Dear Paul,

6/19/89

In your letter of the 15th you say you may be losing your critical faculties and not content with this admission, you display the departure of common sense. Which was inherent in the matter discussed, your shilling for that dishonest John H. Davis.

You say that after plowing through the Garrison and Gorden-Livingstone books you are "more willing that ever to consider the possibility that maybe, just maybe, Lee Harvey did flip out and shoot JFK all by himself."

You could not have framed your self-defeaning letter better. What you say is what you have been insisting on in the Davis defamation and fabrication of which you have made and continue to make yourself part; fact is entirely immaterial.

Two of the more than two recent lousy books make truth of falsehood, integrity of official dishonesty.

Who needs evidence when one has this benefit of a fine education and excellent mind? After all, the politicians lie so lying is right and proper.

We have presidents who make it up as they go, therefore it is right and proper for the John H. Davises to make it up as they go.

And what else do the Paul Hochs need to justify running off at the mouth about what they know nothing about. Davis is truthful when he makes it up (by which I mean 100% of it only!) because presidents are truthful when they make it up.

Just in case you think I'm unkind, I do not have to look the correspondence up to be able to remind you. Jack Wasserman was NEVER here. He never asked me for anything. It was I who asked him.

But the liar Davis had a need to validate his lying by making a nonexisting case, that Marcello was worried about the HSCA drek to the point where he put his immigration layer (as Davis improved on truth, the top mafia lawyer) to work to get all there was on Marcello in the FBI's files. Naturally, waelthy a man as he is, Marcello or his lawyer would not think of merely filing a FOIA request. Too simple to nudge the critical faculties of a PhD, too.

So Davis fabricates a defamation of me as his means of getting around the fact that Marcello didn't give a damn and he says that this top mafia lawyer spent most of a spring and summer here rummaging through all I have.

When the truth is not only that there is not even a letter or comma of truth in what Davis said but it is also that the only rummaging was done by guess who - Davis himself! He had a good senior here all the free time she had in her last year and she copied I do not know what and did not limit or even ask about.

You had no personal knowledge until I told you the truth because you had been helping him, too, and he was also making appearances. But that he made it all up was not enough for you - you had to try to justify his dishonesty to himself. And as it turned out his publosher. And now the reprinter. So, thanks to you and all that fine education and all the mature experience you have gained in your years, the defamation is perpetuated in a greater number of books. And this, from this letter too, was only the overflowing goodness of your heart.

Of course, omniscient as you felt you were to say anything at all, it never occured to you to merely suggest that since none of it is true, why don't you just take it all out. Which is what I asked, without response, and you gave all he needed to satisfy the lawyers that defaming me was right. Thanks.

Just to add to your basis for rushing to the assistance of a rotten liar, I remind you that when his student finished here I no longer had copies of my Wasserman correspondence. Two letters from me, one from him. I asked Davis for copies, which I sent him, and God's gift to the literary world who got so much here free hasn't responded to that, either. Why do you pick them!

Be proud!! Harold

1525 Acton St.
Berkeley, CA 94702
(415) 525-1980
June 15, 1989

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Harold,

Your letter of April 22 did reach me the second time around.

It's always nice to hear from you, albeit sometimes nicer than others. I'm sorry you were displeased by my intervention with John Davis.

In early April, I set aside my tax returns to send Davis, at his request, a list of things I thought needed to be fixed for his paperback edition. It turned out to be a rather long letter - over six pages.

Should I have omitted the reference to you? I didn't think so.

The language of mine which Davis quoted in his letter to you referred only to his apparent intention in that passage. I didn't say that you were out of line to be upset by the language. Certainly, some people could read his reference and conclude that you were cooperating inappropriately with Wasserman. My point was simply that Davis did not seem to be making that argument - not explicitly, at least, and not as his primary point. And it seemed possible, from the language, that he was not making it intentionally at all. In the part of my comments which Davis did not quote to you, I observed that he might have simply meant, by "Weisberg's files," the files which had been released as a result of your FOIA work (described in the previous paragraph), and not the copies physically in your possession. I told him, "if that is what you meant, you could clarify the language."

Of course, I didn't intend for Davis to use my comments in letters to his publisher or to you, but I didn't think to tell him not to. I should have.

I did not have the impression that the relevant part of your letter of March 7 was confidential. My impression was that you were asking me not to circulate your interesting comments on Garrison. You wrote "On Wasserman, and this, if you have any point and interest you can use...." When I wrote Davis, I told him that you had told me that you had informed him that Jack Wasserman did not spend any time with you, or in your basement looking at files.

If this attempt to get Davis to fix his language was the wrong thing to do, my apologies.

But to answer your general question, yes, I may be losing my critical faculties entirely. After plowing through the Garrison and Groden-Livingstone books, I am more willing than ever to consider the possibility that maybe, just maybe, Lee Harvey did flip out and shoot JFK all by himself, triggering all sorts of basically unrelated coverups.

Don't tell Gandolfo I said that.

Thanks for your letters of April 5 and April 18.

The Memphis reporter who called us both was Greg Vistica (phonetic). He is now with the Sacramento Bee, and called me a few days ago on other matters. He says that his editor in Memphis decided not to print his piece on Bud.

With best regards,

Paul

PLH