

10/10/70

Sylvia, Gary, May, Hal,

Now that I have his address and can send him the letter I wrote a week ago, here is the copy of my letter to Flemmonde about which I wrote you 10/3.

In this week, nothing has happened to diminish my concern over the evil of which he is capable and its potential for helping ruin what as of now is as close to an airtight case as one can hope for, as some of you have seen.


A little worse, in the course of checking some things with Jim Lessor in Bud's office yesterday, I noticed a letter he wrote Bud indicating Bud would be paying all of his expenses. This would seem to include a trip to England -and after I had gotten Bud his client and given him his case.

There is more I just am not up to going into.

This is all in confidence, for your information only. I hope what is possible does not eventuate. But I also want you to know in case it does and so that, if you are in a position to and of a disposition to, you may report to me anything you may learn that may seem relevant. I would like to be able to protect my own interests and those of all of us.

There is a limit to how much of this crookedness we'll be able to survive.

Sincerely,


Harold Weisberg

10/3/70

Sylvia, Mary, Gary, Hal,

I have just written Paris Flammonde, whose address I do not have. When I get that address, I will also send you copies of this letter. It is prompted by his new evidences of resuming a career in literary kleptomania, the earlier, sickening, sycophantic (if "unauthorized") manifestations you will recall.

Flammonde has moved in on Bud, some of whose foibles are Garrisonian. To Bud, everyone who makes a noise about the assassinations is, ipso facto, decent and honorable. Having done so little work personally and having accumulated so much of that of others, Bud is not disposed to take a lawyer's attitude in such matters.

We still have excellent prospects of establishing truth in the King/Ray case. Stoner et al did not ruin all the legal prospects. But the intrusions of such commercializers can, as Bud also can. I do not propose for this to happen - and not alone because of the great cost it can mean to me personally. Here we have the opportunity, once we get into court, of exposing the official fictions and the officialness of the frameups. I have given Bud close to an airtight case AND his client, much of the legal work (he tells me I should have been a lawyer - and that I'd have been a great one - in private, of course) and the approach and doctrine. He may find this somewhat uncomfortable, being a lawyer when I am not. I am pretty certain that he is uncomfortable about the totality of his indebtedness. When in his briefs he did not do what I suggested, he now finds those are the viable areas, and those in which the judge demanded more of him. Even the costs of the initial arrangements have not been returned to me, by him or his "committee". And he is now trying to use this to breath some imitation of life into his cadaver.

I tell you these things for a variety of purposes, for they do create unpleasant problems that will have to be coped with. To the degree that I can I do propose coping with them regardless of what it means or what it does to anyone. I simply will not allow this to be blown by anyone, no matter how he seeks to deceive himself into consider wrongdoing as something else. I have been fairly explicit with this to Bud and I have been as pointed as one can be with a fine young man who is actually doing what Bud is supposed to be doing - and without pay for it. This young man, who is a lawyer, concurs in the foregoing estimate of my work. Even a corrupted jury would have the greatest difficulty convicting Ray with what I have done to the evidence against him - and I have that, also. My work has been gone over by a tough-minded publisher, his lawyer, and, I think it is fair to assume, the government, which has, privately (and I tell you this in confidence) changed its official posture. Justice is really up tight about this, so much so that they have advanced from simply lying to perjury. While I do not expect punishment for the perjury, I have called it to the attention of the judge. I am giving them no respite. (And I've filed two additional cases and have several more drafted. This young man is supposed to have been going over them for some months, but Bud has kept him busy on an assortment of other chores, the most recent being the writing of a new introduction and opening chapter of an unrelated book Bud wrote several years ago and for which he now has a publisher.) Aside from informing you, so you can be alert to what I ought to know - and so that you will, please, inform me of anything I should, I also want to ask you to keep me informed of anything you hear about what Flammonde or the members of Bud's committee are doing and saying about this, so that any harm might be frustrated. Flammonde, I believe, presents an immediate jeopardy. I am anxious to know anything you may hear about his writing, publisher, etc.

Sincerely,

10/5/70

Dear Paris Flammonde,

After your (excuse the expression) book on Garrison came out, I wrote Meredith setting forth the extensive plagiarism from my work. The President seemed genuinely upset about this and another theft of my work in which Meredith was involved, was supposed to discuss with a friend of mine doing something about it, and took up with you what he accurately labelled serious charges. As you know, you made no response. As you and I both know, you couldn't. Your insensitivity and your ignorance combined to gull you into the theft of even one of my rare errors. In that case, you were remarkably stupid, for I was able to warn you off. By accident I was with ones Harris when he got a call on it. He said what I told him to say. Had you heeded it, you'd have stolen one thing less.

Reports of your new project having just reached me, I have just written Meredith. Although ~~he does not~~ have your address, I do write you so that preoccupation may not prevent it later. I think this letter is also in your interest.

A minor industry has grown up among sycophants, literary whores and incompetent investigators. It is an old one, theft. In your case, you sought to disguise it with citations to some of it (in every case, without having sought permission). Of course, it is possible that in what you labelled as an "unauthorized" account, so much of which is unalloyed Garrison, your own ignorance may have kept you from knowing when he was using the material of others, which was by no means uncommon. Unfortunately, Jim did almost no original and substantial work, having been enticed from it by those who commercialized him, of whom you are one. I understand that in your case it was not as profitable as you might have wanted. To others it yielded a considerable return. To Jim it was a disaster.

Literary theft is, to me, more disreputable than other stealing because it is done by those who do not have to steal for their livelihood or to satisfy other needs. I am, of course, hurt when I am the victim. More, in the field in which for many years I have worked, I believe much is involved. Others and I have worked hard and at great cost in an effort to establish truth and so that the country can benefit therefrom. The crooks, of whom you are one of the least skilfully disguised, also hurt this effort in many ways, the most obvious being in destroying credibility.

Bud Fensterwald is as open a man, in many ways, as Jim Garrison. He would like to help everyone, and his intention is to help. Like Jim, he has done little personal investigation, having drawn upon others. And like Jim, he is easily imposed upon. The first two times I mentioned it to him, Bud claimed not to know you plan a book on the King/Ray case. Thursday he acknowledged that he knows you are doing one.

What you may not know is how much of what Bud has is my work. So, I am telling you - and in telling you, I am also warning you. Even his client I got for him. My own concern for this being handled cleanly and acceptably is such that I declined a request from a major publisher that I do a short, fast,

sensationally-written book not on the results of my work but on what I have done. This is neither my bag nor the means by which truth is established.

Although it should not be necessary to tell you this, I do remind you that a writer's rights in his material are vested in the common law as well as by copyright. He does not lose these rights when his material is used in any kind of official proceeding (witness the Archives and the Warren material). Prior to making all of my work available to Bud, I did inquire into this. You may have no way of knowing it (save that you certainly know it is not your own work), but a fair amount of the court record is my work. I have not given you and I will not give you the right to use any of my work.

Naturally, you can do your own work, even if in this field you seem never to have done it before. But, stay away from mine, in any form and from any secondary source. There is plenty to be done by everyone. You do not have to be a thief, even if that is the easier way.

There are also differences between the situation today and that prior to the Garrison disaster. I think it might help you to understand some of them. Although it was not the case when you began association with Bud, I am now under contract to a publisher, so it is not I alone who will have an interest in doing something about plagiarism. Nor will my resources be as limited. Also, in earlier days there seemed to be a constructive purpose to be served by silence about the transgressions of an unfortunately large number of people. Not only is that no longer the case, but I have had all I want of the defense of the crooks, that I am some kind of paranoid who imagines these things and other, similar libels and slanders.

Literary crooks and whores seem to engage in self-deception, to make what they do more tolerable to themselves. All, of course, have the loftiest motive. One seems to have spoken for most when he said, "As far as I am concerned, once Hal publishes it, it becomes public domain." I would encourage you not to believe this.

Nor would you be wise to assume that I have written Meredith for harassment. You know of your own theft, but you do not know that they owe me money under signed contracts, where they have never paid the contracted sums, and for the use of what was not contracted - as well as its misuse. I do not seek the hurt of any others, but I do and will seek the relief of my own hurt. If they are willing to make a fair settlement, as they originally indicated, that will satisfy me. If they are not, I do propose to seek relief in court, which will also be in public. If, as they indicated, they showed my letters to you, you should know that I am a father who knows his own son.

In all of this Bud is also in a vulnerable position. I would prevent hurt or the possibility of hurt to him, too. He is my lawyer in some matters, which complicates his life and activities in one direction, and he represents Ray's interests, which does the same to him in other ways. There he also has those who may well be looking for the chance to do something to him. And I, please believe me, will be vigilant in defending my own interests and those that mean something to me. It is not going to be as it has been, whatever is required, whatever is involved.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg