

2/9/72

Dear Ed,

Thanks for the clippings, Jenkins Ugh in Computers 2/72 and Navasky on Dick Gregory's Political Primer. At the time I first hear of the book, perhaps six-eight months ago, he had three in the works.

Your question on the Computer's rubbish, "why would anyone write, let alone publish, this stale stuff in 1972!" is not in the form of a question. But the fact of it is one of our serious questions and problems, the endless publication in minor sources of the most dubious nonsense, all, in varying degrees, passing accross editorial desks with the inevitable reaction being that anything that ever does is at best stale. A careful reading of this one, a kind of torture ~~ix~~ I inflicted on myself while drinking a cup of coffee, shows that at all crucial points it is faulted by ~~max~~ error. Years ago this poor rehash would have been terrible. But the only answer to the inherent question is that these are sick people, our own dedicated wrong. They know nothing, do a bit of reading and think they have acquired all of knowledge, and then ar desparate for everyone to know. I have no doubt of Berkeley's intentions. Onl of his rationality. And why did he print this? Because he is getting no more ~~xxxxxxxx~~ faces from the Sppangues and feels the urge.

I have an inordinately high opinion of Dick Gregory, if I can't stand or undert and some of his sincere beliefs, one of which Navasky goes into, the bit with the numbers and the stars. What I have heard from him is incredible, going back to this kind of thing on the dollar bill. I have never seen Dick in public, know him only in private, save from a few always-magnificent TV appearances. This is a remarkable man of extraordinary talent. You can't compare him and Twain, but in many ways he is, in my opinion, superior to Twain. Withal he is the most human of humans. One can't help but respect him for his dedication to his beliefs and principles. The last time he was here, he was not well and down to 100lbs from his fast. But I find value in this review (as I enjoyed reading it) bec-ause of the Sahl sickness. And Nort also is a great talent. Imagine him saying in New York recently that he is the only humorist left!

I know both men enough to have formed an opinion of them as men. They are both of intended sincerity(Sahl, in my opinion, departs from the authentic when it can benefit him, as he interprets what can benefit him) and great capabilities. But Dick is in a class by himself. Sahl's comment is an unfortunately apt self-description. He is the sick captive of a sick ego who thinks the world is in his debt because he has a few principles and he has come to believe that he also holds to principles. Especially within his field. As a result, he was and remains one of the worst of the bad influences on Garrison.

Thanks,