

JL:One of Lifton's ploys is to circumvent Frame-Up with the court records including the same material. It happens that the person he asked for them after reading the book did not have them but wondered why you or I had not been asked for copies. So, if you have not supplied them, please allege you have no extra copies and suggest that maybe I do. Also, please ask but to refer inquiries to you on the basis that you have kept the files, that they are not in his offices. Ditto for Bob. This way at least we will have adequate records. It was chiefly about my King work that Elman called, but also about RFK. They are interested in both as well as other things. It now is not possible to get permission from O&D because all the rights have reverted to me and I was foresighted enough to get it in writing from Dutton, whose subsidiary successor O&L is. If any of you hear from Dave, please do two things: do NOT underestimate him and if he makes any real efforts, also tell him that the literary rights are mine and to get in touch with me. HW 1/25/74

1/25/74: Ed Kabak, lawyer, told me last night there was no doubt Lifton was trying to steal some of my work through him. Because of their silence after the initial call and their then apparent interest, the first report had troubled me so I phoned Barbara Elman, the one who phoned me 12/19/73, at Wakefield/Orloff, 6528 Sunset Blvd., 213/461-3771 a little after 11 a.m. our time Wednesday. I was told she was out sick (although I had been told at her listed home phone that she had gone to work, after I gave my name). I asked to speak to Gary Horowitz, whose name she had used. He was not in. I left a message for both, either to call back. Elman's residence is listed on Gould, 650-8982. A man answered with what sounded like "Settlement." He spoke to another person each time the operator spoke to him and it is from this other person that we got the W/O name and address so we could get the phone, for I'd lost my note of it when Elman gave it to me. She told me when she phoned that they were co-producers of the movie Executive Action. HW \*\*

1/25/74

Dear Paul,

Lifton is up to his old trick, those you first preferred to pretend he did not practise then that they were inconsequential and not lacking in ethical or moral deficiencies.

I have had two dependable reports of this in the past month, one this week.

So, I write to ask two things of you: one that you be alert to this and not in any way help him with his project, including even what is public, for the fact that any of my work is public in any form does not diminish the rights I have to it (including court papers); and second, what you have never done and I believe should, inform me of any attempts of any kind dealing with any material.

His interest this time is commercial, despite whatever you may think or what he may say. I heard from his associates December 19. It was not until after this that he started what has come back to me.

Those who were in direct touch with me were to have been in touch again. Instead Dave, who has been their associate, started up. More precisely, I did not hear of it until after that call.

Wednesday I placed a person-to-person call to two of the people whose names I had been given, the one who spoke to me and the superior of that person. I got no call back then or yesterday. I'll wait until next week to write them, to give them plenty of chance to call me, then I'll write them. I do not presume that people in their business hold tightly to high principle but I will make a record, with every intention of doing whatever I can if some kind of thievery should result in some kind of use.

This is not much less unpleasant to think of than it is to know what I have been told or to realize that people who do hold some principle maintain a relationship with Dave despite his endlessly repeated proofs of his own dishonesty. It is immaterial if his emotional health is causative for the ends are the same.

The commercial success of Executive Action seems to be the immediate inspiration.

I have not seen the movie. I refused four invitations, two from those who were distributing it. The book was too much. My objections are limited to its pretenses, not anything that anybody believed he should write. Nothing about the book or the movie is at all honest. I find this unpleasant enough. I happen to feel that the end result is not helpful to us. Whatever my opinion is worth to you, I tell you that my mail has been unusually heavy beginning about October 1 and that almost 100% of it is not attributable to Executive Action. Nobody referred to the book. Perhaps two referred to the movie, in no case favorably and in all cases asking questions about it. So, I see no help in it to what some of us seek, any more than I do in the extensive attention Garrison got. Inevitably, as I hope by now you realize, all this kind of drek diminishes credibility and reduces the prospects of rational and reasonable work. This kind of awful stuff lends itself remarkably well to behind-the-scenes uses by those who have the power, the capability, the inspiration and motive.

Each of us has individual beliefs and his own standards of ethics and morality. You need not share my view that he who would teach the pope religion should himself go to church. You may also prefer to shun whatever you might find unpleasant. And it is inevitable that although you have not reported it to me, you have to know of these efforts by Dave to steal, for you are almost alone in not having reported some to me. And your education has been in an era in which recognized scholarship is generally based on some kind of stealing of the work of others. I have for years trusted you with work nobody else has done and with the specific understanding that you were not to let anyone know about it. You knew I had Dave in particular in mind. So, I put this to you on a simple basis of keeping this trust and acting like a genuine friend, not an ostrich. If I don't expect you to report any such effort, I would appreciate it very much if you would. Best regards