

4/17/72

Dear David,

Your letter of the 14th came yesterday. I picked it up at the post office en route to Washington for a medical appointment. It helped make a bad day. I'd best cool off a bit before I respond, as I shall soon. Until then, I make just a few comments.

Your opinion of the Gorts review is both accurate and irrelevant. It will do much to depress the sale of the book in an area in which it should have enjoyed good sale, one of the specific areas of which I had specific discussion and agreement with David. Your letter indicates he has not discussed much too much with you.

You use the word promote as a word says "love", without meaning. I think you should first learn what is is and then what it means.

I take the liberty of suggesting that you, personally, read everything that relates to the agreement between us. It is clear that you are either unaware of it or less than honest, and despite the insulting and non-responsive character of your letter, I'd prefer not to believe the latter possibility.

And, I think it will serve all interests if you would take time to think a bit about me, what you have learned about me if only from editing my work. I mean not only the interest of all of us but yours and David's, individually and collectively. I really think that if you do not, personally, understand all of the details of the agreement we did make, and then fully understand me, in the end you may be very sorry. I should add to the suggestion that you read everything you ask David to give you all the details of what we discussed and agreed to, especially what I immediately set forth as minimum conditions for even letting you consider the book. I could not have been more explicit. I told him in detail exactly why I had rejected earlier offers for it, my wife was party to all of the discussion and agreement we had, and after this nasty business became an issue, I did discuss it with her (as, in fact, I had prior to David's arrival, for with this, as with all my work, I regard her as a full partner and so treat her). Her recollection is clear and entirely consistent with mine.

I have gotten up earlier than I would to tell you these things so you can be as aware of them as soon as possible, for I have to go into town this morning and I will then mail this and the other enclosures written earlier. I think that if you do not now realize it, you will eventually come to understand that this is not an unfriendly gesture and in no means not in your personal interest. I think you will come to understand that the letter to which you non-respond, something I think out of character for you, is, under the circumstances, rather moderate. I would like to be able to reply to yours of the 14th more moderately than I now think myself capable.

While I was in ^{Washington} yesterday, having wasted much time on the previous trip in an effort to speak to Chuck Elliott (the only effort at real promotion David has made that showed any promise), I spoke to him again. It took four calls before I reached him. We had a brief, friendly chat about what he had done nothing yet. I suggested that his interest as well as mine would be best served by his not delaying it longer, he told me what I believe, that he has more things in the pen than he can now handle or they can now use, but he invited me, without prompting from me, to come see him. He set the time for his first free moment after my medical appointment, I was there, having two hours to wait before that time, and I waited for him for two hours more, but he did not return to his office.

Here I take a moment longer to raise a few questions I think you might well consider for the future, when you may again have a controversial topic and an author who is not without public-relations and promotional experience. There is an inherent arrogance in David's approach, as I'm-the-only-one-who-knows-enough anything attitude. His sole concern was that I do something that might cross him up. By now you are aware that I not only never did but stayed away from anything that in any remote way could have. He shared nothing with me, which meant there was such I could and would have done, that our agreement, in fact, called for me to do, that I could not and did not. Had he bothered to let me know at the beginning about this, instead of keeping it some deep and dark state secret, it might by now have come to pass.

As I'd earlier indicated, I know this operation from the early 30s. I worked with Pearson and Allen ~~Smith~~ Jack Anderson was their legman, as Elliott was in one. I never knew Anderson, but my wife did in the 30s. I knew and was close friends with other of their legmen. At the time of his death, ~~Harvey~~ Pearson was interested in the King begging part of this book, as a consequence of what almost everyone working in the field of the assassinations will tell you is close to the impossible, my having been referred to him on it by Ted Kennedy's office. At that time, Pearson was talking to almost nobody, but I got through with no trouble and he did remember me. One piece he once did for look, for example, was all mine. Bud knows Anderson well, and he early offered to speak to him. I then suggested it was premature, and Bud agreed. Once the TV review appeared, this changed. But by then I was under David's all-enveloping wings.

In short, whether or not this comes to pass, and it now will only if I can save it, it had a very good prospect if David had done what normally under the circumstances one in his position would and should have done, told me about it and asked me to go to see Elliott ~~then~~.

This reminds me of one of the many things imperious and all-knowing David ignored when so long ago I wrote him of it, that bit on the CIA. Helms' speech of several days ago gives it a perfect setting. Whether, with the prevailing attitudes, the very depressing effect of your non-performance ~~has~~ had had in the trends as I on me, and the other things I now must do, all clogged up thanks to you, I can now do anything with it, I have already initiated certain things and I will try. Helms says they do no spying on me ricas and I have cartoons of their spying on me. In strictest confidence I tell you that yesterday I made a deal with the ~~the~~ commercial front they use for this purpose. The deal is that I will inform them of all appearances I make before I make them in return for their supplying me with tapes where I cannot see them myself. In fact, I even offered them of tapes of some appearances I recently made of which they had no knowledge, and I will deliver them the next time I am near them so they can sell them to their "client" Wild? Also on tape. So be quiet about it.

Now, in the time I had to wait for Elliott, I went to the Washington Post, which is not deeply interested in Hoover. That you have failed to exploit the only book that is current and has anything of substance on him is simply beyond belief. In fact, David tried to discourage any effort along this line on my part after you agreed to less than the minimum when I phoned you about it before I went to Memphis, from Bud's office. Years ago I started to do a book on Hoover, and the Post wants those old records, I am giving them to the paper. They asked and are coming up for them. I spoke to one of the team of reporters assigned to it and the new national editor. We have mutual close friends and associates (for example, Herman was often his photographer when he was with the Sat. Eve. Post), and while we had never met in person, we had, by phone, often. So, I spoke to both him and the reporter yesterday. Despite the policy of the Post top brass against my work (not me as a person), they gave me what I wanted of the stolen FBI reports,

and in return, I showed them meaning they did not see could not grasp.

These two people, quite obviously, despite David's consistent understanding of public relations and promotion, should ~~my~~ have copies of FRASE-UP when the paper is planning a major project on Jews and the FBI, but reading the paper did not penetrate David's consciousness. Equally obviously, your miserable ~~it~~ chiselling with copies of the book (remember, you have yet to respond to my complaint that I had to ~~buy~~ buy four copies for TV people), I felt that I could not afford to give him these copies of the only copies I have, those I have bought from you under our original agreement and for an entirely different purpose you have rendered meaningless. So, I told them quite frankly that you were not supplying me copies for the press (you have not yet delivered the eight copies called for by the contract, remember, ~~with~~ with of generosity?), but that I, not being able to afford to give them copies I had had to buy, would be glad to lend them. Both were anxious, I loaned both copies, both thanked me, and whether or not it will now rebound to the benefit of the book, they will read it.

Of course, any real understand of promotions would certainly tell David, whose knowledge of these things is so great, that one would not waste copies of one of the ten most important papers in the land by every count, a paper that sells more than 500,000 copies in a city considerably less than twice that number in population, especially when it has a syndicate that goes to more than 200 other papers, including many of the largest and most influential.

In the past, knowing them well, knowing their attitude to the field in which I have worked, when I was my own boss, I nonetheless was generous with copies of my own work - even after they double-crossed me, even after ~~Kihon~~ Kihon ~~Wiggins~~ ordered no review. One of the results you can see if you look at the back cover of PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH. Knowing the New York ~~Wiggins~~ attitude as I did, I gave them a total of 13 freebies of my first, after which I started charging them and they paid. If you would like copies of what Kihon wrote, before the changes there, they total a full page of news on the next two books.

One never knows, but one does try - if one is serious. There is a phrase that bubbled out when I was writing WHITEWASH II II that lingers in my mind. Like its "There are none so blind as those who will not see." I might add that there are none so crippled as those who will not try to walk.

Before stepping for breakfast, there is an added request I make of you and I do expect full and complete response. I would like to try and pick of the pieces of David's failures. I am not suggesting that there was reason to expect success, with the timing, conditions and means of his approaches, for I think that under most circumstances they could not then have succeeded. So may not remember, or he may now be small as in, but these things, too, we had discussed in detail when he was here. I told him of the attitudes of the major shows to this subject. They may have told him the attitude was to me, but this is not the case. For example, Today, to which I never spoke directly, and I have never had any direct contact with any member of the staff, was so embarrassed at refusing to air me some years ago that they offered to air me on any other subject on which I could make a decent showing. While there are a number, I declined the offer.

As your files will show, there are some means by which I might have approaches made on a different basis, some where I may have them made on the basis of personal relationship ships. So, please, immediately, tell me which he approached, to whom he spoke, and what they said. Please do this without delay, for bookstores that have had the book on display have already started removing them. And then ask Harry Farber's professor for a tape of that show and tell them I would like to use it for artistic purposes.