

Phil Lerman  
SIT Productions, Inc.  
5151 Wisconsin Ave.,  
Washington, DC 20016

5/20/93

Dear Phil,

Thanks for the cassette and for the frankness of your yesterday's letter.

My only interest in the cassette was for deposit at Hood because I considered yours a good, fair and perceptive interview. If they cannot use that size, perhaps you'll hear from them.

Either I was less clear than I should have been or you misunderstood me. You did correctly understand that I wanted no association with any theorizing but you did not understand that I also wanted not to be used to give credibility to a wide assortment of people who were responsible for disinformation and that kind of theorizing. I did not know, for example, that you'd used Funtroy and Lane. They are more responsible than most for the present unfortunate situation and what they said was self-serving, often false and misleading, and they had no credibility other than their claimed roles gave them.

Funtroy was a despicable black Judas. I had too much personal experience with him on this particular matter and he behaved badly in all ways, all intended to facilitate or credit in advance his preconceptions. *Which were 100% wrong.*

Lane personally created a dishonest and very prejudicial situation for his ostensible client, Ray, by doing nothing except what he did from ignorance ~~in~~ in serving his own selfish interest. He is the kind of monster who makes people who sell sex look good.

My recollection of the show, now not at all clear, is that the net effect of using me with them when they actually said very little that was factual about the crime and what then happened, was to make them appear more credible than without me they would have appeared.

That is something I have sought to avoid, one of the reasons I refused to work for pay on the Thames/HBO show or to appear on it. I did not stay up for it and did not get a cassette of it.

You did not damage my reputation and I'm sure you had no such intention. If I gave you that impression I should not have. I suppose that if I said anything like that it was from ~~what~~ <sup>what</sup> the Times said that I now do not remember.

I was much troubled by your late checking on Gracie Stephens with me, as I then indicated, and as I'm sure I told you earlier she saw and knew nothing and was not in any way suitable for a serious show. I was then assured that she would not be used as I believe she was.

I suppose that to a degree something like this situation is inevitable with what I ~~used~~ as the cliches of your medium. I regret it and regret being used to give it credibility.

While it may not have been your intent you presented two unconscionable bastards, Lane and Funtroy, as virtually heroic. There was nothing on the other side of what they said and were able to misrepresent themselves as being. Best to you and Michele, *Harold*



May 19, 1993

Dear Harold,

Glad to hear that your book is about to be published. I'm very much looking forward to reading it.

As you see from the letterhead, Michelle and I are back to catching crooks now. I'd be happy to provide you with a dub of the footage we took of you and your files. I've got someone dubbing it onto 3/4-inch format, and will send it along as soon as it's ready; you should have it in a few days. If you need a different format, let me know.

I'm sorry I never wrote you back after the special; I started to a few times, but frankly I was so surprised and upset about your reaction that I wasn't able to respond coherently.

I think the thing that upset me the most was your perception that I had damaged your reputation, and had somehow misled you about my intentions. I don't want to argue, point by point, what we included or didn't include. I do, however, want to point out that every review -- with the exception of The New York Times -- noted, correctly, that the program "stopped short of any conspiracy theories." It was hailed as factual, careful, and (to quote Variety), "revealed the material in an empirical manner: objective, not exploitive."

I raise these not to pat myself on the back, but to assure you that (with the exception of one three-paragraph, snotty notice from a reviewer who appears to not have even seen the broadcast) the vast majority of viewers saw exactly the program I promised you we would produce -- one that was fair, objective, and that offered no conspiracy theories.

It is a shame that The New York Times, which often shows a strong bias against any programs that include re-enactment, allowed that bias to taint your name in print; for that I am truly regretful. I can't stop bad journalists from doing bad work, but I am sorry that such bad work has soured you on the program. We stuck very, very carefully to the areas you discussed; we all agreed that you were the most powerful

speaker we had and, as a result, included much more of your interview than anyone else's; and we hoped that we lived up to your high standards.

In any case, I do apologize for not writing earlier. I hope that you are well. Please keep us up to date on your book.

Cheers,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'PRL' followed by a long horizontal line.

Philip Lerman  
Managing Editor