Dear Dave.

It is now more than a month since we spoke. At that time you promised you would send me cortain things. If you have, I have not received them. If you have not, how am I to regard this? Am I to take it as a sign of your integrity, or as its measure?

At that time I gave you a few of the available means of making your own check on Thornley's honesty, for you said you believed everything he said simply because you believe him to be an honest man. You have had more than enough time to do this, yet you are silent. If you have made such a check and it convinces you he is honest, do you not owe it to him to so doclare to me? If you find the contrary true, after all you have done and said, do you not owe this to me? And what do you owe yourself and those others who are, in effect, linked to you because of their trust in you?

Things are being dens that I would prefer to believe you would not be part of. Lest Wednesday I got a phone call from a reporter on the Tampa afternoon paper. "Is held been carefully fed things by Thornley's larger, he said. Now this was well after I spoke to you. It turns out that he had been given a carefully corrupted account, and that he did not call me until five minutes past the paper a deadline. I therefore presume a defamation was printed. I also know that if he used what he said, you are responsible for it, for the original misrepresentation and the threat under which it was obtained were yours. If, once you knew the truth, which would have been obvious to begin with had it been what you rought, you did nothing to rectify what you had done, are you not then a conscious part of all this?

I took the time to talk to you and earlier I wrote you hoping you would do what you have since admitted you have not done, make an independent investigation. You have failed to consider what you may be doing to yourself and thereby to those who trust you. Then you act at you have and do what you have done morely on Thornley's word, wherein is your position different then that of those on the Warran Commission, those who wrote its Report?

Have you ever stopped to think that perhaps it is as I told you - that I wanted you to be in a position not to hurt yourself?

There is another touchstone to Thernley's honesty. I find he and you through your association and, if I correctly recall, actual articulation, say Barbara heid is "a practitioner of witcheraft". Aside from whethereor not it is libelous, and I think it is, have you independent proof? Have you asked Kerry why he placed implicit trust in a woman he knew was a "witch" and only years later decided the was bad, on the basis of no new associations with her. Have you asked him how he knows there was a voodoo alter in her home? Why do you not and then get in touch with ma? I grant my information also comes from a partial source, but it is that he helped her erect this alter for a single purpose, a TV show! If that i all there is, what have you been doing and saying, what kind of "honest" man is Thornley.

Withell, I want you to know there in no way indicated those things that are or most interest to me. Hurriedly, Harold Weisberg