

3/10/72

Dear Gary,

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I'll be mailing Ned when I mail this. Unless you elect to discuss it with ~~you~~, which you may or may not do, as you see fit, I want it to be entirely in confidence. The same goes for what I will tell you that I have not told him entirely in confidence. I was disappointed that after our talk, no matter how innocent your intent, you discussed Graham with Paul. As I have told you many times, I do not want this and as you know without my telling you, although I have, I am quite capable of telling those I want to know anything exactly what I do want them to know. This is a childishness in the context of the subject. If for no other reason, knowing the state of my nerves, it was on that basis alone wrong, especially for one of your discipline.

It is now about six months since I first asked you to seek assurances for me that he would keep his word. I had many reasons, including my amateur evaluation of his emotional state, psychiatric problems and uncomprehended needs and my fear of the very serious harm he could do the work and the personal damage consequent to "il and to me. I know you are and have been busy, but I don't think you have been that busy all that time. I know it is not a pleasant thing I asked of you. But if you didn't want to do it, the easiest thing would have been to say so, and I'd have been spared at the least the time it took to write those letters. I raised this again two months ago when you were now here.

If my analysis is correct, it is now only academic, for he has done it, that is, what I feared he would, which only begins with breaking his word. If there is only one occasion, I think I can time that with fair accuracy from the nature of one relationship I have had and the out-of-character communication, a really stupid one, from one I now believe he has gone to, despite my absolute prohibition and his promise not to. And if he has done what I believe he has, he will have damaged "il and me enormously and measureably. And I will sue the bastard. I use this description as the alternative to describing him as sicker than I had come to think. And that ego or hidden compulsion will yet ruin him. If what I believe he has done succeeds, one almost inevitable consequence will have been to ruin years of my work and the book on which he has provided a record that will be sensational in court. It will be difficult for me to do anything, but you believe me, I'll make a stalwart effort. And it may provide the means of offsetting the collateral damage that is inevitable. If I am without means of taking depositions, I am not without the energy and determination to take interrogatories, and without giving this deep thought, the number of those from whom I would ask this is great. Moreover, because of diversity of citizenship and the fact that the agreement was entered into within this jurisdiction, it would all be here, which reduces some of my problems and magnifies his.

So, if he has done what I believe he has, if he has not been able to control his ego and ambition, he has been accommodating enough to be stupid about the whole thing and to be as helpful to any effort I may make as I could ever have hoped.

None of this makes me less than very sorry, for him, for us, and for everyone of decent concern. On the official end it will make a miserable mess. He will not be long in coming to realize that it is not longer of meaning to say or prove the report wrong, and then he will have to face the rest of it. All his money couldn't persuade me to switch places when this happens.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

3/10/72

Dear Ned,

When two men enter into an agreement involving the property and rights of one and that agreement ends, and when the first asks obvious assurances of the second, it is not the same as asking a woman to parade in pickets proclaiming her purity.

I ~~am~~ did not ask assurances of you because I was certain you would not find some means of assuring yourself you were not violating the conditions I imposed and you agreed to while at the same time violating them.

Frankly, I was surprised that you didn't provide this voluntarily, without my asking for it - before I had a chance to. I am not comforted by your failure to respond to any one of the requests I have made for this assurance. There has not to this day been even acknowledgement.

I regard this as exceptional. More so because of what I thought of you.

I also now have what I regard as sufficient reason to understand why you would not provide this assurance. In part it seems to involve your doing one thing you asked and I absolutely refused under any circumstances, and to this you also agreed. If this turns out to be the case, you may have done great harm, including to us personally. And if that turns out to be the case, then you should expect a strong reaction. I will not be damaged without an attempt to recover, and what I have that can be damaged represents a great cost in more than money.

Washington, without so intending, often provides me with the raw material with which I can make analyses. Right now I have a fair amount of this kind of raw material, and from more than one source there inside the government and from outside the government, too. One of my non-government Washington sources has not really understood what he was telling me, so he has no reluctance and was very helpful.

Taken together, there are very few directions in which this can point.

If my apprehensions turn out to be warranted, get your thesis done fast. You may be busy for a while.

And I take the liberty of suggesting, without unfriendly intent, that you get some help in putting your head together.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg