

3/17/70

Dear Hal,

Glad to hear from you. What happened to your typewriter? Worse than out worst at its worst!

Long ago I stopped wondering whether at any point the snowman dominated in Joe, or when he was putting one, for I cannot stand to me, it makes no difference. He said on the show he found my arguments thin, but he doesn't know them and I was not about to air them before trial (the government has 60 days in which to respond, we have the right to request immediate trial in 20 days and, if Bud's schedule permits, we will). I think Joe's current position is one in which he is predisposed to find any argument along these lines very, very thin. Which is okay. When the time comes I'll give him all of it and he can then tell his audience any change in opinion he may have. I was satisfied that he was satisfied. I know that show, before Joe, and I know the change in Joe's show since he went a.m. I doubt there have been more than an all three hours, which gave me the measure I needed. He had said, when he phoned, that we'd speak for 10 minutes then open the phones. If it was real good, he said, maybe an hour all together. So, he didn't have to say anything for he'd already said it more eloquently.

He's changed, but he is still one of the best, and I'm grateful for the chance to get that much across to a good and large audience. I wonder what reaction, if any, there was on succeeding days. Let me know if you hear. And I'll certainly call him when I think I have what is of sufficient significance (what is his home phone? He once gave it to me and he said I had it on the air, but that book was stolen from my N.O. hotel room, so I don't have it).

Thanks also for the Thornley letter. How strange the man who beat up women and tried to blind their defenders speaks so of violence! He's nuts. Sciambra thinks that when that case comes to trial they'll take the offensive, alleging it was all my doing. That is crazy enough for either Kerry or Dave. I hope they do it for I could then appear as a rebuttal witness, with an open door. The truth is I had nothing to do with it, have yet to get a copy of the indictment, and have entirely other interests in him, as you know.

I would hope that the show with Joe kindled enough interest so that at some point (after 4/15, when Lil's work ends), someone might want me as a speaker. This would permit a reunion....By the way, when you have time, would you please phone Louis Freeman, tell him of my work, and see if he knows anyone who might get interested or might help bring it out?

We've had a temporary break in the weather. Prediction is for a late-season snow storm, beginning tonight, so I've been doing a bit more outside work than usual, the work needing to be done and I need the exercise. I'm a bit tired, but I want to get a little more in before night. Thanks for everything, best to everyone. One other thing, not to be talked about (Paul knows and may not have had a chance to tell you). I've arranged for Bud to be of counsel to Ray. We are supposed to have a meeting, Jerry, Bud and I, either in Memphis or DC. If it is in Memphis, I'll not be able to make it. It is but a beginning. We'll see what, if anything, eventuates. I'm in touch with Jerry and Bud saw James two weeks ago. That meeting went about as well as could be expected, perhaps better. Subtitle: nothing is impossible!

Sincerely,

March 14, 1970

Dear Hal,

Sorry I haven't been able to write you sooner than this and that this letter will be brief but I'll try to bring up some of the things you've asked about in your latest letters.

I stopped off at Joe Delan's apartment last Wednesday night and had a brief chat with him about your three hour interview of about 10 days ago. Joe said that while he thought your arguments were "very, very thin" (his exact words) he, nevertheless, was very pleased with the entire program. Yes, you are right about his conducting an interview for that length of time. I specifically asked Joe about whether this is a usual practice and he answered that it most assuredly was not and that he couldn't recall when he had done this before. (Of course during his days at KNEW over at Oakland when both you and I were on together for that length of time this was fairly usual but even then that depended upon the quality of the discussion and the person he was interviewing.) He thanked me for having arranged the whole thing and I feel that I've re-established our old lines of communication once again should anything materialize of significance which you may wish to utilize. In fact, Joe told me that he said you could call anytime you wished collect when you had something to mention. (I understand that you had done this and that you had called him on March 10 about the news conference. When I asked Joe how that went he told me that you said only about two or three newsmen showed up. Was that so?)

Incidentally, if you desire to write Joe his complete address is: 6405 Brann St., Oakland, Calif. I'm sure a letter to his address there won't get lost in the shuffle as it would if you sent him anything to his studio address.

I wanted to mention a few other things here but I'm hurrying to get this in the mail now. But before I forget, I'm enclosing a copy of the SatEvePost of Feb. 24, 1964 letter column in which Kerry Theraley appears which you requested a long time ago. Isn't it interesting that Theraley makes no mention of the fact that he knew Oswald? Or was he saving it for his testimony later on, and if so, why?

Best,
Hal
HAL