

19 August 1968

Dear David,

I've just returned to New York after a week's absence, and found your letter of the 12th as well as a sizable accumulation of other mail, including a two-page letter from Weisberg. You will understand, I hope, if my reply is less elaborate than I would like, since I want to deal with all the mail before returning to my job, tomorrow or the next day.

Harold's letter (his first in many, many months) was inspired by my contribution of funds to Thornley, and was quite unpleasant. With his usual logic, Harold writes me this long polemic in order to persuade me to reconsider my views on Thornley in the light of evidence he has developed which proves Thornley is evil, fascistic, and inculpated in the plot against JFK and/or LHO, which evidence he is forced to withhold from me--because of my position on Thornley. As I do not have access to the xerox, I cannot send you a copy; suffice it to say that it is a predictable letter, much like the one he wrote to OPEN CITY. I was prepared for Harold's denunciation of you and Thornley and your unnamed but sinister backers; but I was amazed, I must admit, when Harold was so presumptuous as to comment on how I should better have spent my own money ("better to have used it for 500 copies of documents from the Archives")--a subject on which I take advice from absolutely no one; and even more astonished when he proceeded from that effrontery to the suggestion that Thornley was probably using the money to damage and defame him, Harold. There seem to be no limits to his extreme megalomania, and I really have little patience with his childish hysteria and his readiness to see insanity and fascistic mentality anywhere except under his devoted nose, in New Orleans.

A few brief comments now on your letter of the 12th, by paragraph (to save time): Paragraph 1, yes, thanks, I would like a copy at your convenience.

Paragraph 2, I agree that it is possible, but, as you say, there is no evidence of any acquaintance or association between CS and LHO. I have reason to doubt that G. has any hotel register. Nor do I know of another "Bertrand" document (I have a huge pile of States-Items to read which accumulated during my absence).

Paragraph 3, I would be interested in seeing a copy of your letter to Epstein, even more so in a reply from him, if he sends one.

Paragraph 5, feel free to make copies available as and when you think it would be helpful, I have no objection to copies going to hard-core pro-G people--on the contrary, it might be useful in that no one in his right mind can call me an apologist for the WR or the WC.

Paragraph 8, I will try to read Wicker's book, as soon as I deal with my backlog. Unfortunately, I missed the ESQUIRE article on Rusk, although as of now I am a subscriber to ESQUIRE.

By the way, is it true that Fred Newcomb has come up with proof that the photos of LHO with rifle are composites and therefore fabrications? Some guy in one of the Citizens' Committees claims so, after having visited Los Angeles (George Rennar). Please give me any information on this that you are at liberty to disclose. Also, let me tease you by asking you to reexamine the photographs of the Carcano rifle, in the H & E and in the critical books, and to look for a serious and potentially highly important discrepancy which would strengthen the existing evidence for 2 rifles, one of which was deliberately planted to incriminate LHO. (A hint: pay special attention to the sling.)

Excuse the rush and any incoherence,

All the best,