Dear Phil,

Thanks for the candor of your note of 11/9/ Pelay in answering is because I was away, speaking, investigating, blowing minds and turning people on in what is perhaps the most fantastic of my trips. It lasted a full month, took me to several new cities and the old ones (Dallas for the first time), put me in touch with officials generally thought to be "on the other side", and with an assertment of other meaple, including missing witnesses, some who format their testionary after five years and told the truth this time), atc. It was quite wild, but what a stack awaits me!

This is on time I think I'll just have to let some of the notes go, and how I hate to do that. I just cannot get out from under, after a week. I expect to have to leave again in a week or so. Meanwhile, no writing. I've two completed ms to go over. And how I itch to get the rest on paper, especially as I feel the fatigue nore. Perhaps it is because I've finally taken off most of the excess weight, about 30 lbs. My few mood pants cannot be taken in because the nip pockets would touch:

I cannot go into 11 the exciting things, so 1'll share this one: the man who presents himself as a public benefactor, says he gave away the 25,000 LIFE gave him, Zapruder, who took the movies, is the man of all those I've met with least concern for truth, reality or genuine response, improvises childish lies and evasions and is indignant when each publicity is greated with skerticism, all because he sold the right to suppress his movie, for which he had gotten, a year ago, a helf-million dollars.

a real human bein', huh'?

Didn't neve time to see ony of those you know that I were in A.C. this trip, and heard nothing of any of them. Unless you know fore and Jesse Sore, with whom I had several pleasant visits.

est to you both.

Cincerely,

Dear Hal.

After the conventions Jean and I kept waiting, somehow, for the <u>real</u> candidates to appear (regarding the whole campaign, in the meantime, rather as we might a Beckett play)...but, alas, they never did. Instead, the dumbshow ran on and on—until it seemed that we had <u>all</u> been interned in some surreal zone of paraconsciousness. But the play within the play is—formally, at least—over now. Everyone, say the editorialists, is greatly relieved. Hmmm.

I was interested by what you said in an October letter about your own manner and style of writing. It seems to me you've described the problem uncommonly well. Few that I've known have been able to comment so objectively on their own work. So I'll add my bit ... for whatever, if anything, it may be worth. I do think you should (in print) keep closer rein on your anger and sense of indignation-not because it rings false, for it certainly does not, but because readers may tend to give it more attention than they will the evidence you are trying to present. Remember that if your material is presented in such a way as to allow the reader to feel the essential tone of a situation or set of circumstances without your having hit him over the head too obviously with your own responses...then he will be more apt to listen to what you're telling him. Most readers naturally have higher regard for their own intelligence than they do for that of the guy who wrote the book they are reading. And as soon as you start shouting directly at them...well, then they start having doubts about your credentials as a reliable purveyor of information and analysis. In addition, there is the matter of your particular subject. Feeling still runs very deep...deeper, really, than I had supposed. I find people willing to denounce "all Kennedys" without a moments hesitation, and I find (fewer) people who still mourn for the President. Thus you may expect to have those who will agree with whatever you write—uncritical "partisans." and you may expect to have those who will resent whatever you write or say and seek to silence or discredit you no matter what evidence you present, in however skillful and honest a manner you present it. Frankly, I don't know which group is the more dangerous...but I would remind you of one fact: the professional haters and distrusters of the people, many of whom are as you well know frighteningly powerful, fully expect to be confronted in the not very distant future with the presidential ambitions of Edward Kennedy. With that in mind, they are not likely to rest. They'll want to stop him, I think...one way or another.

Hour of 6a.m. approaching...must have a look at things on the ward.

Best personal regards