

11/3/67

Dear Sylvia,

The viciousness and intent of the broadened campaign you have now launched against all of us who resent the lousy slanders you regret were not stronger ("Had I written it, it would probably have been less charitable and more rude") and the fact that I would like to prevent your making enemies of all the friends you have, as you seem intent upon doing under misconception you pursue pure principle, alone impel me to again write you on this subject, although I repeat I shall not again.

At this point I do not hide what I regard as a Commission-like kind of dishonesty creeping into your distribs. I ignore all the things a friend should in your letter of on 11/1 to me and ask you only how you can justify it and ignoring what also exists in the book (212), the confirmation of the Department of Justice that Shew and Bertrand are identical? Or my addition after the sneaky attempt to withdraw this confirmation. Both are they. You quote like Liebelar.

You are too involved to realize how close to word for word with you and no one else is what Arnoni wrote, and you apparently are unaware of the fact that all of us, except you, are to him unspeakably poor specimens. How else would you expect Fenn to react: What Arnoni said of him, Maggie, me, and whoever else he had in mind is just plain rotten and it is also false. He just lied. Let you'd make it what you call "less charitable". I hope you come to realize how much you thereby abuse really fine people, like Maggie and Fenn. It is not like you. I once would have hoped it also is not like Arnoni.

How dare you address Fenn as you do in your fourth paragraph when you have personally maintained a public silence over some of the things those on your side have done. I do not chide you for this silence; I merely point out as I did in person that on this thing you have multiple stand ards.

What I told you about the case belonging in court stands, whether or not you try and twist it as you do in your letter.

And how dare you say, "Your assertion has no foundation in fact or law" when the Attorney General made the statement and the Department of Justice reaffirmed it to two major newspapers, separately.

Again and for the last time, I beseech you to inquire deeply into what is really motivating you in this strange thing you are doing in the misconception that by the endless repetition of the same charges you serve a principle. I fear your involvement, for whatever reason, has grown to the point where it dominates you and separates you from reason.

Belabor me further if you must, I will not again respond on this subject.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg