

Paul Kohn's Rolling Stone piece is worse than I thought and the all-around dishonesty is much greater. There is no investigating of any kind, despite the blumming. There is the misuse of readily-identifiable sources, all public and rarely credited. Misuse because Kohn is one of the whores or the strange species to whom fact is irrelevant (so he makes it up and pretends it is fact) or to whom other considerations mean more. However it is evaluated it is a thoroughly bad work, one of the genre that does not hurt the spooks because those who stop to think it is inherently without credibility. He has drawn fairly heavily on my work and exaggerated and misrepresented it, with the same serious factual error added by earlier crooks. Among the other readily-identifiable sources are Hank Messick's Lansky; Howard Hughes in Nevada; probably the Newsday Rebozo series, things like these. Except for the unlikely, never-named "CIA sources" there is nothing that bears any relationship to reality that is original and little that is crooked or exaggerated or distorted or just wrong-headed that can't be traced to the source on which he improvised, adding error, even to erroneous sources. It is that bad to the point I've reached, into the carryover, the Hughes part. I'm reading it while I rest, as now after working on a flowerbed for Lil... I never get these papers. Sometimes friends send me articles they think I should have and then I read them. I can recall no real exception to the general rule that they all rip minds off, attractively to make it painless, but collectively they misinform a very large number of people... I don't know why Stone got the electronic attention on this it did because what did get the attention is not new and if it were Stone is no authority... But maybe the attention is someone else's quid pro quo... In the areas of my own work I've never known Stone to do an honest job or not in some ways hurtful. To claim that there is any original investigation in this is indecent... They go in for the new scholarship's trademark, irrelevant footnotes. (With the same accuracy problem in addition to relevance...)... What they do here is roll all the theories, whether or not related (and they are not in fact) into a single piece that to most readers will be impressive. There is no real relationship except that Kohn has put them in one article. If you stop to analyze it, as few have time to do, this becomes apparent... Of such is the day's kingdom of the "left." 5/6/76