

DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY  
20 GARDEN STREET  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

7/20/90

Dear Harry,

I'm sorry, too, that Indralakshmi Din-Dayal's work wasn't what ~~xxx~~ you expected of her. I think she had trouble figuring out exactly what you did want, and she isn't, as your letter said, as close to the material as you are. But she is bright, talented, hard-working, etc/. and does believe that your research is of value. So if your film project gets funded, I hope you'll keep her in mind. She may have some time from this point on to the beginning of the fall term to be of help to you.

I hope that the film project does get funded, though the time is narrowing between now and when the paperback version of the book gets published. I'm assuming that the official Nov. publication date is somewhere close to the November assassination date, though the copies will be available in the stores earlier.

Where are you going on tour for the book? I hope to be able to get some of the Extension alumni in a week or so when they are back from vacation so I can confirm with them the possibility--if they are interested, as I hope they'll be--in your coming here to speak about the book and about the assassination.

The weather is very warm, unseasonably warm, even for this time of year: high humidity, temperatures in the 90s now for five days running. I know that Baltimore is probably hotter, so I hope that you have a couple of air-conditioners in your new home there.

Is there anything new on the other books you planned to publish this fall and winter, or are all of your energies going into the Kennedy paperback?

Do I recall, incidentally, that you were thinking of reprinting the Weisberg book Indralakshmi was reading, or of printing a new book by him? If you do want to do the Weisberg book, it should be rewritten; it's a dense book (she showed it to me), but very badly written, and badly printed. If it should need a larger audience, it will have to be reworked a bit.

Best wishes,

\* ↑  
From a Dean at  
Harvard



7/23/90

Dear Harold:

This note is written in good will, in hopes that the venom that you keep expressing will calm down. I don't mean any harm by you, but feel that do so by me. I frankly take as intimidation the inclusion of something about Rick at the end of your letter.

We all have to take criticism. I have been wrong. I think you go vastly too far in many of your accusations. Once again we have got a mix-up over language on many scores in what you say in the latest letters.

I sometimes say things in haste, as you are not the easiest person to talk to, and you admit that you constantly write things in haste and that they might not be clear. I had been hoping that we could rework Postmortem but you have made that impossible.

As for a mix-up over language. I said over the phone that when I finally got your corrections for HIGH TREASON, it was in Second Gallery. I then put those in and sent you a copy of the third galley changes you requested. I did this for a lot of people, and I was just trying to show you good will and what I get for it is a really vile assault on me: ".... to say as you did or even suggest that you made any changes for me or at my importing...." is a real lie (you say to me.)

All through the recent letters runs the statement that I am lying about this and that.

On the phone I said that we were in Second Gallies when I got your changes. This got to be that you made changes on the galley (yourself).

Yes, when I called you from a phone away from home one day, you wanted to give me the corrections right then, so I took them as best as I could. That was unfortunate, and I told you I felt bad about it as we were doing it. Yes, I did send you the original print-out a year before that, and I believe I sent it to you twice. Since a lot of mail never got from, the U.S. to Canada or from me to others in the U.S. (it is possible that that is what happened.

But I'm sure that you will now accuse me of making that up.

Harold, I am heartily sorry for this fight. I merely tried to point out something to you, and it has degenerated into name calling. There are many statements in your letters that are not true. Not lies, just mistaken.

With reference to the AP man, again, I did not say that you ridiculed me. That you ~~were~~ used to ridicule our findings, and that you did not have the basis in the evidence to make the statements that you made (and continue to make.) You are very wrong.

You also seem to have some huge fantasy as to what I think might have happened between 6 PM Nov 22 and the cutting. I just say that I don't feel that all of that time is adequately accounted for. That's all. I don't imply anything else or even think it. I just want a straight account of what happened in that period and can't find it. as you say, the ambulance trip did not take that long, and I say that the x-rays etc did not take but part of the remainder. Certainly not almost two hours. (if we figure from 6:30 to 8:15.) Again, you get me mixed up with Lifton.

Speaking of that, I have got a massive amount of slander and so on behind my back. I want to see ~~if~~ what is going on here, and if you are now going to pass on some of what you say in your letters--many accusations which I vehemently deny. I mean no harm at all to you, but I think you have meant harm to me all along.

Tell me, Rick was rather bitter about you expecting him to do your ~~xxx~~ yard work. How about being an errand boy and doing copying for you for me? Aren't you trying to intimidate me?

You know, I offered in a polite way to help you get your work out in a better format. You admit that I would have had to assume a work in the confusing sentence about the 4 PM decision on Bethesda. See, Harold, that is a serious problem all through your writing, which was done in haste. A lot of people have had too much stress to sort through all of that. You can't expect too much of people.

If they dare try to tell you this or seek substantive help from you, you try to destroy them.

"When you begin at 4 PM there wasn't really very much time to plot out all you say in your theory was plotted out. And before then it could not have been." (Your quote.) what in hell does this mean? What is my theory? What in hell are you talking about or accusing me of saying? This goes through each letter.

What we have here is some sort of real and greet hatred for me.

Thanks.

Harry