

NEBRASKA PSYCHIATRIC INSTITUTE  
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA COLLEGE OF MEDICINE  
602 SOUTH 44TH AVENUE  
OMAHA, NEBRASKA 68105  
556-6211

DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONS  
STATE OF NEBRASKA  
BOARD OF REGENTS  
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

12 September 1968

Dear Hal,

A note, only, to keep in touch...and to mention a few things in passing. We saw Pyne's show of August 4th and thought you presented yourself very well indeed. I sometimes wonder, though, whether or not you really gain anything by appearing in such motley company: a parade of caricatures, generally, including Pyne himself. Eh?


I understand Shaw carrying his complaint to the Supreme Court... further delaying (or possibly defeating?) Garrison's plans for a trial. Also, the Epstein article hammering Garrison in the July 13th New Yorker a bit disconcerting...what did you make of it? Too, while I'm thinking of N.O., did you have a chance to talk with McAuliffe?

Note: The most asinine book yet: John Sparrow, After the Assassination.

Steppenwolf Three (in ms.) now assembled and should be on its way to printer in London soon. New work, plus translations from German, Russian and even Old English, and an intelligent article on Kenneth Patchen's prose. I'll send a copy along to you as soon as we have it.

So.....how are ya?

Best personal regards,

  
Philip Boatright

9/14/68

Dear Phil,

Many thanks for the clippings on Beckham. Quite a character. How ~~will~~ badly did he do in the primary?

These people seem to show up more and more on the edges. That "church" repeats like a bad meal.

What a coincidence that we wrote each other the same time.

I'd often asked myself the question you pose about Pyne. The answer varies with the participant. Some just crave attention for personal reason, some espouse a cause that may mean something to them if it seems ridiculous to others. They had been wanting me for a year. I had declined to do their show the end of 1966 when they required me to forgo a local show on the same station in LA in which Liebeler had agreed to debate me. He didn't show and I didn't get to do the Pyne show when it would have helped sales.

Generally, he is subhuman, with his staff in apparent terror of him. I can hardly explain how he was different that night. He did reach many, many people for me, those I'd never have been able to get to on the so-called better shows (which are not, they are merely more smooth).

Shaw's complaint is before the Supreme Court. I have no idea when it will be heard. In any event, there is little likelihood of a trial before early next year, if at all. What may work for a trial is the rather widespread belief that Shaw has something to hide, that is why he delays. That may, eventually, hurt the government more than his conviction.

I did speak to Martin McAuliffe when I was in N.C. We had a hurried meeting after a lunch date he had. I'd have liked to have spent more time with him for a number of reasons, but neither of us then had the time. I believe him. However, there are things he could do that would be worthwhile, whether or not they were for Garrison or got to him. Perhaps some time in the future we'll be able to discuss this and see if he can interest himself in helping establish a record of a strange and infamous part of our history.

On Epstein: He is plain dishonest, by intent, for fame and profit. In order to understand him it is necessary to have a much more extensive knowledge of the subject than most people have. He is not, really, a critic, though some of us so credit him. I was asked to do a short piece for BOOKS when his piece came out. They liked it but for some reason did not use it. I made it available to a number of smaller publications. Here is a copy from Penn Jones' paper. I do not need it back. That magazine article is about to be published as a book! Talk about propaganda. First Sparrow, then Epstein, apologists, with magazine articles that can be republished as books, while serious, legitimate, responsible works that are new cannot be published! I so long for a return we will probably never see, to the olden concept of letters, where men could fight each other with words, where ideas and concepts could compete, each with an audience, partisans, publishers! If I had a publisher I could write a real book on Epstein and the other Epsteins, in short time, too. But no one will publish the other side, in any mass form. This is called "freedom of the press". If the article leaves questions, ask them.

I have challenged Sparrow to a verbal duel in any form of his choosing, any forum or publication, with his work or mine or any combination of his choosing, and he will not. The Times Literary Supplement would not give me space for response, now they will print nothing on the subject at all. Sparrow has long-time intelligence

connections and is further perti pris because he is also gay. He, too, is deliberately dishonest. With him and Epstein there is no possibility that they are wrong by error. It is design.

Yours is an intelligent, sprightly publication. I look forward to the new issue. Best of luck with it!

If you have any misgivings about the request I made of you, do not shun expressing them. I will not think poorly of you if you decline. However, I want you to understand that there can be a tremendous satisfaction in turning these types on, and it can be done. After bringing them to public attention, which was not favorable to them, and for it earning their enmity, I went out to California and got Loran Hall and Lawrence Howard to speak to me frankly and go to New Orleans voluntarily. This despite their having gone to court in a successful effort to frustrate Garrison's subpoena! I'm presuming you have read enough of my work to know who these mercenaries of the extreme of the right extreme really are. I will be going out to California again and I will perhaps try and see them again. It will depend on whether I have time, for there is always much to do. In a way, Barber may be more of a challenge, for he appears to be better educated and probably has a higher native intelligence. He can think he has something to fear by talking. I do not really know what he knows. Generally, however, it is safer to share such secret knowledge and let it be known, for this eliminates all possibility of violent reaction save from the irrational or excessively vindictive.

You ask how I am? Physically tired, for I've determined to lose weight and I have, and I'm forcing myself away from the typewriter to do physical work that must be done around the place. Besides, I believe the male requires physical activity for mental and emotional well-being. But I feel it. In my mind, I am, to a degree, content, for I know I have already done the impossible, am satisfied, though I will not say it publicly, that I have done an investigative reporting job like none in history (I have more unpublished than I have published). I am gratified that I have met and overcome the most taxing and unusual challenges, the more so because I am convinced that they are essential to the continuation of any semblance of meaningful freedom. It is already something I will pay for the rest of my life, that may keep me in perpetual debt, may deny me any decent publisher. My only genuine regret here is that the burden is greater for my wife. Our debt, to us, is enormous. How we will repay it I do not know. I do know that we will.

I am also longwinded! Gotta get to other letters in today's mail, which I am answering after dark. Many thanks for this help - it is help. You will understand that merely establishing a record for the future is worthwhile, and this I will have done and this, if in no other way, is the help in just sending clippings. I will also copy and forward them. This did not appear elsewhere, to the best of my knowledge.

Best regards,

Harold Weisberg

9/14/68

Dear Phil,

Many thanks for the clippings on Beckham. Quite a character. How ~~did~~ badly did he do in the primary?

These people seem to show up more and more on the edges. That "church" repeats like a bad meal.

What a coincidence that we wrote each other the same time.

I'd often asked myself the question you pose about Pyn. The answer varies with the participant. Some just crave attention for personal reason, some espouse a cause that may mean something to them if it seems ridiculous to others. They had been wanting me for a year. I had declined to do their show the end of 1966 when they required me to forgo a local show on the same station in LA on which Liebelier had agreed to debate me. He didn't show and I didn't get to do the Pyn show when it would have helped sales.

Generally, he is subhuman, with his staff in apparent terror of him. I can hardly explain how he was different that night. He did reach many, many people for me, those I'd never have been able to get to on the so-called better shows (which are not, they are merely more smooth).

Shaw's complaint is before the Supreme Court. I have no idea when it will be heard. In any event, there is little likelihood of a trial before early next year, if at all. What may work for a trial is the rather widespread belief that Shaw has something to hide, that is why he delays. This may, eventually, hurt the government more than his conviction.

I did speak to Martin McAuliffe when I was in N.C. We had a hurried meeting after a lunch date he had. I'd have liked to have spent more time with him for a number of reasons, but neither of us then had the time. I believe him. However, there are things he could do that would be worthwhile, whether or not they were for Garrison or got to him. Perhaps some time in the future we'll be able to discuss this and see if he can interest himself in helping establish a record of a strange and infamous part of our history.

On Epstein: He is plain dishonest, by intent, for fame and profit. In order to understand him it is necessary to have a much more extensive knowledge of the subject than most people have. He is not, really, a critic, though some of us so credit him. I was asked to do a short piece for BOOKS when his piece came out. They liked it but for some reason did not use it. I made it available to a number of smaller publications. Here is a copy from Penn Jones' paper. I do not need it back. That magazine article is about to be published as a book! Talk about propaganda. First Sparrow, then Epstein, apologists, with magazine articles that can be republished as books, while serious, legitimate, responsible works that are new can not be published! I so long for a return we will probably never see, to the olden concept of letters, where men could fight each other with words, where Ideas and Concepts could compete, each with an audience, partisans, publishers! If I had a publisher I could write a real book on Epstein and the other Epsteins, in short time, too. But no one will publish the other side, in any mass form. This is called "freedom of the press". If the article leaves questions, ask them.

I have challenged Sparrow to a verbal duel in any form of his choosing, any forum or publication, with his work or mine or any combination of his choosing, and he will not. The Times Literary Supplement would not give me space for response, nor they will print nothing on the subject at all. Sparrow has long-time intelligence

connections and is further parti pris because he is also gay. He, too, is deliberately dishonest. With him and Epstein there is no possibility that they are wrong by error. It is design.

Yours is an intelligent, sprightly publication. I look forward to the new issue. Best of luck with it!

If you have any misgivings about the request I made of you, do not shun expressing them. I will not think poorly of you if you decline. However, I want you to understand that there can be a tremendous satisfaction in turning these types on, and it can be done. After bringing them to public attention, which was not favorable to them, and for it earning their enmity, I went out to California and got Loren Hall and Lawrence Howard to ask to me frankly and go to New Orleans voluntarily. This despite their having gone to court in a successful effort to frustrate Garrison's subpoena! I'm presuming you have read enough of my work to know who these mercenaries of the extreme of the right extreme really are. I will be going out to California again and I will perhaps try and see them again. It will depend on whether I have time, for there is always much to do. In a way, Harber may be more of a challenge, for he appears to be better educated and probably has a higher native intelligence. He can think he has something to fear by talking. I do not really know what he knows. Generally, however, it is safer to share such secret knowledge and let it be known, for this eliminates all possibility of violent reaction save from the irrational or excessively vindictive.

You ask how I am? Physically tired, for I've determined to lose weight and I have, and I'm forcing myself away from the typewriter to do physical work that must be done around the place. Besides, I believe the role requires physical activity for mental and emotional well-being. But I feel it. In my mind, I am, to a degree, content, for I know I have already done the impossible, am satisfied, though I will not say it publicly, that I have done an investigative reporting job like none in history (I have more unpublished than I have published). I am gratified that I have met and overcome the most taxing and unusual challenges, the more so because I am convinced that they are essential to the continuation of any semblance of meaningful freedom. It is already something I will pay for the rest of my life, that may keep me in perpetual debt, may deny me any decent publisher. My only genuine regret here is that the burden is greater for my wife. Our debt, to us, is enormous. How we will repay it I do not know. I do know that we will.

I am also longwinded! Gotta get to other letters in today's mail, which I am answering after dark. Many thanks for this help - it is help. You will understand that merely establishing a record for the future is worthwhile, and this I will have done and this, if in no other way, is the help in just sending clippings. I will also copy and forward them. This did not appear elsewhere, to the best of my knowledge.

Best regards,

Harold Weisberg

9/1/68

Dear Phil,

Although since seeing you I have intended looking Brandy up again, I've stayed too busy on other things. I have written two more books and conducted a number of field investigations, various researches and other things. Time flies. The poplars are beginning to turn, the bees are sluggish in the morning, and the delayed dawn permits a few more minutes of sleep each day as I try and get a little more rest so I can be less tired and produce more.

I have not had time to get more interested in Terry. Eventually I will again. But each thing must be evaluated in importance if there is more to do than can be done. He and a friend of his, Dave Lifton, have compelled me to think of them intermittently by a series of stupid and false articles in a kooky west-coast hippie-type paper. Save for these interruptions, my mind had been on other work. One of the books is on the three assassinations, tying them together and introducing more of the suppressed evidence. It is a rather frightening book, detailing those things so like a less violent pre-Hitlerism.

One of the areas of my interest and potential importance is the Cuban angle. You may have read something of this in what I have published. Involved, but the nature and extent of the involvement unless, are a number of American mercenaries, for the most part inept, violence prone, egotistical men who have trouble sitting properly anywhere. Some of them died rather mysteriously. There was one shot when, according to his fellows, he was mistaken for a wild turkey. Another, an experience swimmer and diver, drowned in a few inches of water.

These boys killed the right for money after the CIA was out. Most of them were of the right, not because of genuine political understanding and persuasion but from ignorance, believing catch-phrases and propaganda. I think of them as the dedicated wrong.

I have met only a couple of them personally. They are not intellectuals. One, however, was known as the "Professor". He apparently is well-educated and, if my recollection is not flawed, had the reputation of being a homosexual. His name is Dennis Barber, sometimes spelled Harper. He was in the boat from which the diver, Collins, drowned off the Florida Keys (they had primitive training camps there). Barber is said to be living in Omaha, or at the very least, in the suburban area. I regret I do not have his address or employment. He is said to be in terror of a bona fide assassin, one Abbas who killed for Trujillo. Why the fear I do not know. Abbas, however, of whom I have known since the mid-50s, is a man who warrants fear. He has been involved in some hairy episodes, has the reputation of being a murderer.

Barber may himself be a dangerous man, I do not know. I have two things in mind, both involving you. First, would you try and locate him and see if he would be willing to talk to you, sitting down before a tape recorder and making a record of everything that might, conceivably, relate to what he knows or suspects of Cuban activities that in turn might be connected with either the assassination of those seemingly in some way or another connected with it. Second, if you are reluctant or do not have the time, would you just ask him if he would be willing to talk to me. I will agree to any reasonable restriction he might place on what he says. I hope he would understand that the man with secrets, whether or not he understands their significance, is the man who has something to fear. He knows much about some of the people in whom there is general interest. If you get talking to him, here are some names: Hall, Howard, Seymour (you should recognize these), Massferrer, Jerry Patrick Hemming, Howard Davis, Collins, Captain Bob Brown, Watley, Steve Wilson, Tom Dunkin, several Buchenans, No Name Key,

Ricardo Davis; the various Cuban groups and American raiders and trainers; of American groups, those of the right, especially the National States Rights Party and any of its members or functionaries; any people he may have met in New Orleans or anything he knows the training camps, activities and personnel there; Casaldó or those looking like or represented as him, anywhere; one Davey, in Florida; the Alan Courtney show on QJ, Miami, CIA personnel, if he is willing to talk of them, and covers-corporations and other; who he thinks may have been to see Sylvia Odie; plots to kill Castro and who involved, for whom; Dr. Fernando Senabes, who is editor of a publication in Miami called "Insight of the News" (to which Alan Courtney is a contributor).

I wrote the above last night, while I was waiting for a call from a Florida radio station, to which I broadcast for an hour. It is in Kerry's city. He did not call in, did not have any of his pals bait me.

This may sound like a hazardous request. Under certain circumstances it might be. However, I think speaking to him is not. Finding him, which the city directory, if not the phone book, can disclose, also is not. If he is forcefully unwilling to speak, do not press it, for that could involve some hazard. He may be that kind of a guy. There is reason to suspect his involvement in the Collins death, which may be murder. But if he knows what you can tell him of me, plus that I know about Abbas, including his operations in Britain, plus that I intend him no harm and sharing his knowledge with me can be a protection for him, perhaps he will be willing to make a record of what he knows. If he does not, I will write him. I hope you will try. It seems possible to me that a poet (and I remind you Byron was a poet and an activist) can establish a rapport with a "professor".

I hope your marriage is a happy one.

By the way, you know Kent Courtney somewhat. Do you know a good way to approach Si? Is there one? Is Alan Courtney a relative? I also have an interest in a man in Florida, with a radio program, of that name.

Best regards,

Harold Weisberg