

Dear Jim,

6/18/89

In the mail today I have, in a Tony Summers Ireland envelope but mailed from Washington I think day before yesterday, a copy of the letter he wrote me May 9 of this year. Nothing else with it and when Debbie Roberts was here to deliver the machine she told me it was her last chore for Tony. So, perhaps you mailed it. In any event, I sent you copies of all our correspondence, including attachments, and despite Tony's expressed concern, which is persuasive, it just does not wash.

I've been busy on other things, tire easily, so I didn't get around to writing you as I intended when I responded to Sterling Lord's letter, copies enclosed.

Although I rarely used the machine, the return of which was not my major concern, it happens that beginning about last September or October, I ~~did~~ did need it and was not able to dictate because there was no way of transcribing. Dave had asked me to annotate some books. Not having the machine means that with one exception I had to ^{copy, type} annotate the books themselves and thus what I noted is not available except from those books. The one exception was quite laborious for me because of my limitations but it is typed.

All Tony says is not relevant. He was to have kept the machine only long enough to learn what should have been obvious were he not so cheap, that it saves enormous amounts of time in transcribing tapes, of which he made many. I'd even inquired for him about the availability locally of a machine designed for the minicassettes. Instead he just kept it until after he left. I sent you a copy of my letter to him long before he and Cathy packed up, so the excuse of the deficient assistant is not ~~relevant~~ relevant. He and/or Cathy got it. Moreover, Cathy and Paul had planned to visit before returning, she'd phoned me several times about it, and in the end Tony did not leave them even that little bit of time, such as his selfishness that, I recognize, is also the intensity of his work. But when he places his work over all other matters, that is selfishness.

The one letter he claims not to have gotten is the one in which I notified him that he had not lived up to our agreement and it therefore is nullified and that I want him not to use any of what I told him in confidence, subject to his performing on our agreement.

Which he promptly rewrote and made entirely unacceptable to me. I do not want and did not ask for any "collaborator."

I have a return address on all I mail and the letter he claims not to have received, including I think one to Ireland, was not returned. I got his address from you so I could write him there and it is his correct address.

Frankly, I think his intent is to steal for his Hoover book. Otherwise, why is he so unwilling to recognize what is obvious, that he did not perform. Writing Lord so long after he was to have performed is meaningless. Worse. I'm older, with less time left, and the elapsed time is the time in which I was to have had an assistant to make the work possible.

And while you may not have had the experience, although I excused it and never mentioned it to him, he has lied, grossly. He wrote someone who sent the letter to me saying that I had refused to see or help him with his "Conspiracy." book. There is nobody in the world who can make such a statement honestly and as you well know, most of the time I spend helping other is spent helping those I do not agree with. In that business the truth is the exact opposite of what Tony wrote, I invited him here and offered him free access which, as you know, everyone has.

I've also had prior experience with Lord, whose record and reputation are fine on other matters.

Unless there is more to write him about, ^{I want, but} and if he does not respond as I asked him to some time ago, copy to you, I'll have to write him again. But I want to leave no doubt about it, he has lost what rights he had and I want him not to use a word of what he got in confidence. I'm sure I'll get nothing acceptable from Lord. Best,

David

PHONE
353 (Ireland)-24(Youghal)-96210

ANTHONY SUMMERS

STILL POINT,
DROMORE,
AGLISH,
CAPPOQUIN,
CO. WATERFORD,
IRELAND.

9.5.89

Mr. H. Weisberg,
7627 Old Receiver Road,
Frederick, MD21701.

Dear Harold,

I just got back from the very hectic trip to the States, and received your letter of April 30 - again letting me know that the machine had failed to arrive. I suspect that you must have had a call from Debbie Roberts almost as soon as you had mailed the letter to me - and that she let you know the machine was safely retrieved and on its way in her care. I do hope you have by now received it.

I can see you are still annoyed about this. I did the very best I could, operating initially from such a great distance, and then in the difficult circumstances of my visit. Perhaps I have not explained clearly enough what occurred. My previously super-efficient secretary of last year did not just fail to return your machine. She literally vanished for months, along with piles of documents vital to Kathy and myself, with my car, and a great deal of money, and of course, your machine. Kathy and I spent hours on the phone trying to contact her, and both did so again the very hour I heard your machine was still missing. Then, when I arrived in the States, I made sure the machine was retrieved - literally by having the errant secretary's house staked out. Finally, as I whittled off again - I covered several cities in ten days - I regularly checked with Debbie (who was our able runner last year) to see that she was dealing with the matter. She called to say she had spoken with you, and had made an appointment to return the machine by hand. And I fervently hope you now have it.

Harold, I do not know how I could have handled this more expeditiously, in the circumstances. Before Christmas, Kathy and I would have deemed it unthinkable that our secretary could behave so poorly. But behave badly she did. (For my part, I am still some \$5000 in the hole, and will be taking the woman to court in an effort to salvage something.) That said, I am - I say again - extremely sorry the delay occurred. I would ask you to reflect that it is not my general style to deal with you in cavalier fashion. I have always responded promptly to your letters, and I strove as best I could to help with the King book plan. My agent, Sterling Lord, did make an effort, and did believe at one stage he had found a suitable collaborator for the project. I raised this again with him when I saw him in New York last week (before getting your letter of April 30), and Sterling said he would think again. There are, of course, the usual "Buts". There have been recent successful books on King (though we know they're not anything like what yours would be), and the sort of collaboration you need is hard to pin down. Sterling should have written to you - but then sometimes he does not get letters to me on things, and that leaves me hopping mad too. He is, however, a good agent, and I suspect that he simply has not written until he has something useful to say.

over....

You wrote me last November 23 that you had thought about nudging Sterling Lord, and decided not "because experience suggests there's little hope of progress without real interest." I think that was right, but all the same, I am today writing to Lord to get him to give you the courtesy of a letter at least.

Finally, as to the misunderstanding we had about the King stuff we discussed I believe I am perhaps missing at least one letter from you, and once again my vanishing secretary is probably the culprit. Another of her undone tasks was to clear our Manassas mailbox and send mail on. Kathy and I are gradually discovering that she did pick up mail at first, but then failed to send it on. Frankly, it is a nightmare during such a huge research project. However, this is the way we left it, as I understood it from the last relevant correspondence I did get. You said in yours of December 6, just before I left for home, "I suggest that when you get around to that part you write me what you intend to use. I had in mind those things I mentioned and nothing else. If you would like to use more, tell me what it is and I'll respond promptly." So, on those lines, what I planned to do was simply to summarise the nub of your information rather along the lines of the outline we sent to Sterling Lord, with key names left out if you so wished. And with a firm credit to you, so that it might stimulate fresh interest in the case, through you. That, I think, is the reason for getting this into my Hoover book - to take the opportunity to air the matter in a serious publication likely to be covered by the press. I think it would be a pity to let the matter stay buried, and I do hope that - on further reflection now - you will agree to some such formula. At any rate, what I would like to do is to draft something - not more than a few paragraphs, and mail it to you for approval when I get to that point in the book.

As of today, I have not even started Chapter One, and delivery is early next year..... so I'd better get back to it.

Warmest regards to you and Lil. And, again, I am so sorry you were upset by the delay over the machine. Please God, the thing is back with you long before you get this letter.

Best,

Tams,