeeded. I silenced Liebeler, who remained silent until he had to respond to Garrison. I silence him apparently permanently on the Crane show, despite the change of format in his fillibustering favor and out the Reseda cancellation in a different perspective. Hal wrote and told me I had made public comment on the Report acceptable, or word to that effect. The CCI was reactivated, and it had not been by Lane, who had been extensively in LA before I was (with seven Mort Sahl TV appearance, but that stalwart could not find one for me- he used me, as any tape that undoubtedly was made, for the explicit purpose of that trip, to defend Lane, and I did on every point and call on his radio show, except one where a guy called up to say he had owned

a clothing store in New York and got sick every time Mark came in because Mark was always stealing spits from him (You filed that one, Mort", I said, and, typically, Mort called his caller all sorts of nasty names, nothing else). I now find it strange that when they taped all of these things, those people never had a single tape on any of the appearances for me. The only exception, over the years, is where, when he was afraid to tackle me to my face and when he was going after Garrison on his radio show, a stranger sent me a tape of my phone Dolan appearance in the summer of 1967. This was so I could respond and I did. It was after Phelan's piece appeared.

Oh, well, back to work. But I am so disappointed that these people, for whom I tried to do so much and at such great cost to myself, now abuse me as without apparent significant exception, they do. I am more than \$1,000 further in debt because of just the actual unpaid expenses of my trips to California, not counting the enormous time I put in, a vast expenditure in correspondence alone. I often find myself wondering if it is because I was so right on Jim, they so wrong, and I did try and alert them to it, and how much of it can be attributed to what he, Turner and Boxley were undoubtedly doing of which I wasn't aware. Only Mark's work was known to me, and he used his knees and nails on me whenever he could, including to those he did not know would let me know.

Have you thought of calling to the attention of the new mayor out there what happened to you when his police stood by and permitted it? He might just be embarrassed if it resulted in a suit. Try and find a diplomatic way of getting it presented to him. You might even find that the city may have had a kind of insurance under which it might be covered. Now that you have met the city attorney, could you ask him if there is such insurance?

By now I am so worked up over these vilifications, I'd like to know what reactions you get, if any.

Best,

6/17/69

Dear Hal,

Trying to do too many things for too long has resulted in chaos in my files. So, when preparations for what I was asked to do for N.O. immediately before the trial forced it upon me, I began a reorganization of them including a rudimentary carding system. When and as I can, in the odds and ends of moments that present themselves between larger things, when I get to a good point to stop one piece of work or another, as before retiring or meals, I nibble away at them. Little by little a semblance of order is coming. Yesterday and last night I was in some Cuban files, which is the immediate purpose of writing you. I found what you sent me for Oswald in New Orleans, your hand-copying of some AP dispatches on the Masferrer first Haitian caper. In it are some names that do not appear in any of the other clippings I have on this. That, in turn, assumes a possible current significance because of what may or may not have appeared in your papers out there. It got scant attention here, but I have learned a bit more of it. There has been a federal indictment that now seems to be under the neutrality act, of about 10-12 guys. I have ten names, I think. This grows out of the gas-bombing of Haiti a couple of weeks ago that got a little more attention. I made a few inquiries in Washington when I was there Friday and for a reason I cannot now explain, this prosecution seems to be under customs. If it seems strange, let me remind you they are the ones who busted Hall in October 1963, which also seems like the wrong agency. Now there is a broad involvement of the former Cuban mercenaries in all of this. About two months ago there was an "accidental" killing at a camp on the edge of the Everglades. One of the men involved in that is Dempsey. One of those just charged is Kolby and, without having checked them all out, several others of those now charged are familiar. One, Howard Davis, is certain to me. I have several files on him.

What I cannot immediately fathom is the prosecution at this particular time when it is inconceivable to me that the feds did not know everything they now know months ago. For example, as the people in LA know, Hemming laid the whole thing out to me on tape the end of last October, when I interviewed him. He was discussing it openly on the phone while I was with him, with no effort to obscure what he was talking about. Of course, his lying is commensurate with his size, but there is no doubt he was talking about it and out loud. With so many of his Cuba-days associates involved, I have no doubt he was in on it and quite possibly, as he indicated, in charge. Larry was with him on it.

If the lawyers rather than the agents know of me, I think they will be asking me questions for two reasons: I have written of these people and I have often discussed them on the phone, including my taping an interview. I do not think that on their own any agents will approach me. But, these are very dangerous people and irresponsible as they are dangerous. They are in no sense revolutionary. When I asked why the Haitian involvement, the response was a shrugged "Replace one dictator with another". They have all sorts of weapons stashed away all around the country. You may have noted it. If you haven't, some of the Cuban Power bombings were with CIA explosives and by men with CIA training. So, if I am approached, I will want to help. This does not mean involving you, for giving them a copy of those dispatches does not require telling them how I got them. I would not for other reasons, as you know, for I would not disclose you source. I would tell them only that on those dates stories with such and such contents appeared. But, if you have anything else on these characters and their operations, let me know the names involved. Do not copy the clippings, for that could be a large and expensive job. If you have names I do not, I can then ask for specific things. I will be adding this to COUP anyway, for several of them are already in it. I have finally begun writing the addition to it, having reread what I wrote a year ago. Just finished that Sunday. The only changes I have made are in tenses. To make

others is beyond my capacity and I do not regard any as necessary. After a year, with all that has happened in that time, this is not a bad record. However, I have much I will be adding, particularly on Ray.

All of this reminds me of several things. Have you ever checked back with Brandon? I would like very much for him to cut me in touch with those women, directly or through you. Their knowledge now assumes more significance for several reasons. Would you please try again and let me know? There is no reason for them to be concerned about themselves, but there is reason for them to worry if they have not let what they know be known to those who can cut in proper perspective.

An aside that you may find unwelcome: just at the time I succeeded in turning Hall and Howard on and they agreed to go to N.O., after their success in court, Garrison was turned off of them and onto Masferrer. For the longest time he was persuaded that Masferrer was responsible for the murder. It later turned out that Turner did this and that there was no basis for his doing it. He merely persuaded Garrison it was so. As so often happened, Boxley pitched in and helped. When Hall finally got to N.O., there was a taped interrogation in which they all participated, then Hall was turned over to Boxley for about a week. There is no record of any kind of this. No one in the office knew what, if anything, Boxley got in that week. One thing that did happen that I cannot regard as isolated or uninspired is that Hall went to see Pena and Pena didn't like it for a minute. Now, with Hall's story that he had been in N.O. only once, then with Hemming, and he saw only Le Barre at that time, his insistence to me that he had never been at or near the Habana, there is little likelihood that he had gone to Pena's on his own. Other things that I developed through Pena, who did not understand their significance, also persuaded me this way. There were also others who went to Pena, in violation of my standing agreement with the office, that they would stay out of what I was working in unless either I asked it or an emergency and a genuine legal emergency only required otherwise. The result of all of this (Pena told me he threw Mark out, for example, was to turn him off, and very effectively. He really got up tight, as I had never seen him, and would not even talk to me. He knows much I haven't learned and I learned much of great value through him. If and when you are here again you may want to hear the tapes of some of the interviews he set up for me. A whole new picture of Oswald and Bringuier had emerged, and of Oswald's associates, and of at least one False Oswald. Because of all of this, we may never be able to get to the bottom of that now. And, there was at least one mysterious death involved, of a person interviewed by the FBI as in those On-The-Ball Wall interviews, where the person was asked about palpable manufactures and blatantly false ones and nothing else, to the end that if anyone asked anything the Feebees could have said, "Oh, yeah, we conducted that interview; nothing to it." Now this was a person who saw "Oswald" regularly at a time it could not have been the real one and in the presence of one person only, rather, the company. It also is apparent Oswald could not have been the man at Pena's bar for that drunk that was no drunk at all but was staged. On this I have the statements of several people who were there. Pena was so furious, at more than Hall and Mark trying to cut in on me and him, that he refused even to tell me what and why. Now if you stop to consider that he had thought what he was doing through and had made a major change in his life and perspective, you can understand the depth of this to him as he saw it. He had decided, "Okay, so I get killed. The hell with it; I enjoy." And he had gone out and bought a purple, air-conditioned Cadillac in which he drove me around, dropping his attention to his own business to do it. If you know him and the close attention he pays to business, you would know what this means. Meanwhile, I was checking out what I was getting and it did stack up fine. There is corroboration on much.

This sort of thing persists on various levels, to this day, and is

also being done by people who may not have any such intention. I have been silent about some of it because we have already been too fractioned by it. I have not written you about some of it for a number of reasons, one of which is that you have never written me what you said you would. It is not my desire or intent to bug you. But silence does not indicate unawareness of some of the things that are going on. They do reach me, from assorted sources. One one level, when people are told what they have difficulty believing, they directly ask me about what they have been told. In some case, it is impossible for the pieces not to fall in place.

In our discussions of Lifton, on whom you have not agreed with me, I can show you proof that he was running his strange kind of campaign against me going back to mid-1966 at least. I have never mentioned this to you or Paul in discussing him and what he was doing. I recall being informed of this by that time, when we had never met, way before I was out there for the first time. Because of it I sought to avoid him and succeeded in doing this until the last minute, when my continuing to do it was embarrassing my host, Bill O'Connell. Sp, I did see him for a short while on a Sunday morning, when I could not plead the pressure of time on the appearances. That is the only time I recall seeing him face to face. I recall phoning him but once, then at Paul's behest (and Paul was right; I then should have). I have avoided him. However, his campaign continues, intensified recently, as you must know and he must have told you some of the many lies he is telling. Because I had been told that he tapes everything and because I also knew that he twists everything, I made a tape of my conversation with him, only for my own protection. I have never played it back, never let anyone hear it, but I do have it. At that time I proved to him that all the things he was saying about me were false and had to be, to his knowledge. One example, the cancellation of the Reseda debate with Liebel. Now this is one of the things that Gary asked me about. I gave Gary the file with the stipulation he return it to me, but so he could read all the correspondence and see the truth for himself. If you doubt this, ask Gary, who has returned that file. If you want to see it, under these terms, you are welcome. I do not see further disputes or fractioning and ordinarily I do not concern myself with these things, for they at best waste time that can better be spent otherwise. If I cannot tell you why he does these things (my own hunch is that he is off his rocker), I can prove that everything he has alleged of me of which I know is quite false, and I can show you my written challenges to him and the proofs.

More recently Fred has begun the same thing, with a few nasty embellishments of different character, the kind that cannot be disproved by files and the kind that are never effectively satisfied by mere denial, the sto-beating-your-wife kind. However, it is possible to totally refute most of what Fred alleges, and my own correspondence with him is entirely inconsistent with the other things. By which I also mean his correspondence to me in itself is a refutation to reasonable people (I wonder how many such are left?). This relates to many things, including his sources on some of the things he has been working on, the Thornley stuff he gave Lifton (and has full awareness of its potential for willful misinterpretation - I think it is fair to say the certainty that this is what would be done with it) and other things. I know you have maintained your associations with both. Did Fred ever tell you what I have never mentioned, that the one thing he gave Lifton is not the only communication he had from me on this? It is the one I never saw, having merely dictated it to a girl in the office (you know my handwriting and I was not then carrying my portable typewriter for reason you understand, having me at the airport so many times). As a consequence of this incident, I began taking my typewriter, the result being that it was intercepted and ruined, beyond repair. Fred never had any doubt of the purpose of sending him picture in pairs he was not to separate and he did have a letter I wrote myself he did not give Lifton. There is more I do not take time for. My real purpose in telling you these things, aside from the fact that you should be thinking of the, is that your name is now

being invoked as confirming these assorted lies and slanders. Because everyone who knows me know the high regard I have for you, this is rather effective. It is because this has now come to my attention that I let you know of it. I do suggest that you not say anything about it on the chance that, cunning as some people are, it may have been done for the purpose of fingering someone if it is not true. By "true", with the kind of people we are discussing, what I really mean is not true but what a sick mind can distort into the semblance of truth. You are not alone. The names of others are being used the same way, with statements in direct quotes. If these things have been said by those others, they have said what is completely false and again I have the files to establish this.

If what is attributed to you is so, I can say only that I am sadly disappointed, for you should know me and what all this has cost and is costing me and you have seen and heard me defend in public and to large audiences those who have made themselves my enemy and who have gone out of their way to hurt me - and succeeded. I would also be disappointed at your failure to confront me with the evil things that have been attributed to me.

These campaigns go in cycles. There is a remarkable coincidence between them and other events, coincidence that has often made me wonder. Exactly paralleling the beginning of Fred's, for example, is FBI interest in those who have been working with me unknown to any of you people, including Fred. Of course, this can be coincidence and I have no way of establishing that it is not. I also think it is coincidence, so far as Fred is concerned. But it also is fact.

One of the obvious results is to turn people off. This includes people not deeply immersed in the subject who accidentally came across what fit as they did not understand with other things of which they had no awareness. There have been so many cases of this, where people who had been close and friendly - and in touch with Fred - abruptly turn off. In no case can any of this be attributed to our correspondence. Try as I might, these are not things I can attribute to reaction to Garrison.

The utter foolishness of the allegations that I am trying to steal what Fred has is laughable, for I regard much of what he "has" as unsubstantial at best and I am the one who turned him onto the one area where he may have made a worthwhile contribution, including the raw material, for which I have his written thanks. One of the new variants is on Z, and I can show you where I sent out there and to him what I alone had discovered on this. While I am unaware of what his work on this now amounts to, I am aware of where he began and I make no effort to hide my skepticism. My own discoveries, however, including those not published, are in writing, stated, and in letters to you people out there. Fred's beginning point, if he did not tell you, is that the entire Z film was immediately remade. It is all a fake. Meanwhile, as you may recall, I was busily engaged in trying to preserve for him credit for what was genuinely his. I have not altered the credit in COUP, which, as I said, I have just gone over. One of those who attempted to steal from him is one who has been close to you, and it is blatant and I am responsible for his knowing of what Fred have done. This also is in writing.

I have no intention of carrying this further. I have told you about it because your name was used or misused and I felt I owed you telling you. Any time you want to be in a position to check the basic integrity of the people conducting this campaign or the fact of what they allege, be my guest! As you certainly should know, you can have anything I have. In this case, with the restriction it not be used to further the divisions. I add but one thing: there has been a measureable reaction to the thing I earlier called to your attention. Coincidence? Perhaps. I do not know. Sincerely,