

Dear Jim,

8/12/75

If you have any objection to this letter to Stetler, just don't mail it. There is no mail I can make prior to meeting with you tomorrow anyway.

No, I did not write it in anger. I do have objectives other than angering Paul. I'll explain them, including the emotional ones.

I told you to begin with that this would be an angled anthology. ^{It} was immediately apparent also that the other objectives, while the anthologists may have told themselves otherwise, was crass commercialism to take advantage of the current situation without making any kind of significant contribution to worthwhile objectives.

The personalization of Paul's dislikes, which stem from exactly this kind of criticism of his earlier stupidities, is barely hidden. I decided not to ignore that and to let Stetler, whether or not Scott, be aware of it. Whether or not he believes it.

The writing is much worse than you indicated. The error is what would have shamed Howard when he was only 15. Not all of it is careless error. Paul's refusal to go to the library for utterly spurious reasons is one clue. ^{He} really doesn't know this stuff or this aspect of the evidence.

This is what really shocks me. The rest I'd more or less expected.

I have no intention of telling them what they've omitted in this area. The book won't do enough good anyway. I have learned the extreme to which Paul will go and I don't want to tempt him. (No, I don't mean in this book.) His ego is much offended from the more than justified clobbering he's gotten in the past when he has attempted his own writing. (How bad was another shock, beginning with concept.) It is my purpose to offend it more. I don't care what he thinks but maybe, just maybe, it will do him some good because he has two others two face on this and there is no mail separation.

I'll go into a little of this with you, but for your information only.

The essential comparisons are ignored entirely. They have to do with the other evidence entirely omitted and with the jacket. With lead, particularly when it was scarce, and with the kind of stuff Musco used it is not at all impossible that there was cheap and poor mixing, within any batch. I take it that whatever Guinn concluded comes from something like this.

Good lead was so scarce that we used to save empty toothpaste tubes for salvage.

However, this was not true of the jackets or the shells. ^{Nobody} ever mentions the shells. (I did, in WW.) Or the gunpowder. The mixing with these components is much finer.

But he doesn't even mention the clothing. Or the curbstones. ^{Or} Windshield.

Don't even specify the incompleteness. I'd rather leave them alone with their possible embarrassment. Besides, it is better for the few serious workers to get an accurate reading on these guys and their actual knowledge. There is no excuse for ~~me~~ Scott in this, either.

I've taken some awfully chickenshit criticism from Paul, almost without exception over imaginary errors. ^{It} has other inspiration, whatever it may be. I also regard his behavior on WW IV is entirely unethical. He also wasted much time by it and we do not and then did not have that time. ^{He} may have cost us some chances for the ancillary rights, and I'd include Rolling Stone on this. I know of no standard by which what he then did can be considered honorable. I may say nothing about this but I was stunned that he would even think of it. More after I offered to make him co-author....^{He} is one thing when it comes to poring over records and trying to find some. ^{He} is, from what I've seen, entirely different when he puts his own stuff on paper or has political thoughts. ...By any measure this stuff is atrocious. Let them alone with it unless they toy with your own words. Best,