

Dear Dick,

11/26/92

My work was going well for the first time in weeks when Harry Livingstone phoned me this morning. It was a very long and ultimately very unpleasant call, tiring when it was no worse and throughout I believe a bit wild.

When I said something true that he did not like as he got more and my trying he just hung up. I then wrote him the enclosed letter, "I called me to lunch and after thinking a little about what he said about you and about Graf I decided to write and not trust him to tell you what I suggested he tell you about. It was upsetting enough so that instead of trying to work after I write this I'll take in the football games on TV today.

The reason for which I attached a page of his letter to my letter to him will be clear. As you'll see, he told me nothing about what he says he discussed with you that he asked me not to discuss with you but he did tell me today. *I suppose!*

He also told me of his current adventures and interpretations and suspicions, at least as he sees them or wants me to believe he sees them.

With regard to you and to Graf, he said that at a two-hour lunch Graf had told him of the attempts to blackmail them and perhaps Berkley. Perhaps he did not attribute the latter to Graf and learned it elsewhere.

He says that among others the blackmailers include Zapruder. When I asked him why Zapruder was blackmailing he said it was over use of some of the frames of the movie.

I then told him to tell you of a decision of which you might not be aware, one that Lesar and I got when the FBI denied me copies of pictures to which Time-Life claimed the rights. (I also told him that I have an agreement with Zapruder to make copies of each frame for research, not for commercial use, but ~~we~~ have not felt I could spend on that what it requires, he said he'd pay for that and we got off, as always happens with him, on something else important to him at that moment.) It was in CA 75-1996, a King case, we went up on appeal and as a result of the remand got the copies and a decision that as I understand it says that copyright does not include the right to suppress or to deny copies for scholarly rather than commercial purposes. I told him to suggest that you speak to Lesar about this. Helen <sup>can</sup> make copies for you here next week but it is likely that Lesar may remember what she won't find or what else may be relevant.

I also told him to tell you that I had used frames of the Zapruder film beginning in my first book without protest or demand for payment and had done this on TV from coast to coast in about 1967-8 without hearing a word. I think that Groden <sup>also</sup> did on Geraldo Rivera when he was on ABC-TV. People have been selling prints for years, including but not limited to Mark Hane. Probably still are.

I had his letter to me when we spoke at his request, so I could read parts to him. One was his incomprehensible reference to something in Dick Russell's book. Russell had told me he'd send me a copy but hadn't so as with much in his letters, it was not possible to know what Harry was driving at. Now for football! Best to all,

*Hardy*

November 24, 1992

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
7627 Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Harold:

Thanks for your letter. I sincerely hope that you and Lillian have a nice Thanksgiving weekend, and things go better. I also hope that your infection goes away.

I would like to make a few comments, but first must ask you not to jump off the handle, not to get angry, to just listen. You are very free with your criticisms of me, which of course are for my own good, though not necessarily accurate. A certain amount of what you say is true. But what I am after are facts, not opinion so much, though in some cases your opinion is very valuable. You are not infallible, nor are you the Pope.

I, on the other hand, have never denied being a bit crazy. I try to do the best I can but there are also things going on of such severe nature that at the behest of Richard Gallen, I went to the FBI last week. I must ask you not to discuss this or me with him, but I will be glad to answer your questions. If you recall, a handbill was handed out with mugs shots of JFK the day he died on his parade route and at Dealey Plaza. Just prior to the ASK conference, Robert Groden did this to me, with a terrible story. A lot of them. He did it at my press conference last May in New York, and he has been doing things like this for four years. Before that Lifton carried on a vicious and massive campaign to wipe me out for ten years. I have documented all of this.

When I find that certain people in Dallas are connected to what is happening to me, which threatens my relationship with my family and my very viability as a human being, I begin to ask questions of them.

With regard to my letter (and others) to you, you often miss the way I am doing things. I test what you know, what your opinion is, and you spend a vast amount of time attacking me and often heaping abuse on me. This does not help me get the facts I need. I know that you are not there to teach elemental things to jerks like me, but I, too, have little time.

You horrify me with your concept of how I might interview Diana Bowron. I am only interested in hopes that she can answer some of the questions in the evidence. Of course I let people talk. Don't you think my interviews are pretty successful? That is one of my greatest achievements in this life, but you are in quite a hurry to denounce my technique, which you clearly misread. perhaps you are talking about someone else?

October 26, 1992  
History Department  
UWSP  
Stevens Point, WI  
54481

Richard Gallen  
260 Fifth Avenue  
New York,  
New York 10001

Dear Mr. Gallen:

Enclosed with this cover is the manuscript of part of Harold Weisberg's new work in progress, given the working title of "28 Years of Silence." He requested that I send it to you. A few words about the manuscript is necessary.

The script represents a work in progress and carries a few of those marks.

-in numbering the chapters I skipped numbers 10 and 11, believing at the time some of the earlier chapters would divide to fill those numbers. This did not occur.

The submitted manuscript totals 16 chapters--the Foreword, Chapters 1-9, 12-17.

-a few of the chapters have not had revisions of the text for typos, floating facts, and other oddments that sometimes creep into a text in progress. e.g. #17. I do not believe that any of these intrude upon the sense of the chapter. Most are minor.

-in the process of typing, correcting, and discussing with Mr. Weisberg various points we sometimes passed each other in the mail. Consequently, revised chapters and non-revised chapters do not follow an "order."

Perhaps it would be appropriate to make a few general observations about "28 Years".

I have spent many, many years reading, speaking, teaching, and studying the JFK murder and have published on it. I have taken as sub-fields i) a knowledge of the books published on the subject; and ii) the original investigation of the murder, which now consumes my time.

"28 Years" is a landmark book. Mr. Weisberg's finest hour.

Essentially it encapsulates the entire issue of the murder and the failure and refusal of officials to investigate it. As one reads the arguments builds. One thinks it is going to be about the AMA and its wretched May

19 article in JAMA. It is that, but soon other elements are woven in and gradually the cumulative impact hits you. It is more than merely an autopsy tussle. He shows beyond question by a candid person that every organic institution in American society failed in this crisis, medical, media, history, political, investigative agencies, military, etc. What ultimately is at stake is the integrity of the American nation-state system as developed in the milieu of the twentieth century's perpetual wars.

The argument is presented in factual terms, rooted in a massive documentary base of the murder and its investigation. In so doing, he sweeps before him as idle dust balls not only the supporters of the official version, but also the irrational critics and their moonbeams of theory.

It is unique.

I believe it could revolutionize the subject--perhaps for all time. It has that potential.

Sincerely

David R. Wrone  
Professor of History

cc:  
H. Weisberg