

Hoch's adverse comment on WW IV HW 12/4/74

While with JL today working on various matters I read the I think six page tirade Paul wrote prior to pub date. I think he dated it 11/19 but it may have been a few days later. I do know it was prior to any public attention. Single spaced.

It is a fairly paranoid blending of a variety of emotions, those probably most basic, like envy, jealousy and hate not showing because of the pseudo-scholarly pretenses. However, he can't even carry this off and lapses into the ridiculous. As in saying to JL, to whom he wants to be kind but really isn't, that as a lawyer JL may be satisfied that Rankin said what he meant, he, PH, as a scientist knows better. On evidence yet! (When I reached that point all I could think of was melons.)

It happens that JL has also received a warm letter from a history prof who has compiled several bibliographies on the assassinations for scholarly publication. He checked out each of my cited sources and found them accurate.

I'll not bother when I get a copy to check Paul's complaints because if all are accurate or at least well-based they are minor. His posture is that they are basic and he forecasts a terrible time for me as (legitimate) criticism is unleashed.

The actuality is that I can't remember, although there may have been, a single case in which the extensive coverage has been as straight or one in which there was a total absence of snide remarks. As I'd told Jim before reading this, while we drove to the copyright office to see to it that all the papers were in order, while we have no way of knowing what exposure we had it has to be in multimillions even allowing for those who miss news stories or skip from the heads. Typical as were all the heads of which I know. And to date not a single adverse comment and from the few "critics" who have had time to respond all the other way. More attention is certain for the arrangements are made but without knowing this PH forecasts a disaster of media neglect.

Where there is a probability of factual error, one of the things Howard did for me so I could continue other work, there is no real purpose to be served by checking that because it relates only to the number of actual pages the FBI omitted in "transcribing" LHO's notebook for the Commission. One is enough and he doesn't dispute that.

Paul is so carried away with the insatiable lust he actually defends Arlen Specter because two months after Specter, in taking the medical testimony, neglected to use the available film, wrote self-serving memos (I gave PH his copies) encouraging the members to examine the X-rays. Specter's examination of the witnesses omitted the fact that he and other staffers and the witnesses had examined these X-rays. On this subject, where Rankin says they have a picture of the rear, so-called non-fatal wound PH criticizes because he postulates Rankin really meant a sketch. (I have other Rankin excess. quotes where he says they have all the autopsy pix, and in color, and there is no doubt they had the X-rays or that Specter, personally, saw the picture Rankin refers to.)

Where I want the reader to read all of Bringuier's testimony because of the subject and refer to it there is severe criticism of "factual" error in my not having referred to a single page of it.

There is no point in recording all of it. These samples are merely a record of the results of the emotional involvement that is reflected in stronger personal opinions and declarations and charges, as in my alleged motives in allegedly not showing him copy in advance. He can't understand that is and I work, without counting the fairies, and work hard and fast, and he makes no reference to my having phoned him the a.m. after I received the transcript and inviting him to come and be part of what I would do. (Thank God he declined!)

He faults JL for describing the Williams affidavit as "preposterous." JL laughed, for in context that is a kindness.

I am also in alleged error in saying that Hoover said he could not <sup>connect</sup> ~~connect~~ the so-called "missed" bullet with the car or its occupants. And he a "scientist" aside from what Hoover said? That it could have hit the car or an occupant or occupants and then have hit the remote point at which Tague was hit by concrete spray from it would be magic!

All in all it is pretty sick stuff. Bitter, wrongheaded, hate-reeking and in its better moments petty. Assuming these are better moments without checking.