

Mark Zaid
47 South Lake Ave., #4
Albany, NY 12203

4/30/93

Dear Mark,

Seems to me that when you were first in touch with me I cautioned you against your puffing up your importance and accomplishments and that only recently I felt I should do that again because you are making yourself more important than you are or have been, something only the assassination nuts may be impressed by. Those who know may not say anything to you but they'll perceive it and will like and trust you less for it. Beginning with referring to yourself in your letterhead as "Esq." I don't know a single lawyer who does that. To them, whether they tell you are ~~not~~, you look ridiculous ^{and} baselessly self-important.

If you do not want to identify the person who spoke supposedly on my behalf to "Carroll, Graf and Gallen" with the effect, as I told you, the exact opposite of what you tell me, there is nothing I can do about that. But with all the indications ^{you} that what that person said, as I also told you, inspiring Livingstone to even more vicious attacks, I am less inclined to believe that you were told in confidence. That is not the kind of thing for which one ordinarily asks confidentiality. When someone speaks well of another?

I think it is obvious that you are making yourself seem more important ^{than} that you really are with such a claim and that the person you refuse to identify to me is one who spoke of me in a manner to inspire Harry to greater irrationality and menace.

Important Mark also tells me "As far as I am aware the Livingstone situation has been rectified." If you know what that "situation" actually is you are full of crap. The opposite is the ^{clear} ~~clear~~ record.

You are also full of crap, as is also your "confidential" source when you say that "due to my contact's inquiries with the Baltimore police department and then Peggy's complaint, Internal Affairs was very happy to involve themselves in the situation." This is false. While IA was glad to hear from Peggy neither her call nor your "confidential" source's "inquiries" had anything to do with the beginning of that inquiry and it was not an inquiry into "the Livingstone situation." Is your alleged source on "the Livingstone situation has been rectified" also another of your allegedly "confidential" sources or did you just make that up to make yourself seem important. At least to your self.

"I believe that since then Harry has been silent..." Again bullshit. He became even more venomous. Sometime after that he began referring to me as the alleged ringleader of the imagined conspiracy of his. With enlarged threats.

Aside from being careful with this supposed well-wisher who believes he has to protect me to a friend I don't really care who your source is or what was done to "benefit" me.

"They," you tell me of this source, "do not want to become involved in these alterations." Then why did "they" do that to begin with?

When ^{do} in the hell do you get off saying to me, "I do, however, hope the information I

supplied to Peggy did have the intended effect of causing Herry to desist his unexcusable tirades." What, prithee your honorable esquire can that information possibly be? Come off it boy-little boy in mind at that! You are just bullshitting me to make yourself seem so very important. At least to yourself.

First off you have no such information and second it had no such effect.

Then you promise that "If I can be of any further assistance to you or Mary, my services are always available."

You call this "service?"

Whether or not you were responding to my April 1st 1955 letter what I asked about your so "confidential" source was in January.

And you have not been spending all the time since then trying to "establish my law practise." You also set up a one-man outfit for yourself and distributed an impossible agenda for it.

More self-promotion.

I don't know whether you are really worth the time this has taken. You are older and you've completed a law education and you are still trying to make yourself out to be something you are not, as a very important person. This is a way of at some point getting into serious trouble. It also is a way guaranteed to make people who understand think less of you. I here have in mind not the assassination nut with whom you associate but outside that area, in the real world. You'll mark yourself lousy and will have a hard time overcoming it.

Beginning several weeks ago I heard nothing from or about Harry. I believe that is because his book was due to be handed in 4/15. Getting it handed in and then answering questions about it should keep him busy. I know he told someone he expected to be in New York for a while once he turned it in. That is natural.

Learn it and learn it well while you are young: outside of businesses where there is something to be sold as a one-shot those who are favorably influenced by bullshit are those who are ignorant, stupid or both. If they are not they will be adversely influenced and will think less of you for it. The former are rarely of any real value in life. Except to those who have nothing going for them other than their bullshit. Most intelligent people see it this way.

And, now that you are important enough to refer to yourself as "esquire," why do you not ask yourself what IA has done about "the Livingstone situation" and what authority it had to be interested in him. Or what it has done to the cops about their "wrongdoing." Or how doing something about this "wrongdoing" has any influence at all on "The Livingstone situation." Now that you can refer to yourself as an "esquire" and as you have done, as a doctor of jurisprudence, you should be able to answer these questions. If you do, then you should ask yourself why you found it necessary to inject such shit into your letter.

Grow up, Mark!

Hand

MARK S. ZAID, ESQ.
47 South Lake Avenue, #4
Albany, New York 12203

April 26, 1993

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Maryland 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

My apologies for having taken this long to respond to your letter of April 15, 1993. I am afraid that my letter writing has been relegated to the back seat for a while as I establish my law practice.

As far as I am aware the Livingstone situation has been rectified. I was able to provide certain information to Peggy regarding Livingstone's background and due to my contact's inquiries with the Baltimore police department and then Peggy's complaint, Internal Affairs was very happy to involve themselves in the situation. Apparently, as you undoubtedly know, Harry's police contacts were suspected of wrongdoing and Peggy's direct inquiries provided concrete evidence of such. I believe that since then Harry has been silent, although only to the extent of which I am aware of course.

I have no reason to doubt the story provided by the source whom you have requested that I identify. This person did speak to Gallen (they have a business relationship) with, and I can assure you of this, your best interests at heart. That was the only reason the conversation occurred. If the conversation had the effect of provoking further action on the part of Harry then it most certainly had the opposite of its intended effect. The person never would have broached the topic if this was thought to be a possibility.

However, after much discussion this person still does not wish to be identified at this time as they do not wish to become involved in these altercations. My source only meant to alleviate some of your problems without becoming formally involved. I am sure you respect the fact that I am bound by an oath of confidentiality and I of course wish to respect that oath as I would want my source to do the same if the roles were reversed. I appreciate your understanding of my situation and I trust the non-identification of this person does not present any problems for the future. I am sorry I could not be of further help in this particular instance.

I do, however, hope that the information I supplied to Peggy did have the intended effect of causing Harry to cease and desist his unexcusable tirades. He did not show himself in Chicago which was a welcome relief to many. If I can be of further assistance to you or Mary, my services are always available.

However, I can tell you that my source was never Gus Russo. And, no, I am not the co-author of his (or anyone's for that matter) book. Believe it or not, but Carroll & Graf is not the publisher either. The publisher is one of the larger companies but the name escapes me for the moment. It is, however, no secret as far as I know.

I trust all has been well for you and your wife. Everything is fine here. I hope your Passover went well and I look forward to hearing from you in the near future. With best wishes always, I am,

Sincerely,



Mark S. Zaid