

11/12/70

Dear Paul,

This will be but partial response to your letter of 11/8 (and many thanks for the enclosures). I will not have time to check those things to which you refer and, please take no offense, I really haven't time for this. In today's mail are letters involving such things as \$2500 out of which I have been beaten, royalties overdue me and about six others, plus several that have accumulated, and I've laid them aside. It is because of the regard I have for you, the appreciation of the many helpful things you have done for me and a continuing concern over you and the atypical things, like some of the evasions I'll come to that prompt this. So you will understand the time pressures added to the long-standing fatigue: I'm in the midst of going over proofs, where stupidities all unnecessary in the editing require much time and exacerbate; I'm deeply immersed in a number of promising but time-taking legal things, without any real help (Example: I went to Bud's twice this week to get a simple thing done and even when I spent the weekend preparing and retyping what they had asked, they did nothing with it, I drafted the next thing to be done (two pages involved), to be edited and retyped overnight—and that was not done; and a simple motion was to have been prepared—and that was not done—but Bud is ego-trip tripping like the possibilities were about to end and hasn't yet discussed with me the hearing we have Monday while tying himself up so we can't get together to discuss it before court-time Monday—all with an assortment of interest-conflicts and crap. I'm not just saying I haven't time for full response and I'm not just saying I'm past exhaustion and can't take time for diplomacy and the kind of polite shit I know you've been sent not to offend you. My concept of friendship and sincerity is to be outspoken.

I've had that supplement by my chair since I got it but haven't been able to find enough time to do the word-by-word reading with a lens. I hope to be able to read the 1st copy sooner. I will some night, when I'm too tired for anything else. I've addressed an envelope to Stamm and will mail today.

It seems to me past time for you to stop the negative (that "insists that it (your test) has absolutely no 'scientific' validity) and directly answer my direct challenge, which was that you show me faithful reproduction of that which you allegedly test. My recollection is that in no single aspect was there any fidelity, not even an approximation, beginning with a totally incompetent replica of a human skull, though the wrong weapon, the wrong (undescribed) ammo, the wrong angles, no attachment, etc. It is time for you to answer, not evade. Your failure to do so is one of the things leading me to say going further is a futility. And the very concept, of something you knew could not possibly achieve public attention except out of context and interpreted as meaning other than you intended. I find from each succeeding word from you even less need for you to have done this for Alvarez and more reason why you should have known better. You at least as well as any other known it is not possible to separate what you said you were doing from the entire thing, yet that you did. If you took offense at my references to flat-world science and a fairies -and- needles approach, you have said nothing that in any way addresses these criticisms, and they are no less valid than when I made them.

What you have now done may not be as bad as what you did to begin with, but is there any doubt that I am, shall I understate, not alone in describing the first thing as very bad and without possibility of any but the deepest hurt to what all of us have done at such great cost? How else describe a project to be used out of context, wrongly, and when it doesn't even address what it pretends to? And here again you have been silent so long time, unless it is in this new variation.

Alvarez: called to his attention by students. I'll not check the file. It is in something published or in a letter he wrote, over and above the CBS thing. It clearly came from someone who had read WW, as I recall. I accepted your word the first time you gave it. I still do. You need waste no more time telling me it didn't come from you.

If CBS, whether or not Alvarez plagiarized, and your comment is, "I find your charge... totally pointless", you have delivered yourself of a fine exposition on your concepts of morality. If you doubt what I've told you of CBS, you have some of it in the letters I wrote them and their replies at the time of the videowhitewash, their responses, lacking in denial, and you can examine my file whenever you want, including their rejections of my proposal, which

they then, later, used. This was done by the man who rejected the proposal, with those working in touch with me and getting help from me, and with his predecessor also having read the work and given it to him to read. Midgeley was then no 2 man. Palmer Williams was his boss. Williams would have liked to have done what I proposed (witness he is no longer in charge with such attitudes).

Alvarez' letter, of which you sent two excerpts: as a scientist, if he had the "naivete" to which he alludes in 1966, where the hell did he get off doing what he did? Has his "naivete" diminished any, his factual knowledge increased, that he is up to the same evil now? I think he used the wrong word. (The accuracy of his scientists quotations are here: "iz. 'Whitewash' (Weisberg, Baytsville, Maryland, 1966)" The address and date are both wrong. That he privately acknowledges that I copyrighted this and whether or not he knew it (he did know it was not original with him for he is specific in what I have in saying he was told it), together with 20¢, will get me a cheap local hamburger-if I go there for it. I have not asked nor would I like him to say "that I first learned of the streaks from Paul Hoch", which you should be able to spot as a demeaning evasion, nor is there in the light of the fact he does know anything but deliberate deception in his statement he didn't know of your interest in the assassination until after the broadcast. I have seen some of his letters. This is consistent with them. He is a politically-motivated, arrogant, egocentric whore. By the way, he was permitted to make what I think is a special examination of the Zapruder film. Why not see if a copy was sent him (may through Frank Stanton). If it was, it would be very helpful impending litigation. I would very much want to use this at the right ~~time~~ time only, as you will understand when you see what I've sent Mary for further distribution to those desiring it.... Note you also repeated the claim to his originality in his first draft.

= I've already updated you on the memotransfer. FBI SS tapes: I've intended asking for dubs when I could pay for them. If you do not get, let me know. What you enclose seems like what I saw, but I'm not completely certain. There may be another thing on this.

If I misquoted your letter to Dick, it was not deliberate. Your explanation of not writing him before making all those mistakes is not persuasive, particularly because I told you he could help you avoid them.

Assume that you do "pretend" to answer my criticism in this very late thing. Why did you not once respond to the intervening letters, or tell me that, since it is obvious that I dropped everything to do this, you had received it and would respond? At the pace at which I go, with all the things I feel I should do and can't, including having a little personal life and a few simple pleasures, this was a hell of an imposition. I also wrote you about a special concern, elliptically, but you understood it and remain silent, long silent.

That crap at the top of the second page is below you. It is childish, self-pitying, and may in some ways comfort you, but if it does, I am worried about you. It is unworthy of further comment and it addresses nothing.

If you "can't call what we now have 'proof' that CE399 or a similar bullet (meaning, I assume, another full-jacketed, military in itself total refutation of the entire official mythology), was not involved", you are beyond hope and have lost your capacity to reason or have refused to use a very fine mind. But there can be no doubt. And there isn't, to anyone else. That 399 itself was not used as said can't be question. I challenge you again to drop this shit and show me how it could have been. Ditto with the repetition and evasion of what I wrote you about Tague shot. You show me how it could possibly have come from "a fragment from the head". In any event, you wrote the paper and you defend it. But you should stop and think about your persistent evasions, your constant efforts to pass the back. If you do not answer these two things, they you should quit.

You may very well have returned that brief or whatever it was. I thought I said I was not certain I sent it to you. But whoever I sent it to, it has not reached me. Once I learned that Mary has access to a good xerox, when there have been small things (and lately no other), I've sent them to her with memos to others so they'll know what she has.

Sylvia had to have geard of Bringuier, if only from the Guitarts, close to him, Guitart was at the trial.

Sincerely,