

4/10/69

Dear Ross,

Again you have been very helpful. The Leifermann-UPI writing on the Ray case did appear in this area, but not the story you sent me, which had a few significant things in it, things I will use. Gavzer, who looks more like the villain he has been in the fuzz, did a series some of which appeared here -but not the story you sent, which is also of considerable value to me.

I cannot ask you to go to the trouble of clipping everything for me, but if you see anything with names or facts that are inconsistent with the official story, on the NSRP and Stoner, on any of the lawyers, any misgivings, I can use them and will welcome them. If you have any other clippings you'd like to keep, let me see them and I can return them.

On Trent, I agree with you. But I am a little more charitable, because he is also working, which sometimes makes it impossible for him to estimate time. He is much less cooperative, much more self-seeking, than he could be, but I do not doubt his sincerity. I also believe he goes off half-cocked, before checking things out, and has made serious mistakes. In one case I tried to deter him and succeeded less than I'd have like to.

My thanks to you both,

April 7

Dear Harold,

I took the precaution of cutting out some Ray articles. I am enclosing 2. I will send anything else that I may come across. I am also enclosing a form letter sent to me by Brent Gough. I've found Gough to be concerned and honest but highly ~~un~~ irresponsible. I would write him for further information but am sure he'd forget to answer. You would probably have more luck, if you're interested. I received this notice of the April 3rd lecture on April 3rd. When I lived in New York, he was always late ^{by weeks} to return phone calls etc. Various projects planned by him as described in his New letter never seem to pan out. Nevertheless, he may have something

Ross

I OPENED LETTER TO
INSERT APRIL 6TH
EDITORIAL

Leifman