

to:  
George Michael E-vica  
107 North Beacon St.,  
Hartford, CT 06105

8/13/93

~~Dear~~ From Harold Weisberg

The problems I have with your persisting evasiveness and non-responsiveness are complicated by my mislaying the letter you wrote me other than caption <sup>all</sup> in response to mine of 6/21, the letter you noted revising twice.

It is in that letter that you referred to Marrs and White. I find that I wrote you 7/7 and 7/13/93. The letter refers to your 7/12. I wrote you about it also 7/15, I see.

So, I'll appreciate a copy of the letter that somehow got mislaid here. From what you say in your 8/8, if you said that in the letter of which I see no copy after a search <sup>tried</sup> included all the nearby files on both side, I <sup>clearly</sup> ~~clearly~~ misunderstood you and owe Marrs and White apologies that with this they will understand I make.

However, I do not recall language in that or any letter that you use in the middle paragraph of page one of your 8/8, or the next one. A copy as I've asked will leave that cleared up.

You 8/8 does not say what you intend it to respond to. I wrote you 8/4. The first sentence <sup>reads</sup> ~~begins~~, "When I asked you who put you up to <sup>to</sup> ~~to~~ that planned 'scholarly' paper on me as a <sup>(SIGNIFICANT)</sup> government disinformation agent, your answer, if that is what it really was, is that Marrs and White had." It is clear that you had given me that impression in what I responded to 7/15. That you did not see fit to correct me and tell me that I was wrong led to what it would not have if you had then responded.

What is obvious from the very first is that you steadfastly refuse to make specific response, as of your current evasion. It is not an unequivocal response to say, as I quote from your 8/8, page two, that none of you has had any connection, well you don't even say what I was going to say. You say that none of the three of you "based any part of our conference planning or implementation on any past, present, or future work by Harrison Livingstone."

That is as evasive and non-responsive as it can be. It seems to me that what I asked you is whether you got the idea directly or indirectly from him. If at the outset you had done what I hope you teach your students to do and not gone into your own special interpretations and this kind of lingo, you could say "yes" or "no", perhaps qualifying the "no" because you might not know all the people he has working for him.

You keep referring to people in the plural who have been saying that silly stuff and you say that your conference intended "to initiate an in-depth self-examination ~~of the~~ within the critical <sup>assassination</sup> ~~community~~ " so why all the evasions, the steadfast refusal to give a single name? Is there <sup>after</sup> any single way to leave a record, that questions whether there was a single one and that it was your own idea? So I ask <sup>again</sup> ~~again~~ as I have from the first, names, please, and no more self-justifying crap. Harold Weisberg, 7627 Old Receiver Road, Frederick, MD 21702

Harold Weisberg