

Dear Bill,

6/11/93

Thanks for your thoughtful letter of the 8th. I'll at least begin to reply now, before going to our ophthalmologist. Had a healed hemorrhage in my better eye and then an infection that has not healed. Makes the eyes water and that makes my bad typing worse.

On Groden, he is likely to miss anything not in accord with what he at any time believes. He aims to try to confirm whatever he then believes, and that is usually something from which he can hope to benefit.

The name Jim Mitchell seems familiar but I cannot place it. He is correct in what he said about Garrison fighting and winning that precedental lawsuit on criminal libel. The fuller story is that he prosecuted a Bourbon Street stripper, got her convicted, and they asked that she not go to jail because her kids needed her and the jails didn't. That led to the assaults <sup>and his response</sup> that led to that lawsuit and then to his initial fame.

I think there is no basis for giving any meaning to the misidentification of the profile. Except perhaps in terms of the investigation.

Thanks for the congrats. It is not bad luck and I hope that what you'll see in the Publishers Weekly I sent you that the eruption of all that cfap and smoke might forecast.

You have every reason to be proud of the fine thing you did in expanding the Cooper archive. <sup>Hope</sup> you get what is not there. I think also that there may be a better prospect of finding what he said about the WC in the personal files of an employee or associate or friend than in Cooper's files <sup>if</sup> unless, like Russell, he wanted to make a record of his doubts. Lil and I both respected Cooper. <sup>Here!</sup> Although we are both registered Democrats, Cooper was the kind of Republican for whom we always voted. I did in my first vote in the very early 1930s. <sup>And</sup> our then local Congressman, who became our Senator, was a friend, a Cooper-type GOP.

I am confident that aside from whatever gave him doubts about the WC's conclusions he was troubled by the great pressures on the WC from the FBI <sup>of</sup> which he did know and perhaps from the White House also.

Your position as house counsel for your father's business is not all that much unlike mine with the critics now. But those enmités are no problem and they mean nothing to me.

There wasn't very much Cooper could have tried to improve the WR and I doubt he did anything. Even principled politicians, which Cooper certainly was, cannot do much, as he knew, faced with what he knew he and they faced, This and the fact both probably account for his public silence. But this does not rule out his having made a record that you have not yet heard about of seen.

We agree on what you say about the First Amendment. You've had a peek at how I practise that belief. On how I felt on being called unpatriotic when I published White-wash, I do not remember but I'm sure it never troubled me and I'm also sure that my reaction varied with the accuser and the form of the accusation. I was often able to use those things as a sort of intellectual judo and when I could I enjoyed it!

I've not been near any other liquor stores when I had time to see if they have bock. We are lunching with Everett and I'll ask him to ask his suppliers if they can supply any.

Sorry it took me this long to get to the bottom of the stack where this was.

On accusations, there is much in the certainty of being correct. Once can't do much if anything about the ignorant, the unthinking or the ideologues. And I'm still being attacked for saying the crime cannot now be solved. Most recently by that personification of evil, David Lifton. So, I took time for a lengthy essay on his mistitled book to replace what a Baltimore cop working for Harry Lifton borrowed to copy for Harry and instead sent the only copy to Lifton. *- my analysis in particular.*

While to many spending any time on Lifton may seem to be wasting that time I think otherwise. It enables me to perfect the record for history. His knowing fraud has been the best-selling of the books and it has deceived, misled and misinformed more people than any one critic or book. I've sent the rough draft, and it is rough, to Wrono who will run it through his computer. Which his doctor daughter is pressuring him to update. She returns to her internship today so I suppose she and he got it done yesterday. Not locally. Brilliant, remarkable daughter, too and highly principled.

I've been provoking Lifton deliverately, pointedly, very insultingly, in all cases solidly factually, and he can't respond on fact and doesn't. In response he can't even criticize me on fact and his insults are childish and baseless. But my accusations of his knowingly perpetrating a fraud he cannot and does not address. Nor can he deny he has my stolen files. However, he surprised me by extending his nazism to Hood, which has Meagher's records in shape for use. Some of hers relating to Lifton were copied for a friend of hers and an enemy of Lifton, Roger Feinman, and Lifton is epileptic about that.

He is, I think, sick, perhaps dangerously so. He has come to believe his own fabrication and to believe also that all the rest of the world will believe them, too. So in a letter I got from him yesterday he said he was going to tell the people at Hodd just what kind of bad person I am because they do not know me! I replied immediately, giving him the names of the people he said he should write. Like the nazis, his nonresponse is always to attack, and his fictional criticisms are themselves nazi-like. He is, however, a determined pest and a nuisance and by persisting in the past he has too often gotten what he wanted. For one recent example I understand that just to get rid of him Oliver Stone gave him \$50,000. He had done nothing for Stone, Stone had not used any of his crap, and the probability is that as with Hood he threatened to sue. With Hood over giving access to that part of Meagher's records that include their correspondence. He never asked confidentiality. I was not asked how to reply but I suggested that he be told that Hood was following traditional and accepted procedures with deposits of records and if he regards them as being somehow not being followed or if he thinks any laws have been violated, will he please specify? They may regard his threat as spurious, which it is, but if they do not respond, that momser will keep after them. I believe that if he does not response to the kind of questions I suggest he be asked to respond to he has wiped himself out and they thereafter can safely ignore him.

Perhaps if he does file, by countersured<sup>it</sup>. He may have enough ~~to~~ to make it worthwhile. If in federal court I think Rule 11 would be in point and even his lawyer could be subject to sanctions.

What he represents and at its worst typifies is the largest single cause of popular confusion about the assassination and the largest single discouragement for the few of concern in the major media most of which, as a result ignores legitimate criticism. But with the plethora of books due for the anniversary, there will probably be attention and that, too, will mislead and misinform.

In this regard, I'll appreciate anything you may see about these coming books. I have started a special 30th anniv, file for the historical record, as I did with the <sup>2</sup>25th.

As you can see from the Publishers Weekly Livingstone's trash appears to be entirely on the ritifs. He ~~far~~ from the publishers' statement seems to have abandoned his insane nonsense about the killers of which he'd told me. With the book clearly designed to have him the only responsible critic, which he surely is not, motive for the libelling of the rest of us appears to be apparent and ~~that~~ the malice test can be met. I plan no litigation and I know nobody else who does appear ~~to be~~ likely to sue, with a single exception. But the investment the publisher has in this outrages is not a good sign for my book, of which he is copublisher.

Or, it is a crazy, crazy world!

Best to you both,

Harold