

Dear Dave,

9/27/94

As soon as I read the two Fourth Decade reviews you thought you'd sent me but did not get here, sent by Ed Tatro, I wrote him immediately, copy to you, so that it might save you the time of making copies for me.

I am more amused than offended by DeVries. He discloses quite a bit about himself in what he wrote and in how he did. I believe he is one of those I have offended, if not by any prior reference to him, by debunking the theories they all live by and regard as important when they are in fact the curse that stands before the slight prospect of truth. One indication of this is his criticism of me for not naming the tramps. Who have never had any relevance of any kind. So why name them? And how petty it was ^{when} he has finally learned, or should I say had to admit, that they were totally irrelevant and were in effect tramps, to criticize me for not giving what he regards as support for saying they were winners. That is important in any kind of review, more so of a book that does what it does: to Posners and ^{to} the media?

DeVries discloses a self-importance and a superiority belief that is really rather immature. He knows I am 81, in impaired health and not very mobile and he makes some of the criticisms nonetheless. Like a lack of footnotes where in almost all instances the source, rather than in notes, is in the text. He knows that by far most of what I wrote was cut out and I had no control over that yet he presumes to criticize me for not saying what I did write in considerable detail. You saw the size of the ms. when you were here. It is at least of 200,000 words.

He could make all that effort to learn from C & G but none to ask me anything at all?

So he makes a fool of himself saying he can tell immediately what parts I dictated when I dictated none! And never did! And never told anyone that I had or ever discussed what I never did do with anyone. I have no idea where he got that notion but it is possible ^{that someone heard} that before I decided to do a book I had intended dictating notes as I read ^{the book} it for the record for history. But that was not for a book and I did not do it. Period. Ever.

I thought you'd told me that Rose had decided against any review when the book was first out. Books, as you learned, particularly in some of the chains, do not stay on the shelves long because there is always demand for that space. So Rose delays the reviews until the chains have begun to return the books. That is the way to get the word around? Or does it express something else.

For your information, NEVER AGAIN! was not only completed, it could easily have been published several months before Posner's book appeared. It is of about 250,000 words, a large work. Why it continues to be delayed I do not know and cannot learn and there is nothing that at my age and in the state of my health I can do about it. And until I wrote it and more of which you do not know for the record for history I had been writing and accumulated a rather considerable stack of substitutes for oral histories. Thanks ^{as} best,

I wrote this when I first awakened, before I got ~~back~~ back on what I've been writing, leaving the reading and correcting for later when I might confabulate less. And having done all I can on what I am writing until something comes in the mail, I did read and correct it many hours later. Then a few other things occurred to me.

One is does this arrogant, self-important man have the slightest notion of what it is to be 81 and ill and do what I did? That is not a consideration in any impartial review? That nobody else did or ~~tried~~ tried to do it is not also a consideration in any review intended to be impartial? Both limited to what was published. How much less impartial when he knows that only a fraction of what I wrote was published.

While walking I wondered if he really did not understand what I wrote about Rosemary and Lui and pretended not to so he could make some unjustified cracks. I used both to illustrate plagiarism. And if DeVries knows as much about the subject-matter as he pretends he would also know what I did not go into, that what the Zapruder film shows that Rosemary did is other than Lui says and Posner cribbed from him. And I did not say it was from the Dallas Times-Herald, as he says. I used the Boston Globe, a much longer article, and said so. See below.

I was a bit curious so I asked Lil to check her list of those who got our books. It shows that in 1991 he asked about them, we sent him the literature, and heard nothing further from him. He did not order any of them.

Which tends to confirm the impression I got, that he is one of those who depends on what he gets from the likeminded and who despite contrary pretenses finds fact not essential if, indeed, worth any time. Knowing fact is not congenial to the children's games he prefers, playing detective.

And if he saw the letters I got about Case Open, from children included, he would know how wrong he is about the comprehensibility of my unedited writing. From several 15 and one that I recall of ten. Plus a retired FBI agent who wrote that the book convinced him that Oswald did not fire a shot.

The people who spout their theories are old enough to understand but that do not understand that they desecrate our history.

And they are too self-involved to understand that they do harm. They do mislead people.

The net effect is to help errant government at the least by confusing people even more.

* It was not written for the Dallas Times-Herald, either. It was written for the LA Times. I did note that Lui's work was faulty, but did not go into detail because he was a child.

#