

HW:

Your 7/17/74 memo on Kim Grosscope. The name is totally unfamiliar here, so what comment I make in response is based less on the few facts about him your memo provides and more upon what appear here to be the objective circumstances. Central among these is the contents of the car and the apparent absence of other, normal contents. This suggests that it was a none-too-thoughtfully staged affair, presumably to provide an excuse for interviewing you. What the purpose of that might be remains to be seen. The most innocent might be to throw a scare into you, but from your description this seems not to have been the case. The probable purpose, if it actually concerns you, is very obscure to us here.

So if the purpose behind the whole thing was in another direction (assuming you were worked into the picture only incidentally) one of the most important questions must be whether the subject is a candidate for some sort of role in the Oswald-Sirhan-Breme# tradition. From what you say he appears to be quite eligible, and the Laurel incident conforms with such a pattern.

As you may recall, for a long time we have considered that one of the big dramatic holes in the Heroic History now being written is the ~~absence~~ lack of any real assassination attempt which could be taken seriously. The New Orleans incident pooped out, and the busted windshield occurred in the wrong city, Dallas. Nevertheless, both could have been trial runs of a sort, to test reactions at various levels.

Attached is an extremely interesting scenario by William Safire of the NY Times and formerly of the WH staff, which, if it does nothing else, depicts very clearly the corny dramatics underlying the thought processes that are at work. To Safire's scenario (which I assess as his own construct based on his experience, rather than a planted version) I would add two elements which could be dusted off at any moment. One is a return of the phlebitis which lurks in the wings, and the other would be an assassination attempt. If Safire's outline proves out, add these two elements and you have established some basis either for resigning or taking the 25th, both of which we have vowed never to do. Neither would be likely, in my opinion, unless both impeachment and conviction were voted decisively enough to be unchallengable in the public mind. Still, one needs to have these devices handy in case of need, and it must be galling indeed if, still unable to exploit a suitable illness profitably, one cannot point with martyred pride toward an assassination attempt SOMEbody will take seriously.

Who could be the straw boss of such a delicate project? Well, you yourself mention a threat which your visitors' agency dismissed as nutty, and I think it worth remembering that its author (according to our independently reached conclusions) could still be in business. As you probably noticed, he just bought an \$80,000 house in Miami.

jdW21july74