

JW

Dear Mr. Griffith,

6/10/75

I found your letter of the 6th informative and interesting and requiring explanations. What you say is promising, too. However, I think we have better reach some understandings. If you have any questions, please ask them. The years have taught me much that I'd rather not have had to learn and remember.

However, until there is persuasive reason to the contrary, I begin with trust in everyone. This can be a fault. 't is mine. So, I trust you.

But unless I draw upon this experience and communicate it to you, you are handicapped and you cannot understand me and what has come to diminate me and my thinking and actions.

The conditions of my life are such that I was interrupted four times in reading your letter. This was not too bad because from tje length I knew I'd not be able to respond in full so as I read it ~~xxxx~~ I marked it up.

There are today very few in the field with whom I deal openly and in whom I have trust. I stay away from those who have achieved most attention because the best of them see to be in it for the attention only. I know some of those you may respect to be amoral and unethical. Others are plain nuts.

You may have no reason to take my judgement on this and all I can tell you is that in each case it comes from painful, often costly personal experience.

Most of the well-known ones do not even have a command of the basic and uncontradict established fact. They are essentially promoters and to them fact is irrelevant. There are others who consider it a worthwhile accomplishment to do no more than what can embarrass the government. This is anathema to be and of no real value.

So, with the brief explanation and as I am about to have to suspend to get the beginning of the electronic reporting of the Rockefeller Commission report, I will want it understood that this will be between us except with my prior approval. There are too many who are not friends with fact and are loose with tongue and words. They have done nothing good to date and much harm. I, and what I can tell or send you must be detached from these people. Otherwise I can't go into this.

But as you will see, I will be informing you without this assurance. 'ron your letter I see no problem in this for you. If there is, please let me know promptly.

Penn is a great little guy who is paranoid as hell and entirely out of his depth. When I broke up what would have been a disaster for all of us, one of Garrison's most irrational plans, to 'em I became a CIA agent. Mention me and you are cursed with him and with the others down there, the others for additional reasons having to do with slavery to moneyed people regardless of how they behave.

I have not seen the account you mention. If I'm inclined to doubt it, I'd like to know.

The FBI's interest in you when you were interested in the text interests me. Have you any proof? Remember the date, names, etc? Had you talked to anyone about this earlier? Could they have thought you planned some kind of job?

Was there a special reason for picking out Detrick of all the posts within not much more than an hour for the M16 demonstration? It is chemical, not ballistics in any way. By chopper Aberdeen is within minutes of the same time. Belvoir is closer and well equipped for this kind of demonstration. The closest edge of Detrick is only a half-mile from here. The main part is 3-4 miles.

Maybe Penn now has the police and sheriff's connections you say. I have reason to believe that Roger Craig supplied these in the past.

On Connally's wounds it is best to read the testimony of the doctors. Do not forget Shires, who was not called to DC. It does seem possible that he had a through-and-through wound. I believe the thigh fragment is a fragment and never was any more. But it has some energy behind it. Not from 399.

It is not easy to reconcile what I know of the JFK wounds with what you say except as perhaps from a second head shot. There seems to have been the coming typical of an entry wound in the back of the head, larger in diameter than what I'd expect from



what you say. I can help you more, which can help me or my thinking but I have to ask an unusual promise of yours that you not discuss it with others. The number who are rational on this to begin with is small and almost nobody has done enough work to be careful and to understand and to be trusted not to go off half-cocked with what I'm sure will be in the Rockefeller Report and will hurt us all. If you will agree, I'll send you a non-secret document that with extremely careful reading will be helpful. I've done my writing on it, do not expect to add to it, and my precautions are no more than that, the precautions painful experience dictates.

The dust-like particles are in the brain, near the front.

Shaw's death was not sudden. He lingered for a year. Ruby was sick in the head to begin with, before any of this. I don't think there is anything abnormal except the time it took to get him to the hospital where it would have made no difference anyhow. He did suddenly start looking bad. I was with Elmer Gertz when Gertz returned from the funeral, in Chicago.

I know the Shari Angel-Athy-Ray story. The feds were looking for Kay. I think I have that story. I got them from Dallas only rarely. Kay British, illegally in the US.

I was in Dallas the day Walther got shot. If you have the details you suggest in any solid form I'd appreciate them. This is the second time I've heard that account. The official one was hard to believe. The occupier was lying in bed naked with a woman. And then disarmed Walther, with another armed deputy present?

I have been able to print no books not on the new list. If you want any I'll trust you for these you can't pay for. Reading them may help you.

Please excuse the typos. The press here is great. Thanks,

Sincerely,