

file Tom De Vries

Dear Ed,

9/26/94

Thanks for the two fourth Decade reviews. Dave Keck thought he'd sent them to me but he didn't.

With regard to your letter, I know nothing about Maggie. Never heard of her. And I hope your health is fine again.

I do not know DeVries. He has his own agenda and resentments and he is entitled to them. But he is also remarkably insensitive. When only about a fourth or a fifth of what I wrote was published, and he knows that, what basis can he have for complaining about what I omitted and he says did not write about? As it happens, DeVries is incorrect. And he did not ask me. Never spoke to me. As before writing what he did, by his own standard he should have.

What he says on page 23 about my telling someone he does not identify that Case Open was half dictated is without any basis at all. I dictated nothing and never have. *As so said. Ever*

What I sent and they liked was the unretyped first draft. They were to have edited it. They didn't. *They cut-like butchers*

It happens that I've gotten more than 200 letters from total strangers after they read Case Open. Not one even hints at a single criticism DeVries assumes they will all have. With the exception of one from Jim Monroe, who I think will not write me again, they are all glowing praises.

I fear that omniscient DeVries is lacking in understanding in what he says I said about ~~Ruth~~ David Lutz and Rosemary Willis. Or perhaps he was self-compelled to stretch to justify a preconception, but I neither said nor implied what he says.

Footnotes are a physical impossibility and a mask for often dishonest writing. Did I give the sources in the text, which I have always done? Of course I did. So why the artificiality of so many young fogies?

Knowing full well that 75-80% of what I wrote was cut out he criticizes me for referring to those things as wins. I suppose he is one of those who stupidly hung themselves up on that fiction. Well, I had two of the best sources and went into that and in 1968 I forced an FBI investigation the result of which I have-and cited.

I don't mind any of it. But the DeVrieses ought recognize the hazard of throwing stones from glass houses.

Many thanks and best wishes,

Harold