As you will have gathered John Davis is not only a cheapskate, which is about the best thibg I can say about him, he is a contemptible, deliberate liar. I am now certain that my not getting a copy of his book was no accident. It cannot, as I told him, withstand critical analysis. Not even his padded and factually inaccurate sources — in which he also lies. I did not go into this in my letter to McGraw-Hill but in time I will. The louse even claims to have had a formal interview of me when we have never met. He also lists his alleged interviews, classifying them as formal and informal, taped and not taped and written and lo! I'm not there! He can't even lie straight!

I've read through Chapter 24, Oswald and the Marcellos, and it is an atrocity. It is of incredible dishonesty and it is, more than anything I can recall reading in those oh so many years! based on conjectures which in almost all instance, all that I recall, are untenable. In this one chapter I tried to underline or encircle them. It might be a good exercise for some bright student to go over that chapter with care and mark and count them all. It seems, it appears or often appears to be certain, it is reasonable to assume, it is apparent, it is likely and possible many other such formulations. Not one I recall is even sensible.

And he is so ignorant about the things of which he writes! He cribs, he paraphfases, he anlarges and misrepresents. And, of course, he just makes it all up.

He does not even know how to cite FBI records. He has a list of about a dozen. I have no way of knowing which or how many he got from me but he got many, many more than those he cites, taking up much space in so doing, He assumes and says that SV-T-1 means that the person is an FBI informant. That is one way they do not represent an informant. It is a means of hiding the identification of an occasional source of information whose identity is hidden when there is an expectation the record will be distributed outside the FBI. If that man had been an informant of the Savannah Office it would have been like SV 9876 C for criminal, which this would apparently be from the context. There is no need for any further disguise to not disclose the identity of the source.

Even when he steals and embellished on that theft he is incompetent but the average reader has no way of knowing that. He simply made up that Oswald tried to help the Gubans who had a (he fefers to one only) "training camp" the location of which he does not give. I think he didn't know it, Anyway, that is the McLaney place and he refers to that property in the sense of being large and usable for "training." It was a home in a suburb and the property was a building lot in that subdivision! 't was not and could not have been used for any kind of training. It was merely a home in which those guys were staying. And waiting.

There is not a single footnote and no sources are given. This is a minimum need he has because that grap can't be footnoted and sourced.

Frankly I'm aghast! An established writer this totally dishonest? The man has an unimaginable ego and believes his inventions or he knows how dishonest he is.

There is a nice touch in his acknowledgements. He apparently converted one of his assistants into his mistress and he makes it clear that she is and how much he appreciates than and her other services.

Legar, by the way, was very impressed by the book and told me so, that it made out a good case. Wait till I talk to him again!

I'm sorry it isn't possible for me now to handle the book and a notebook and to have all the notes on paper that can be xeroxed. If you type any from the annotations on the pages I'd appreciate a copy for archival purposes.

On another subject, I heard from Fox TV and The Morton Downey, Jr. Show on successive days last week. Both interested in Ray. I declined to be on the Downey how but said I'd help in ways I could. They may be coming here for that. The Fox interest is by their The Reporters show. I'm sending a few copies today. Dest,

Harry