

Dear Jim,

1/4/95

Sorry I was not up to present snuff when you were here.

I think I forgot to ask Lil to get the copy enclosed that she'd made earlier so I could send it to you.

What Tony cribbed, and I checked it, does not come from WW IV. In it I said only some of what I say in the article. So his only possible source was that article.

And making up words and putting them in quotes to make it appear that what he uses is his own work, so far as I am concerned, ~~is~~ self-descriptive.

Jeff Morley phoned in anger after he read what I'd sent Outlook's editor, who has had nothing to say in response. He told me that you are among those who thought the piece should be published. You told me in advance that there was an important article coming in the Post. Morley also said that Lardner had not opposed it. According to Gary Mack, Lardner told him he did oppose it. Which is what I'd have expected.

There goes what slight chance there was of the Post carrying anything decent, relevant and accurate. If the La Fontaines had not been dishonest, as they assuredly were, and I did check, there is no real relevance anyway. No matter how much you (plural) stretch.

Each and every one of these things of the past has been hurtful in various ways and those of you who should have learned from them either have not or ignore the lessons they learned.

There is not a single part of the La Fontaine fiction that is relevant and stacks. I do not doubt there was gun thievery and running, but that has no relevance and the CIA did not need to resort to that kind of storybook stuff for weapons.

This is to say that you erred on reading that crap that you found for some reason I do not see interesting and worth being published in not checking the available records on those tramps. As you should remember from several things of the past, all you had to do is phone me. As you should remember from the King case I forced and FBI investigation of that then. As you should remember from Garrison's planned monstrosity of 1968 I had two investigations made then. And as you should have assumed and I think would have if you'd had any question at all in your mind, I did have a readily-available file of duplicates of those FBI records.

Gary Mack also told me that the La Fontaines had a segment of Hard Copy in 11/93, with Elrod on it, and he then said the exact opposite of what the La Fontaines said he said.

Aside from ^{the fact that} this kind of self-seeking for sensation confuses the confused people even more, it destroys all credibility. Please think about this before you get involved in another such venture. ~~Best~~ Best,

Harold