

TO: Jack White, Jim Marrs, Ed Tatro, Gary Mack
(copies to Charles Drago and Jerry Rose)
FROM: George Michael Evica, 207 N. Beacon St., Hartford CT
06105
DATE: August 14, 1993
RE: The Providence Conference and Harold Weisberg

In summary:

As co-host of The Third Decade's JFK conference and in preparation for that meeting, I wrote thirty people (in the U.S., Canada, Ireland, and Denmark) thirty DIFFERENT questions in order to elicit abstracts leading to possible conference papers for the Providence conference (that is, in addition to all those elicited by the general announcement). Twelve people responded to twelve DIFFERENT questions. Two of those "special" responses eventually developed into papers--neither on Harold Weisberg--which were presented at the conference (in addition to all the others).

Several people declined to participate but found the questions they received thought-provoking enough to respond with either shorter or longer letters to me. I repeat, each of the thirty people were asked thirty DIFFERENT questions. All thirty questions were deliberately provocative. Only one of those questions (asked of one person) had anything to do with Harold Weisberg.

Three letters I received in response to my queries from three people (responding to three DIFFERENT questions) who declined to participate were excellent: in effect, mini-papers. These responses were from 1. Jim Marrs responding to a question on the suspect institutions and organizations in the JFK assassination; 2. Jack White responding to a question on the apparent lack of sophistication in the faked backyard photos; and 3. David Wrone responding to the following two questions: a. "Has Harold Weisberg been a significant source of disinformation in the JFK assassination?" and b. "Why?"

I repeat, the question asked of David Wrone was about Weisberg as a "source of disinformation." It did not accuse Weisberg of being either a "disinformation agent" or a "government disinformation agent." Those two phrases are both Weisberg's. No statement was made and no question was asked about Harold Weisberg as a "disinformation agent." Weisberg was not characterized as a "disinformation agent." Only four people were aware I had written to Wrone: Drago, Rose, myself, and Wrone. I alone was responsible for the thirty questions.

Inadvisably, David Wrone communicated to Harold Weisberg some distorted version of the questions I asked Wrone--or Weisberg misread Wrone's communication.

Neither I, nor Charles Drago, nor Jerry Rose based any part

of our Providence conference planning or implementation on any past, present, or future work of or by Harrison Livingstone: I consider that charge an insult.

No one presented an abstract on Harold Weisberg to myself, Drago, or Rose; only David Wrone responded in a private letter to me about Weisberg; only David Wrone wrote an appreciative summary of his knowledge of Harold Weisberg's work which, I repeat, with certain possibly actionable charges eliminated, could be publishable if Jerry Rose saw fit.

No one wrote a paper on Harold Weisberg for *The Third Decade* in Providence.

No one made a presentation on Harold Weisberg for *The Third Decade* in Providence.

And I certainly did not make a speech anywhere accusing Harold Weisberg of being a disinformation agent. If Harold Weisberg has made such a statement, that statement constitutes an instance of actionable slander.

When you finish my letter you will read the letters of Charles Drago and Jerry Rose. And, unfortunately, you will read the letters of Harold Weisberg. To be brief and succinct, they turned my stomach. If any of you can halt Weisberg before he contacts any more people and further distorts this story, please do. You will find his letters filled with unproven charges and accusations (against myself, Charles Drago, and Jerry Rose) and articulated often in highly objectionable sexual and scatological vocabulary and imagery. I'm sorry you have to read these things, but you must understand that after praising Weisberg for what he did in the past, you must deal with what he is doing now.

Why did I ask the question of David Wrone?

Let me share with you an eight-year experience.

After three serious surgical procedures within nine days in 1985, I decided to again become active in the JFK assassination community. I presented a long paper in Washington on "The Second Oswald." By 1990, I was active in Washington, D.C., with AARC and attending JFK conferences and seminars across the country. I have given nine major papers since 1991 in Fredonia, Nashua, Chicago, Providence, and Dallas, for example, and have acted as a host or co-host at three major conferences.

Possibly because of my late (re-)start in 1985, possibly because *The Last Hurrah Bookshop* picked up my book *And We Are All Mortal* and it, in a sense, became newly available, possibly because starting with the Fredonia conference I have freely shared ideas with young researchers, have commented positively about young writers and researchers, and have tried to help and encourage young JFK researchers and critics, and have done all of

these supportive activities in the presence of other young researchers and students of the JFK assassination, I have been approached by scores of novice and beginning and aspiring students of the assassination. These responses were especially heavy after Harrison Livingstone attacked a presentation I gave at the Fredonia conference. These young people, carrying odd combinations of new and re-issued texts under their arms, asked me again and again: why do the critics and writers attack each other? What does it all mean? And the name that recurred over and over was the name of Harold Weisberg. Was Weisberg, they often asked, being used?

Whether deserved or not, whether true or not, accusations have circulated attributed to Weisberg made against a dozen critics and writers: charges of theft; cribbing; lack of proper documentation or faked documentation; dishonest use of documents; material gained from Weisberg and then not attributed or cited as gained without Weisberg's help; documents gained from government agencies refused to Weisberg, with hints of a special relation between the successful researcher and the agency in question. I repeat, whether true or not. I have heard negative stories attributed to Weisberg about Jim Garrison and the researchers who continued to support him after the Shaw trial; about Mark Lane; about John Davis; about David Lifton; and about others. You all know that the lone assassin media had a field day with Weisberg's criticisms of Garrison, Stone, JFK and the writers and researchers who worked on Stone's film. Several JFK writers and researchers have felt unfairly and unjustly criticized by Weisberg; why, they have asked me, did Weisberg attack them? Regardless of Weisberg's claim that he has not passed on his criticisms, the stories have been passed on.

David Wrone's letter to me documents some of the circulating Weisberg charges; Weisberg's letters to me give you more instances of these accusations (true or not).

Had David Wrone agreed to write a paper in response to my question, the Providence conference would have been enriched by Wrone's positive evaluation of Weisberg's past work. Wrone declined, and that should have been the end of it.

But, unfortunately, Wrone pressed Weisberg's button, and since then Weisberg has raged on, ignoring or misreading Drago's, Rose's, and my letters, all of which clearly indicated that no paper about Weisberg was presented at Providence. And, in the process, Weisberg has succeeded in slandering my good name, my character, and my reputation.

Please do not forget the charges made about the Providence conference being the creature of some un-named writer (who turned out to be Harrison Livingstone, according to Weisberg).

People who attended conferences and seminars in, for example, Fredonia, Chicago, Albany, Meriden, and Dallas have

asked me about Weisberg's circulating charges and accusations, and have wondered if Weisberg was being used by anti-conspiracy forces--whether, indeed, he was, unwitting or not, a "source of disinformation."

I quote directly from Jack White's August 9th, 1993 letter to Harold Weisberg:

[quote]

I had a very distressing call from Gary Mack last week telling me that you [Harold Weisberg] had told him [Gary Mack] essentially the following:

"George Michael Evica recently made a speech in which he stated that Jack White and Jim Marrs think that Harold Weisberg is a disinformation agent."

[end quote: emphasis added]

If being a "source of disinformation" is (deliberately or ignorantly) stating a falsehood in speech or writing, then the latter sentence certainly contains absolutely false and slanderous disinformation, and the ultimate source of that disinformation is certainly, therefore, a source of disinformation.

The source of that statement is (according to Gary Mack) Harold Weisberg.

Dear Ed Tatro: thank you for your offer.

Dear Jim and Jack: I look forward to seeing you again in Dallas.

Dear Gary Mack: I'm sorry Weisberg has involved you.

Yours

George Michael Evica
107 North Beacon St.
Hartford Ct. 06105
203-232-9673