

TELL TALES

(Continued from Page 4)

ficient cause to bring criminals to justice, which answers Greenspun's next paragraphs:

IF THE RJ HAS CORRECTLY REPORTED THE INTERVIEW WITH THE DA, IT SHOWS BEYOND QUESTION A CRIMINAL ABUSE OF PROCESS, OR A PREDETERMINED STATE OF MIND WHICH IN ITSELF IS A MALICIOUS ABUSE OF AUTHORITY.

FROM WOOFER'S OWN LIPS COMES EVIDENCE THAT HE IS UNFIT TO PERFORM HIS DUTIES.

If there is any abuse of process it is on the part of Greenspun, whose claims contradict all facts and are totally without substance. Woofter elected by a majority of the citizens to be chief law enforcement agent of Clark County, is accused as being unfit by a man whose background is fraught with questionable and highly suspicious dealings involving millions of dollars.

Greenspun ponders on belaboring a point on which there is no foundation:

TO PUBLICLY CHARGE A CRIME WHEN IN FACT THERE IS NONE, BY HIS OWN ADMISSION, PREJUDICES THE RIGHTS OF THE "UNACCUSED" EVEN IF LATER EVIDENCE IS DISCOVERED.

Here we are coming to the meat of Greenspun's motive for the column. First, we reassert that no crime, as yet has been charged, either in public or by deposition. No rights of anyone have been prejudiced. Remember, it was Price who instigated the law suit which brought about the depositions. Woofter, as a private citizen, was subpoenaed to testify under oath. The deposition, filed in the county clerk's office, was made public by the Review Journal. Why did Price wait all this time to deny the charges? Paul was there when the deposition was taken. He heard every word of it. If Paul knew it, certainly Greenspun knew it, because a large portion of the deposition made by Woofter involved the Sun publisher. Neither at the time, nor in his recent column, does Greenspun refer to his own involvement. Why?

Perhaps this explains the reference to, "EVEN IF LATER EVIDENCE IS UNCOVERED." Is Greenspun attempting to minimize the importance of "later" evidence? Greenspun admits, in his own words, that Price, as yet, has been "unaccused." So why is Greenspun so adamant in discrediting Woofter. Here's why.

In his sworn deposition, Woofter states under oath, that he was approached by Wes Howery for \$7500 for Price, or a series of articles, of a negative aspect, a general attack, would be commenced in Price's column. Woofter told Howery to tell Price to go to hell. Woofter, further testified, he went to Hank Greenspun's private office with Doc. Knoellar, a mutual friend. This was in the late afternoon of Friday, April 26.

The deposition states: We went into detail with Hank. Hank says, "I can't believe that," Woofter replied, "I'm telling you exactly what is going to be in Sunday's column."

Hank went out and came back with the copy - assumed to be Price's column for Sunday. Hank took a red pencil and started striking our paragraphs. . . . "I am going to strike out everything pertaining to you except ---- (one item of public notice.) Hank then stated, according to Woofter, "I will talk to Price about this."

Now we ask, and certainly Greenspun should have been furiously curious, how did Woofter know on a Friday what was going to be in Price's column the following Sunday? If Wes Howery did not threaten Woofter, along with the shake down for \$7500, who did? All of these incidents took place in the short space of a couple of hours.

But Greenspun, in his recent column, prefers to conceal any mention of his own involvement. Instead, he preferred to state:

THIS IS NOT AN ATTEMPT TO DEFEND SUN COLUMNIST PAUL PRICE BECAUSE IN MY JUDGMENT HE NEEDS NONE.

There you have Greenspun's blanket statement. No reasons given for his judgment, no qualifying statements. Before even being charged with a crime, and with full knowledge of what we have just disclosed, Price needs no defense, in Greenspun's judgment. How do you like that?

Perhaps Greenspun will offer some defense for Price after he reads the admissions of Price himself in another deposition of the same legal action.

Price testified under oath he was permitted to do public relations work, "with the knowledge of my employer." Price said he was asked for advice and guidance on Ed Fike's campaign (for governor) for which Price admitted receiving \$2,000. Price stated: I discussed this with my employer and he said it would be perfectly proper." Price continued: "I did well and good as far as I could until our former Governor appeared on TV and blew everything."

(Price was referring to the TV debate between Paul Laxalt and syndicated columnist Jack Anderson.)

There's an interesting item attached to the Price-Fike relationship. The whole deal was for \$5,000. After the campaign got underway there was a falling out between Greenspun, a registered Republican, and Fike, the Republican nominee. If Price was a hired-for-pay press agent for Fike, why should he discontinue his services during the campaign? Since when does a paid flunkie determine the relative merits of the man who pays him?

So we ask one question: Was Price hired by Fike as a general consultant for guidance and advice, or was it strictly and solely for the usage of his column? Price did not state the "guidance and advice" he rendered, except, "I did well and good as far as I could. . . ." After Greenspun's falling out with the Republicans, what prevented Price from continuing guidance and advice for other newspapers and radio and TV? Price had \$3,000 more coming, but evidently his value as a "consultant" was eradicated when he could not "deliver" the Sun.

Price showed no personal preference for political ideals. About the time he was working for Republican candidate-for-governor Fike, Price testified under oath he solicited Democratic candidate-for-Lieut. Gov. Harry Reid "and tried to get him for publicity but he wasn't interested."

Reid's deposition stated: Price told Reid, "there was another man running for state office, and he was helping him, for State office --- and he would help me."

Reid swore: "He said he could put something in his column once in a while. He said he couldn't do it a lot because it wouldn't look the right type of thing."

Price was forced to admit under oath, that he received moneys from the now defunct California Club, the Golden Nugget, the Thunderbird and the aborted Henderson Race Track. He denied being paid by Pussy Cat-A-Go-Go, but changed his mind when he signed the deposition, it was reported.

Price followed his boss on the Howard Hughes gravy train by soliciting Hughes Nevada Operations Chief Robert Maheu, and was put on the payroll of Mercy Ambulance.

Greenspun you may recollect, had testified under cross examination at a hearing of another law suit that he was working for Hughes. There is no record of Hank being on any payroll but here's what the Wall Street Journal had to say, after reporting a \$4,000,000, VERY FAVORABLE loan from Hughes operations to Greenspun, A LOAN GENERAL MOTORS COULDN'T HAVE GOTTEN AT ANY BANK.

The Wall Street Journal also reported: IN ADDITION TO THE \$4 MILLION LOAN, HUGHES TOOL AND MR. GREENSPUN AGREED IN 1967 THAT THE COMPANY WOULD PAY THE SUN \$500,000 ON DEMAND FOR ADVERTISING FOR THE HOTEL-CASINOS THAT WOULD RUN OVER THE NEXT 15 YEARS. HUGHES-NEVADA DIDN'T EVEN GET A DISCOUNT, APPARENTLY: THE ADS WERE TO RUN AT RATES PREVAILING WHEN THEY APPEARED IN THE PAPER. THE AGREEMENT WAS NOT ANNOUNCED AT THE TIME IT WAS NEGOTIATED, AND HUGHES TOOL OFFICIALS SAY THEY DIDN'T DISCOVER IT UNTIL EARLIER THIS YEAR. FURTHERMORE, THEY SAY, THE SUN HAD BEEN BILLING THE HOTEL-CASINOS FOR ALL THE ADVERTISING THAT IT WAS RUNNING, INSTEAD OF APPLYING THE BILLING AGAINST THE \$500,000. IN AN INTERVIEW, MR. GREENSPUN ACKNOWLEDGES HE WASN'T APPLYING AD CHARGES AGAINST THE PREPAYMENT TILL EARLY THIS YEAR.

The reason we bring up these matters at this time is to show the pattern of how stories in the Sun get into print, when they rhyme with the mint.

Here's what the Wall Street Journal said on that score:

DURING THAT TIME MR. GREENSPUN WAS ONE OF LAS VEGAS' GREATEST SUPPORTERS

OF MR. MAHEU AND THE HUGHES OPERATIONS. BUT SINCE MR. MAHEU'S DISMISSAL MR. GREENSPUN HAS BEEN ONE OF THE CITY'S MOST VICIOUS OPPONENTS OF THE HUGHES NEVADA EMPIRE.

So you see, when you read an article in the Sun, you must ask yourself: (if its favorable) is it true or was it paid for and how much? (if its unfavorable) is it true or how much was demanded to keep it out?

Now do you see the corruptness of what is being palmed off to the public as a daily newspaper? Can you believe anything you read in that PRINT-FOR-MINT rag?

Now lets get back to Hank's recent column. He's talking about the d.a.'s investigative staff delegated to find something on Paul Price with which to prosecute:

A PERSON WITHLESS SENSITIVITY COULD ALMOST CHARGE AN ATTEMPT TO FRAME A CITIZEN WHO IS MERELY DOING HIS JOB IN POINTING OUT SOME OF THE EVILS WHICH BESET OUR GOVERNMENT.

In the light of what we revealed, which must have been known by Greenspun, does this look like an attempt to frame a citizen? Does it look like Price is merely doing his job in pointing out some of the evils which beset our government? It looks like the only evil Price was intent on preventing was the "evils" that stood in the way of his grabbing a quick buck, and we add without qualification, with the KNOWLEDGE AND CONSENT OF HANK GREENSPUN. Hank nears the end of his column:

THE DA IS QUOTED BY THE RJ AS FOLLOWS "IT'S THE FIRST TIME SINCE I'VE BEEN LIVING HERE THAT PRICE IS ON THE HOT SEAT."

No truer words were ever uttered, or printed. If it were not for our son, Jay Tell in his Las Vegas Free Press, and this very LAS VEGAS ISRAELITE, Greenspun's Sun and the likes of Paul Price would go on ravaging the reputations of those who refuse to pay and raping the minds of those who haven't the time to understand the full impact of the machinations being pulled off.

The bleatings of innocence by Price, underscored by Greenspun remind us of the O'Henry character nabbed for selling underwater lots in Florida as real estate. He denied the allegations, but he couldn't deny the alligators.


Greenspun concludes his column with: WHAT CLARK COUNTY DESPERATELY NEEDS IS A QUALIFIED, UNBIASED CHIEF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER. . .

To which we answer, what Clark County needs above everything, is an unbiased, honest newspaper, to report ALL the news, without favor, and certainly without publisher or personnel involved for personal gain.

There is one post script!

A few weeks ago we were in conversation with one of the most revered and respected public office holders in our state. He is not a candidate and therefore was not seeking our support when he made an impassionate plea for us to continue exposing Greenspun and Price. "Otherwise," he said, "there will be no one to tell the truth, about those two newspaper tyrants."

Case closed.



\$1.50
LUNCHEON SPECIAL

MEL AIRE BRIDAL SHOP

MORE THAN 300 GOWNS IN STOCK

624 - 626 FREMONT - 382-1764