

10/17/71

Dear Dick,

I started to read your October Computers words but that got too painful, so I wound up skimming it. However, I can receive one of the deep, conspiratorial, intelligence functions Oswald pursued on his first trip to Mexico. It was to spend the night with a whore. This is one of the more subtle expressions of sinister intelligence activity.

If you ever come to realize the terrible things you are doing, you will not be able to face yourself. If you are determined to destroy yourself and your self-respect, continue on the same course. We have been through this before, and I know trying to warn you is a futility, and fact is below contempt when there is the substitute of fancy.

A long and distressing history would tell me that trying to persuade me that shit is not mine is a futility, but I repeat it, I hope for the last time, for I would not only save you from the ultimate self-confrontation, but I would defend me all from the end product of such insanity committed to paper. If you think these are exaggerated statements, then I offer you this challenge: Pick a date when I have completed the work upon which I am now engaged, bring all your Computers writings with you, and I'll go over them with you word by word, extemporaneously, on tape, you bring your machine and I'll have mine and we'll both have a record. But I believe you will not because you are possessed of a good mine on every other subject and you will not, subconsciously, face what your considerable ambitions drives you to.

I have other purposes in writing. For the last time, I'm telling you that that Ward's Paul material is mine, not Bud's or the CIA's. I got it independently, told Bud about it in confidence, he offered to check the Ward's Paul files for me and in strictest confidence, and he not only breached that confidence but when he was here to copy some pictures, he also made a slide of what he did not get from Ward & Paul but from my files when I was not watching him. He has since returned 3 slides and I can and will show it to you. Now, what you say (42) is that "the Commission went to the extreme of forcing the stenographer to destroy his notes." Your reference is not to the source of this inaccurate statement. That is my material as I have told you and Berkeley. I never gave you permission to use it. I forbade it in showing it to Bud to begin with. "You persist in misusing it. I don't want you ever to do it again. And I go further, if you persist in publishing this kind of utter rubbish, which is so harmful to all of us and credibility and the possibility of doing responsible work, I will at some point have to address myself to it and I think you will at that time find what I will do something you will not forget as long as you live. If you want a slight sample, where the material is not nearly as rich, reread the "Epilogs" to W & P.

Your intentions, of which I have no doubt, is one thing. Your ignorance, irrationality and irresponsibility are quite another, and I am more than willing to confront you on my use of ward, as set forth above.

It was quite painful for me to take the time and use the words I did at Bud's party on the 0 matter. You then thanked me, but from what I soon heard your ego couldn't tolerate this and you were soon giving an entirely contradictory account. I then charged you with the possibilities. "Remember to you, one of the consequences was to close off an entirely different source that had opened to me, as soon as you wrote what you did, and I then told you that you were being used. If I did not then show you the proof, I did show "in case he will confirm it, but you prefer never to learn from any of the endless mistakes.

I believe you refer to a total of three agents to whom Oswald reported in two cities. I would appreciate it if you were to give me their names and the proof, not some second or third-hand establishment. I would also like to see the copy of the CIA you say Walters gave Garrison. I was there at about that time and this is not the story I was given.

Dick, I beg of you, do not force me to what you are making inevitable to our survival.

8/13/71

Dear Miss Nixon,

The enclosures answer your inquiries about what else I've published. I keep working full time plus on a number of books but have no idea if, when or how they will be published for I can't get further into debt to do it myself.

There are, in my opinion, two Richard Spragues. The person is a fine, well-intentioned fellow, the zany who writes for Computers under his own name and aliases is dangerous, sick and a serious impediment to the credibility of those really working, doing their own work. He has obtained what he had no business having, work not his, used and misused it, for all the world as though he had done the work. Most of what he has done that I see is wildly insane and ought not be able to survive the cool examination of an average intelligence. Like having "confessions" from "about" 6 assassins.

What he originally set out to do, collect as many of the pictures as possible, he did well and all are indebted to him for this. It is when he got over his depth making out like an investigator and interpreting his own farout desires and opinions as analysis and fact that he got lost.

It is too bad, because he does want to do what is right and is a fine person as a person. ~~But~~ But on this he has crossed the line and is utterly, stubbornly irrational. Don't believe anything he has written without independent confirmation from a source you know, independently, is trustworthy.

I'm sorry the truth is so unpleasant.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Jim Lesar

5/24/71

Dear Dick,

An enormous amount of my time has been spent in trying to prevent (what in too many cases do not rest on my opinion) that which can hurt us. Some of these have been disasters. In almost every case some very well meaning person has been the cause or a succubus. There was one after I saw you at Bud's party that convinced me I can't prevent all the zany things the dedicated wrong can dream up. Besides this, it is an enormous emotional drain I can long long tolerate. You have no idea the cost in time alone in these things, and for me the financial cost of some has also been great. I think you can understand that when I began without funds and have no regular income, the very slightest cost becomes a considerable burden.

After Bud's party I heard a rumor that your attitude, or at least what I then understood to be your attitude, had, shall I say "changed"? If so, there is nothing I can do about it. I spoke to you honestly, the advice I gave you is advice you will regret not taking if you do not. If you do not believe me, we'll have to await the unfurling of time.

In any event, I'll write no long letters as I have in the past, to you or anyone else, trying to inform, trying to make it clear that a planned course of action is an error. I can't prevent the errors so many are capable of dreaming up.

My purpose in writing, however, is not this, which I intend for your understanding. You can accept it or you cannot, as you decide for yourself.

It is, rather, because of some troubling details of the entire Jim G. business. Although I was aware of the possibility from the very first (it not having been the first such venture if it is not genuine), lately I have wondered more and more whether it was a carefully-devised thing and whether or not your part in it was contrived, either by Jim or by someone else using him (where his intentions need not have been evil). Is this some kind of put-on, some kind of snare or trap? I don't know. I have substantial reason for so believing, yet it is not at all certain.

So my real purpose is to ask you to give me all the details, from the time he first wrote you or, if it is no burden, copies of the letters he may have written you. What you do not know is how little detail he has added to what I had known for some time, in those areas where you were informed (and from what you said, you were not informed in all). There came a time when I leaned on Jim a bit. He told me he had told you that he had been working with me, and that I had tried to both caution and direct him. I have no way of knowing whether or not this is true. But if it is, ask yourself why he then told you? How much work have you done on that aspect? How much do you really know about it? If, as I believe, you know no more than what is generally believed, why should he have blabbed so to you? The only substantial information the CIA has on this of which I know is my work. So, when he is dealing with a man who is an expert on that aspect, of which there are among all of us only two, what should he suddenly make an approach to a man who is not? There are other things I could add to this, but I simply haven't time for it. I got up at 5 a.m. to continue writing, but this was on my mind, as it has been for several days, so I write you. I will add one that you should have little trouble understanding: if what he says is true, is not one or more people in some danger? Potential danger, anyway? The first things I did was warn him of this, long, long before you were out there. Why, then, blab at all about this, and especially to one who clearly tends to rush into print and who could be depended upon to inform a number of others, any one of whom might let it slip (and have an unfortunately clear record of having done this too, too much)? Do as you will, but I think it would be a good idea if, as soon as you can find time, you give me all the detail possible, including the tiniest. This may be a working of what Orwell called the Department of Distortion and if so, it is a subtle one. Best regards,