

PH - Release

Dear Paul,

1/31/78

An old friend who is an editor of the National Inquirer and a reporter on his staff are here for several days. Night now and all morning they have been going over the 1/18 FBI releases. In a moment we will take a break for lunch.

So I won't forget, out of any logical sequence I note that on your 12/20/78 CLIPPING list there are three stories of a content Jim has indicated he expects to find important in the transcripts suit. These are 72, 75 and 76. On these subjects, Ford and the transcript that is not accounted for (1/22), any reference ALB gives you to documents. If you have the documents a copy would be faster than a reference, as I'll try not to forget to explain. So if you can please send copies of these stories and any others, including of the 12/7/77 releases, thanks for what might turn out to be a real help in court.

What the Enquirer people are doing, or going to do, it mark any records of which they want copies with a paperclip. When they have accumulated a number of copies to be made I'll handle the Sections and only she's to keep them as they were when I got them. They are bound with Acco clips, etc, and each has an FBI marking I want to preserve.

We have worked out that she will make two copies of each record of which they want one copy and I'll keep the second one in a separate file so they can consult with me and I'll know what they are talking about.

I'm by no means certain that these files hold the kinds of materials that make what ~~xxxxx~~ to the Enquirer, meaning to Pope, is a story. But I'm also sure they'll find at least a few things.

Of course on those things in which they have interest, until I learn that they have no interest, I won't be taking initiatives with other reporters.

What this means is that I'll have some input and that I'll be able to tell them when something is nutty.

Because this is a continuing interest of theirs and because of some of their attitudes I think it would be a good idea if they had all your memos and lists of news accounts. From the memos they may spot what can be a story to them. From the stories they can learn, in some instances, whether or not the story has been used.

How much of the kind of reporting you want it might lead to I cannot say. My own belief is that it has been worthwhile to be able to show them that some stories they had planned were not good ones and that as a result they did not go ahead with those stories.

If you can send a set of all the lists and memos and let me know the cost I'll repay it and they'll pay me back. I can then indicate to them on these what I know, if I think it is the kind of thing they might go for. Whether they would be willing to pay the costs on a regular basis I do not know but I've recommended it. Their ways with money are odd and the reporters cannot ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ engage in such expenditures without approval. But because they have the continuing interest I think it would be good for them to have the guidance and perhaps some of the restraint they can get from what you are doing.

I'll expose your note on the envelope with these people and others in the press. I think it can be an important story.

I've not been able to look at the documents and won't be able to on a systematic basis for some time. I will be making them available to almost anybody and I will be able to refer to them when I have an inquiry. Now that they are here perhaps it would be a good idea if I kept a set of your notes there for the use of any others who want to go through those records. They are in the cellar, not my office. Be glad to pay for the extra copy, which will be clearer than a copy of it and can keep me from forgetting it. (Our machine, while good, has a long warm-up period so we try to accumulate the copying work.)

Jim says that the DJ is actually considering appealing in 77-2155- after the case is moot on me getting the records. They'd then have to get them back. Which is crazy. But from what some of the lawyers tell Jim they really are considering this in the appellate division. What is perhaps craziest of all is that they can wind up with an adverse precedent when they now are not burdened with a precedent. Gesell was specific on this, as you probably noticed in his order.

Their hatred of me and desire to harm me is incredible. If you've seen the recent UPI King stories, I'm sure they leaked all of that to a sycophantic reporter in UPI just to hurt me because I broke those records loose and have had them for a long time. (Your 1/26/ )

On the FOs, I have requests in for the Dallas and N.O. records. They are stonewalling. I'm sure the official investigations have not seen that material and I'm hoping you have learned enough about the assassins committee not to tip them off and have them ruin the responsible attention some of it might get later.

I don't think Kostman intended any personal insult, either. I don't know him but I also had no earlier unpleasant experiences with him. What I know about the outfit is not good and I'd rather have nothing to do with them. Particularly with this reflection of their concept of what can be done in court - or what the records are good for anyway. I suspect they'd already gotten flack over their irresponsibility and assumed incorrectly that I wanted the records to used to beat them. So such thing. I wanted them for use in the suits. But if they did misrepresent the content, the records do not hold the indicated values. However, I hope you will please be alert to anything on the ~~xxxxxxx~~ spectro and NAA testing and what is related to it, like requests for the testing, comments and where there were records we did not get searched.

There have been many interruptions so I've more or less forgotten some of what I have written, confusing, I'm sure in some cases, with what I had in mind. Sorry.

I've read your excellent and I think important broadcast summary of 1/18, 1/19. I think I told you that I've made ~~xxx~~ separate files on the coverage. I can't monitor and transcribe the broadcasts but I have kept as full a file of clippings as possible. I have separate files of these for both the recent releases and I'll put this with them.

At one point Tillotson of your local area TV station did say they are processing the Dallas FO files but she gave no source.

I don't have personal knowledge of the realities of the Hudkins story but I'm certain that NBC did edit what they filmed and taped and I'm willing to believe that they did it to wind up with something ~~ixx~~ that is not exactly what Lonnie said. Lonnie and I have become friendly. He has been talking of coming here for some time. He does not drive, his wife does, and the last I heard from him they were looking for a new car to get dependability. I suppose that when the bad weather breaks it will not be too long before I see him. Kantor has part of the story right but he does not have all the story. NBC certainly omitted that with Stern and I'm certain Lonnie said this, as he as to me, and more. You underlined an s for the plural on friends. The other one on that conference-call setup was Bill Alexander. To the best of my knowledge Lonnie has never retracted what Stern or the film editors have him appearing to retract, the part of the story they did not present. What Lonnie has laughed at is that everyone went for the fake number. No more that I know of.

To the degree I can I'll be helpful with these records and for others who have in the past reciprocated I'll try to make copies if they provide citations. For some who have not been this burden will be too great for us now, especially during atx season, when Wil is pressed for time. But I do intent to let any responsible people and those who do not have prior records of merely taking my files go through these and the others I hope to get.

As I think I told you they are separated by the file numbers. Where there are special interests I'd like to have a drawer for file folders holding these so that anyone going through the files can be aware and can be asked to make records of what seems relevant. I can then send this to those who may ask. I can't go around soliciting this kind of business because I'm carrying too heavy a time load now but for people like you I'm willing to try.

Back to your letter: Guthman, for years since an LATimes editor, then was with Dobby in DJ, I think as the information officer.

You have heard what I have heard about the assassins committee. I can't take time now for the not good things I'm sure you have no way of knowing and they do not know I know, but they did bad things with and for Lane after Sprague left. As an example. I'm sorry to have been as right as I was about them.

And from this I do hope that a few others will go through what to them may be a painful learning, that there is no possibility of any responsible accomplishment by pursuing theories and whodunits.

If you find or can get a reference to the Section or Sections referring to the critics I'll go over that and make notes. I'd like to see what they have on me for a special reason, I had invoked the PA and they did not respond. Before the releases JL put them on notice. If nothing else I think this will be helpful in litigation. Particularly when it appears that they gave what I forced them to give me to UPI to get it misused, as it was misused in the King case, and to hurt me. As this has.

Best,