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Degr V4ctr,
Glod you ade e ristifiso and efrst acnt yout lotiar of the gies to nur old adcress. I hope it put me in e position to stroighten out the Po . where I us ed to live. They ero supmesed ir deliver ell mall acriresesd to mo at Eyattstom to my
 me, fri hanes on to gll the junl until she is were or we sm there. She fomardad e Ietter e reok age. It hascit trevelles tim 20 miles since. I kowit itas returned.
 incrodible, tcey do more mork to blolete the regulations-an. they don't throw a single serer of tha furk mall emey. I get oll of thet!

Tiants for the chook. of, de se read 1 t:
Unt 11 recentiy I mes not amre of Genoge's many roblemg. nife fomily is



 There is mo dobt zout tala, for it is imposaible Por a to travol under orher

 We had no income. And $I$ do owe 640,000 , with my pronerty as security. Just reising the interest nad n nomenel peyment on vimciple is a ereut burden. Tha doal meg that

 the cost of cettine to the givpent ghe tae jertixe cs the cer thers. No sceonosetions
 whulit be snall honocerium gt one cellege and a collection the the othar. Not until I wos tisere aid he logn he coulc no mete the collection. I am certein if ho says he
 My travel egent is an old irtend, so he ajvanceu ma the ticiet. $i$ had to arrange to pay for it after I cot home. The total fare was about 3350 , as I recail, plu close



 keop agnarate rocords. I've ton much to do mithout tont.

Put if y a do not aer hom Georgo could possibly hovn tnough you enuld afford th pay in travel oncte, can yon see how moh sess if could have constidered this without it? The rothers, al of whom deat with tha past and thet frresenetbly, all got very hizh foes. Ione's ren about 31,500. I did thia usurily for mothing, ond in Colffornia, on every toin frionds orranged, I got stick for my actuel corts.

I than you miseost oraie, poseloly Pean. I toink meither is motirated

 Agsin, thile there mey bs doutts about motive, there ia none nbrat fect, but you'll not getbthat from s ther Roger or Penn. What Fen: printa is ehockingly irresponeible. Ho has tokez me off kis list, but I hen= from nthers and I die see his "nom" (ush) book. This sort ot thing connothelo an: cooent.

Atter writine you, it occurced to me taet Roger might not hove been in unoform. And the ruestion, with me, never bo bo on did he spoak to Pritz. I heve never had any doubt thet the essence of what he testified to dic hepon. it is what he has since added that troubles me, spocislly because 1 heve checked the history
of the trancript thorourhly, onj beseuse ${ }^{2}$ know court moports sre not in position



 I do not. I gat this for Bradley, on his mori he'd drop ton action agiajes y mil and Penn.


 enc, typically, Eenn Alan't do sny chacking.



 judge. I do rot brlieva yru beve cry haes he: much lime I wated en Gacrge tryinc to keep you poople from mosing some of the rict kes yov rid. tra wis ns ottention. heod


 put $t$ utor to thie to "cre 1 tikneme. Juacing by the other monstore, the will be
 Callforniane, , whelesaler, 2,500 , for tooke. Another guy got 5,000 osmald in Nem





 one bernus: of my gelfish irterests, ir tale case I rould. Fut picese bccert e eerious

 tind of chogp sensotion. Se fo ro lase comarcial than the tarst, and he trades on

 hi: melline list.

We" are u otreage bunch, if wa inelace all those creditean us
I nste not seen tiof Confidentisi, presume Joel Palmer did tais, sni I
 right sitar I left you, efer I tumbles to ft onc questionea mim in Tenetornoide


 to see that story, if inu hare it.
 I did incur tion gided debt ot no prospect of profit, to try and ielp in the mink upon


 so on us. Thenke for gnything you cet do enc my test to overyone.

Dear Harold,
First, my apologies for not replying some time ago. I don't want to become a silent George. I can't even communicate with the latter myself. I've tried calling him both at his home and at the hospital and am never able to get him. As for Malvina, her phone is disconnected, and I don't have the slightest idea where she is (as you know, she and George xxe were living apart). What I intend to do now is write George care of the hospital ( $I$ am told he still works theee) and include a copy of your letter of $11 / 8 / 69$ and ask him a few questions.

Now, money. To try to simplify the problem in my own mind, I am breaking it into three parts: (1) honorarium, (2) travel expenses, (3) book sales.

1. honorarium. The Experimental College at San Diego State College tells me that $\begin{gathered}\text { ars } \\ \text { they wrote you a check for } \$ 80 \text {. If you }\end{gathered}$ have no record of this, I'll try to get them to check on exactly when this was written, the number of the check whether it cleared the bank, etc. As for any your appearance at UCSD, this is something I'll try to find out from George.
2. travel expenses. This is the part that is an utter and complete mystery to me. I have absolutely no recollection of x区utre F a promise to pay your air fare, etc. I don't see how George could have possibly thought that we could haxe afford that kind of money. Another thing that I have to try to find out from him.
3. books. Here is where I see a clear obligation, as I told you before, the main reason being that we have sold most of your books, although I think a few of them were given to people. Gut of the 64 Whitewash books we have only $12 \mathrm{re}-$ maining, and out of the 50 Oswald in N!O. bogks, we have only 2. I believe, by the way, that you made a mistake on the consignment record that you sent me: the total for the 64 Whitewash books actually comes to $\$ 158.40$ rather than 153.40. Thus the over-all total is also $\$ 5$ more or 186.65. Of this I have paid you $\$ 25$, and I intend to pay the full amount even if it has to come out of my own pocket, which apparently it will. Enclosed is $\$ 25$ more, which is all that $I$ can afford at the moment.

Your criticisms of our last newsletter (2:4) are probably valid. Being an amateur in this business and not having the first-hand information taat you do, I have no way of checking your allegations against Jones, Craig, and Joesten, but I assume that there is some truth to them. However, in the case of Jones and Craig, I can't help asking myself the old question of what are they to gain by misrepresenting things and $I$ answer nothing, except maybe the dubious pleasure of leading a life that is constantly full of risk and danger. I realize that in the case of Jones you believe that he is "sick" and you offer me evidence. I don't think I want to see it. What I plan to do is write Jones and ask to get on his mailing list--we've never been on it-and maybe ask him some questions
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about Craig and the photograph, and possibly I can form my own conclusions about his mental health. This is not a slam against you; it's just that on questions of this sort I think that one has to find out for himself.

I see in the L.A. Free Press ( $2 / 13 / 70$, p. 20) that the book Coup d' Etat!, written by Stanley J. Marks, "one of the nation's leading authorities on the Kennedy-King-Kennedy Conspiracy," is due to come out
 Harold Weisberg? When you have a free moment, I wonder if you could answer some questions for mex. First, wry why the nom de plume? Do you have any objection to our mentioning the forthcoming publication in our newsletter and mentioning you by your real name? Will portions of your book be serialized by the Free Press? Was the Free Press article actualły written by you? Is there any chance that we could serialize a few pieces, too, perhaps advertizing your book for those who would like to send for prepublication copies? I imagine that out of our list of about 1500 maybe 1000 would be interested enough to do this (if it's not too expensive).

By the way, is that Ferric letter that we quoted from Confidential for real?

Yours for Truth,


