

Dear Jon,

11/25/74

From the State Creek Journal (Denver) to Detroit to Houston to Portland to Long Beach, back up to San Francisco - perhaps others, these I recall, by 3:30 p.m. my time today these are your subscribers from whom I've heard.

Maybe Omaha? Yesterday they phoned.

Others could have Friday before my wife or I got home, about 6 p.m. for her, later for me.

This is aside from those who used your copy. Phone interviews.

Milwaukee? There, too.

Thanks for SFTexam story. I like to keep copies for the future. AP was probably too late for the west coast a.m.s of 11/22/74.

You didn't enclose the Wecht story. I'd like to see his entire story. Bob Smith is probably really doing them.

If you do another piece, with so many of your clients heeding you, please add how their readers/audience can get the book. Including postage, by mail, \$6.25. In each pkg we automatically include the other available books in an order form for those who have the interest.

And the odd thing is that the only books still available are the "underground."

I've had a few letters and calls because of the Post/AP stories.

But from the media, much from you.

You reached many. If I can't estimate their audiences, nonetheless many, many other people had a chance to hear/read.

I hope you work your way through Lesar's fine analysis on the FBI law, ^{overridden} December, Ford's veto of ~~many~~ amendments to restore the pre-Nixon Congressional was/just last week. The first of four specified cases requiring the amendments is one of nine in which Jim handled all the filings after the first.

I think Jim's work is newsworthy for your clients. Plus some pretty good copy in it.

Hasty thanks,

Dear Jim,

11/21/74

Jon Newhall phoned me earlier

about the book. I asked him what was new from Bob and you'd just as leave not know!

He then said he had phoned Bob only because he had not been able to reach you, to which I responded that you have to consult law libraries and other people and if the need presents itself again to ask me, that I'll know if you are away. You were not.

He will want to do a story for his subscribers about the time the papers are filed. I suggested that instead of picking up on the missed passed, which will be as newsworthy later as it is now, he then concern himself with what you will have filed.

He agreed and agreed that he will call you on the 2d, the day by which the papers are to be filed and when, if you restrict yourself to a description of what you've filed, you should have no problem.

With all the record we made, we talked about poor "intermediary" who is now in jail. Nothing about the case.

Square that I am, I suggested that on the 2d he might also want to call Maile.

His response was that he does not like Maile and does not like the kind of thing Maile says.

"Instance?"

Well, it turns out that Maile told him that Chastain and I are both crazy. Maybe not crazy enough to be institutionalized but, "In Harold's case I'm not sure." The quote is of Jon's quote.

This was as I recall after the hearing. I think Jon said about five days ago.

You will recall that after a long series of deliberate manufactures about me, lies beyond any question and lies with no possible basis, I wrote Maile and warned him that I would regard anything more along this line as of malicious intent. He never made response but calling me crazy and suggesting that I should be put away after he confronted the evidence for which I am largely responsible it, I think, outside fair comment or the need of his official function.

I will not go off on my own about this but I think it provides me/us with an opportunity I would prefer to use. I would like to file a civil suit against Henry and exercise the right to discovery in it.

To this end - and it can't be until after McRae rules - I would first ask Jon to give me an affidavit. I would then write Henry, copy to his boss, asking a public apology.

This all would take some time. After that time I would, failing what I would not expect, a public apology, file a civil suit.

The defamation was interstate. This means I have to file in neither Tennessee or California, no?

Any ideas or suggestions? Does it open anything worthwhile up?

Should I begin by asking Henry for a public retraction before asking Jon for an affidavit?

Should I forget about it? For me this would mean merely a letter I would show you before sending?

Remember our long-range plans.

and backstepping.

Henry has an official capacity. He represents the State of Tennessee. He has no personal basis for deciding ~~whether~~ whether I am or am not sane, but he speaks for the State, whose agent he is in this matter. If he is drawing on any other material, in a civil suit it would be mine as a matter of rights. Hastily,

Dear Jen,

11/14/74

I wrote you yesterday afternoon and opened the envelope this morning to see what I think may interest you because of your own efforts in the past and because of the changes I'll report.

You may recall my strong complaint to Rolling Stone when you told me they had commissioned Robert Kaiser to do a piece on conspiracy theories of the assassinations. Well, he has independently concluded exactly what I told Rolling Stone and is doing another kind of piece. His attitude is different than the concept of the original story plan. I don't know what kind of story he will write but the one with which Rolling Stone began seems clearly not to be it.

He was here until 1 a.m. We talked openly with two preconditions: he says so he could be certain and I get the tapes when he is finished; and he not use anything I say about anyone else without my reading and agreeing. I told him I want to say nothing in public about others with whom I disagree but at the same time I feel the obligation to give a writer an opinion so he can then decide about on his own, independently.

It is not an easy position to be in because all the noise comes from those who have nothing but noise. And because dishonesty characterizes the noisy ones. The amount of literary thievery is great but the consequences are not nearly as harmful as the misuse by the thieves of what they neither understand nor care to. They want sensation. On the subject of assassinations Ramparts, which did so well on so many other subjects, was never able to do anything besides steal except manufacture. Fiction.

Anyway, Kaiser and I get along well. He is new at the point you were months ago, believing that Rolling Stone should distribute the new book. He also wants to review it. And, interestingly, when he went to the Archives and asked to see some declassified material, the first thing he was shown is this transcript. You may recall I told you it was given to me for me to use because there could be benefits to some in trouble from that use and that I'd write in a manner to minimize or eliminate this. The letter to me on the declassification is not filed with the transcript.

^{Kaiser} ~~He~~ showed Kaiser the book the day before. The printer was supposed to deliver the copies to me again yesterday but did not. Kaiser finds the construction of the book interesting. It is different. Of course he also finds some of the content interesting, too.

If these editors to whom you spoke months ago had not been close-minded something might have come of this. If it does now it still will help but it will be late. However, Kaiser and I talked little about the book. Merely a few stories on what preceded giving me the transcript. We'll get a copy from Kaiser today.

While at the time your efforts and my rather strong letter seem to have done no good, it now appears that both did. At least in making these people aware of the possibilities of misinforming many people by a bad approach, a bad concept. This is what I wanted not to happen and I'm now satisfied it won't. I don't know and didn't ask what he intends instead. I responded, not trying to direct his questioning. As when I interview, it was more of a conversation than an interview. So, I hope he is better prepared for responsible writing. I think he intends it.

Thanks and best,