

Dear Paul, Hoch

4/22/89

Have you lost your critical faculties entirely? Do you find some way to support any irrational theory of the JFK assassination, regardless of fact?

There can be no question at all, John Davis knew he was lying and that he was defaming me. There can be a question about his motive but not of the fact.

Apparently in trouble with his publisher and legal counsel, after writing me on the 12th a letter they found inadequate he wrote me again on the 19th repeating with satisfaction your uninformed opinion that what he wrote was not critical of me and that his purpose, his point, as you saw it, was "simply that Wasserman and Marcello were concerned about HSCA and FBI findings."

I for the moment ignore your first blindness and get to the second one, in quotes above. What is Davis' evidence of this great Wasserman/ Marcello concern over HSCA/FBI?

"There is," he says on 414, "solid evidence that he (referring to Marcello) was quite disturbed," so greatly disturbed, in Davis' words that "he apparently assigned the matter to his most trusted attorney, Jack Wasserman, for investigation."

The Davises and Scheims of this world would have no books were they precluded from conjecturing, "apparently" above. So here we have the combination of "solid evidence" and "greatly disturbed" and Marcello's ordering his attorney to investigate. Only not merely his attorney who, as his attorney, rather than being the "most trusted" was limited to immigration matters. Elsewhere he is, according to Davis, Marcello's "top" lawyer, which he also wasn't.

What follows next is that under Marcello's whip Wasserman "immediately" looked me up to go over those 220,000 pages I'd gotten from the FBI.

And next he has "examined," suggesting it took some clever investigating, the "correspondence between Wasserman and Weisberg." Not that I had given it to him and not that he had to say anything like this at all. But why did he? To say that "throughout the summer and fall of 1979 Jack Wasserman foraged in Weisberg's files in an attempt to retrieve every FBI document that could relate to the possibility of his client's having been involved in the assassination. Because of this frantic response..."

Not a word of this is true and beyond question Davis knew it was not true when he wrote it. I am his sole basis for the fabrication so essential to his crazy disinformation that like others of the past you apparently love. Wasserman was never here, didn't write or phone me and instead responded to a letter I wrote him. I had my own interests in writing him and it was related to this one of HSCA's crazy concoctions. I never heard from Marcello, of course, we never saw or spoke to each other.

Davis lies in saying that Wasserman was here, as indeed he does say and you know it. But you find that entirely innocent. He then lies in saying that he had the run of my place for much of a year when he was never here, in person or through someone else. You also find that entirely innocent. He did not ask me, by any means, for anything and Davis says all of the above? Naturally to an incisive thinker like you when another theory is involved, that, too, is pure and motiveless.

And that he has nothing else in the world other than this series of fabrications that is his allegedly "solid evidence," is merely his ticket so heaven, so clean is he in mind and word.

Not a single word is true and you write him your exoneration so he can use it to claim his publisher and publisher's lawyer when republication is at issue, at hand? And this is to say nothing about what I believe I also told you about, his thanking me for "formal" interviews when there were none, thus making me responsible for what he says about me. All of which he just made up.

2

As you will see from the copies I'll make and enclose, his proposed change, which still pins his bullshit on me, was for "legal", not editorial.

The man has to be a pig. I spent countless unpaid hours trying to help him when he knew, as you long have, that I entirely disagree with his theory. Then he not only doesn't send me a book, as why should he with this fabricated slander in it, he takes almost half a year to write me. Not in response to my writing him. He never responded to that. Not in response to my writing his editor, as he never did. Not in response to my writing the publisher's president, which he also never did. Only when "legal" raised some questions and paperback and foreign publication comes up. All that money for a fabricator, a disinformationist with whom you even now collaborate.

What did I ask that he refuses to do? Do you think you can come out of the clouds of conspiracy driven long enough to come into glancing contact with reality? I did not ask for an apology and a printed retraction. All I did was ask that the lies about me be taken out of any additional editions. and as of now he ~~is~~ refuses and tries to con me and his lawyer problem, with you as his endorser.

If the rascal ever gets around to returning copies of that bloated correspondence, consisting of my letter to Wasserman, clearly not in response to him, his response and then mine, I'll send you copies because you apparently believe this monster and not me. In many months I've not had any response at all to this simple request and my copies of them are missing only because his woman either misfiled them or sent them to him by accident. Nobody else expressed any interest in them. (I do not make this as an accusation but the only other person who was in the basement without me and could have had any interest was Kanfer. All he had to do in the hours he was there without me was look through the subject file, which I'd shown his crew, and find Wasserman or Marcello.)

Paul, if you'd been as blind and unthinking when you were still a student and I first met you, I'd have been disappointed. But you are a grown, mature, experienced man and a bright one. How in the world you could have involved yourself in giving unsolicited support to a slander of me, even after I told you not a word in it was true, is much more than a disappointment.

Back off and take stock of yourself and your thinking and attitudes. You are lost in idle and untenable theorizing, perhaps from frustration, but you are not in contact with reality. And I would hope that in thinking this through you are also a little ashamed that you go out of your way to - on your own initiative and without informing me - to help perpetuate a deliberately contrived/defamation that will forever be available to undermine confidence in my work.

I dorry for you that you were capable of this. add of 4/23 below on this, too.

In the course of looking for the correct name at McGraw-Hill, Davis having used two for one, I noticed *K. Gold* my letter to you of 3/7/89 and I quote the first sentence, which is under the caution "confidential": Unusual as it is, I've asked that you keep this confidential for two reasons that may be one, I don't want to get into any controversies now and I don't want to get involved in extra correspondence now because I'm not up to it." Am I in the light of this to believe that there was some consideration more important to you than my trust?