

Dear Js,

3/15/73

I'm sure glad you had time before going out on the 13th to send those two pages. They are very helpful. As it is important to have devil's advocacy available, it is also important to have confirmation of deductions or plans for courses of conduct. One of my real problems has been isolation - no one to who I could turn for advice in whom I could impart trust and who had enough experience in life to supplement a good intelligence.

As I did yesterday, I lay an abundance of other things aside because I feel there is potential importance in this - either way. Again you have triggered<sup>ed</sup> further thoughts and possible correlations.

Both of your possibilities of interest are tenable, not just one. If there is no connection between the waif and the New Yorker, it is remotely possible each represents a different interest, although I do not believe it is the case. Oddly enough, for several days I have been toying with the idea of sending a copy of my only response on my FOI inquiries directed to GL to Byrd and Tunney because that reply, by the man of the moment for several days and in today's Post's second lead story confirmed the employment of the wigger as of the time of the crimes and when he was a participant in them. ~~THEY~~ It also discloses that the most recent blabber knew this and didn't tell all in telling as much as he did. If I decide to do this, I'll enclose a carbon.

And there is a possible third interest, one that has not been in focus ever and in the viewfinder only intermittently. Just because the helm is gone doesn't mean it is rudderless. Interest is irrespective of the presence of helm. By the most remarkable of other coincidences, after toying with the idea for a while and with a little more than what initiated the thought, STM's bios, I took steps to initiate a damage suit. For this purpose I approached a lawyer active in causes. His response says that my letter was long delayed in reaching him and tells me to get in touch again after a lapse of time that ran out yesterday. Wrote him before daylings today. In his own right he is the attention of inordinate interest because he has been both diligent and successful in such matters. I have no knowledge that this latest seeming approach preceded my letter. I know it could not have preceded my talking about it.

Then there is the decision in my spectro suit. Properly used - and I think the possibility remote - some of the gray areas become black. It directly contradicts the current blabbing and the blabber is signed to it in his previous role. It raises serious and substantial questions of criminality of which the blabber is part. Suborning perjury is as much a crime as perjury. In his role as blabber, Blabber has given one of the proofs of perjury or indicted himself in his current blabbing or both. If I have had been expecting this decision for several months, I am sure others did also and knew its potential.

If the lesser personnel might be active in this, then it is not impossible the third, the one I've added, is not detached, even though there seems to be an official disconnection. That's a matter, it now comes back to me, I discussed with Sandy Smith over my phone.

I think you are right in saying there can be no middle ground. That was my initial feeling, the one with which Lil agreed, as she did with my playing it straight inclination. In this connection, I also spontaneously offered what really can be valuable literary properties on entirely different matters. One of these is being worked on by another. I gave a reference to how I could be checked on this and how my judgement could be by one whose position alone makes him a dependable appraiser. As I think I told you, several hours later the call had not been made. If it has been since then, I've not heard of it. This can be but need not be a test. Or, appraising also works two ways.

Now it happens that the chatelaine has completed the first part of a project similar to the Ma one with which you are familiar. This one is without the lamentable wrinkles. It lacks the scrimshaw. (Why make it easy?) Depending on the accuracy of the forecast, tomorrow is the 270th day. We expect a call tomorrow night which will provide the data now missing. My source just happens to be in the field of the professed interest of the one whose name you describe in accord with my initial reaction to it when I first heard it. I will make the obvious inquiry in the open when I get this call. May I here note that if one is disposed to make Ockie-like implications, several puns are possible.

If you had heard the conversation, you'd know that by just being myself I laid the basis for what you call dealing smoothly with the second venture. That is, I am already

some kind of character, the reading others would have given. Including on those things about which I might have a kind of reluctance without cutoff.

The only way in which the lateness of blooming can be satisfactorily explained, in the thoughts I've had, is in terms of commercial competitiveness. The seemingly synthetically named knew of two projects and might well think they can or will establish a market. I have had this experience before and know it can be the McCoy. Some of the other questions in that graf I can't really answer. However, the approach through Bud was an obvious one and tends to mask if indirection was intended. Bud's attitude has been changed by his needs. I got a letter from him today asking me to call him, and I did. He also phoned me two weeks ago. His needs override his ego when they are urgent enough. I suspect that his mind may have been reached by the calculations of which all the rich of my acquaintance are capable. He has spent a fortune and has nothing to show for it except the successes I have given him. Contemplation of that expenditure may have motivated the most lofty principal of the rich. About Jim I have no doubts except in terms of an inability to separate himself from the nuts. That can be explained but is here immaterial, nuttiness not seeming to be a factor. On intent and intelligence he stacks.

In conjecturing about what could be of unrecognized importance, the involvement of and the personal, financial crookedness of GL, addressed briefly yesterday, can be one. The auspices of 1965's seeming involvement might be another, for there is a prima facie case of lingering involvement, not just with personnel of the past, if you recall the nature of my interest that led to my FOI inquiries. An unanswered one might be very relevant. The more I think of it the more I feel maybe I'd better do some letter writing. This may be the time. If I may coin a phrase, the spook regards the ghost not being seen as indispensable.

Them, too, the full shuimen has not been disclosed. What has been disclosed has to mean a much larger project than all of what is known can begin to equal. One of the means of getting to it was FOIed. This could lead to ~~the next~~ what would make the teapot's dome appear smaller than a picayune.

You may realize that this transcends open operation. It was by direct-mail and to the one whose bashfulness is currently center-stage. So, if this is it...

With all the focus on coincidences, I note receipt today of a self-serving meaningless from Outerbridge that just coincides with the approach by a friend of the past and by me to a New York lawyer, who today reported he can't handle but is looking for one who can. How dull life could be without amplethora of coincidences!

Thanks for the time. It helps and we'll see. The time for the call is close.

Best,