

George Evita
107 N. Beacon St.,
Hartford, CT 06105

and Charles Drago 6/21/93
and Jerry Rose

Now that your self-described "research conference" is past, if in rational circles what you engaged in can be styled as research,

On what ^{basis} factual did you request a "research paper" on me as "a significant source of disinformation in the JFK assassination" and "Why?"

Was this your idea¹ and yours alone? Charles Drago¹? Any other person or persons¹?
If so, who?

And again, on what basis in fact?

Did you, The Third Decade or any others consider whether this is libel?

If the affirmatively-stated "research paper" was proposed by another or others, what qualifications did you perceive in such person or persons?

Did you ascertain whether any such person(s) had or could have had an ulterior purpose, such as inclusion in or relevance to a book?

The stated purpose of your conference, its "Theme", is "Taking the Critical Offensive." Your stated intent is "to initiate an in-depth self-examination within the JFK assassination community (sic)" (or should it be "sick?").

You make it apparent that I as "a significant source of disinformation," meaning serving the government or the assassins, am central/in your conference.

What do you consider qualifies any of the persons indicated above and all at The Third Decade to be in a position to propose or offer an informed opinion on me and/or my work in the stated context?


Do you, Drago, Rose or anyone else at The Third Decade or in any way involved in your conference, which you describe as one of "research," consider it to be scholarly to request such a paper on me to coincide with the coming appearance of a commercial book announced to state what you state is the "research" purpose of your convention?

Who suggested and who approved the stated subject of your conference, this alleged "in-depth self-examination" that so closely parallels the stated content of that book?

You expressed the "hope" that you would "reveal the identities of the conspirators," their "methods" and "goals." Was it indicated that the author of a coming book would provide this alleged information? What person or persons did you expect to provide it and did one or they? What were the scholarly credentials of this person or persons?

Was any such "research paper" on me presented? If so, by whom, and may I have a copy of it? Was there ^{any} recorded discussion of it? Was I or my work included in any other alleged "research paper," and if so, may I have a copy or copies if in more than one?

By a copy I ask the same questions of Charles Drago and Jerry Rose.


Harold Weisberg

Charles Drago was when I heard from him years ago in

6/21/93

a Providence advertising and public relations firm. I'm not checking the file to be certain but it is my recollection that without having done any real work he thought he knew enough to be writing a play or a movie script. As I recall he had some questions and I answered what I could.

Evica was never in touch with me. He organized some kind of confab at Hartford, where he teaches, in late 1966. When among those invited or those who heard about it were people familiar with my work and they asked Evica why I had not been invited to address them Evica's honest response was to the effect that he wanted Mark Lane to get all the attention. I've had no interest in or communication with him but as I heard about him from time to time he was big on the nuttier theories. He published a book I've not looked at. The Third Decade supposed self-criticism of critics, not in all probability intending any of its circle, coincides with Harry Livingstone's High Trash 3 being retitled into Killing the Truth. Coming from him it is more likely killing the truth-tellers. In any event, he is the only one of the innumerable nuts who has ever made any such accusation relating to me and that is what I'm hinting at in some of the questions I ask Evica, Drago and Rose,

Of all the possible stupidities Evica asked Wrone to submit the paper on me as a dis-information agent. Wrone's polite, professor-to-professor response should have chilled Evica's interest. He did not respond to Wrone.

It would appear that in more than 25 years Evica has learned nothing and that he knows nothing about me or what I have done. Or about himself.

Perhaps to Rose is it enough that I've never subscribed to his publication and perhaps it is enough to Drago that if he has not been able to complete what he was writing or if he had was not able to do anything with it isn't either somehow caused by some invisible conspiracy against them and what they want to believe and say to their own minuscule circle. Such geniuses, such towering intellects as they are, naturally not the cause. They are, as they know so very well, faultless and well informed.

My hunch is that this gathering of the nuts was in Providence because it was believed that Drago might be able to influence what could get attention, could get discounts for the conference and accommodations, etc. I've seen or heard nothing at all about it.

Not one has ever asked me for copies or any records I got or even what they reflect.

This is not unnatural. After all, don't they know all there is to know?

Weren't they going to identify the assassins at this conference?