

Dear Mr. Gallagher

From your letter of August 9 I cannot tell whether you are non-responding or non-responsive. At least one of my previously unanswered letters warrants a few more AP words. You can, as you know, muster up to 20,000.

AP<sub>o</sub>  
1  
Meanwhile, until you decide, here is another little illumination of the integrity, lucidity, complete impartiality and devotion to nothing but fact. It is your own Lingerin Shadow.

~~Meanwhile,~~ The interest in me that the AP has taken is teaching me things about news values and coverage, AP style. It seems that when the New York Times decided my book PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH: SUPPRESSED KENNEDY ASSASSINATION PICTURES, was worth about 40 inxhes, your New York office asked your Baltimore office to do a story. They kept me pleasantly occupied for perhaps an hour (the first time) but filed no story. From this I learn what is news, what the AP members should get and what they <sup>(their readers)</sup> may and may not read. It now seems that you went to all this trouble (I know the money means nothing to you) to write a story just in case a member demanded it. When nobody demanded it, it wasn't news and wasn't put on the wire. How effecient, <sup>is this what you call "publicism of the press"?</sup>

The part that bothers me, though, when it is for Sunday papers and there are no afternoon papers on Sunday, is how were your members to know about the story you didn't give them so they could ask you for it? Or is <sup>a new</sup> the "New York Times" the new "advance man" for the AP.

Service of

You know, for a moment I thought it was that you are angry <sup>about</sup> what PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH says about the AP. Strange how silent you have been about that. It really isn't complimentary. <sup>It says you suppressed assassination pictures.</sup>

I am looking forward to your next non-response, for there is everything to be gained by further correspondence. If you want an itemization, I will be glad to accomodate.