

9/25/70

Dear Gary,

Thanks very much for your letters of the 20 and 21 and the enclosures. I'm sending one of your good Koch memo to Sylvia and I'll send the other two extras to others, including Hal. Dienstfrey will be here tomorrow and I'll give him your note to Jacobs. Sorry it took so much trouble and phoning. Let me know if he doesn't send you a check, in which case I will.

There is still only silence from Paul, which makes that mess more troubling, especially because of the vigor of my criticism. Now that you reached your own conclusions, I'm sending you a copy of mine that, like yours, were composed while I read it. First instinct and then what I took to be evidence led me to believe this was of Alvarez' inspiration. I find no confirmation. So, I feel Paul will be hurt personally by the vigor of my criticism and some of the ridicule. That it and more are warranted is immaterial. I still cannot conceive of the Paul I know doing such work. It has no relationship to science. It could not be more unlike him, not in any way. His is a precise, methodical mind and that is illogical and imprecise.

Bud will not likely use Grace Stephens as a witness, assuming the occasion comes up. The legal work also was deficient. How it all happened is unclear. I enclose an abbreviated version of Paul Valentine's story you can keep.

I've also heard nothing from Renner. You are more optimistic about Bud than I. He is bullheaded, unlearning and off on an ego trip. They have finally begun segregating my stuff to make it unavailable. Barn door dept.

I, too, am not satisfied with what I wrote on Paul, but where the hell can we get the time to do this sort of thing endlessly? By the way, that camera-jerk bit did not originate with Alvarez. Paul and others, having read it in WW (47) so it immediately became Alvarez "discovery". It then disturbed me that Paul was silent over this misused plagiarism.

Crosby/Mewsweek, fine. If he can get any interest, they have a man in Washington (we've never met) who can get a good, independent rundown on me. His name is Horak and he lived or still lives with Paul Valentine, who has come to know me and my work pretty well. I can tell Ned something of the cunning King books, some of them. I'm very interested in what his source is on that "mindblower". As you understand, one interest is plagiarism.

I'm celebrating the first cold in years. It has me weak. Got it the other day when getting my annual (good) checkup. Only EKG remains to be made.

Sylvia has not responded to my comments on Lifton. It turns out that I was correct in my presumptions about his Liebeler relationship and on Liebeler's theft of classified papers (O in NO). I can use this in litigation, if I can ever find time to clean the drafts of the suits up. And I think that would be by far the best way. In court.

This typewriter has become impossible and is beyond repair. I've about decided, if I can find time, to make a new desk, a bit lower, so I can use my very good Hermes portable on it. You may recall that when I was out there my then-new Royal got skilled attention and was unrepairable. I'm out of file space again, so I've decided on other changes, including eliminating the bottom shelf of the bookshelves, which will permit four-drawer cabinets under it. I have two I can use, have located a legal-size one, and would thus have to but but one. All of this will also take time I do not have. But it has to be done....I've got a major repair job on the pool, too. The liner is gone and I've emptied it preparatory to removing. HW

September 21, 1970

Dear Harold,

I sent this letter off today after getting Jacobs by phone. It sounds like the sketch should be on its way to your publisher in a matter of days. The only drawback could be if he has trouble finding it in the files. He was very cordial and promised careful packaging.

Please try to get the \$15 from your publisher to reimburse me. If you cannot, then I will absorb the cost. But this is something they should pay for. The quality of the sketch is well worth the \$15.

Jacobs works part time for the Memphis Commercial Appeal in the Commercial Art Dept.

I am dissatisfied with the thing I wrote on Paul's article, even more so after having reread it. But my time is just too limited. I don't pull any punches and any one of my major criticisms are sufficient to shoot the thing down. I do raise some bigger questions as to what it is supposed to accomplish and had to stick something in there concerning my feelings about that SOB Alvarez and his camera-jerk and neurophysiology work. I had thought of leaving this out so as to sound a bit more objective if and when Alvarez sees this, but the comments have to be made by someone, and I guessed that the others might not have. The biggest thing I regret is that I didn't have time to polish it up, and some of the sentence structure is bad with some of the points a bit difficult to follow.

Well, I have two meetings tonight. One is with Ned Crosby who hopes to meet with some pop people at Newsweek, possibly this week, to discuss some news coverage of our group of critics. Ideally I would like to see them agree to interview you and do an honest story (or their closest approximation to it) on your work. In any event, this is just a feeler to see what they have to say for themselves. It is one of the few places in the major media where Ned has an in, and he wanted to personally feel them out to see what their attitude actually was. He knows that I am very down on them and I have told him of the attitudes of most other critics towards Newsweek. I also expressed doubts that they would even do a story, let alone one with some prior agreement concerning its final content and the possibility that we could have veto power of some sort. Ned also has the job of trying to find out about books coming out on King. He just heard from a high up source that there is a book due to come out on King which will blow his mind (and his source is one who is against the critics on JFK). Ned assumed that they had wind of Coup, but I told him that I doubted that they would react favorably if they did. Other obvious possibilities include Flammonde and God only knows who else. So, hopefully, Ned will find out.

I'd better go. Best wishes and give my regards to Lil.

*Gay*

Sept . 20, 1970

Dear Harold:

I hope to get a long critique on Paul's paper done in time for inclusion in this letter although I know I'll never find enough time to do a really thorough one.

I am working hard on getting you that sketch of the King assassination site. I've had some bad luck but hope to get some definitive info by tomorrow. I had Ned Crosby call Cunningham, a friend of his who is asst. City Desk editor at the Star. He found that the sketch was sent out by UPI and that the artist was John Jacobs of Memphis Commercial Appeal. I called the local UPI and got a run-around until Seymour Frank of UPI told me to call Bill Stribling of UPI in New York. I called him, but he wasn't there. Instead Bill Ryan talked with me and suggested the fastest route was to go through Jacobs, the artist. I called the Memphis Commercial Appeal, but he was not there, and they gave me his home number. Thus far I have had bad luck catching him at his home number. I have done it all by phone because of the time problem. In the future I would advise going directly to the artist.

What's the deal with Grace Stephens? How much railroading is involved. I've read newspaper accounts, but would like some more direct info. Her husband's testimony isn't worth anything in my opinion anyway, but it would be important to know if she was railroaded. And, by the way, deterioration in that type of state hospital occurs quite frequently and can be due to the hospital itself, so it's not way out to suggest that she has gotten worse in the hospital. The state hospitals in the south are notorious.

Larry Haapanen, of the old Washington State Committee, called today. He is an info officer in the air force, now stationed in Montana. He has apparently been in the airforce for several years. He is in touch with Mary and with Fred. He says that George Rennar, his old friend, is still on the case, but mostly in touch with Fred. I still haven't heard from George in almost a year now, including two unanswered letters. What ever happened to the Uncle Charlie tape? Larry saw Bud when he was in Washington some weeks ago. He is working on the Terra Haute rifle story and managed to interview Ripple, the police chief. He also interviewed Jack Puterbaugh. He says that he'll send info. He was hoping I could help him on some stuff that needs to be done in Iowa. I intend to try.

You've taken good steps with the Bud thing but it will be some time before this is 100% straightened out I suppose.

Enclosed is a copy of a brief letter to Paul plus the critique I did on his article. Circulate it to anyone who has seen the original. It's sloppy but I just didn't have enough time to do anymore or polish it up and feel that the flaws I point out are so critical that the article as it is should be scrapped anyway.

Best wishes.

Gary

cc:Paul

*PS. 3 copies of <sup>the critique</sup> Paul's paper + a copy for you are enclosed. Send Sylvia one & anyone else who you feel should see it. I wish I had more time to write more & write it better, although I think my basic objections are sufficient to demolish the paper!*