

Dear Dave,

2/10/89

On page 371 Davis says of Nixon's presence at the Pepsi convention in Dallas 11/20-22/63 that "Kennedy/assassination researchers took note that the Marcello- financed politician was in Marcello territory during the ~~hours~~ days and hours preceding the murder of his former rival..." Were he to have had a better foundation for this structure it would have been sand.

While it is not important the farthur I've gotten into this literary swamp, often more of a gutter, the more I've gotten the impression that much of what Davis pretends he got from the records he's made so many references to came to him verbally. He really knows very little about unquestioned JFK assassination fact and he makes minor mistakes as he pretends, high-school journalism style, ~~the~~ add detail intended to be impressive and to show thoroughness and command of the most minor fact. Warren DeBruseys' name is on countless FBI records and it is not possible to get any grasp on the earlier Oswald records or the reports from Dallas when he was temporarily there without seeing his name, DeBruseys. He has it du Bruseys. He can't really know the Dallas critics, if they can all be called that, because his repeated identification of Jack White is inadequate and he as Gary Shaw as a reporter in Dallas. He is neither, *not a reporter & not a Ballaire.*

I've seen only one mention of this book in a review, a brief one in the NYTimes by Ronnie Ruggier. I think the book will amount to nothing in sales simply because it is so very ~~is~~ bad a book. It is needlessly repetitious, belabors the reader too much and is so obviously biased. He might have had a more than decent book if he'd left this utter nonsense he has on the political assassinations out. It could have been a real success if limited to Marcello as the capo and devoted itself to the Brillab case. By the time the reader gets there he is utterly bored and probably most are by then indifferent. He could have made a much more interesting figure of Marcello and thus have made the book more interesting. I think he has ruined what might have been quite good and a useful work by his sick and weak indulgence of his egomaniacal mania. His weak case, really a nonexistent case, is made ~~weaker~~ weaker by his zealotry. He strives to make a case where there is none to the point where he really weakens what could not stand alone with his ~~adless~~ props that can't hold themselves up.

I also find myself wondering if the original proposal for this book is the form it took. If it were worth the effort I'd try to check through such things as Publishers Weekly, where often new proposals are reported and sometimes discussed, to see if it was originally conceived or proposed as the kind of book I mention about. I am inclined to think that the assassination stuff is so thin no responsible publisher would make McGraw-Hill's investment in the one based on such stuff if ~~it~~ it had been described fairly or if any check was made. I've not seen any of the puffery and there may not have been any at the time the book was contracted. Mafia fans, if any, may have what there then might have been.

I've finished with it. It just peters out. Much too late! Awful!!

On another subject, Lifton cribbed his theory from an article "oger found, in Skeptic, by Newcomb and Marshall. I'll be getting it and sending you a copy.

Best,

Harold