

4/22/71

Dear Js,

Someone due here soon, so no time for the large morning's mail, collected en route to largely wasted day in DC. Very glad to get footswitch with your letter 4/20, to which I'll reply separately. Good letter from (I think changed) Hal today.

Thanks for the ad, which my publisher has not yet sent. And the Amory (with whom I had a strange lunch 1966) column on "advances" is still an understatement. I have yet to get paid by Spanish republisher 1966 or statement from Feltrinelli, who sold out his printing NW before printing. Need + mention Dell, of whose reprinting I have copies of an edition they have yet to acknowledge.

I'll read the Foreman with care, even if that piece says nothing. By now, our letters having crossed, you know my pinpointed interest.

Same on SR, Sam Arrchbald and the Missouri people, who would do nothing about my first or subsequent suits. Sam took me to a nice lunch at the National Press Club and I've neither seen nor heard from him since. He is also Fair Campaign Practises Committee and is very busy. Nice guy, personally.

...Working guest late, so I read the Foreman piece and return it herewith. As a matter of fact, because I am interested in him now per se, there are a number of interesting things in it, a few potentially useful quotes, and perhaps a good lead, the case of ~~the case of Vincent Vallone~~ Vincent Vallone. It would be good to be able to check some Houston morgues in that case and see why anyone wanted to kill ~~him~~ ^{Diego Carlingo}. And perhaps sometimes, if they are still alive, I'll be able to get something from Sheriff Kern or Ranger Johnny Klavenhagen. I'll be making a broadcast to there is about 10 days and before air time I'll ask my friend who runs that show. No, that's not Houston, that's San Antonio.

He seems unable to give the same reason for leaving the Ruby case twice. The last I head, and direct quote, is "nobody tells me how to run a case", which is not what he says here.

...The Missouri FOI piece is also interesting, especially in its accurate comment that there has been no big-media financing. This can be explained by what is missing in the story, their fear of both the law and its use. They fear that it will be used unscuccesfully and thus precedent against freedom of information from government will make present efforts even less successful. Aside from hangups on me and my subject, this may, perhaps, explain the close to total suppression of my suits, including the close to unique summary judgement vs Justice.

Today I graduated to tri-focals. They were okay until I started typing, Now my eyes are watering, so I'll have to stop. Again many thanks for the controls. The last time ~~is~~ I used a foot control on my own stuff, I was able to learn to anticipate the length of continuation and could pretty well stop at correct, logical points. I'll soon learn....I was in the NBC DC office this p.m. when the Boggs story had just been digested. The worker attitude toward the speech was entirely unlike what Brinkley aired. More of this later. Boggs is about to have a job done on him, and the question is will he accept the help he may need? If so, from the wrong ones, who have moved in.

Best, and thanks,