

11/20/70

Dear Gary,

Kind of a stormy night, I'm tired and don't feel like working, and we're going to Wilmington for a couple of days, to see my mother and for me to take care of some old and overdue business, so I don't want to begin anything requiring thought continuity.

= You've had nothing to say of yourself for some time, about the benefits (I presume) from the therapy, etc. I presume the silence is a good sign, plus that you are busy.

Based on things in this area, I discourage Jerry's mailing what he spoke to you about. Unless you conceive an urgent need and immediate use.\*

I've heard nothing lately except what you are aware of from carbons.

The publisher keeps reporting visionary schedules and, when he does something to speed things up, shouldn't. Like today, if he kept his schedule, he sent the footnotes to the printer to be set. I haven't seen them! First they delay, then they rush the wrong way. I suppose it is an occupational illness. They all seem to have some form. So, I know what to expect, but that doesn't make it agreeable.

Gary's man never called back to let me know that the tentative speech was or was not set. When it was getting close to court time, I phoned him, but he never returned the call. I took it that he got no confirmation and wanted to (or had to) economize. Even if they do well, I'd suppose the first year would be a hard one, most schools working in advance and this topic, in my case, not being too popular at the moment. I think maybe it will change when the book is out.

I'll be near Howard but probably won't have time to go there. And he never gave me his school phone. I'll probably place a person-to-person call to his parents and locate him that way. We'll be but an hour apart.

The pictures of special character in which I have a special interest, as does 'ohm, I now know were studied, and not from the source you'd expect and not for telling anyone. Just so you'll know there was not that oversight, despite the contrived record.

It may be academic by the time you can reply, but I'm interested in your opinion of the enclosed letter to Kelley and the one to Jim on it. I do believe the feedback can be that bad.

Increasingly I tend toward your analysis on Paul. Hal is back, moved to a new address, jobless and probably will be until tax season, when he can get a job with a friend until mid-April. Through a mutual friend you don't know, I've sent word to Hal that I'd like him to engage Paul in a long conversation to see if he can spot anything to confirm it. As you've noticed from my letters, they are not all like yours. One of the reasons is that PH is sharp and if I get too far out of character... There are what to me are telltale signs of something wrong. The whole mischigas is so entirely out of character for him so utterly and completely inconsistent with everything he'd done or said, every behavior pattern and attitude. Then, he has not failed to answer me for the reasons he gives but because I have done more than criticize: I've given him direct challenges to meet and he cannot. And he knows he cannot. At the same time, especially because he sent me excerpts from a letter from Alvarez, I feel that in addressing him I am also addressing A, and I want failure to allege even the minimal authenticity of the test. Dick sure gave him a load of what I'd said he would, probably the reason PH never wrote him to begin with, when I suggested it. Dick had to keep after him to get a copy. Of course, I could have sent mine to Dick, but I felt it better this way... So, I remain disturbed. And all these things seem to come when I should be concentrating most of all. And each time I'm proven right about Bud, it is that more depressing. I see signs of a pricking conscience, but not enough of a growing consciousness... He has Jim's capacity for learning from mistakes... I now think, tentatively, that when I get clear on the proofs, etc., I'll redo the Ferris complaint and let that on the panel cool, unless I decide to draft it preparatory to returning to the PM writing. I actually did get started a month or so ago—did a single paragraph, got interrupted and never have been able to return. My present plan is to make III into II and add a relatively short III, with what I removed from I to carry forward, what I've developed, etc.

11/17/70

Dear Gary,

Today's Washington Post had a long, exclusive interview with Hoover in which he says that Bobby was next to the worst AG, Clark being worst -and a jelly fish, of whom you could never tell which way he'd flipflop. I fear the characterization of Clark as yellow is accurate.

However, aside from any interest Crosby may have in this, it should supply Clark with incentive, esp. with his seemingly apparent Presidential interests.

I have clipped this, will try and get a dupe in case you want it - or if Crosby does. I presume the story will be both picked up and syndicated. It has been getting heavy radio-news play here.

It is also exceptional that Hoover gave this interview to the Post. There has been a mutual feud for years, with the FBI nonetheless maintaining a kind of good liason (example, George Lardner, Jr., who did not write the story). Hoover could easily have turned them down, if they asked for the interview. He usually leaks to the Star, which is Republican-oriented and more "conservative". It would be interesting to know whether Hoover took the initiative because of the reviews of Clark's book, a large one in the Sunday Post, in Book World, and one in LIFE that I know of.

Best