

5/19/71

Dear Betty and Joe,

If "productive" is the right word, then I'm much more productive than you know. This book is about half the original work. I've others I've copyrighted in limited editions because they cannot be published commercially, have three or four partly done, and have just decided to do another, with a specific submission in mind.

By a happy coincidence, a combination of unhappy and joyous events will take us your way next weekend. I am suing a crooked wholesaler in Wilmington for not paying me, and the hearing is tentatively scheduled for the 28th. If this is not changed, we'll go to Wilmington the evening of the 27th. Gloria has a small confirmation (Mary has been out of work) the 30th. I'd sort of hoped we'd be able to go see you the 29th, perhaps the night of the 28th, if it would be possible to see the others I'd like to see, like the E's, and return from Gloria's after her shindig is over. I do not like to travel on holiday weekends, and I certainly don't want to await the last minute. This is tentative. If things go on schedule, I'll phone.

After hearing from me of Kaplan's antecedents, Leonard, now editor of the Sunday Times Book Review seems thoroughly embarrassed. At least this is what he has told others who have phoned him in protest. He has yet to answer my too-hasty letter setting this career out, although it has been two weeks. K was Tom Clark's law clerk (and Ramsey was Attorney General during the period covered by my book). He was then in the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, which is where all the legal work of the framing was done. It is not unreasonable to presume he has friends remaining there, if not other loyalties. Then he became a bitter partisan of the Warren Commission, but not sufficiently persuaded to respond to a rather strong (even for me) letter I wrote after some of his lousier stuff appear in (excuse the expression) The American Scholar.

The whores are lining up. He is but one of three ^{such} "reviews" I have thus far. Two others are enclosed. But it is not the reviews as much as the publisher that will kill this book, even if it is in its second printing. Kaplan, by the way, also works for the USIA, which is one of the less persuasive evidences of impartiality. And did you notice there is no addressing of the evidence I gathered Percy Foreman has more respect for me. He fled (lit) a TV studio in NYC while his makeup was being applied when he learned he'd confront me. I really have a helluva story to tell you about this book, what I have done, and where I've carried the evidence and my connection, which include a bird whose cage is not gilded.

I've never had enough exposure to self to learn whether or not I suffer an allergy!

Hope we can get together. Best to you both,

JOSEPH COTTLER
7715 MILL RD. • ELKINS PARK, PA. 19117

May 17, 1971

Dear Harold:

What a productive guy you are!

As for the NY Times, I recall that reviewers killed John Keats, et al. The American Commercial critics especially are notorious for malice. They seem to use their assignments as opportunities to work off personal frustrations or to do a bit of backscratching. It beats me why an editor would devote so much space to a book the argument of which he considers wrong unless he also considered the book important.

It occurs to me that with your nose for Skullduggery you could do a hamraising Whodunit + thereby make a million. Or are you allergic to self?

Give Lil a hug + a kiss for us + tell her to bring you along to us.
I'm in my sentiments too, why don't you pay us a visit? Telephone before you come. Love Betty.