

Dear Ed,

8/22/93

I'm ^{very} glad to get your 8/18, albeit without any page 5 and I assure you that so far as I am concerned you ~~are~~^{are} not in the middle on ~~any~~ anything at all, I'll make no use of anything you said. But when last evening I had a chance to read that swill Evica sent I got even sicker of the whole bloody mess and of the ignorance, arrogance of mind and spirit and the ~~gross~~^{gross} stupidity of those who palm themselves off as experts when their only apparent expertise is in juvenilism, irresponsibility and self importance. It once again convinces me of the correctness of my position in having nothing to do with any theorizing of any kind. And I'm impressed by Evica's evasiveness and distortions. The simplest explanation of one aspect of this is his steadfast refusal to make direct response to the real question I asked him, not his reformulation that was intended to deceive his addressees, was Harry Livingstone in any way, directly or indirectly, the cause of his formulation, that paper proposal and in particular the language of its formulation. If he had answered that to begin with nothing else would have followed.

More, the man can't really be rational when he says that anything wrong said is "actionable."

Whatever he may be otherwise, on this subject he is not rational. But in this subject, irrationality is not that unusual.

I never met Evica personally and never had any prior communication of any kind with him. I think it is ~~not~~ perhaps a bit unusual when he presents himself as an expert that in all these years he has not asked me for any information of any kind, has not asked me what the records I obtained contain or any question at all about them. This is to say that his concept of subject-matter scholarship excludes information to begin with.

I first heard of him in about early 1967, perhaps a little earlier, from an indignant man who lived near him. Evica had announced or was part of a confab of some kind in Hartford, perhaps at his school. Those he invited did not include me. Do not misunderstand this. If he had invited me I would not have been able to go. In those days I was that broke. ~~If~~^{If} going would have increased my debt and my expenditures then were restricted to trying to reduce the debt from my publications. But this man asked Evica why he had not invited me. The thrust of what Evica told him, from what he told me, is that he wanted to limit the attention among authors to Mark Lane. As is true in what Evica wrote and you ~~saw~~^{sent} me a copy of, it is not impossible for things to get twisted, but you will find that I was not at that Hartford conference and if you ever get a chance to see his records on it, I was not there because he did not invite me so far as his records can reflect.

This is to say that whatever its cause, Evica began with a prejudice and that from that time on I wanted nothing to do with him and was never in touch with him.

Before going on, and I'm doing this without rereading what he wrote, let me pose a different version of irrationality. Is it possible for anyone not irrational to believe that I could be any kind of purveyor of real disinformation, which means no matter how he twists it, for the government, with my public record? From the seven books I've published and their content? From the many lawsuits I filed against the government? From the precedents set in them? From even having caused the amending of the Freedom of Information Act to open CIA and FBI files? Separate from this is the reason he now gives for posing the question, a reason I believe is at best dubious in its irresponsibility if not rationality? Or ^{Evica} ~~Evica~~ and not he alone ^{we} so utterly involved in their conspiracy-theory games that nothing else is real to them?

On why he did it, if what he tells you is true, why did he not tell me that to begin with when I asked him? Is this rational? I write him to find out what started all of it and he now says some ignorant kids looking for information did and he can't tell me that in response- if it is true? *Who can prove anything - or take his word?*

I get to this to get it over with and not have it intrude in my day as soon as I arose. If I have not told you, from several of my illnesses I cannot help being wide awake when I ~~am~~ awaken very early in the morning. The only way I can increase this little sleep is by retiring quite early. Then I can get, with interruptions from these illnesses, from four to on a good night six hours sleep. Not enough for an 80-year old man who ~~has~~ has a number of serious illnesses and has had many more serious operations than Evica invokes as justification for his oversights, if that is the word?

Is it not reasonable to ask what kind of man starts what he intended to be public that kind of inherently defamatory nonsense about one of my age, regardless of health? Is that in itself less than monstrous, at the least crudely thoughtless? Anything other than the inherent irrationality of all he is and is into?

As I hope will become clear, and I'm ~~not~~ going to reread his crap to be certain, it is characterized by evasions, fingers-crossed expressions and statements he has to have had questions about. This includes what is also irrelevant, that no paper was ever presented, ~~things like that~~ *never said or suggested that there was a paper.* It is clear I made no effort to interfere in any way and that I waited for several weeks before writing him-after his gathering was over.

And he lies throughout. I'll come to the first I marked. What I did as I read it was use a highlighter not intending to waste more time in rereading. So there may be early on what I did ~~not make~~ ^{make} that is relevant to what he said later.

On the first page he says that "Inadvisedly, David Wrone communicated to Weisberg some distorted version of the questions I asked Wrone ~~or~~ ^{why inadvisedly?} or Weisberg misread Wrone's communication." He knows that all aspects of this are false. What Wrone, shocked as he was, did was to send me a copy of what Evica wrote him. Rather than misread it I quoted it verbatim to Evica. ~~So~~ he begins as a deliberate liar in his 8/14. And in my later references to it I did not misread or misinterpret it in any way. (I have

trouble and sometimes pain in moving around and for years just ^ogetting into files and re-filing has been a problem so I did not go to the files to quote him verbatim again.)

Now what, other than in Evica's closed mind and self-concept, is "inadvised" in anyone informing anyone else of a defamation or of what can be the beginning of a major distraction in his life and work? Work, I add, that is factual, not the childish games that are the reality of what Evica is into?

He next evades in saying that in the planning Livingstone's "work" was not considered. His is adept at using 10 words when one will do. But the point is that Livingstone's "work" was not what I asked him about and in the posing of the question alone he raised what ^{alone} Livingstone also had raised.

He then uses blacker type to deny he made a speech, careful, because he knew that what he had been told was not likely at all, to say, "If Harold has made such a statement." He actually knew better when he pulled that one because we had exchanged letters and he knew I had restricted myself ^{the question (?)} to what he wrote Wrono.

What actually happened is that Gary Mack phoned me about a different matter, I then asked him, because I had no address on either, to ask White and Marris if they had been the ones who raised that insanity with Evica. ^{Evica} he never answered my question on that and he did use their names. Why use their names if they had no connections? He

in his letters to Drago and Rose said he attached their letters. He did not attach or enclose them when he wrote me. But what I told Mack is precisely what Evica said. How it got twisted I do not know but Evica knew ^{it} that I was saying and it is dishonest, unless he lacks rationality, to emphasize what he had no reason to believe, that I said he had made a speech.

I don't know what in the hell his 1985 life has to do with anything ^{involved}.

Before resuming with his unnumbered page I note that ~~his~~ that his ignorance extends to the law. He says that is what Wrono wrote him there are "certain actionable charges..." The walking and stalking self-important man is in plain English full of shit. And this is not his only reference to what he says is "actionable."

He then refers to "young researchers and students" who he says asked him questions and he refers to the crazy theoretical books supposedly on the assassination as "texts". He says they asked him "again and again why do the critics and writers attack each other?" He then says that "the name that recurred over and over was" my name. That is plain false. I have always avoided public criticism of others when that was possible, no matter how much I disagreed with them, for various reasons I here do not go into. I have attended no meetings and I have even avoided most TV and radio appearances. I cannot safely travel to studios, either, so I have not in many, many years.

The one thing that there can have been in anyone's mind, and it certainly cannot have originated in the minds of the kids he cites as his basis, is what I did and said relating to Oliver Stone. About which Evica, self-proclaimed scholar and expert that he pretends to be, does not know a damned thing. All he knows, and this is the commo

intellectual sickness of that zany gang of those whose lives are involved in theories they make up like kids' games and in which the ~~the~~ available fact is anathema because it precludes the games they love and make them feel important. None of them know ~~xxx~~ what Stone said in announcing his movie or care because fact is irrelevant in their lives. But for that matter they live in ignorance of much that they write and talk about, Evica in particular, on Stone and on Garrison.

I have not been asked a single question by any one of that sick tribe about what I learned or was part of in New Orleans. To begin with I believed Garrison but in time I had to face the fact that what he did not steal and enlarge upon he just made up. Take this 100% literally. It confronted me with one of the most difficult tasks of my life when just before the 1968 anniversary two members of his staff, his chief investigator and the assistant district attorney who spent most time with him, asked me to try to do what the staff had failed to do, talk him out of marking that anniversary with what was absolutely crazy and he had talked himself into believing. He was going to ~~charge~~ charge Edgar Eugene Bradley with being one of the assassins on the grassy knoll and Nanny Ferrin Rich's deceased husband with being the other assassin.

I hope you are not one of those who saw any relevance in those "tramp" pictures because there not only was none, it was not in any way possible. But that is the only basis for his including Bradley, his misidentification of Bradley as one of the men in those pictures. Perrin had killed himself in 8/62. Knowing that Garrison invented the story that the conspirators, in 1962, went through with a pretense and buried a Venezuelan seaman in ~~Perrin~~ Perrin's name and that Perrin continued to live under the name "Starr" and was an assassin. No investigation of any of this at all. He just made it up. There is more, but this should be enough. When I prepared a ~~xxx~~ report on the actualities, Garrison knew he did not dare go any farther and he dropped it. But he also could not admit that he had made it all up. So, he fired Boxley and said what he knew was a lie, that the CIA had infiltrated him to wreck the investigation. I have my report and its documentation. This and more like it is the man Stone was going to make into a hero and did in his movie.

Now if Stone had not presented his movie, made a repeated public representation of it as non-fiction, he had every right to say anything he wanted to say. But he began and never ever really stopped saying that he would and these are his words, record their history for the people and tell them who killed their President why and how. When I learned those things, several months before he started shooting, I wrote him at some length about Garrison and in particular about Garrison's book that Stone said would be the basis of his movie, with the foregoing and several other gross lies in that book. I attached some documentation, offered more and to answer any questions he had, and never heard from him. So, two months later, when I was given a copy of the script and no changes in the script have any relevance at all- I gave that script, which

Stone lied and ~~and~~ stole-how in the world could I have ^π and my ^{low} file on ^e ~~his~~ I printed an unimaginable disaster for all if ~~his~~ ^{was} charging a ^{ed} corpse with ^t being an assassin-to George ^Lardner, of the Washington Post. That is the beginning of the public discussion and criticism of Stone's movie.

It can in part be simplified as his making a hero of a fraud and representing as truth what was false to the people- and doing this knowingly, just to make more money and get more publicity, for himself and for his movie.

It is only gross and determined ignorance that can let anyone speak well of Stone's movie in Stone's terms, the terms that ~~his~~ ^{story} would otherwise record, as the established truth about the assassination and about Garrison. Evica is one of those determined to remain ignorant because he asked not a single question and he knew how to and of whom. This gets to his and the self-concept of many others of those who live the childish game of theorizing conspiracies: they need no fact. They knew all there is to know without any fact.

If there were these kids in the Number Evica represents ^{and} if they asked him the questions he represents they did, what ~~is~~ ⁱⁿ the hell kind of expert or college professor is it who does not ask a single question of the source he knows about?

Careful to try to cover his lie by asking "whether," Evica then says - and he should, ^{is} he intended honesty and responsibility, sought to have learned that "whether", ^{was} that, in his own version, "anonymously," that "accusations have circulated attributed to Weisberg" of charges against a dozen of so others. If Evica had any reason to believe this he does not state ~~and~~ it and there is no reason at all. What I regard as crap does not interest me, I waste no time on it, and on the rare occasions when I cannot avoid it I am always factual. There is, as you know, none of this in my writing and I am not often quoted in the papers. I want to be explicit of this. If Evica is not a knowing liar he exaggerated, ~~knows~~ ^{knows} knowingly greatly. Moreover if it had been true, there is no way in the world that those he describes as kids and "neophytes" could have known it.

Now what do those kids ^{had} "neophytes" allege against me? That I made "Charges of theft; cribbing; lack of proper documentation; dishonest use of documents; material gained from Weisberg and then not attributed or cited as ^{going} without Weisberg's help; documents gained from government agencies, with hints of a special relation...." That this no good seeks to cover his invention with "whether true or not."

"Neophytes" could know all these things? And, that is the way I spend my life, my remaining days? Is it not to wonder when I have not been public in such matters what kind of source(s) Evica could have had for what could have been in my mail only?

But then look at this another way: Is it ^{my} ^{one} true? ^{ought} ^{not} a pretended scholar, another other than a phony, sought to have learned the truth instead of that wretchedly dishonest, ^{back} ^{faced} conclusion, "whether true or not"?

But then suppose it is true. How in the world can anyone other than a real phony or a literary theory himself condemn exposure of dishonesty and error? ^{Or} ^{Thinking}?

Then this omniscient, just ask him, ignoramus and enemy of real scholarship says, "I have heard ~~stories~~ 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." Well, this genius "heard stories" so did he make any effort to learn the truth? Shit, ~~man~~ man, who needs truth when he has preconceptions? Again, I have avoided going public with this and before I ~~discuss~~ discuss it how could he consider himself a scholar, even an honest man, in talking to his kids and "nephytes" at his feet in quest of truth and knowledge without learning the truth first ~~so~~ he would not lie to them? Evica just assumes there is no basis for anything like that when in fact there is no basis for anything else. Lane just perpetrated a knowing fraud in a book. Lifton knew his theory was impossible but made a fortune from it by selling it none the less. And John Davis! What a man from the depths of the profundity of his studied ignorance Evica picks here!

Davis has no basis for his Marcello crap at all. So he made one up, with me as his victim. That ~~was~~ was not in fact to have been his book at all. He saw how he could commercialize the assassination for money. So, his invented basis, and look in the paperback, it is there (and what a job I had getting it out of the paperback) is that not Marcello but his lawyer spent most of a summer "rummaging" through my files. Davis previously described this lawyer as a "top mafia lawyer." In fact he was not any kind of mafia lawyer. He was one of the best and most respected immigration lawyers, Jack Wasserman. His "rummaging" around my place for so long? That is one helluva way to say ~~we~~ never ~~aid~~ eyes on each other! He was never here. He never asked anything of me!

The one who did "rummage" is Davis himself. He did not want to come here and do his own work. He asked me to get a student to do it for him and she did for much if not most of her spare time in her senior year. Just directing her to the right files after spending some time orienting her took quite a bit of my time. That she also did ~~in~~ in other ways was inevitable. She had unsupervised access to all my files and to my copier, with the only charge half our actual copying cost per pages, and I have no idea what she copied for him. I never do and never want to. But what kind of dirty bastard is Davis to have had all that free ~~to~~ ^{and} then to have invented the libel that I left the mafia "rummage around" here for that much ~~if~~ ^{any} year? But without something like ~~that he had~~ ^{Davis} had no basis for his fabrication of Marcello interest. If he had had any, all he had to do was make a FOIA request himself or get someone to do it for him. But then the geniuses, the men of the most acute critical minds, like Evica, find fact and even minimal interest in fact below them. They know all there is to know without wasting time on fact. Or should I here add common decency?

Lifton, by the way, got a man working for Harry Livingstone with like all researchers having ~~un~~ unsupervised access to all I have, steal the only copy of my analysis of

Lifton's phony book and the copies^{ee} of the records he got from the MDW, both of which prove Lifton's dishonesty, and he was paid by Lifton for it.

Wanna hear any more about those "thefts" Evica said he heard about without any check checking, that also being below him or his need?

Evica is a plain, overt liar in alleging that I made "charges about the Providence conference" of any kind. And I am certain that he lies in saying that those people at the conference "asked me about Weisberg's circulation of charges and accusations." It is not true as what I do and it cannot be true that all those people could have known it *if it had been true.*

He comes to his end, sadly not the end this subject would be ever so much better off it became the end, by a deliberately dishonest ^{sort} register to those nasty ^{qualifications}.

It is true that Jack White wrote Evica as he did. But that does not mean that I said it and Evica had no reason to believe I did or had any need to. Gary first got by the time he spoke to White or somehow it got garbled but it is not what I said and it is what Evica knew I had no need to say. But he is such a dirty swine he can't resist ^{resist} ~~resist~~ ^{an} chance to be dirty again.

I've spent more time on this than I would have and have yet to read and correct my typing that cannot be any ~~be~~ better to have a record for history of the insanity, the dishonesty, the ignorance, the ~~conspicuous~~ stupidity and the nasty personal ^{stuff} attributed of some of those who live and dream in the conspiracy theory world without interest in or contact with fact and for a record of the problems they make for others and their corruptions of our history in pursuit of their personal games and reputations among others, reputations that have no basis in any real ~~achievement~~ accomplishment or any kind of really authentic scholarship.

For all their degrees, on this subject they reflect no single attribute of authentic scholarship.

As I read and correct, a few other thoughts. One is who in the world said I needed any defense? Against the nutty imaginings of ignorant kids and "neophytes" and then to a minuscule audience? That also has no credibility.

On 3, criticism: I give and always have given unsupervised free access to all my records knowing in advance that those who use them will say what I do not agree with.

Top of 4: inherent in this junk of his is that Stone may not be questioned about anything merely because they have not seen any conspiracy theory they ^{do not} immediately make

sacrosanct. No matter how many refute each other, if it is a theory it has to be good! If it is not a theory, it can't be good is what it also amounts to... Sorry this will be so difficult to read but I'm too tired and can't take more time. Thanks and best

wishes,

Herde