

Mr. John A. Davis
20 East 10 St.,
New York, N.Y. 10003

7/30/89

Dear Mr. Davis,

Your fan, Cindy Kolenda, is right in comparing your writing with banana splits and it has almost that much value. But what in the hell does that have to do with your gross and deliberate defamation of me that you ignored until the publishers' lawyers got after you about them? And as you all know, you ignored my letters until they did. And now you continue to lie.

(my) You say that I said that your "research assistant Amy Stevens took files from your office and you want those files back and you attribute this to the lawyers. You know very well that as soon as I found that something had disappeared I wrote you. And you ignored that letter, too, as you then ignored my letter about this to McGraw-Hill.

It was not from my office and Amy had no interest in them. It is part of the correspondence I initiated with Wasserman for my own purposes that you also lie about. I did not ask for the return of "files" and I did not even ask for the return of originals. All I asked for is what you can provide, the return of copies so I'll have that information, which just happens to have disappeared when you were fabricating a false case important to your banana-split of a book. Even now you refuse to do this and in support of your continuing bad behavior you have another lie, "(t)hus every document from your files that I now possess is in your own files." That this is a lie and you know it is a lie is proven in your files in my letters to you. And that the lawyers know it is a lie is proven in the letters I wrote the publishers - all without getting back a few pages of letters.

You "regret" that you "have not responded to" my "most recent complaints as quickly as" I "might have wished." You have not responded to them or my earlier ones. You justify this by telling me you had no time for correspondence. Have you no shame at all, man? How about my time. And not only in having to write you more than once about matters no writer with any self-respect or professional standards ought have to be written about more than once? How about all of my time you took and Amy took for you? Who do you think you are, God? The only person in the world whose time means anything?

Your biggest lie is, "(a)s you are aware, we made the changes you requested on page 414 of all editions." You did not and when only after the lawyers got after you you sent me a copy of the proposed change I made it clear that it was not what I requested and that I did not accept it. What I requested is that you eliminate any reference to me and your failure to do that with all the copies of this truly evil fabrication already printed and sold you did not eliminate either the defamation of me or your trading on my name.

It was not by accident, as you profess, that you listed me in your "formal" interviews when there was no interview. It was to trade on my name.

and if you had not had this intent, there was no reason to continue to use my name on page 414. All you had to say, and this would have permitted you to palm off the same fabrication that is basic to your book, ~~is~~ that Marcello's lawyer got what the FBI had disclosed about Marcello in its JFK assassination disclosures.

You did not do this for the same reason you made up that lie about my Wasserman correspondence - to give your fraud of a book some seeming substance. But it defamed me and that didn't bother you. As the lawyers may not have realized, you described Wasserman as this top mafia guy's "top lawyer" when he was in fact an independent and respected immigration lawyer, now safely dead. And then, when the correspondence you have made clear you were making that vicious lie, you said that he "rummaged" around my place for much of a year. In complete freedom

2

made clear, you were making up a vicious lie, you said that he "rummaged" around my place for more than a year, in complete freedom.

How can you ^{consider} ~~condider~~ yourself even a human, leave alone a decent human, when you did this to an aged and ill man, enfeebled and limited in what he can do, of whom you took so much uncompensated time (you were even too cheap to send me a book! or too self-important and above normal considerations), who made everything it had cost so much to get freely available to you? Have you any ^{NOTHING} ~~nothing~~ of the time Amy's presence and working here cost me? Or nuisance and ~~an~~ inconvenience? (She was not a nuisance but anyone here so often and for long had to be. Only nobody else was - it was you alone and not Marcello's lawyer who "rummaged" through my JFK assassination files.)

And even now you can't find a word -or time for a word-but you find time for banana-split literary praises, as you find time for xeroxing that ~~but~~ ^{Not} for the copies of my missing correspondence that disappeared when you were "rummaging" here - of regrets or apology. You characterize yourself: you are not a man, not of any decency.

and publishers and their lawyers characterize themselves when they are silent knowing the truth.

For their information - I'm sending them copies - Wasserman was never here. ^{He} never asked to come here, He sent nobody here. He had no interest at all - I initiated the one letter he sent me that you lie about. (Even saying you had "access" and suggesting thereby that it was secret when I sent you copies.) We never even met. *On spoke.*

And there are almost no names mentioned less frequently than Marcello's in those FBI JFK assassination files so there was not even a reason for any Wasserman search for Marcello. But if he'd had any such interest all he had to do was write a letter to the FBI and the cost to him would have been a pittance. And he could have gotten more, what was not included in the JFK assassination records.


You fabricated that malicious lie about me to give your phony book some smoke that you made appear to have substance by your fabricating of it.

You know you made it up. You knew and know it is a lie. If this was not your purpose, what other purpose did you have - or could you have had? And you traded on my name in the field for the same purpose, even making up nonexistent "formal interviews" for that purpose. And you refer to that fabrication as made "in a spirit of gratitude." Some "gratitude!" Especially when you convert me and my home into a mafia den!

Perhaps I can't do very much when I'm 76 and severely limited medically and physically but if I can do nothing else I will leave a record for the future for those who do not regard so great a national and international ^{at} tragedy as suitable for literary whoring and pimping. And I now ask for that purpose for a letter of apology and retraction from the publisher, which I intend by sending a copy of this to Mr. Farley. I'm not able to sue if it is not sent. I want it for record purposes and I also want to give them a chance to recover a shred of publishing decency, the shred they threw away when I first wrote and that letter was referred to you - who ignored it, too.

You are as utterly shameless as you are dishonest,

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg

JOHN H. DAVIS
20 EAST TENTH STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
(212) 475-0503

July 22, 1989

Mr. Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I have your letters and copies of your correspondence with McGraw-Hill and the New American Library.

I have removed your name from page 555 of the Acknowledgements. To have included your name here was a careless, but, I believe, understandable, error. You will note that your name does not appear in the list of formal (taped) interviews on page 542 of the Notes on Sources. That I included your name in a spirit of gratitude among those individuals with whom I had conversed both formally and informally about the research was perhaps careless, but I believe understandable in view of my deep sense of gratitude to all those who had helped me, not the least of whom was yourself.

As you are aware, we made the change that you requested on page 414 in all editions. I have been advised by both McGraw-Hill and the New American Library that no further change in page 414 is warranted. Likewise, I have been advised that no change on the succeeding page is warranted.

We are all agreed that there is nothing defamatory whatsoever in stating that Mr. Jack Wasserman made use of the FBI files your FOIA request, and lawsuit, made available to the public. If it had not been for your FOIA requests, the FBI files on the assassination would not have been available for study in the FBI Reading Room at Headquarters in Washington or for interested parties such as Mr. Wasserman who were willing to pay for their duplication.

Mr. Farley of the McGraw-Hill Legal Department has informed me that you wrote him that research assistant Amy Stevens took files from your office and that you want those files back. I have been out of touch with Ms. Stevens for some time and do not know where she is at the moment. I have no idea what she did with the files she took. Certainly I do not believe she took any files that were not copies of your files. All she probably took were copies of your copies. At least I

Mr. Harold Weisberg
July 22, 1989
Page 2

know that what she turned over to me were copies of your copies. Thus every document from your files that I now possess is in your own files.


I regret that I have not responded to your most recent complaints as quickly as you had wished, but I have been so busy with my own work that I have not had any time for correspondence. For me, over the past few months, it has been one writing deadline after another, including the construction of a lengthy new book proposal demanding much research.

I wish to assure you that readers of my book whom I have questioned on the matter of your complaints have all reassured me that my book does not defame you in any way. On the contrary, they have told me that I have cast you in the role of a hero. They especially note the compliment I paid you in paragraph one, page 245.

Once again, I wish to thank you for the valuable contribution you made to my book.

I am enclosing a letter from a reader that was just forwarded to me from McGraw-Hill. As a fellow laborer in the vineyard I thought I would share it with you.

Yours Sincerely,



John H. Davis

cc William P. Farley Esq., McGraw-Hill
Alan Kaufman, Esq., New American Library

5562 Wilkins Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA. 15217
June 26, 1989

Mr. John H. Davis
c/o McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.
11 West 19th Street
New York, New York 10011


Dear Mr. Davis,

Greetings from one of your greatest fans - an avid reader and lover of your wonderful books!

I am re-reading THE KENNEDYS; DUNASTY AND DISASTER for the third time this summer. It was so beautifully written and magnificently researched. Biographies are my favorites, but yours was the best I had enjoyed in a long time. It was not just the subject matter, which was interesting in itself, but your superb writing style. Your great talent comes through on every page. You have a gentle spirit, I believe, for your writing is filled with kindness and sensitivity - and yet never at the sacrifice of truth. Then I gobbled up MAFIA KINGFISH in a few sittings. It was so good and, again, so well-written, that I couldn't wait to finish it. Your theories are so well-founded and so logical. At last I believe I may know the truth about the assassination of President Kennedy. It's about time! And this book was also written with that fantastic style of yours. You make book reading actually delicious! I enjoy reading a well-written book as some would enjoy a banana split. I'll take your books any day over a banana split.

I also have finished THE BOUVIERS; PORTRAIT OF AN AMERICAN FAMILY. What a melancholy story. As with all families, there are sorrows and joys. I rejoiced on one page and wept by the next. It was also magnificent! You have exceptional talent, and I appreciate your sharing with the reading public in such excellent books. Thank you so much for jobs well done. You have a fan for life.

Sincerely,



(Mrs.) Cindy J. Kolenda