7/31/69

Dear Gary,

Often I've though about writing in luxury, outside. I feel the heat today, so I'm trying it for the first time. In the shade, on the pool side, with a pleasant breeze, but where the tempaerature is till 90, it is best. But papers blow, so I'll recall first what I can of your letter of 7/29 and enclosures. I8ll be brief because I want to relax from a day that has not been relaxing with a little swimming before supper and then to the post office and, I hope, a little writing before bedtime. Because the equanil seems to enable me to sleep longer I am not getting my once-customary early start. I slept 8 hours lasy night but it doesn't feel any different. I know it is better, though. Do not worry about getting me a supply and do not buy it. I raised the question because I didn't know how well the detail men took care of your establishment.

Your letter to Mondale is very good. It will, however, surprise me if I hear from him. I've been down that road with others, including Kupferman and Senators better known than Mondale. This is not criticism. You are doing the right thing. Your letter to Paul also is good, and I'm glad to know some of the things Dave has been up to. However, I would break it off there with Paul. The risk is to alienate him. You have told him enough.

I am sending you only copies of my correspondence with the baddie. Bud knows about it and has seen some of the letters. Please say nothing, to anyone, under any circumstances. You should not have to be reminded how thin this ice is. I welcome suggestions, however.

The Archives stuff requires no explanation, I hope. I think this long, painful and costly labor is getting to where it may yield something and I hope no one louses it up.

Your hope for Penn was wishful thinking. The enclosures should say enough. He is sick. Mary's reflection to me of her attitude to Boxley is not consistent with your presumption. She goes so far as to say he was never with the agency, that he made that up to hide his period of alcoholism.

On Patsy, agreed. It is also worth the risk when there is doubt because our alternatives are so limited. Also, there is sometimes a plus in letting them know. Never overlook the possibility. Several times I have used my phone effectively.

Garrison: try it by mail. Ask him for what you want. If he wants to help you, there is no problem. He has women in the office who can do the copying. You do not reflect the necessary basic understanding of the man, his flexible ehtics and morals, if any, and his illness. The presence of others is not material, nor is their absence. Let him feel lonely for a while, but he has enough sycophants locally available. Do you need anything else to estimate his integrity when he hasn't paid my expenses but has funds for others to visit him? He did, indeed, make a promise to stay out beginning immediately, which was <u>before</u> the Shaw trial. Vince, Bud and I talked this over on the way down, Vince proposed it, saying he should evote himself entirely to getting re-elected and he agreed. This was also intended to cushion the great blow to his ego. You cannot imaging how great that really was last December, when he suddenly realized how utterly terrible his own judgement had been and how everyone he had trusted had sold him out. I saved him from the most public disbarment in history, as Moo even confessed. Vince's account is partly wrong and partly based on his absence when I left. It is not in any sense true that he didn't know why I wasn't there. I phoned him and Maggie before leaving and told each that I had to and why. His conscience, I fear, impels him to misrepresent this, and in what you have told me he has. Remember his saying I asked him to beg of Maggie for me? I merely told him that my feeling was I could do more good elsewhere but that I didn't have the funds to maintain myself there. If the critics wanted me there, then they'd have to make it possible. I made it clear I would stay there out of a sense of responsibility only, that I was convinced I could put the time to better use. But I also wanted no later accusations against me for not being there. My funds were so short that when I was last there I didn't have a meal to which I wasn't treated. My breakfasts were a ten-cent pie and the office ugh passing for coffee, etc. I went there after cancelling my reservations when four of the lawyers asked me on a conference-phone set up from the NOAV, and two of them met me at the airport, not an investigator. They found truth unpleasant, but was I to sugarcoat before the trial, when they were preparing for it? My predictions were precise, and I was specific in pointing out how and why they would lose

the case. Point by point I was right. They knew it then. They were locked in. This is why I specified I insisted I be listened to (not followed), for without that it was a futility. However, they really believed I would be back after the Halleck hearing, and they so told me, especially Moo and Alcock. I assured them I had no such intention except under the specified circumstances. Can you imagine what Jim then felt and said? But, before leaving I did prepare them for cross-examination of the predictable defense witnesses, including with copies of Post Mortem, which they used, references to specific parts of my published writing, whic h they used, and by phone to Moo during the trial. This was not something that imvolved personal feeling either way. It was doctrinal. I would not return without prepayment of my expenses and assurances they would listen to me. They actually had me seated at the prosecution table and to the end never removed me from that list. I was actually said to have been there during the trial because of this. What Vince does not know, and don't tell him, is the personal attitude toward him. Save for Jim there is no single exception. They dislike him and what he says. It is both personal and political. When he finally left in December they forced him out of town. I was there. He was refusing to leave. They did it diplomatically, but they would have put him in the plane by force if necessary. Matt and I took him to the plane.

The only good reason you have given me for going there is pleasure. That is a good reason. However, I fear the consequences of any encouragement, no matter how indirect and unintended. You just cannot imagine how Jim's mind works. But, if you think he wants to cooperate, ask him for what you want. The Bolden file is nothing. I have what is of any possible consequence from it and other sources. If there were anything in it I'd stopxand send you copies. You can go over it when you are here. I haven't even classified it. I copied only a few pages from the proceedings. It is something he can safely copy and safely mail. Askforit but do not say what you know or suspect. It is, as I recall, merely the public record. Mark never even wrote a memo. He was sent for propaganda for him, nothing else. And nobody in the office knew or had a record of the names he is supposed to have provided. Bud went over the files and picked out what he wanted. So did Jones Harris and Turner, to my observation. Bud alsoxhas his own file on Bolden. He is not in the office much. He is writing a book (not on this)xand must finish it. He got a nice advance. You cannot, accurately, speak of Garrison's "investigation for in meaningful terms there was no such thing. This is the only reason I had to go there, and it is when I realized this that I started going there whenever I could. I have no reason to believe there is dependable material on those things cited by Schmitt and I shudder to think of the possibility of some of what I have seen being believed. And used.

And, frankly, I shudder to think of Fred dealing with Bradley. It is like the canary cohabitating with the cat. Burton was a minor. I believe no action against him was possible anyway. Garrison is immune and through him Jaffe. Of course Bradley has much information on those who framed him (and with it Jim and us). They were suing each other at the time. Art Kevin has a competent and complete rundown on all of them. I gave this to Louis immediately. I have a dub of the tape. When you are here, if you'd like, you can copy it. Do you think those radical-right nuts will drop a case they think they have against any "liberals" on Fred's persuasion/ You know their kind better. In any such suit you always throw in more than you think you have for the effect. I would like to be able to examine the papers. I have not seen them. I think I can get the SD committee off the hook, but do not say anything about this. I now do not want even them to know. The unfortunate thing is that I kept warning them, taking much time to do it, and even went out there to try and inform them on this and other things. Go back over my letters before the 10/68 trip and you'll see I told you my real purposes. Meanwhile, the committee has not met its financial commitment, has not paid for the books they got and at least some of which they sold, has not returned a copy of PM III and does not answer letters. Be careful how you trybto convince Fred of their innocence until you know the facts. They may not be, which is not the same as saying they shou,d not be defended successfully or should nlt be. I will do what I can, and without their knowledge, working around them, am trying. But their personal behavior has been deplorable. The file is openxto you whenever you are here. Remember, George is also the son of a friend I prize highly. If I failed to comment on anything or on the enclosures, ask me. Supper time. Best,

H

UNIVERSITY OF *Minnesota*

MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

July 29, 1969

Dear Harold,

Got your letter of 7/24 and its enclosures. Thanks. Let me first discuss the enclosures.

Your letter to Paul of 7/18. Enclosed is a letter I wrote him hoping to back up your claims with some raw data. Thanks for accepting my assurance that I did not tell Dave about the affadavit at face value. In the enclosed letter to Paul you will find the full quote from Dave's letter, which I don't think I sent you (because it had no relevence) which asks me if I knew of the affadavit, thereby indicating that it was not me who leaked it. Months ago I decided never to mention anything dealing with PM or the King case to anyone, not even Dick or Paul, unless they brought it up, so as to preclude thepossibility of any type of slip. That was why I was so certain that I had never written Dave about it (I have carbons of the letters anyway), and sinee he had not phoned in months, I knew that I could not have told him of it on the phone. I think that you will find that my letter contains sufficient documentation to back your claims. Although I have not seen Paul's letter to you (unless it was that short one which made reference to certain paragraphs or items in your letter, and therefore was not easily followed), or at least it isn't fresh in my mind, the nature of your reply bothered me a bit in that it suggested the same type of problem I ran into with Fred. Dave shows those guys one side and is in personal touch with them, which leaves us at more of a disadvantage than one might think. It is like the Boxley thing with Penn. It was simply impossible to convince him of anything, and the only way would have been to see him and show him evidence. Boxley could do this but we couldn't. Over the years you have become used to telling things to Paul and having him accept them, but when something like this arises in his case, his fine quality of objectivity enters in and there is a need for documentation, which at this distance is very difficult. On the SS# cards, I have also checked, with the same results as you.
Your letter to Penn was a good one, and it might do some good.

Mary is quite a good friend of Boxley and his family, and I hope that it doesn't lead to trouble I will not mention Boxley in letters to her, but will probably end up having to discuss it with her if it comes up. I found out about this from Fred.

On your letter to Dick, Gary Murr's clippings were sent me by Bud. (Remember his earlier confusion of me with Murr.) I sent them back to him, and later wrote him to send them to Garry, which I think he did.
By the way, in case I haven't replied to your 7/17, agreed on the approach with someone like Patsy, but bear in mind one thing: it is sometimes important to know how trustworthy someone is when something important comes up. For instance, some photo work might help Dick with stuff on the shells, but some of it would give away our interest in something and could lead to the other side getting prepared. In the case of its use in a lawsuit, such as Nichol's, it could hurt.
I will pass the Olson letter on.
Enclosed is the final draft of the Mondale letter.
I will see what I can do about trying to get you some free medicine, but this could be tough.

On Garrison, I have no reason to really believe that he would attempt any kind of courtroom case dealing with the assassination, nor that the staff would not threaten to quit if he did. From his interview with that Foreign reporter he would seem to have nothing in mind. Nor do I think that he will speak much of the case during the campaign, for I think that he knows if he does that he will lose. If he does so and loses, then he will be out anyway. His offering to pay my expenses did not really surprise me since he knows me more as a friend of Vince's than anything else, and also as one of the authors of Watchmen which he really liked (which is more than I can say for my own attitude on it). So I really have no worries about his becoming involved in the case in a legal sense, and in any event, the only way to find

out what he has up his sleeve is to see him. I feel that I could, given the absence of Lane Boxley, and Turner, plus his disenchantment with Bud, sway his opinions if they are leading in the direction of something which could be harmful. Another thing you should know, and that is that it might be unwise to be so certain that inaction by the staff necessarily means that the reason is that the DA has so ordered it. Vince's accounts of staff attitudes towards you are not the same as yours. This is not to say that he is correctly recounting them, or that they gave him their real attitudes anymore than they gave you their real feelings, but only that for whatever reason, they might not feel as friendly towards you as you think. According to Vince, for instance, in a phone call from N.O. during which I urged him to get them to bring you down for the trial since they were in trouble (and Vince honestly asked me why you weren't there, not having any certain knowledge that it was not by your choice), after having checked with the staff, said that they were against it, and implied this was true of a number of them. I think that, even with my limited knowledge of the staff, I could provide a rational psychological explanation for them having such an attitude, and it would not have surprised me, although I would have considered it irrational and regretable (the first rational in this sentence means one rational to you##, not indicating necessarily rationality on their part).

I am unclear about the meaning of your sentence: "If you associate yourself in any way, you sanctify his violation of his word." Did Jim make a promise to stay out of the case after the Shaw trial? If so to who, and under what circumstances? My principle desire to go there other than a ### curiosity about Jim from both a personal and psychological point of view, and an interest in the historical aspect of his investigation in terms of the forces which motivated him and what made him tick, is to obtain information on a number of subjects, including Crafard. He has access to things we don't, such as criminal records, etc., which he can easily get, and we can't under any circumstances. As for his files, I did not know that they were available. Where and from whom? I know that Bud claims to have about 1/3 of them, but he is certainly going to be able to get no more. In addition, Bud has yet to come through for me on my requests from info from Garrison's files on certain people such as Bolden, even after a number of requests. Despite his cordial letters, I am still without those files, for whatever reason. In addition, I refer you to Jim Schmidt's letter to Paul Hoch of June 27, of which Paul sent me a copy (and I assume the same is true of you). He list many things which should be in Garrison's files and which would be of interest, and says "that the importance of this material would be hard to exaggerate!" He also notes that "NO doubt a certain process of attrition is by now well underway. Much of this will not be again available. Anything gotten by the wrong people and filtered back to us cannot be trusted as pristine." etc. The point here is that I agree with Jim, despite the flack that you and I know abounds in## the files, and despite the fact that a good deal of what we would find would serve only to rule out red herrings which is not exactly a small job. Judging from Jim's apparent opinion of me, I might be able to get this stuff. So, while I understand, I think, the points you are making about a visit to Jim, I do not agree that it might not be worthwhile, since the time involved and the expense would be compensated for in my mind just by getting a short time to visit N.O., a city which I really love and which I am always looking for an excuse to visit.

In strictest confidence, not to be mentioned to Paul or anyone, I tell you that Fred has been in touch with Bradley, and that he claims to have convinced Bradley not to include Burton, Jaffe, or Garrison in the suit. I am writing Fred to try to get to ### get Bradley to drop the San Diego committee from the suit. He claims that Bradley seems to have much info on those who tried to frame him--other right wingers--one of whom is Swift. If anyone finds out that I told you this, Lifton will go beserk and so will Fred (I assume that Lifton is in on this). I only break confidence here because of how dangerous the situation is for friends, and because of the possibility that something might be done. Do you have any suggestions. Right now, in my next letter, I am planning to try to convince Fred that the SD committee is innocent.

Well, I'd better close now and get some studying done. Best wishes.

Gary

Dear Paul: July 29, 1969

I am writing this to answer a question or two from you last letter concerning the Lifton affair and also to clarify some points mentioned in Harold's last letter to you.

As I tried to indicate in earlier letters, the only reason I got involved in that fracas with Dave was because of what I thought was intolerable provocation on his part, which to make matters worse, was done totally in front of Fred Newcomb and his wife. Some of it was even quoted to me by Fred in letters. By far the mostincredible statements by Dave were made over the phone so there is little I can do but tell you what they were. He repeatedly called Harold a liar, and a thief. He said that someone (may have been plural but I am not sure) who had read Harold's recent manuscripts said that there was nothing of value in them--just Weisbergisms. He characterized himself as a very creative person, who had either solved the case or just about solved it (i.e. claiming that if his book got a major publisher, the case would have to be re-opened, and that knowledge of just a small part of what Dave has has caused Liebeler to say that he might change sides), and Weisberg as someone who had never done anything big or important in terms of the solving of the case. He said that his only interest in Weisberg's stuff was in case Harold had a few tidbits which would enhance his case, but by the end of one conversation implied that even that was unlikely. Fred not infrequently echoed these comments on the phone, or even in letters. Then he went so far as to accuse me of having broken a confidence with him on the Powell thing, which was ludicrous, and which, after raising a fuss, he took back. Then he indicated that Harold was stealing one of Fred's discoveries (the "color changes") and even implied that I was a willing or unknowing accomplice, and then questioned my honesty at least indirectly. Had Dave written me only, and had he not only told all this stuff to Fred, but shown him or given him copies of his inflamatory charges, and had he not brought Bill O'Connell, Lillian, and statements attributed to Ray, Maggie, and some unknown person who was in Weisberg's confidence and who had read all his recent manuscripts, into the thing, I might have saved my time. But things got out of hand. My relationship with Fred was so strained by this that it is only now coming back to normal, and the same goes for Marlynn. As for you and Hal, he never specifically cited any comments as having come from you, but he brought your names up several times before beginning to cite that unknown person familiar with Harold's work, etc. He has used your name with both myself and George Rennar to try to gain himself legitimacy. (Ironically, when I wrote him,until his charges began, I never questioned him about his stand on anything save perhaps Thornley, but indicated rather that dispite our different points of view I would like to try to cooperate on things such as archives research.) In fact, when George Rennar indicated that he didn't think much of Lifton's photo blowups and his grassy knoll of paper mache, Dave replied by indicating that the SF people take him very seriously, and mentioned your name.

As I indicated before, Dave has specifically forbidden me to send copies of his letters to me to anyone, and I have honored that, even when it enraged me that he would make such charges against Harold and yet forbid me to send copies. But since there is still a lack of communication on the amount of Dave's charges, let me quote from a few of his letters. Some of the quotes are not charges, but rather indicative of his infuriating style and his incredible feelings of omnipotence:
Dave's letter of Sat. May 24: "Of course, I know the topology of your defense mechanisms..." [something even I as a psychologist would never have said to him] "Weisberg lied." and "WEISBERG IS A LIAR." He had a tape of a telephone conversation in which Harold "really blew up at learning that I could bear witness to his duplicity and deceit." and "You know, there are people who are liars; Who lie as easily as I might put on a raincoat as protection against inclement weather;---well, they lie whenever they need to, at the drop of a hat. Facts are just there to be played around with, and they see no virtue in resisting the temptation to fabricate whenever it suits their interests." [All referring to Harold]

then "WEIBERG BREAKS CONFIDENCES" and "Weisberg has stolen---yes, stolen---material of other researchers. Fred knows the details on Lilleans (sic) stuff. He had done the same thing with Ray Marcus." and "Conclusion: WEISBERG STEALS. Worse: WEISBERG STEALS DELIBERATELY!!" [All dealing with things about which I had no direct knowledge, by the way.] "He is a cruel exploitive person." "You are completely free to hold that man in deep affection. That is your busines Somebody has defined love as "exception-making". But however you feel towards him personally, you should not fail to draw judgements about the darker side---if not the predominant side--of his character, no matter what particular aspect of it he shows to you..." "But I know, on the basis of personal experience that---summing up---the man lies, breaks confidences at the drop of a hat, and has a theiving disposition. (He also happens to be extremely offensive and lacks any tact or couth. Now you don't like that, I suppose. But those are the facts as I know them, and certainly, as Fred knows them. (And, I suppose, as Ray Marcus knows them). I happen to think its wonderful that you and he can get along so well; but, in communication with me or Fred, if # you fail to acknowledge these aspects of his character, or insist on ignoring them---then you have to realize that that tells me something about your judgment---and about your objectivity." and: "I know people who know Weisberg quite well, who honor his confidences to them, and yet do not kid themselves about these different aspects of his character. (One such person has told me that---if I really have new material in my manuscript---there is no question that should Weisberg learn of it [interestingly enough, he originally had"discover"rather than"learn of it"; and crossed it out] he would probably publish it.) Now none of this says that Weisberg is not a good researcher [I had earlier cut Dave down for adopting this attitude on the phone, and getting Fred to also]. He just happens to also be a thief.

and: "Now my personal psychology happens to preclude the possibility of developing authentic and close friendships with people who lie, steal, and break confidences. I am acquainted with a wide variety of people; there are close relationships, and not so close reààtionships. When I see things like that in a person's behavior, it affects my attitude towards them. I just not going to fake it. If a person is mean to his servants, I don't like it, even if he's not mean to me." [Although the following was later recinded, when I pointed out that Harold could scarcely reply to his chargges unless he knew what they were, here it is.] "In closing, I want to emphasize again how important it is---from my point of view---that no information whatsoever (even a sentence such as this)--get to Weisberg or anyone else." [Bear in mind that he at no time gave me anything from his work, or even his theories, so that he was baring me from telling various people of references to them, or charges made against them.] After a short discourse about how someone might inadvertently drop info, and a warning that "Weisberg is an expert at pumping people; the mere thought thaat he should even know about my feelings towards him, and why I hold them, or anything having to do with my work...," he writes: "A trivial example. On the phone, I told you that an army intelligence officer was in the TSBD. I didn't go into it any further, but hinted that it might have some significance. I'm also sure I asked you to keep that under your hat. But did you??" [As I pointed out to Dave, this was a total fabrication, even though he went so far as to be"sure"about the above phrase which he underlined.] "Recently either by phone or in a letter, you informed Fred of that fact. Now I happen to like Fred, and I really do trust him, very much so. So I want to assure you that nobody got hurt." "But recently, Fred told me that he had learned from you that an army intelligence officer was in the tsbd, and he wanted to know if I had know about that. I asked him where he had learned such a thing, and he told me it was from you. I then closed the loop and told Fred what must have happened." And; "But I'm curious---does Weisberg nowknow about the Army Intelligence officer in the TSBD?? Is that now out on the grapevine? If it is, I'm sure you meant no harm.?.etc.

In Dave's PPS he wrote: "Having seen through Weisberg by now (again, I'm referring to his personality, many of his claims, boasts, and statments (sic0) Fred knows when, in response to something he worked on for a long time----be it a letter or a research discovery---he is getting back Weisbergia, only from your mouth. Do you remember when you wrote me? "Clay shaw [sic] is a big boy now ..etc...." That, of course, is straight from the mouth and mind of Vince Salandria." [Something which I have never heard Vince say in all the time I have known him.] "For example, in the case of the Z film, Fred and I both wondered aloud, when you gratuitously offered the info that Weisberg had already seen those color changes, whether or not Weisberg had pumped you, learned of Fred's work and theories, and then claimed prior discovery...thus relieving your conscience over--perhaps--having told him stuff Fred didn't want you to; and, finally, that you should then be the repeater station that he utilizes for putting out on the grapevine his version of how he had already discovered that, oh months ago!" [This was all total bullshit, in absolutely every respect, as I pointed out. Both backed down from it.]

And so, Dave ended his letter of May 24: "Is that sort of thing going on? Fred and I had identical suspicions when he told me of your statement of how Weisberg had noted those color changes some time ago. Only you know if this happened. If it did not, I think you owe Fred an explanation of how that sort of little "Weisberg discovered that a long time ago" scenario happened to end up in your letter." Etc. Paul, this is all as it was in his letter, with all underlinings being his, and the only changes being some correction of spelling errors. Oh, I forgot the PPPS of that letter: More of the same except with the additional info that "Maggie Fields (sic)..dislikes [Harold] for any number of reasons."

In Dave's letter of Friday May 31, he acknowledges that he was wrong on the charges with regard to both the Powell thing and the color changes, and then tries to elicit my help for more info on Powell, etc. It was probably a bit of a put-down to have me casually refer to Powell by name after he had carefully avoided mention of his name in his letter. In reply to my request that he answer my various arguments posed in earlier letters, he indicates that I have no arguments (I am manipulating the"rules of inference"), and indicates that he supposed that I have thought nothing out, have no position, and don't know what I stand for. He refers to my arguments as "immature and technical" (whatever that means) and goes on to use Lillian's and Bill O'Connell's alleged words to label Weisberg a thief and liar countless times, claiming that he had rechecked the stories with those people just that morning. [Later both he and Fred backed down from as much of this stuff as they made mention of again, after I provided a long series of citations in that letter, which you have.] Intermingled with this character assassination, citing other critics, are things like: "(HA!HA!)" and "My god, how immature can Weisberg get??" Then Dave again says that my stand on issues provides "an excellent test of just how good a judge of people" I am. The third item of my "bad judgment" is with regard to Harold: "c) having a viscious liar for a friend." Then he ends his letter of May 31 with: "At both stages, I think that you have exhibited the results of seriously flawed reasoning. I can't possibily attempt, at this stage, to get at the roots of such a situation in an exchange of letters. You are, as they say, in a "bag," similar to one which I have helped others get out of on this issue; you are really in it--stuffed way inside there!" "Yes, I agree that you have influenced Weisberg and Salandria, Regarding Weisberg, the phraseology of your last letter is so similar, at points, to his, that I am now confused. I am not sure whether to accuse you anymore of repeating Weisbergia, or he, Schoenerisms." Well Paul, I don't know what Dave's investigative abilities amount to, although I have become aware of many limitations in his knowledge and the depth of his work on the case that surprised me given his many rash statements about his massive findings. Unlike Dave, I do not claim to know the topology of his defense mechanisms as he claims to know mine. But the above stuff is craziness, and it doesn't take one trained to look for it to spot it. Between the persecutory paranoid ideation, and the incredible grandiosity, which are both paranoid characteristics, and as you probably know, typically are found together in such people, Dave can really get out of hand. As long as some sharp people check his manuscript (Sylvia is I think) this will hopefully not creep into his book.

In Dave's letter of June 2 he took back the apology for the color change charge. The reason: "I must retract this second apology, since it was based on statements you made which have proven to be untrue. I took your word that these assertions by you were accurate." He then says that my claim "is false". He then calls Harold a moucher, and calls himself a creative person, and then: "I think your curiosity should extend to getting to the bottom of how it came to pass that you ended up repeating a story which completely undercuts Fred as the discoverer of this phenomenon, and whether or not you are the unwitting tho well-intentioned repeater of such information, which in fact originated from communication you had with Weisberg after you learned of Fred's work in this area." [All of this was complete fabrication. Harold until much later did not even understand what he was supposedly to be conspiring to steal, and although Dave is carefully trying to take the focus away from me, what it boiled down to was my integrity since Harold had told me of it on the phone for certain, something I had claimed in letters to Dave and Fred, many months before "Fred's discovery." They emphasized my claim that I thought that I had written it in letters to Fred. The real irony was that Harold's having spotted color changes with the naked eye, as I pointed out to them countless times, was a much different thing from Fred's detailed analysis of the film and finding of splices in it.

In Dave's letter of Sat. June 7 he indicates that his last letter had some bad wording and punctuation which led me to believe that he was accusing me of lying, etc., which he wasn't, but I wasn't very placated, because given the claims I was making, whether or not Dave put it in writing, to say that the story of the color changes was false necessitated saying that I was lying.

Then Dave wrote: "(And by the way, in connection with Nichol's suit, Harold is apparently filing an affadavit, under some May 1969 date, stating that he has been permitted to handle and examine the Archives Z film and has checked it for splices, and that there were none. All Nichols apparently wanted was statements which showed that researchers have been permitted to handle evidence. I think this affadavit could really muddy certain waters, especially as there is no distinction drawn between "pictures of a splice" and "splice." Do you know about this affadavit and do you think it is a wise thing??? Couldn't Harold have chosen something else he has examined in order to make this point??)" [The point that Dave is emphasizing, is that Fred is building a case for there being splices in the Z film, and Harold's affadavit would therefore cause confusion. I was shocked that Dave knew of this at all.] The PS of this letter is: "I have no object to your checking out---with Harold or anyone else---any of the allegations I made in my previous letters. I am sensitive about having xerox'd copies of my letters I send to you sent elsewhere; that is my only request." [I tell you this because I want you to know that Dave has taken away the earlier restriction of keeping this top secret.]

As far as I am concerned this affair is over. Whatever was motivating Dave's behavior, he has stopped the charges and claims. I made numerous efforts during the dialogue to try to make a point with both he and Fred that this was costing valuble time and money for all of us, and that at the very least Dave was greatly exaggerating and distorting things, so that instead of saying that Harold's account of something was biased (just as Dave's is, and mine is, etc.) he went wild and accused Harold of being a liar, thief, etc. I also pointed out that independant discovery in this case by two or more people is very common, and with the limits of inter-critic communication, the discovery of something by one critic in 1965 and discovery by another in even as late a date as today's could be entirely independant. I also pointed to the fact that I had previously been under the impression that Harold, through memory tricks which are common to all of us in different degrees, often was certain that he had spotted something when someone else brought it up, although he really had not. This, of course, would scarcely be theft, and ironically, in my correspondence with Dave he himself did it, as with the [redacted] Powell affair where he actually [redacted] claimed to remember the circumstances which were non-existent. I pointed out that such an thing would not lead me to call him a liar or a thief. And that dealt with memory from only a few months before, rather than years before. But having visited with Harold, and dealt with him now for over a year, I have come to realize the incredible extent of his work and files, much of which he forgets or has no time to develop due to its physical mass. Even myself, who has done far less work than he has, and less work than you have, have forgotten much of what I have found out about many things. Such is true of any generalist in this area, even if he has a good memory, something [redacted] which is true of me (i.e. I still know the first act of Macbeth which I learned on a whim in my junior year of highschool). I am sick and tired of extreme charges and attempts to discredit people, when there are much easier explanations for events, or where no attempt is made to examine both sides to an issue. I also dislike omnipotence---I have my fill of it in my patients---and ravings, and the other things which Dave can express for hours on the phone or in long letters. It is enough of a strain to have to deal with it in the clinic for a number of hours per day. The critic community, which has more than its share of this, suffers more from enemies within than from those on the outside in my opinion. At least my correspondence with Dave appears to have had some affect on the damage he did to Fred's views, although the irony is that Fred's anger might never have been aroused had Dave not engaged in subversion of sorts. I suppose that Dave would like nothing better than to have Fred getting him things from other critics, providing him with all that photo work, and keeping it from others so that Dave's book can contain all kinds of exciting new stuff. That wouldn't even bother me except that Dave's book has been promised to be forthcoming time and time again, and the latest word is late 1969 or early 1970. The [redacted] delay is even worse if Dave really has many items of importance.

Well, here I am again wasting time . Please be discrete if you discuss this with Dave, because it will just start him raving again since apparently the greatest thing he fears is of you learning of what he has been up to. I write to clear up the questions you asked, and the citations Harold made to me in his letter to you.

Best wishes.
cc:Harold

Gary