

Dear Paul (JL, HR),

12/14/77

Hasty comment on your 12/10/77 on the 40001 pages and the press coverage while I read it. This may account for any misinterpretation. I do not recall if I sent you the WxPost stories the first day, so I'll enclose a set in the event I did not..

Some time ago I wrote Bud and I think you saying that I would apply for a remission of all costs in getting these records and that if I did they'd be available to all in DC for copying. Meaning for having the copying done there commercially. Nobody has responded. Jim has filed this application - did prior to the release. The time for response has expired so Jim is about to file. He may accompany this with an effort to obtain a temporary injunction that would include the remission of costs decision and my having a set of the records at the same time they are available to the press - so I can service it, as to a rather unexpected degree I was able to on this first go-round. This would not get around the FBI having another super-s]pectacular PR event but it would enable me to find and comment on any record if these are as they usually are arranged.

I know I sent you a copy of the story in the local paper. To it and to others I pointed out that the FBI's reason for not complying with two dozen or more of my requests was to be able to pull this kind of disinformation/misinformation stunt. I said it was a good think done in a bad way.

The Post veered away from any smoking-gun quest and from any search for actual evidence, with a little encouragement and I think good judgement. It was a situation in which the best of reporters with the best of intentions could not be certain there was not an unseen contradictory record. I believe that as a result the attention to the actualities of the "investigation" and the personnel of the agencies does contribute to public knowledge and information.

I think I was able to moderate APs Pedro Charles nonsense. I know I influenced Lardner on this. As he started to tell me the story I interrupted to tell him it was Pedro Charles, non-secret and the subject of one of my ignored FOIA requests. Ditto with him and the Post on the leaking of the CDI report, Hoover/Katz./Warren.

I think I got the same form letter. I also had a request that included what you sent me of those 597 pages. The FBI has not responded to my complaint. It will not. I did not learn until after the protest that this had been released to you in response to your requests. It was given to AP and to WINS all-news radio in NYC just before the release, with the Post getting its copy the Friday prior to 12/7 of 12/2. Lardner learned on his inquiry at DJ that it was released to you, as you had not told me at the time. It might have been helpful if you had because Jim could have made use of it as I could in the four higher-level DJ conferences we had with the FBI in which discrimination and stone-walling were issues.

On early reporting: while a briefing is possible, and there was an earlier unsolicited opinion from Gemberling some time ago, I think the explanation is that those who bought copies had them for use the moment of release. Otherwise they'd not have been able to use their copies. I know that Lardner was on the phone fairly early in the day and from the Post, not DJ, as were two other reporters. (The Sinclair final quote is not entirely in context but there is nothing sinister, just what happens when a reporter has to contract. True also of the local story.)

Pedro Charles: in addition to what you say and quote of Scott there are other proofs that Hoover knew before he wrote his memo. His investigation of LHO, for example, established LHO had not been in Miami. I was not able, to the best of my knowledge, to get what I told reporters used on this - that Hoover knew better when he wrote his comment. I believe this is true of other of his memos and notations of comment.

Amy Intelligence: No use arranged as yet aside from what you know about. I'll use today in a broadcast to San Antonio which may lead to some local reactions from some of personal knowledge. I'm hoping, though the odds are not good.

To all I pointed out that this was a mass no reporter or combination of reporters could digest. All agreed. Some made the same complaint. But I know of no uses by any large paper.

On the Anderson 12/1 column: At least one of my mailings must not have reached you. I was responsible for that, their source being my files of which I sent Les W. a copy. The alleged destruction of records was of all JFK assassination records. What you were told

about the finding of no relevant records in the 112 INCT Group files is what I was told years ago in more detail. The phone number you give must be at Fort George Meade, where Army Intelligence and other spookeries are housed, with NSA and others.

On the Post Cointelpro story, I wrote Jacobs without response.

On the FBI's weeksheets, you call it an inventory, I have filed an FOIA request for them and for any other relevant record, such as an inventory. If I get it will all be available. It will also include claimed exemptions for each withholding, including by obliteration. Withhold these records protects unjustifiable withholdings.

There are major problems with your good idea of getting all the records on the critics. I've finally obtained partial compliance from the FBI after earlier and more partial compliance from the CIA. The fabrications are transparent to me and I can pinpoint the sources that are corrupted into themalevolent. Really debased, vicious stuff. Any release of what Hoover gave Marvin Watson for LBJ would have had consequences. It would never be possible to catch up with the evil, so many minds would be influenced. I've invoked my rights under PA. With Lane the stuff is very bad, of a personal nature. From reporters to second hand from the Clay Shaw defense I've known for years. With regard to just about everyone something like this is certain to be true, that whether or not accurately and almost always in twisted form there will be the genuinely defamatory. Under the Acts the FBI cannot release such information. The best you can hope for is a Lane making partial and angled use of incomplete records. The only possible uses are of this kind. They need not always be as dishonest as Lane's. But each individual alone can make the use. im, for example, has made partial use of the records I've obtained, obliterating the worst of the defamations.

If you receive anything from the Army in response to your 10/31/77 FOI request please let me know because my earlier ones include anything responsive to it. They have given me nothing and claimed to have nothing.

The few pages I mailed you this morning were sent to me by Gardner. I'd asked him to be alert to anything that might be relevant in the spectro/NAA suit, on appeal now. I explained that this would include anything medical or ballistics in content. I expect there is much more in these released pages, including Sibert-O'Neill "communications." Their word but not the usual FBI terminology. Rather the word about what HQ had received from them prior to the well-known report. There should be other interviews with doctors.

I'm sorry people were not able to get together on these records because we could have ~~bought~~ bought a set reserving the right to recover (and in the past I have in part), meanwhile having a set from which less costly copies could have been made, greatly reducing the cost per copy/page. As I've said I believe I have the best chance of obtaining a remission of charges.

I'm not in any hurry to obtain copies for myself right now. I would not have time to look at them. My only purpose was to make it possible for others, especially those who want copies but cannot pay for them at 10¢ a page.

Hastily,

Harold

[I am making no effort to put these notes in any logical order.]

This is been the most bizarre media event I have ever seen close up! It was certainly a PR coup for the FBI. They got the sort of treatment that Nixon must have hoped for with his Watergate transcripts, but didn't get.

I wonder what sort of coverage there would have been if the FBI had released 1000 pages a week over the past year? Quite different, I'm sure.

I was told that someone in the FBI now thought it was a mistake to have released the first 600 pages to me in September - allegedly because it allowed stories to be written based on speculation which was rebutted in later documents. In fact, it allowed a couple of stories to be written based on careful selection of documents, with time to get the necessary background information from other sources.

I guess I didn't expect the press to focus on the conspiracy-oriented evidence, but I was astounded by the speed with which they concluded that there was nothing to contradict the Warren Report. (As if there was nothing in the 26 volumes or the Archives that did that!) Evelyn Wood must be proud.

Unless my ears were playing tricks on me, I heard NBC Radio report at 7 a.m. California time - half an hour after the documents were made available in the reading room - that there were "no startling new revelations."

Were there FBI briefings for the press? Maybe NBC got that on background. We should ask around. Was Gemberling prominently present?

It was also astounding how often it was reported that something had not been released before, or had not been given to the Warren Commission, when there could barely have been time to check that, and it was in fact not true. UPI "discovered" the Sibert-O'Neill report on the autopsy, which hadn't been released before, unless you count 1966. I would think it doesn't take a very great expertise in the case to know that.

The "new release" angle really got people going. What would happen if I took a few thousand pages from my file of internal Warren Commission memos, stamped "Top Secret" on them, and left a copy on UPI's doorstep, saying they had been obtained from a confidential source? We can't entirely fault the FBI; the form letter I got specified that much of this material had been in the 26 volumes or was available at the Archives. Didn't the press get the same letter?

I was impressed that Jim McManus of CBS seemed to be out of step a bit. While most of the press was saying that there was nothing to disprove the Warren Report, he said that: So far, reporters have found no new information to put to rest the many controversies that began in Dallas.... (Radio News, 6 p.m. 12/7) Nothing about the Warren Report being upheld. Good for him!!

I guess it's not wise to jump to any conclusions without asking McManus, but a little literary analysis of what he said does suggest to me that there was some conflict, involving corporate policy. The just-quoted conclusion was tempered by the following: but in half a ton, assassination buffs will certainly find new leads to pursue. Here, "but" doesn't make much sense; "and" would be more appropriate. That's the sort of glitch I would expect if the first part of the sentence had originally been to the effect that there was nothing to disprove the Warren Report.

[Whoops - I have been quoting from a rough transcript of McManus' remarks. Here are his exact words: "So far, reporters have found no new information that would put to rest the many controversies that began in Dallas 15 [sic] years ago, but in a half ton of FBI records, assassination buffs almost certainly will find new leads to pursue."]

For the Cronkite show (which may or may not have been taped later), Cronkite started out by saying that McManus "so far has found suspicions of conspiracy, but no hard facts to contradict the Warren Commission conclusion" that LHO did it alone. McManus' own conclusion again contained an inappropriate "but": "It is likely that amid the half ton of FBI papers, assassination buffs will find more leads to pursue; but so far, the record reveals no new information that would put to rest the many lingering controversies surrounding the death of President Kennedy." Again, "and" would be better. [I recognize the possibility that I'm reading this much too closely, but...]

By the morning news on the 8th, CBS had pretty much gotten back in step, and "but" was used correctly: "So far, the once secret record does not contradict the Warren Commission findings, but the documents also confirm that the FBI did not tell the Commission all that it suspected in the murder of President Kennedy."

In fact, contrary to this report, the FBI did tell the Commission about the Pedro Charles letters. (What they withheld was much more interesting!) Still, one has to give McManus credit for trying!

A few facts about the Pedro Charles letters. McManus was not the only reporter who said this was withheld from the Warren Commission. Not so; in fact, it's even in the 26 volumes. (CE 2763: 26H148) The text of the Pedro Charles letter was obtained both from the Secret Service (CD 87, SS 308) and from the FBI (CD 205, pp. 183-5). I'm confident that the accompanying letter to RFK is in the Archives, but I don't know where offhand. Peter Scott wrote about these letters in 1973 ("The Assassinations," pp. 360, 363), suggesting the obvious interpretation, that this "oddly self-incriminating letter" might have been planted by militant anti-Communists to make the case for a U.S. invasion of Cuba. (This interpretation could also apply to the "D" story, which was taken so seriously by Ambassador Mann and others, as detailed in the Schweiker Report.) Scott also suggested that according to a more sophisticated version of this hypothesis (involving a 'two-tier conspiracy'), the clumsy fraud was meant to be exposed. Having first served as a pretext to engage the services of anti-Castro Cubans, its ultimate intention was to justify not an invasion but a massive federal de-bunking of all traces of conspiracy - the false and also the true." As the LBJ-Warren meeting shows, such stories did have that effect.

(Didn't anyone check the index to our anthology? Oh well. I did hear that an early AP story had used the Pedro Charles item as their lead, but that it was toned down later - I gather when they found out it was a hoax, or in the Warren Commission files, or both. Does anyone have such a story?)

Actually, the situation is even worse than I had realized - I just checked, and the Pedro Charles story is even mentioned in the Warren Report itself. (Page 307, at note 570.) Charles is not named, but referred to as a "particular Cuban agent." The footnote cites CE 2676, which is unrelated, rather than CD 2763, which does name Charles, as well as describing the Molina allegation that Charles had paid Oswald \$7,000.)

(Parenthetically, at least one report mentioned the Pedro Charles letter and the allegation that a Cuban had paid Oswald \$7,000 without connecting the two.)

Anyhow, what I was getting at was the one piece of substantive information on the Pedro Charles matter which I did find in my files: the FBI lab had completed the tests which established the hoax (i.e., that the Charles and Molina letters had the same source) on or before December 11 - the day before Hoover's now-famous memo. It is not clear to me whether Hoover had separate conversations with Johnson and Rankin, and whether one was held on the 12th, but if so I think it is newsworthy that he was apparently treating this story as a live one after his lab tests had been completed. (My source is CD 205, pp. 186-7, which says that the FBI Lab advised the Dallas office of the results of the tests on December 11.)

Back to berating the press: I guess if there had been a signed and notarized confession by Fidel Castro or Richard Helms in these 40,001 pages, it would have been noticed. As Haynes Johnson pointed out on PBS, no smoking gun was found; I think what we have seen is a serious problem with the "smoking gun syndrome." Certainly something important but less obvious could have escaped everyone's attention.

The often-quoted half-ton figure doesn't really give the best impression of the press' task. Let's suppose that one news organization had 10 people working 8 hours each before coming up with the conclusion that there was nothing really new. That works out to 10.3 pages per reader per minute. The first time I looked at the 600-page preliminary release, I might have been going that fast. And I don't think I noticed the 6 pages relating to Army Intelligence and the Hidell draft card - an item which, I think, most of us (and quite a few press people) do consider potentially quite significant.

about the finding of no relevant records in the 112 INCT Group files is what I was told years ago in more detail. The phone number you give must be at Fort George Meade, where Army Intelligence and other spookeries are housed, with NSA and others.

On the Post Cointelpro story, I wrote Jacobs without response.

On the FBI's weeksheets, you call it an inventory, I have filed an FOIA request for them and for any other relevant record, such as an inventory. If I get it will all be available. It will also include claimed exemptions for each withholding, including by obliteration. Withhold these records protects unjustifiable withholdings.

There are major problems with your good idea of getting all the records on the critics. I've finally obtained partial compliance from the FBI after earlier and more partial compliance from the CIA. The fabrications are transparent to me and I can pinpoint the sources that are corrupted into themalevolent. Really debased, vicious stuff. Any release of what Hoover gave Marvin Watson for LBJ would have had consequences. It would never be possible to catch up with the evil, so many minds would be influenced. I've invoked my rights under PA. With "ans the stuff is very bad, of a personal nature. From reporters to second hand from the Clay Shaw defense I've known for years With regard to just about everyone something like this is certain to be true, that whether or not accurately and almost always in twisted form there will be the genuinely defamatory. Under the Acts the FBI cannot release such information. The best you can hope for is a Lane making partial and angled use of incomplete records. The only possible uses are of this kind. They need not always be as fishonest as Lane's. But each individual alone can make the use. im, for example, has made partial use of the records I've obtained, obliterating the worst of the defamations.

If you receive anything from the Army in response to your 10/31/77 FOI request please let me know because my earlier ones include anything responsive to it. They have given me nothing and claimed to have nothing.

The few pages I mailed you this mornin g were sent to me by Lardner. I'd asked him to be alert to anything that might be relevant in the spectro/NAA suit, on appeal now. I explained that this would include anything medical of ballistics in content. I expect there is much more in these released pages, including Sibert-O'Neill "communications." Their word but not the usual FBI terminology. Rather the word about what HQ had received from them prior to the well-known report. There should be other interviews with doctors.

I'm sorry people were not able to get together on these records because we could have ~~bought~~ bought a set reserving the right to recover (and in the past I have in part), meanwhile having a set from which less costly copies could have been made, greatly reducing the cost per copy/page. As I've said I believe I have th best chance of obtaining a remission of charges.

I'm not in any hurry to obtain copies for myself right now. I would not have time to look at them. My only purpose was to make it possible for others, especially those who want copies but cannot pay for them at 10¢ a page.

Hastily,

Harold

Speaking of Army Intelligence, the 11/27 document mentioned by Carl Oglesby on "Good Morning America" may be quite useful. I'm not inclined to give any credence to the story that there were two people playing with rifles in Dealey Plaza on November 20. It sounds very much like a number of similar reports which I have seen in the Warren Commission files. If this particular report is in the Archives, or even the 26 volumes, I probably wouldn't remember it. (Mary et al. - is this familiar?) If we can locate it, I would like to know which police officers were talking about it - that might be an important clue to an information pipeline between the DPD and Army Intelligence.

Is there a whole series of reports from the Army back to the FBI? Were they getting lots of goodies from the DPD? (Someone should check.) What struck me about this new document is that one of the two items which Army thought important to pass on to the FBI as late as 11/27 was that Marina had told the DPD that Lee had a rifle matching the description of the assassination rifle. As Peter Scott has discussed in detail, it was an interpreter who had been brought into the case via his Army Intelligence connection who may have been putting words into Marina's mouth, specifically on the matter of the appearance of the rifle. Let's check this out.

By the way, from what I have heard, this memo does not imply that Army Intelligence knew about the alleged 11/20 Dealey Plaza incident before 11/22.

Jack Anderson reported on December 1 that certain Defense Department files on the assassination have been destroyed. My guess is that this would refer to Army Intelligence files. (Harold Weisberg may know more about this.) I have asked the Army for their pre-assassination records on Oswald (and Hidell). I was told that an index check gave a "no return," and that no relevant records were found in the history of the 112th INTC Group or its successor, the 92nd Military Intelligence Battalion. My request did not cover post-assassination files, although of course I am very interested in them, especially the records of contacts with the DPD, the FBI, etc. in the week or so after 11/22. On December 1, I wrote the Army again, pointing out the references to pre-assassination Oswald items in FBI Serial 49D; there has been no answer. If anyone wants to pursue this, my request was handled by the FOI Office of the Army Intelligence and Security Command, at 301-677-4011/4743.

One more substantive point - I am quite curious about what the meeting with Hoover meant for Rankin and the Commission. Someone could ask him, of course. Also, we should check the executive session transcripts of January 24 and 27, where there was (as I recall) some discussion of the difficulties caused by Hoover's position. (I don't recall anything relevant in the earlier executive sessions.)

Back to "Beat the Press": I wonder if any of the reporters feel that they have been had by the FBI? For some, it might be awkward if a smoking gun did turn up in the 40,000 pages tomorrow. (Or in the next 40,000 pages, even.) They may have been sandbagged into a pro-Warren Report position, the way Hoover may have been committed to that position by his initial reaction. As Sylvia pointed out to me, we're seeing a bit of a rerun of 1964, when the Warren Report was resoundingly endorsed before the 26 volumes came out.

It's amusing to see the press having problems with a swamp of details, the way the Commission did. Some reporters might appreciate seeing the comments made by the Commissioners in the early executive sessions, to that effect.

It is interesting to see the press make a virtue of the way the FBI tracked down all the junk leads, and of Hoover's suspicions of conspiracy. The dynamics of the pro- and anti-conspiracy forces right after the assassination are, I think, quite complex and not at all clear yet.

I think the S.F. Examiner gets the prize for the most astounding editorial on this subject. (And not only because part of it is based on the report that Hoover withheld the Pedro Charles story from the Commission, which the Examiner thought he really shouldn't have done.) The writer seems to have perceived that the claims of "nothing to contradict the Warren Report" might have been a trace premature. "Considerable time would be needed to digest the entire report." Do we get a call for a careful study along those lines by the press? No; "Once that has been done

by the many who make either a career or a hobby of questioning the conventional verdict on the assassination, a number of conclusions will emerge. All will differ." (Actually, one will be the same.) The 40,000 pages "provid[e] an extensive feast of fact and speculation to stimulate the appetite of that insatiable breed, the conspiracy cultists."

What have we done to deserve this? This time I can't even blame Mark Lane!

Seriously, it does seem odd that conspiracy buffing has such a bad reputation now, after Watergate, the Church Committee, Cointelpro, and MK/ULTRA. Or, as Rod McLeish put it, referring to Watergate, "finally, real conspiracies in high visible places."

What to do: for one thing, I think we should continue to talk about the files which have to be released before the FBI can be said to have made everything available: the pre-assassination files on Oswald (other than the one HQ file), whatever they may have on the critics, anything relevant in the COINTELPRO files, or in Hoover's personal files, and (maybe) even the field office files on the investigation.

We can refer to specific documents of interest - e.g., those cited in the Schweiker Report, particularly the Gale memo of 12/10/63. (I have been after that specifically for some time, with no luck; is it in the 40,000 pages?)

We can try to turn reporters on to Sam Stern's unsuccessful request for the pre-assassination files. (See my manuscript.)

We should make an effort to focus attention on the 1967 Morgan-Roselli-Anderson flap, as detailed in the Schweiker Report (in edited form). For one thing, Schweiker is one of the few public figures who will say critical things about the FBI's record on this. (There are problems with the SR's analysis of the WC-FBI relationship - mainly that the WC doesn't get its share of the blame - and the analysis of the FBI's pre-assassination Oswald file is weak, but that's another story.)

(Maybe this isn't the time for it, but I would like to see some press attention to the still withheld testimony taken by the Schweiker Committee, and some pressure to get it out. There is probably more of importance there than in all but 1% of the 80,000 pages.)

Since some reporters have been looking for interesting things in these FBI files without much concern about whether they are new or not, we can easily offer them old material on specific topics which will be in the next release. You want a report on what JFK said when he was hit? Easy. Some nice documents on Loran Hall, maybe? We can get them wholesale.

On the other hand, there may be some reporters who would want to know if certain documents have been released, and what related material is available. We certainly can do that for them; preferably, in exchange for some documents.

One specific lead which I would like to see pursued: in the recently released COINTELPRO documents (which got far too little attention in the press), there was a reference to operations against the Cuban movement starting in June 1961 - specifically including the FPCC. (Washington Post, 11/22/77, p. 6; by John Jacobs) Jacobs said the documents do not specifically mention Oswald. Nonetheless, I would like to see any general instructions to field offices, especially in 1963, and anything relating to New Orleans. Were the field offices under pressure to come up with COINTELPRO ideas, as they were in other programs? Does DeBrueys' name appear anywhere? (I've long been amused by the possibility that Oswald's letter to the Militant (the "L.H." letter) was a COINTELPRO-type operation, especially given the report that he sent the rifle photo to them. If they had published that photo of Oswald before the assassination, the SWP would have been quite effectively disrupted.)

By the way, we should definitely continue to go after the inventory worksheets, which the FBI apparently isn't giving out. That has no apparent function other than making things difficult for us and the press.

I'll hold back on additional comments on specific documents until I see them.

[END]

Freedom of Information Act Request

HW
2599 LeConte Ave.
Berkeley, CA 94709
(415) 845-4669
October 31, 1977

Office of the General Counsel
Department of Defense
Washington, DC 20301

Dear Sir:

This is a request pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act for certain Army records.

I would like a copy of all records relating to Lee Harvey Oswald which were held by Army Intelligence before the assassination of President John F. Kennedy on November 22, 1963.

I believe that the relevant records would have been in the files at headquarters (Washington) and in the files of the 112th INCT Group in Dallas, San Antonio, Corpus Christi, and New Orleans.

It might be most convenient for you to have these files checked first, before initiating a more general search.

Indexes should be checked under the following variants of Oswald's name:

Lee Harvey Oswald
Lee Henry Oswald
Harvey Lee Oswald
Alex James Hidell

Hidell is the alias used by Oswald; it is known that some of the requested records were in that name.

As far as I know, none of this material was given to the Warren Commission in 1964.

I am willing to pay up to \$25 for this material; in view of the public interest in this subject, I hope that any fees could be waived.

Please let me know if the costs will be greater, or if you have any questions about the scope of this request. I hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely yours,

Paul L. Hoch

Paul L. Hoch

P.S.: If your search turns up documents which came from other agencies, you may wish to simply list them for me. If any have not already been released, I could contact the originating agencies directly.

John Le Carré The Honourable Schoolboy

I
l:
t:
o.
C
-
th
b
u
ut
ov
Se
ba
in;
se:
le:
th:
ter

wi
Ea
Ge
vet
qu
sur
Jer
J
bla
anc
anc
out
anc
hin
def
gro
loy
spu

ment under heavy siege. Even otherwise tolerant spirits became savagely retributive. Treachery! Breach of contract! Block his pension! Put him on the watch list! Prosecution the moment he returns to England!

Down the market a little, those less rabid about their security took a kindlier view, though it was still uninformed. Well, well, they said a little ruefully, that was the way of it; name us a joe who didn't blow his top now and then, and specially one who'd been left in ignorance for as long as poor old Craw had. And after all, he'd disclosed nothing that wasn't generally available, now had he? Really, those housekeeper people should show a *little* moderation. Look how they went for poor Molly Meakin the other night, sister to Mike and hardly out of ribbons, just because she left a bit of blank stationery in her waste basket!

Only those at the inmost point saw things differently. To them, old Craw's article was a discreet masterpiece of disinformation; George Smiley at his best, they said. Clearly, the story had to come out, and all were agreed that censorship at any time was objectionable. Much better therefore to let it come out in the manner of our choosing. The right timing, the right amount, the right tone: a lifetime's experience, they agreed, in every brush-stroke. But that was not a view which passed outside their set.

Back in Hong Kong—clearly, said the Shanghai Bowlers, the old boy, like the dying, had had a prophetic instinct of this—Craw's High Haven story turned out to be his swan-song. A month after it appeared, he had retired, not from the Colony but from his trade as a scribbler and from the Island too. Renting a cottage in the New Territories, he announced that he proposed to expire under a slant-eye heaven. For the Bowlers, he might as well have chosen Alaska. It was just too damn far, they said, to drive back when you were drunk. There was a rumour—untrue, since Craw's appetites did not run in that direction—that he had got himself a pretty Chinese boy as a companion. That was the dwarf's work: he did not like to be scooped by old men.

Only Luke refused to put him out of mind. Luke drove out to see

him one mid-
cause the old
day is long, he
be bearded by
not a Chinese
George: a pe
who had app
plained to Lu
newspaper sy
"Handles th
Asia."

Whoever I
podgy man, I
he was intrud

So the
death and res
censorship; L
Circus's inspi
but, as life w
later. A typh
swarming po
hero. And cu
Luke, in his
hero's coming
stand-by, anc
tomary fervor

"Folks! Gi
beat, men! H
damn comic!

"His Lords
of blue blood
say." With a
"Jesus," he sa