

11/17/77

Dear Dave,

Instead of saving your article for SHA to read at the lab today I read it before going to bed last night. I'm glad and I'm sorry.

I'm sorry because after the waiting period, which can be a half hour and then after they draw the blood I have to sit for 10-15 minutes, until the technician is certain I'm not going to hemorrhage from the prick. Because this requires that I keep pressure with the opposite forefinger on the place pricked on the opposite ~~left~~ elbow I save typed matter to read. It is awkward trying to keep a book open.

I'm glad because it is a fine piece of work. It states well what has long been in need of saying. While it should have wide use and appeal, it seems to me that for the intended audience it is about the ideal presentation, saying more than enough to make its essential point and saying it very well and quite comprehensibly and effectively.

I don't see how you crammed so much into so little space.

It also is a subject I'd like to see addressed in something of the length and definitiveness possible in a thesis.

From recollection a few things not of great consequence that you may want in your notes on the subject.

As I recall it Popkin criticized me from using Troy West as a witness in his early passages and then turns around the cribs the same thing for all the world as though it were his own work.

What to me was the giveaway on Tink is the Saturday Evening Post article he wrote to coincide with the appearance of the book. In those days it generally meant \$5,000 plus the promotion for the book. The Post had its own preconceptions, particularly when they could be shaped by some of the right-wingers of whom Mike Mooney was one of the more important ones. So in the Post, although most people missed it, Tink has three completely independent and coinciding conspiracies, each having selected the same time and the same place to off JFK.

Almost everybody missed this. I recall it clearly, have the spot on the page still in mind. I picked the magazine up at the LA airport on the way to N.O. where we discussed it. Lane denied it when I mentioned it to Garrison, so I asked for the magazine and they ~~gee~~ gee whizzed. It is inconspicuous but it is there.

You might want to consider expanding it into a book. Unless you decide to do one on Lane alone, where my hasty and unread draft will help you much. If you do Jim's idea is best. Instead of the anger and sabre cuts I indulged in the draft the thing to do is to kill x him with kindness. He is the most fitting subject for the self-ridiculing treatment.

Enough reporters hate Lane, with cause, not from prejudice on the subject, to forecast good reviews for a book on him. Probably more now because of his injudicious allegations about them all being CIA if they are against him or criticize him.

Rain, so its time to exercycle to the morning news. Best to all and congratulations on a very good job.