

31 October 1966

Dear Harold,

Many thanks for the UFO clippings and for your two letters which I opened and read tonight just after seeing you on the CBS-TV Archives segments. Thanks also for your kind mention of my Jack McKinney broadcast. I had almost a dozen letters from listeners, in each case intelligent, well-informed, or at least well-meant.

No; I didn't get to see Penn. We were to have dinner Wednesday night but I had come down with a bad upper respiratory infection and I couldn't make it—anyway, I had laryngitis and was probably a danger to healthy companions. I did catch his WCAU broadcast, which was very good mainly because Penn comes through as a man of genuine feeling and courage, a man who can not reconcile himself to injustice. I'm glad you wrote to UCLA. Liebler must be losing what was left of his wits—imagine, announcing the initiation of an investigation AND its results ("will prove the WR findings are correct") at one and the same time! I do agree with you, Harold, that things are moving much faster than might have been expected—and moving our way, by and large.

Your segment on CBS-TV tonight was fine, I thought, certainly very fair and forthright. I was on the Barry Gray show on the 13th, perhaps the one you could not make—with Kupferman, Sauvage, and some irritating and irrelevant fools who knew nothing whatever about the WR but had the usual fixed opinions. I did not realize until afterward that I had done anything noteworthy, but the PR from Esquire (who got me on, mainly to publicize their December issue in which I have a piece dealing with items that should have been investigated and perhaps still can be) told me with bulging eyes and dropped jaw that I had "talked back" to Barry Gray and gotten away with it—I was really surprised, for all I did was to continue giving him a list of the anti-WR books that he had asked me to give and brushed aside his attempted interruption (what do I think of Mark Lane? to which I said later that it was irrelevant but if he wanted to know I thought his book was quite good, although I disagreed with some of his interpretations of evidence). I am most interested to know more about your new book, about which I have been hearing murmurs. My ms. is at a good house and the editor who asked for it, after reading my TWO articles, is 100% for it but fears his higher-ups will resist any book on the subject, since it would come on the heels of at least 5 such books published since late spring. I am not counting too much on publication now but it is good to know that the editor thinks so highly of the ms. Must close—guest is at door. Warm regards, hope you are keeping well.