

June 18, 1969

Dear Dave,

I have been too hampered by work to write to you earlier, and I do not have the time to write as lengthy a reply to your letter of June 7 as I would like. Most of what I would have written to you is contained in my letter to Fred and Marilyn Newcomb of June 17, 1969. I have asked them to make this available to you should you care to read it. I did not have enough carbon paper handy to be able to make you a copy since I wrote it late at night when our main office was closed. If for some reason Fred will not allow you to see this, I will dig out my carbon and send you one, but I expect that he will show it to you upon request. It is a long letter which took quite a while to write and even more time to prepare for its writing, since I had to go over a great pile of things which Harold sent me and read them all, plus re-read your correspondence and that of Fred and Marilyn, and then the things you sent me about KT.

You will remember that you read that letter that I did just what you challenged me to do—asked of Harold, or got without asking, some proof of the things he had told me, and which I had relayed to you. Harold claims of his, you by and large labeled lies and on this basis, labeled Harold a liar. In other words you implied it, but did not use the word. Well, after this extensive investment of time and effort on my part, and time and even money for searching on Harold's, the conclusion I draw is that if anyone is a liar it is certainly not Harold. I make no charges of lying against you or those who you quoted since I do not throw that word around as lightly as you do. But I do say this: That I have seen sufficient documentation to dispute all of the claims you made in your letters which I forwarded to Harold—all of those involving alleged theft of other peoples' work and passing it off as his own, alleged lying about why he went out to Cal etc. Some were refuted specifically back to the last word, as with Lillian's claims, while others were strongly supported in his observations enough that although Harold offered more material as so as he had time to dig it out, or his other files on these things, I have decided to decline (al though from his last letter, he says there are still some at further cost of time and money to himself) since the best that could result in your names would be a slight show of Harold having slightly exaggerated due to my fears in the manner in which we all do for most stories we tell. But even the latter is not of high reputation in my mind. So, your charges of his lying, and of his theft are outright falsehoods. I have seen this correspondence written by Lillian, Fred, yourself, Maggie, Bill O'Connell, and Ray with my own eyes and examined it at length. For whatever reason, and of whatever cause, these charges are not true.

In two cases, ironically, the opposite is true. Lillian, for instance, begged people to use her work, and not only said she didn't want credit, definitely asked that her name not be used with it, and even indicated some fear of such a thing happening. So Harold could have legitimately used her stuff without citing it, and in fact, would have expected her to want that rather than using her name. And then there is, in Lillian's own handwriting, at a date far after Harold published WW II, the statement that no one has used her K202-Willis S stuff and that no one probably ever will, so there is no doubt that she knew that Harold used a proof other than hers in his book. Ironically again, she is seemingly dependent that no one will ever use it. Then the case of Fred. Harold cites Fred in his newest book, and I sent Fred the page. Harold has cited Fred many times on Radio and TV (I have heard about 8 myself) and fought with Gough and Lane on Fred's behalf over proper credit for the work, then challenged Turner's claim and Sprague's claim over it. Finally, he challenged Mark Lane on TV, and Mark defended the theft of it and defended theft in general, and then wrote this up in Coup D'Etat. So Fred says that Harold is a thief or has tried to steal his work, and that Mark is a good guy who gives credit. Well, the irrefutable record proves the opposite, and in fact, that Harold has done more than even myself to defend Fred from theft.

In your letter to me of June 7 you say that you did not state for mean to imply that I had told a single lie. Yet in your letter of June 2, paragraph 1, you indicate that statements made by me "have proven to be untrue." and that you took my word that those assertions by me were

Dear Dave,

I have been too harassed by work to write to you earlier, and I do not have the time to write as lengthy a reply to your letter of June 7 as I would like. Most of what I would have written to you is contained in my letter to Fred and Marilyn Morsch, of June 17, 1968. I have asked them to make this available to you should you care to read it. I did not have much carbon paper handy to be able to make you a copy since I wrote it late at night, and my office was closed. If for some reason Fred will not allow you to see this, I will dig out my letter and send you one, but I expect that he will show it to you upon request. It is a long letter which took quite a while to write and even more time to prepare for printing, since I had to go over a great pile of things which Harold had written and then edit, plan, and retype your correspondence and that of Fred and Marilyn, and that the things you sent me about the...

You will recognize that you find this letter that I did just what you challenged me to do - asked of Harold, or got without asking, some proof of the things he had said, and which I had relayed to you. These things of his, you say and large labels like out on this page, labeled Harold a liar. In other words you indicate, but do not use the words "liar", after this entire sive investment of time and effort on my part, and then not even use the word "liar" in the conclusion I draw. If that is not a lie, it is certainly not Harold's and you are charged of lying against me as if that the you get out of me and then that word around as lightly as you do. But I do say that I have been sufficient documentation to disprove all of the claims you make in your letter which I published in the book - all of those including alleged that of other people's work and pointing to me as the doer, although lying about it as that sent to Cal etc. Some were refuted specifically in the last week of the book - William's claims, while others were strongly supported in his direction except that although Harold's charges were material as far as he had time to dig it out, of his doing with on these things, I have decided to decline (although from his last letter, he says that he would like to see the things which I have sent to himself) with the book that would result in your book about the rights of Harold having slightly exaggerated the role of the FBI in the matter of which we all the statements in the book but even the letter is not of high importance in my opinion, and your charges of lying, and of his that the FBI had taken, I had seen this correspondence written by William, Fred, yourself, Maggie, Bill O'Connell, and the other way around and checked it at length. For whatever reason, and of whatever cause, these charges are not true, but of an even more serious nature.

In two cases, broadly, the opposite is true. William's charges, Harold's people, use her work, and not only said she did it but even said, definitely stated that her name not be used with it, and even indicated some fear of such a thing happening; if Harold could have legitimately used her stuff without citing it, and in fact, would have expected her to say that not then using her name. And that was in William's own handwriting, at a date after the book published WW II; the statement that he was his used her FBI-Millican's stuff, and that no one could ever will, so there is no doubt that she knew that Harold used a great other than her, in his book. Broadly again, she is seemingly dependent that no one will ever use it, but the case of Fred. Harold cites Fred in his latest book, and I certainly charge Harold with Fred many times on radio and TV (I have heard about 6 years) and fought with some people on Fred's behalf over proper credit for the work, then challenged William's claim and Harold's claim to it. Finally, he challenged Mark Lane on TV, and Mark defended the theft of it and defended theft in general, and then wrote this up in Coup D'Etat. So Fred says that Harold is a thief or has tried to steal his work, and that Mark is a good guy who gives credit. Well, the irrefutable record proves the opposite, and in fact, that Harold has done more than even myself to defend Fred from theft.

In your letter to me of June 7 you say that you did not state me mean to imply that I had told a single lie. Yet in your letter of June 2, paragraph 1, you indicate that statements made by me "have proven to be untrue." and that you took my word that those assertions by me were

concrete. In the next paragraph you label a claim by me as false. Furthermore, this whole issue of the color changes revolves around my story, not Weisberg's, as you well know. I told you people point blank that he told me about them before Fred did, so you are questioning my word, no matter what other inferences you make about Harold. Harold, until just recently, did not even know that this argument was taking place, and it took several letters before I got him to understand what the dispute was. He still may not fully understand what he supposedly "stole." So, no matter how you round it, or how much you want to try to emphasize your theory about Weisberg having stolen the stuff and then used me as his dupe, the claim is mine, not his that he told me about it prior to Fred (bear in mind that we are not, as I pointed out in an earlier letter, talking about exactly the same color changes, and certainly not the same evidence for their existence, which is what counts anyway). So, while your distinction of not having literally called me a liar, using its operative definition, you are incorrect in terms of what the argument was about, and in any event, came pretty damn close to doing it outright. I add my modification "...to wit, I accuse, lying..." primarily because you had carefully avoided the point in your letters that the basic claims in the question of the color changes were mine and had nothing to do with Weisberg. He didn't claim he told me before Fred told me anything about it—I did.

My explanation of your last paragraph of your June 1 letter, in which you state that the info "in fact" originated from Weisberg, were I to read it your way, would indicate that I am the fabricator or liar. In other words, there is no question about me sending you people the claims or info, and the only question is the source. Whatever the source, according to your analysis, it is an attempt to steal Fred's work. So, that boils down to me as Harold. Further here, you totally neglect to mention that you asked how I came to "repeat all story?" That we further suggest Weisberg, since if I say something on my own, that would not be repeating anything except perhaps my own thoughts or musings. But when making charges of this seriousness (purposeful deception and theft), it would be wise to be a bit more careful with your wording, if in fact you meant only what you claim to mean now. So, in brief, the color change story is mine, and it came from correspondence (I am almost certain) or in any event, definitely two phone calls, from Harold to me, mentioning these things. If I mentioned it to Fred in a letter, and I am certain that I did, it would have been those phoned, and had to do with the identification of the source of the Russell Junction (or any of Lawrence's copies) of the Z film which I was total in the dark about, as my correspondence with both of you show. In fact, if you will examine that correspondence, you will see that I hypothesized a CIA source for it.

As for your other comments on Harold, to the best of my knowledge, now after having checked correspondence from the people you cited which says just the opposite, and as is indicated and partially documented in my letter to Fred and Marilyn (trust me, of course, that you do not think me a liar, and trust me to quote from letters I have in my possession), they are unfounded.

As I indicated in my last letter to you, I do not want to even see your manuscript, although I hope that it gets out in book form soon, since I do not want to be open to charges of having stolen things. Bear in mind that such could have happened with the Powell thing had I read your manuscript the same as I did just through correspondence and you having falsely remembered tell me that or advised, for some reason, that you had. I originally had not really "requested" a chance to read your manuscript, but rather offered to do it to help you get it ready for publication and perhaps to find things I could add. Harold and others have long come to accept my offer what they see: I am most interested in lending any help I can, especially for things going into print, since that is the critical major contact with the public, and books should be as well stated as possible, and also have all relevant info on each subject. Ironically, you have for long phone conversations and in letters attempted to pass me for info, sometimes for what Harold has and will publish, and have indicated that you have spoken to someone else who has read one more of his manuscripts in order to find out about what is in them.

Well, that's all for now. Please go and read my letter to Fred and Marilyn of June 17. Best wishes in getting your book out soon. I hope that it lives up to your promises.

Gary