

Dear Js,

4/11/73

Aside from all the goodies with your notes including those of 4/7, I welcome the excuse to get my mind off the most disagreeable, going over those of the government's records we finally got relating to the damages to the farm. I started working on them at 5 a.m. I don't know if one can give an emotional equivalent of the physical, and I do know that the physical varies with individuals. Let me attempt this by saying it is like slitting pig guts all day, pulling the viscera out, and doing nothing else all conscious hours. At many butcherings I've not been the butcher, but I've been near enough for the stench to be oppressive. Imagine an emotional equivalent for all waking hours and you get a notion of what this is to deal with. I have to get off of it, and your notes provide a good switch.

KPFA WG, referring to the 10/3064 Calif judgement vs Nixon et al for dirtyworks vs Pat Brown: I'd heard of this and think I have an account. With the hat put firmly on him then, who assume it doesn't fit now? I have always assumed it is his hat and belongs on his head. What I have not assume now seems possible: he will put it there himself, personally. I think his sickness more than his dishonesty or fear account for the present situation that is so far beyond the rational that even Barry Goldwater has gone far out of his way to disassociate himself and say that Nixon might be responsible and if he is, BG is through with him.

4/7, quote of Pauling: "He is expert on insanity too? What eyes do you suppose he saw flashing insanity on TV? GL's?" By the way, I think it not unlikely that a study of insanity could have been a byproduct of chemical researches.

4/7 Buckley as trustee: thanks. NBC as of today hasn't returned my copy of that or of either Buckley tapes. This means all is replaced because you provide the text, I had a dupe of the show as aired that I'm made in case you didn't and Jim has one of the original tapes and has ordered another. If he is sole trustee, that is close enough.

4/1 letter, the Hinckle tinkle:

Now I'm glad word of my duplicate didn't reach you because I was unaware of the cover of the natural yield of the STM's usual perfection in the employment of that which is allegedly a feminine characteristic. If this piece is a sample of his "autobiography", then what "unchausen penned is scripture.

We might ponder the Freudian overtones of Hinckle on Hinckle, "If You Have a Lemon, Make Lemonade." Begin with how thin and diluted the product. One lemon and all that liquid? No matter who or what the lemon, if lemon as in automobile, he has said it all. "He has turned every vehicle into a lemon. Not excepting this one. I'll expand, but I didn't want to until you'd formed your own judgements that I take it coincide.

Title: "The Ramparts Caper". False. "Regardless of who started it, Ramparts didn't. They gulled themselves and the readers, as Hinckle here does, but it was never their caper. Maybe he was doing no more than trying to capitalize WG, but it was an intelligence caper and to call it anything else is to exculpate intelligence. This is the central thrust, of all his pushings, that I detect, exculpating CIA.

Conspiracy: you are right in noting that he doesn't knock any such theory down. This would have turned off both the nuts and the informed. Probably most readers. "He ignores that and thus remains clean. However, what he does not ignore is precisely what you say, any suggestion of conspiracy (and "theory" is long since past description of the hard and irrefutable) has to be a hoax. Whose interest does that serve? Can you not consider CIA among the man, all official and including all spooks, Feebees and DJ lawyers?

I didn't know that Ramparts used the same piece. I presume without changes or you'd have noted it. Isn't that odd? To make themselves seem so honest? Or to reach that audience?

Turner's help: not in the writing. I don't think all of it pleases the self-styled reformed crook. "Help" on info perhaps. Probably.

It could plug either book. Postulate that either the collateral rights are sold or can't be and how else plug either book in a magazine of mass circulation? That may not have been the purpose but it is relatively innocent and can balance the suspicious.

It makes Garrison look much less ridiculous than he was in the whole infantilism. So much less that I dismiss this as a probability. Not even an intended by-product. He does use Garrison and the affair to make himself look more credible than even his representation warrants, and with two such book impending, that could be a purpose and

a needed one. The Kaplan is so delayed its appearance coincides with his next, it was so troubled that two professional writers had, in their desperation, to drag in a third and pay him and give him top billing. Hinckle says that on the rare occasion when my perfect judgement fails, I am never without Sherlock Holmes' questions and my periods short of perfection are short and few. In the end I came out all right and I alone undid this dirtiness.

I didn't know Turner had the movie. I blew my one chance to see it, as the tape recounts. I knew Marcus had the one he clipped from the clipper Newcomb. Maybe they made copies? I've never had the contents described, but I know it had to include enough to give basis for a Shaw mistrial move. I mean I believe this. Without that it has little point and is redundant beyond justification of the cost and effort.

Might sell some copies for Turner, but not enough to explain the piece and the putdown of him that is inherent in it. What, this big-deal FBI expert so easily conned?

Larry Bensky at KPFA: Don't know what kind of guy he is. Spoke to him but once, by phone, after he telegraphed to ask me to be on the King committee. He thus knows that I immediately sent him the pictures Ramparts and Turner claimed as their own work and if for no other reason from this knows Bill is dishonest. So, if you can ever talk to him, I'd appreciate his account of the affair and those he met, with the details that are possible, because of the beliefs I hold and have from the first held. He could do it on tape while going to and from work, no sweat, if he is willing. Maybe, after you hear my tapes, which are anything but complete, you might be interested enough to talk to him about it and tape that? My interest is in this as not only an intelligence operation, which doesn't need proving, but as a combined one between CIA and the right-wing SDECE elements typified by Visjoli.

I won't take time for exposition on the other events with which this fits. I'll mention some that roughly coincide.

Gauldston (still silent); Dion (still silent); WG (all but one to date identified CIA pasts, all trained by CIA for the roles they served); CIA Nixonian reorganization; Garrison-Shaw's suit, due this month; The Romero Romance; CIA-ITT-Chile. All sorts of thing all involving CIA in bad p.r. and in p.r. needs. These needs can be served by making CIA look like good guys and by making it the unjustly accused. Romero does one, Hinckle the other. I'm sure there are more. I hasten, as usual.

Sure, there is always the chance now that something new on the assassinations can surface, if the odds are against decent attention to it. (That, too, hangs all Rampartsers up: they haven't done a single worthwhile thing, except that marvelous if hurtful "review" that Hal will remember Keating admitted was a spoof of me.)

So, I think minimal context is that it is not without one and that there is no way the one it has is helpful to the spooks.

4/6 McCord, etc. It is not yet all clear. I have no reason to doubt anything publicly attributed to him. Notice hasn't yet been, but vengeance is good enough for me. He could consider it belated patriotism. He come from a culture in which the word is kept and where it isn't no obligations of honor remain. I disagree with your statement that he has contributed little new unless you mean in what you and I and a few others could understand or anticipate. He has, from what has been attributed, already made a very good record of involvements (and as I wrote earlier, don't be deceived by the "hearsay" nonsense) and I expect much more. He was a pro. He therefore is as prepared as most of his experience, with his political limitations, could have by way of a self-protecting record. Thus the attack that become open a week ago. Thus also my staying away from Bud and my offering to help. That I, a non-layer, knew of immunity what they did not is a sufficient description of them, not of me. That they hadn't considered the obvious political need he faced in this and if they initiated, they did too late, also says something of them. It may of Alch and Rothblatt's motives, for they also should have done this as soon as he said he had struck the tuning fork for key and pitch. Neither seems to have.

Except that he is a friend of Gray's and wants to survive, Weicher is less clear than he could be. If GL were not sick and were really bright, he could take it that Weicher is running interference, in the one field he seems to say he really digs. Weicher has,

first by inference and then explicitly, attacked McCord. When McCord is saying what he says he wants said, why? When McCord says what he says he believes, why? On the face of it this doesn't make sense. Nor does it for a Senator and a lawyer to speak of hearsay as he has and does. In hitting at Haldeman while saying he has no proof (his reasoning is sound enough), he is saying not GL, which serves GL. The one rational explanation I can make of GL in all this is that he intended repetition, the key to him. A Checkers replay. He is steadfast in his faith of those he trusts, so that when at long last he has to say they did it (not he, of course) he will appear the victim!!!

Weicher tape: I was wrong. It was on Face the Nation. My tape even says that.

I'll use the tape in something else I make for you. I'll explain why I won't now dub my recollection of and related to Farewell America. 99¢ for any C120 is fantastic. For a decent, branded one means the prices of decent ones will tumble. Ampex is also sold in PXs, so if you can get someone with PX rights, you can get them cheaper. They also had a boxed deal of 10s that a year ago, in C60s, sold in PXs, with the box, for \$6.00. That is 60¢ each with the storage box free. Each separately cased, too. Lesar is getting Sony 60s for \$1.50 in DC.

For hour-long shows, these Ampex are ideal. I'm decently supplied with cheapies in 60s and can forgo the 120s. My chief use for them is in interviews I want to keep. There I use the Sonys with the warning and I have four, which will take care of any now-unforseen need. Not unforeseen, unexpectable. There is much I should be doing and somebody's ego is blocking it.

I'm not dubbing the recollections because I don't dare tied up the TC40. Yesterday Jerry Ray called me for the first time in a long time. James had told me he had told Jerry to leave me alone, stay out of touch and silent. It was an important call. It is important that I taped it. If the TC 40 is tied up I can't. If I could make a decent patch between the old Norelco-style VOM and the Craig, then I could dub safely when I need to keep the phone-taping available. By the way, and don't make a special trip, when you see your expert, I have the standard Norelco patchcord with one of the other ends fitted with a standard plug, the other with the RCA that comes with them. I can't record on the VOM dependably. Sometimes it just doesn't record. It never fails to play back. If I could feed from it (7 1/2 volts) into Craig, I'd like to know. Only then could I justify the cost, here \$8.00 min and per hour on any work. I couldn't afford it but I could justify it. Here one can't even get a Y connector. When Lesar and I were dubbing a week ago, the way we did it was to feed from my TC 40 into the Craif, direct patch, let the volume up on the Craig, and pick that up with the mike on Lesar's TC40! This want, of course, we had to be silent or whisper. If I can't get a simple Y here, you know how little is available. Jim forgot to get it in DC, as did Smith before him. I asked both, and Bob is an engineer. So, I'd rather send the three cassettes, let you listen and decide if or what you want. It would be safer to have to take the time to repeat the whole thing. I'll send them separately.

You will observe I seem to ramble. I do. I had not planned this out. However, I would encourage you to consider if the seeming digressions need be irrelevant. I think that in going into the seeming side issues I was including more of the whole story of which this was part. I don't think Turner and Boxley and Palmer can be separated from this, nor their insanity to mark Anniversary V. Villere's Coal Scuttle, by the way, is like a scene from a spook movie. (I guess. I never see any!). Real cute.

Your *, McCord doing his own leaking: not directly. Russell, who I suggested is one of the more likely, the other Prouty, is his partner.

No rush in returning the Farewell recollections. I'm sorry I don't dare risk not being able to tape the instant the phone rings.

I'll be getting the Buckley tape of the Aunt show. I can dub the whole thing or just that part, whichever you prefer. And I can let you have a fair air tape when I get it back, if you'd prefer to the not good one you have. Perhaps a dub of the Buckley one and the inaudible voice on the one you have would be best for your purposes?

First thing I did was list what I got from HR today so you won't copy from NYT needlessly. Enclosed. I guess that brings me up to Sunday in the Times, 4/8. There was a review from it. Thanks much for the WG clips. I'll be reading clips during my evening waitings for Lil for a while. I'll probably get to clip today's Post and enclose, but I have it. Best,

hr