

Dear Michael Morrissey,

Over the years I've gotten thousands of letters from concerned people all over the world who were and are distressed by the JFK assassination. By now there must have been 20,000. And I've answered them all, as honestly as I can and in the detail my circumstances permitted. As I believe I've told you, I consider that my successful uses of the Freedom of Information Act make me surrogate for the people and I therefore give anyone access to the records I've obtained and responded to their questions about them. I am pretty sure that I also told you that I am nearing my 78th birthday and am severely limited in what I am able to do by serious circulatory disorders and for a little more than a year even more limited by open-heart surgery, which imposed even more limitations on me and what I can do. I've written you at some length in an effort to respond to the many questions you asked, questions that to a large degree you would not have asked if you had read the six books I've written on the JFK assassination. I did not tell you, as I should have, that in the course of acquiring your education you should have learned that those who write non-fiction do so to inform people and to tell you, as I should have, to first read my books, which happen to cost less than those you've read, and then ask me what questions you have. Nor did I refuse to respond, telling you, as you also should have learned in the course of acquiring your education you should have realized (I was about to say that common sense should also have told you what follows but in retrospect I realize that in your letters you do not display the common sense that less exalted mortals ranging from children just through puberty to truck-drivers reflect) that each thing I do at my age means that there is something else I will not be able to do. You are an American living in a foreign land and you teach so I did take the time - waste it as I now know - in a futile effort to inform you. I did realize from your questions that you are dominated by those books on the JFK assassination that theorize solutions to that terrible crime and in response to your questions I told you what I think about them. I should have realized from your letters and their many questions that you have an exalted opinion of yourself, your knowledge, your understanding, and that if some <sup>thing</sup> does not fit within the preconceptions you have it just is not true. Your judgement if not your knowledge tells you so.

I now write you for a reason that will be apparent although I have additional and visible problems in writing, the end of my fingers are split and I can use only those that ordinarily I do not use ~~now~~ in my hunt-and-peck typing. My purpose is to tell you that if you write to me again I will not respond and to tell you that you are a common shit for doing what you have ~~done~~ done, from your omniscience become a provocateur. I take this as a fair measure of both your intelligence and your character, to say nothing of your self-esteem. I do not believe that anyone of your age, to say nothing of education, ought not have realized that he was just making trouble.

Harry Livingstone has troubles and you troubled him more. You just made me angry.

Well, you've made trouble for me, too, because I now have to respond to a long letter from him to which he attached a page of a letter you wrote him. That page begins, and you can read your own copy, "I have also exchanged a couple of letters with Harold Weisberg (under-scored, as is much of what follows). He says everybody is full of crap. Fiction and lies. In his last letter he said," and you quote what I said about the question I've asked Harry without response. It is still without response, unless you consider it is responsive to say that people ~~fake~~ counterfeit money and commit other crimes.

If you do not want to take my word for it that Harry has troubles, as I suppose you take my word for nothing, knowing all there is to know about the subject if not everything, I asked you to ~~consider~~ consider what he <sup>says</sup> reflects in twice in his letter telling me that what you quoted me as saying is libellous - and then adding that he has sued others for libel.

Skipping what you wrote Harry that you'd not have had any question about if you'd had any interest in the works (not mine only as you also said) that deal with the fact of the assassination rather than theorizing about it, you make it clear that in addition to being a cheapekate you are a deliberate liar. You say, "I haven't been able to get hold of any of his (my) books yet..." You knew this was a lie because you knew not only that you could get them from me and didn't but that when you did order one you reflected the mature judgement and wisdom of a true scholar <sup>= first and only</sup> by ordering the last of the series first. And then demanded that I mail you a second copy of it alleging you had not received the one I did send and you said you'd not received. (Every package we mail has a clear return address on it, I've had no complaint about any domestic non-delivery in so many years I can't remember the last one and of books shipped to other countries, in many years I can remember only one, sent to <sup>a</sup> Canada.)

I do agree with what you say in your next paragraph, that you feel like Chicken Little. <sup>You are</sup> You reflect that clearly. You also complain that Schein's books is listed as fiction because you say it isn't. Try and remember how much it says about the JFK assassination and ask yourself whether that qualifies as non-fiction. And about your own judgement and perception in not realizing that it says as close to nothing at all as any mention, no matter how slight, justifies. You mention another book I won't take time for but it would be wasted time anyway because you do not know enough to <sup>reading</sup> decide that it is also a work of fiction. If people say what you want to hear, they are wise and truthful. If they say what you do not want to hear, they are not and you must make trouble for them.

I think you'll be wasting your time and money if you order any of my books so I suggest you do not. I'd prefer that you don't. I don't want to trouble you, as an authentic scholar would be troubled, because that would only agitate the mark in your mind, to say nothing of informing you of original and uncredited sources.

I'm sorry there is so little in your life - or in your character - that you have to make a common nuisance of yourself. You'll be happier (and I suppose find what you've said of me justified in what I now say) reading Garrison's book which, to my knowledge, personal knowledge, is fiction. Harold Weisberg

Harold