

28 June 1969

Dear David,

Thanks for your letter of the 24th and the enclosures. First let me deal with the new batch of Archives documents. I would certainly like to have them, subject to the conditions you attached and the proviso that you might not find it possible to copy the stuff. I am enclosing a check for \$40.00, the surplus over the \$37.35 to be used for postage.

You indicate that you will xerox the documents during the first weekend of July, at which time I will be traveling to Boston (Sunday 7/6/69) to remain there until the 1st of August. I would like very much to receive the stuff at Boston--it will give me something interesting to do in my free time there. So I would be grateful if you would send at least part of the files there, particularly the first three sets described on your list of 6/25/69, numbering 325, 49, and 230 pages respectively. The address, to repeat it for your convenience:

c/o The World Health Organization
P.O. Box 325, Prudential Center Station
Boston, Mass. 02199

Please mark envelope "PERSONAL" and "URGENT". A million thanks.

Now to other matters. I had a card from Fensterwald, from Dallas, indicating that he was on a field trip and that he would give me a report of his findings when he returned. I had heard from other sources already that he was in Dallas and very thick with three ultra-Birchites there who have apparently been working like beavers since the WR came out, compiling colossal lists, indices, cross-indices, etc. etc. The trio consists of two ladies, with neither of whom I have ever had any contacts, and a man named Kimbrough who did phone me once and who wrote a few times--seemingly a very pleasant, earnest chap. I have the impression from a letter I got from Harold Weisberg that Fensterwald is bringing the three of them back to Washington with him, perhaps to visit the archives, and the like. Incidentally, Harold phoned me yesterday during a brief visit he was making to New York, and devoted most of the conversation to alleged efforts being made on the west coast to discredit and defame him. He feels that you are conducting a systematic campaign against him, and that Bill O'Connell and Maggie Field have been "influenced" by false information. Then he went on and on about the abortive debate he was to have with Liebeler at some high school (on which you had sent me the full story and correspondence some time ago). I am mentioning this on the assumption that you will not react in any way---it is best to let these things run their course and peter out from sheer inertia. Attempts to clarify and refute are unlikely to produce any positive results, especially when the sense of persecution is an essential support to the psyche. My advice is, do nothing--and in any case please ensure that Harold does not get the impression that I told you about his conversation with me. I don't have the strength to get into any hassle with him, which always requires novella-length letters rushing back and forth, with the most innocent remarks turning out to be "offensive," etc.

What did you think of Fensterwald, by the way? I've never met him and my feelings are ambivalent, partly because of his dealings with the likes of Garrison, Flammond, etc. and partly because he apparently misrepresented my relationship with his committee to one person (and perhaps to others, for all I know). Garrison is in the headlines again, I might mention, but this time in connection with a controversy about organized crime in New Orleans (he is under fire for inaction) and also because Charles Ward resigned in a huff and will run against Garrison for the DA job.

Dave, I have respected your request to say nothing about your research but I think you should know that Weisberg is aware, from other sources, that you are doing a book.

He told me that you will charge that LBJ and Rusk together engineered the whole thing, and that at an earlier time you had considered it was LBJ and Dulles. Any truth in this?

If you write in the next few days, please bear in mind that I will still receive mail here in NYC on Saturday 7/5/69 but anything mailed after 7/4/69 should go to the Boston address.

All the best,

P.S. Yes, Crehan's letter to TIME was a masterpiece. As for my own correspondence with J.E. Himself, the question is not whether I bugged him, but whether he bugged me. Quite a business, isn't it, on the bugging of MLK and what part RFK had in that, with the surprising statement by Ramsey Clark denouncing JEH and asking him to resign. When thieves fall out...as the saying goes. Clark better be careful crossing the street.

P.O. Box 325, Prudential Center Station
Boston, Mass. 02199

Please mark envelope "PERSONAL" and "URGENT". A million thanks.

Now to other matters. I had a card from Fensterwald, from Dallas, indicating that he was on a field trip and that he would give me a report of his findings when he returned. I had heard from other sources already that he was in Dallas and very thick with three ultra-Rightists there who have apparently been working like beavers since the WR came out, compiling colossal lists, indices, cross-indices, etc. etc. The trio consists of two ladies, with neither of whom I have ever had any contacts, and a man named Kimbrough who did phone me once and who wrote a few times--seemingly a very pleasant, earnest chap. I have the impression from a letter I got from Harold Weisberg that Fensterwald is bringing the three of them back to Washington with him, perhaps to visit the Archives, and the like. Incidentally, Harold phoned me yesterday during a brief visit he was making to New York, and devoted most of the conversation to alleged efforts being made on the west coast to discredit and defame him. He feels that you are conducting a systematic campaign against him, and that Bill O'Connell and Marky Field have been "influenced" by false information. Then he went on and on about the sportive debate he was to have with Diebel at some high school (on which you had sent me the full story and correspondence some time ago). I am mentioning this on the assumption that you will not react in any way--it is best to let these things run their course and peter out from sheer inertia. Attempts to clarify and refute are unlikely to produce any positive results, especially when the sense of persecution is an essential support to the psyche. My advice is, do nothing--and in any case please ensure that Harold does not get the impression that I told you about his conversation with me. I don't have the strength to get into any hassle with him, which always requires novels-length letters rushing back and forth, with the most innocent remarks turning out to be "offensive," etc.

What did you think of Fensterwald, by the way? I've never met him and my feelings are ambivalent, partly because of his dealings with the likes of Garrison, Richmond, etc. and partly because he apparently misrepresented my relationship with his committee to one person (and perhaps to others, for all I know). Garrison is in the headlines again, I might mention, but this time in connection with a controversy about organized crime in New Orleans (he is under fire for inaction) and also because Charles ward resigned in a huff and will run against Garrison for the DA job.

Have, I have respected your request to say nothing about your research but I think you should know that Weisberg is aware, from other sources, that you are doing a book.

WJH