

12/17/76

Dear Henry,

No, I wanted you to get the details from Bennett because I do not want to figure in this now.

What the chances of collecting are I do not know. The fact is absolute and I do have it. There is a better chance of collecting if this character uses the mail.

All the characters are not dead. I know two are alive.

I can't take the time now to answer all the questions. They are reasonable. But if I did not have this I would not take a minute.

McDonald is one of the most accomplished of con men. He has been getting away with it so long he is careless and over-confident.

Some of his credentials are legitimate. All are irrelevant.

The jails are full of credentialed crooks.

Kimsey's lady friend thinks McDonald stole the inventions from Kimsey, who she says developed them while he was with CIA.

This will not be good for the PSE business.

Sprague, who is not rational on this subject, can't do more than he has. He has been lost in anti-fact for years.

The first version was done by a different ghost. The plots are pretty much the same. The details differ and he would probably claim he did this to protect his life or something else that means nothing. However, there are other facts, basic ones, about which there can be no question at all.

Please believe me I have solid proofs. Remember, I had a commission and I did perform it successfully. This meant a confrontation with McDonald that had his people in terror although I said little and nothing they did not like - then.

Do not be impressed by machines. They will be on test, not testing. I detest them because they are presented as substitutes for the human mind, in this case also reason.

So please, when you can, get all the details for me of the offer. This is all I want but is full particular.

Believe me there is no question at all - he is a fraud and the book is, too.

Perhaps it will amuse you to know that to Goldwater's security chief the man behind the JFK assassination - in the first version - was LBJ.

Troit is deMohrenschildt.

It is Davidov, without the final "e" added in the final version. Getting two different stories from him on two different occasions. Kimsey went to work for him after the CIA fired him.

Really this is solid, Henry. So please do get me the details as soon and as completely as possible.

Hope you have a good holiday.

Sincerely,

December 15, 1976

Dear Harold:

Thanks for your letter of the 5th, just received. The holiday crunch is really causing the post office fits if it takes this long for a letter to come from Maryland to New Jersey. Even the pony express must have been faster. Whatever.

As I read your letter, you want me to contact Bennett at Hagoth and make arrangements to collect the \$10,000 reward for proving McDonald to be a fraud. How do I prove it? I've read the book and have my own suppositions about it all, reinforced by Richard Sprague's comment in the November Truth about ~~the~~ the original manuscript's contents versus what was actually published. Now Sprague would certainly have greater details --- couldn't he make the claim for the money?

I would think that in order for anybody to make a claim for the loot, solid evidence has got to be in that person's possession -- unchallengeable stuff...especially since Bennett is so convinced McDonald is telling the truth, having checked him out with pse, etc.

You say "Sprague knows, says too little." If he's got the story, why doesn't he make it public. You say three versions of the manuscript were around. Do you have all three? Specifically how are they different in addition to what you say in your letter? How does one prove the three manuscripts were actually done by McDonald or his writer? Are they all typed on the same machine? In other words, what's to prevent McD from saying the versions you saw were frauds and he never wrote any of the things in them?

Do you really see a chance to collecting the money? How strong a case can be made for the book being a fake? McD has all those credentials reproduced in the back of the book, testifying to his character and worth. A lot of people seem to believe that anybody with that kind of pedigree must know what he's talking about, including Bennett.

Where does one start disproving it all? Conveniently, McD's characters are dead or unlocatable and therefore they can't refute what he says. How do we do it, especially if he can pass a lie detector and pse test?

Regards,



** and what you've told me in previous letters.