

Dear Gary,

3/29/93 + 3/30

I wrote a very large book on paper clear one side, have enough on hand for several more large ones, and have begun using this paper, conservationist that I am, for other purposes and may save a few branches if not a tree and some pentocylum, if not a barrel.

After we spoke I got an idea. Awaiting the coming of people due soon, I offer the suggestion that came to mind.

You said you were going to write Carroll and Graf to tell them that all Harry says about you is false. Why stop with what he says about you? Why not make it as inclusive as you can on the subject matter and put them on notice? Could you not be specific on his fabrications about the Bronson film? And tell them that Seales did not let him see it for that reason and because what he says cannot be trusted, fact not being sufficient for his purposes? As any informed reading of his books makes apparent?

Have they had any of his books read by real authorities on the subject? Do they have any way of knowing whether those he quotes know what they are talking about or whether the interpretations he gives of what people say to him are factually correct, even reasonable to those who do know the fact? Or is it that you do not care as long as you profit

Falacious as his first two books are, ^{basically} ~~basically~~ wrong as they are on the assassination and the investigations of it, his third book, which he has said they have contracted, from what he has said about it, extends his egomania and rewriting of history into personal attacks on people whose sole actual offense is that they refuse to have anything to do with him or his book and all that he imagines for it and about himself. Whether or not technically libellous, is this their concept of responsible publication, to make money from the suffering of others, from injury to them and to their reputations and their work in the course of indulging the magalomania of a johnny-come-lately exploiter and commercializer who has ~~not~~ made a public spectacle of his lack of contact with reality solely to indulge his unreal and baseless self-concept that is offended by their refusal to bow low to him or to ^{profit made from the} ~~pay him for the~~ ~~same~~ subject-matter trash his earlier work is and this inevitably also will be?

In addition to you and at least one other he has singled out for the cheap revenge you make possible ^{no} ~~to~~ elderly ^{ill} and infirm people at whose feet he is not fit to sit for particularly malicious and utterly false accusations ^{he has articulated.}

If this is your concept ^{and responsibility} ~~of decency~~ in publishing you deserve what will follow publication of his sick and entirely imagined conspiracies, including non-existing conspiracies against him.

All controversies do not help sales and profit seem to be your sole motive. Otherwise it is not easy to see your continued association- and financing - of him in his evil.

Best
Hend