

11/15/72

Dear Js,

Today's mail is heavy and there is much preparation for the trip that begins in early a.m. While I hate to leave Lil alone for so long, she has suggested that I take all the time I can and do as much as I can while I am away. This may mean that I'll stay in Dallas until the 5th, for as of now I have to leave then for a Wisconsin speech for which my expenses will be paid and I'll get a slight phenomenon. I'll be getting out of H.O. as fast as possible. For reasons I think you understand, and there is much I can do in Dallas and I do have a pad there. So, I've gone over your mailing of the 11th, put aside what is to be read, and if I don't get to go over it before leaving, will read on plane, and mail ~~home~~ home from Knoxville. I'll be responding as I make first reading. I'll be leaving p.m. to look one more place for Sony tapes with sensor and mailing so I won't have to take time for that in early a.m.

Ur10: No response MK's AA. But I think what little chance there was of Marshall okaying is now dead, and we are thus saved a disaster. Terror: this has always been part of my belief, and with MK it is virtually unhidden. There is an added and ignored factor, that they are the creatures of those with a vested interest in what they know, believe and will consider. My brethren have been indulging prejudice and emotion, have no experience with the workings of bureaucracy, and to the best of my recollection, not one has switched roles, out himself in the place on any K, beginning with Bobby. This is one of the crises witnessed, who was determined to pillory them in the guise of friendship, incredible as this may seem for a man who has decided to lay aside his thesis on ethics. I wish you could go further into that confidence, which I have other reasons for crediting, but do not encourage it, knowing the preciousness of this to our craft. But it could illuminate and be helpful. If you'd like, consider the encourage attitude to LBJ in this connection. You are correct on Krakow, but you forget San Fernando State. In all other cases it has been the trusting of the honorable men bit, which I agree is their best, really almost their only position. No K can survive a presidency in which there remains a single unmasked or unanswered? about at least the JFK case. Think of this a bit and you'll see their position better. And what I've paid for it. With MK add a strong family dealing/bond and that he is the sole surviving male.

Je's(?) cut notes: Marboro has so many retail outlets, they can save the advertising cost where they do not have an enormous supply and where they think they can seal over the counter. I must admit I am baffled by the remaindering. I've not sent you carbons of the OGD corres. on this, but they deny and I have a friend who bought one at Barnes & Noble for \$1.00. Marboro told him they'd remaindered most at \$3.00, which is rather high, in their NYC or one of their NYC stores alone. They could be wrong. But it is something I can't now resolve or spend time worrying about.

Noguchi as ex: since then I've gotten a clip from the Nat Enquirer referring to him as ex but not saying when, why or how he left. If you don't have answer by time my return, remind and I'll send this. I have no further info. No explanation.... Busch: I have CNS copy, which contains what is not in any clip I've seen and as a commentary on current reporting, it pretends the bullet removed from the 6 or 7 cervical vertebra is the fatal! If I get full text, will stat.... 10/7 says it is Je, as type indicated.... NYC cops/tinks: interest limited. I'll be doing an intro to Agent Oswald on informants, and in the course of spasmodic thinking about that while occupied with other things, it occurred to me that at some time there might be a popularization of SPY in informants, going back to the bible, the blowing of the horn, and with modern emphasis. I think it could go. But I don't really need more on NYC cops. I've got some pretty farout stuff, including JKH's radicalizing of his own. A bit was in WOP, including one who blew his cover before the HUAC! Red to Je Jr, Lil is making progress and may mail in my absence. Just a couple of inches to go, then the washes, etc. I'm not asking her intentions, for this is her project. If she sends before I return, I'll regret not seeing the whole thing after flattening. For while some of it is not as she'd planned, I rather like it.... The small note attached to this encourages

that I do my own thing. The few compromises of the past have been disasters, so this time I had no problem not considering even the slightest departure. I've not sent you all of this but if I had, you'd have been aghast. I had no choice. It was one of the easier if more costly decisions.

11/9: Vantage point. Not important, but thanks....Roberts: not really important, but he is now national editor, which means fairly dependable fink credentials, and he had offered going friend notes is he could find. As of two days ago, nik....JMR/Wallace/Mutual now solves. Pl. giarisa, inc. UPI, from a story by a friend I'd backgrounded in Chi and he interviewed EF by phone. I have his (valuable) notes not used in story. UPI put "puston dateline on it, But Foreman was in Chi putting another client away!

What I hope can be a last word on the Ned pain: his original proposal was that he edit and consense the three parts of PH, written over a period of 5 yrs. The first part was done before our second wave, had been edited by another friend and retyped before the appearance of "ink's and SI's books, the second, then called III, was written in a couple of weeks, literally, and of course this presents serious problems of organization, etc., so I was quite happy. Because the proposal included paying for a printing of the unabridged work (his was to be limited to what could sell for \$5,000 and would face-fall without back-stopping), and because the unabridged is really overwhelming, I loved the idea. He is loaded (Weyerhauser, General Mills heir), I had no reason not to trust (friend of close friend), and I'd begun the writing of an intro to unab. setting forth the problems of the whole thing and explaining why that edition appears as written, and the timing, etc., which could overcome the liabilities if not in normal commercial format. When I return, in between the many things I'll have to cope with, I'll try and finish this. The government has not surprisingly double-crossed on the pretense of negotiating an out-of-court settlement on our damage suit and that will have to be priority when I get back. It can not only mean much to me but also to others. What is little known is that I have established one of the precedents in noise ecology and this permits broadening it, which puts a heavy load, aside from our selfish interests, upon me. And I am pro se, having been double-crossed by lawyers (Warren's best of one of his best friends and his former law clerks, Edward Bennett Williams and Peter Taft). To make this more comprehensible and less paranoid-seeming, the law prohibits what we can't offer anyway, tacking a retainer is such a suit and the lawyer's cut to 20%. They never take their shoes off to count, so while they'll all take 25,000 cases at 33%, they never figure the cut on say at \$250,000 suits at 20%. Incredible, but I've been through so many, it is consistent. The single exception, an impressive conservative, stipulated what I couldn't swing, depositions vice interrogatories.

Ned again! we did have an agreement. He started modifying it as soon as we reached it, unilaterally, and told himself it was because his own integrity was involved! Need more?

Nixonier Getysburg: Great! I'm sending to the best humor of us, to whom I've given all my S. Asia files. He may find an ultimate use.

x Goff's: unreported here. One of like name, former preacher, well know from previous MSC hostroy, apparently different buy, preacher. Desmond also unreported here.

Chou-Nasser: unfortunately, too little of what should remain in head does. I think my point and interest was in hostage angle, for I am certain it was JCS plan to provoke Chinese attack on US men in Asia, and this would indicate Chou awareness. You will see in TIGER, On dope, etc., no possible disagreement, as on other social things. As I recall, this was my only real interest. If we discuss this again, I'll be falling under Tiger, JCS. I also have subject/filing problems!

Gallbraith, not reading now. He is chicken on JFK-ass. I've been in touch. He was to contact when in DC, as of three years ago. Never happened.

Best regards,

9 Nov 71

Eventually she gets around to filing, and usually finds bits of unfinished business.

Yours of 10/18 (so - "eventually" was the right word). Vantage Point: that morning you had heard on radio news that NYTimes apparently had said he (LEJ) had used some of the Pentagon Papers sealed by court for "national security," and you asked - if we still had it - for a copy. Don't have it. It's possible, but not very probable, that I missed it. Two possibilities: it didn't appear in the edition we get, or it was in the Sunday issue, which we don't get at all. Oct 18 was a Monday, so report could have been from Sunday edition. That batch of papers, as it happened, was piled up to be disposed of, so it was simple to check Oct 16, 18, 19. Not there. Might have been on the back of something already clipped, but I look on the back before clipping. I really don't think I could have missed it.

In same letter you ask if we have any recollection of Gene Roberts' reporting from Dallas. No, we haven't, in terms of connecting any particular story to his byline. (Our files are by subject, sort of, and we've had occasion to regret it, but we're stuck with it now. We do have cards which serve to cross-index some of the main files, but had to discontinue it I think in the summer of 1967, just couldn't keep it up. Now, when it seems necessary, I stick a memo in a folder as a reminder of something filed elsewhere. We have been able to continue with a record of magazine articles and books, by author, source and date, and in this connection if you see an ad or review of a book, say, we'd appreciate having the details - author, title, publisher, date.) Back to Roberts. Jimmy had a bad, bad headache today and spent some time in bed, and to make sure he'd be able to sleep I did some quiet work, so it was a good time to check the Dallas stuff. Nothing bylined Roberts.

Note written 24 Oct, in which you ask if we'd be interested in tapes you might make of intvs such as one you'd just heard with an American doctor back from China. Of course we would, in theory, but it would cost you time and effort and - apart from the problem of finding the time to listen to it (I've had to erase tapes I've made which Jimmy hasn't been able to hear) - you might be duplicating what we've heard here. KPFA has carried a great deal on China, especially post-ping-pong: intvs, discussions. But we thank you for the thought, the offer and the willingness.

Note, 10/24. You had heard morning Mutual news which had story saying one of JER's former lawyers had said he didn't care about getting caught because he expected Wallace to be elected and pardon him, Wash Post had nothing on it and you asked that if we'd seen anything to send you a copy. Nothing here. But I do remember something to that effect and perhaps also heard it on radio. But have nothing in print, in our files.

Your letter 10/31/71, last page: "Lil has long been after me to isolate myself and just work." As Jimmy said in his letter of 4 Nov, we agree. My question would be, with Ned as a for-instance, can you afford this kind of help in terms of what it costs you in time, energy and emotional strain? That isn't to say I wouldn't have been tempted and wouldn't have accepted, because I think I might have. (How easy it is to give advice, especially when you know how something turned out.) That isn't to say, either, that you shouldn't accept help, but - well, I was going to say that since you're the one who knows what help is needed it should be on your terms, but in Ned's case that was pretty well spelled out in advance, wasn't it?

10 November 1971

Dear Harold:

Your mailing of Nov. 6 came in today, or rather yesterday, and there's time for a note to say we thought your letter to EMK's administrative assistant was very good, bending over backward to be fair and considerate. You have done what you can, certainly. Now it's up to him. No one can say you didn't lay it right on the line.


Regarding the Kennedys and their attitude all along, my impression is that most of their critics (this doesn't necessarily include you, for we have no clear indication how you feel on this) never have given adequate weight to the factor of terror in their situation. The general assumption is that they are all lousy rich and don't need to worry about such things. This is fallacious, in our opinion. The rich habitually worry about kidnaping for ransom if nothing else, and to assume the Kennedys were in any way immune to the influence of terror is unjustified. In fact, an objective review of their behaviour suggests fear as the controlling element in all they have done and in much that they haven't done since the JFK assassination. EMK does, it is true, continue to speak out on liberal causes, but he never mentions the assassinations if he can avoid it, and when he does treats them as obliquely as possible.

One reason we feel this is a scrap of information we picked up some years ago from a very good friend, who gave it to us in strict confidence, and for this reason we shall say no more about it than we do here. This was to the effect that a teenaged ~~xxxxx~~ cousin of the Kennedys remarked (I place the time at well after EMK's first plane accident and well before Bobby got it) that "we all know Uncle Jack was not killed by just one man." Coming from a very young teenager, this impresses me as more nearly representative of the family state of mind than all the bland disclaimers of suspicion and ~~xxxxx~~ interest. If it reflects the central convictions of the family it means they felt their only protection was never to challenge the official story openly, never to display any sign of further concern. You will recall that Bobby never made the slightest comment on JFK's assassination until late in June, 1964, and then he was in Krakow, Poland, and answered a student's question by saying he believed Oswald shot JFK because he was a misfit in American society, not because he was a Communist.

Perhaps we accord this fear factor too much weight, and it is certainly true as you point out that politics and bureaucratic restraints affected much that Bobby did and didn't do and say. Nevertheless we feel the knowledge that all the men in the family were marked if they got out of line must not only have affected them but perhaps even more profoundly the women in the family.

We note your notation on Foreman and will be alert for anything that turns up. We would have been anyway, knowing your interest, but we'll keep an extra eye peeled.

All the best,



jdw

I cut out two paragraphs
because on re-reading 10 Nov they
didn't make much sense. No loss.
What I was trying to say was,
do your own thing yourself, you can
be proud of it. It's harder to do
without help, but you eliminate the
possibility that someone helping you
won't, with the best motives, do the
wrong thing, and you'd certainly
save the time watching out for this.

I'm having trouble putting on paper what's in my head (it's much clearer there), but I'm getting sleepy and dopey.

Same letter; remainders, Marboro. How did Marboro sell every copy without listing? Were they all taken off their hands by one interested party?

Undated note, with mailing postmarked Oct 28? - illegible postmark. Noguchi. You say one of your young friends (the one doing a study of the press) says Noguchi is ex-coroner now. What our files show is that he was reinstated 31 Jul 69, but nothing to show he was fired later. If you can remember sometime when you're talking to this friend, would you ask him about this? If we missed it we'd like to have for the file the reason given for the dismissal, the date, some reference, possibly copy of clipping.

This reminds me: I made a note to check something you referred to in copy of postscript to a letter with no indication to whom it was addressed; came in mailing postmarked 24 Oct. Anyway, it concerned the Blehr/Wolfer thing and you were asking for a copy of DistAtty Busch's full statement. Didn't think we had it; checked; don't have it, only a few quotes from Busch at press conference 18 Oct, which you probably already have.

10 Nov 71

Didn't mail today. Had expected to have time before getting Jimmy off to work to make copies to be included. Didn't make it.

Later

Your note, undated, rec'd in mailing with illegible postmark (28? Oct), about Post story on NYC police graft. You asked to have clipping returned and it was, without Jimmy asking whether I'd read it. Had not, so I don't know the particular angle you're interested in. NYTimes carried pages and pages and pages on it but this was a subject I thought I wouldn't bother with, and didn't even skim. HOWEVER, most of those papers haven't yet gone to the recycler, and will hold them until we hear if you want those papers clipped. So let us know. No big problem since most of the stuff is on full pages, but here and there I may have clipped something on the back.

Saw tiny Jenifer for a few moments today. A beautiful child, with delicate features and a sweet, secret smile. I smiled a secret smile at her, knowing who has a personal blanket in the works. She's found she can stand if she has something to hold on to, but finds it very aggravating when she can't remember the procedure for sitting down again.