

Dal McGuirk
93 Pah Road Epsom
Auckland 1003
NEW ZEALAND

4/19/93

Dear Dal,

As a friend said in congratulating us on our birthdays, my wife's yesterday, mine 10 days earlier, Congratulations of your 161 years! They tell on me more recently. I read your letter of April 9, here today, and a bit of the Stone contribution to Prouty's book, and then took a nap. I awakened more tired. So, I respond in haste because we'll have visitors the next two days and that will get me behind a bit.

The visit to Hopkins was for a consultation. That was followed by internal consultations. They decided not to remove the polyp the X-rays show and to make a sigmoidoscopic examination of about the lower six inches that are partly obscured in X-raying. I go there for that, outpatient, May 3. I do hope they find nothing! I think the decision not to remove the polyp was a balancing of potential hazards to me. The hematologist was in on it.

Thanks for asking.

As far as I read in Stone there is nothing new in it. He just pretends it is his ideas but they are old and oft-made criticisms. Prouty's publishing is in the minor extreme-right press. The owner is a native fascist of long standing. About World War II time he published what he expected would be the American "ein Kampf. Imperium, by Francis Parkey Yockey. Like Hitler, in jail when he wrote it. Some time ago Prouty told me he was preparing articles he had published to appear as a book. I guess this is it. In the past I've had trouble accepting some of his interpretations and did not accept some. Some were wrong.

I could write a book about those so-called tramp pictures! They are relevant to nothing. I can be said to bear a heavy responsibility for them. Years ago I turned on a fine guy who was then a vice president of a major accounting firm. He said he travelled much and when he was in Dallas what should be do? I made specific and general suggestions about getting the many pictures the FBI and the Commission ignored. He did a fine job of that and then started making unjustified interpretations. When Garrison saw those pictures he decided that they showed conspirators. They all the hangers-on started "identifying" the men. Never accurately. Or as you note, even rationally. As soon as they got wide attention for "identifications" and I debunked them they made new "identifications." Based on his own imagination and nothing else he was going to indict a man he said was in the pictures as a Grassy Knoll assassin to commemorate the fifth assassination anniversary in November, 1968. Two members of his staff, where more had tried to talk him out of it, asked me to try as I left New Orleans in early November 1968. At the airport I mailed sets to the then district attorney, who was and remains a friend, and to oil magnate H.L. Hunt's chief of security. They made independent investigations, one not knowing of the other, and gave me identical reports: that the men were winos picked up drinking away in a parked railroad box car a block west and two block south of the scene of the crime. They were picked up in an area sweep. They were

walked past the TSBD building because that was the only way they could be walked out. (Dallas police records confirm they were held, questioned and turned loose.) Now the ^{other} man Garrison was going to charge as an assassin on 11/22/63 had killed himself in New Orleans the previous years, as I knew. So, when I returned one of those who'd asked my help, the chief investigator, sent his men to get the evidence I asked for. I put a memo together after more than a week of hard work, ~~gave~~ ^{gave} it to the other one, the most junior of his assistant DAs, and he bearded Garrison with it on a Sunday morning. Garrison then fixed the man who used the name "Boxley", ^{blaming} ~~blaming~~ it all on him, quite falsely, and in a press statement said that Boxley had infiltrated his staff for the CIA, to ^{wreck} ~~wreck~~ his probe. He tells this lie in his book, as Stone knew two months before he started shooting in the penny-dreadful script based on that book. *Hold Stone in detail. He did not respond.*

I had those pictures and when shortly after the King assassination one of the men in them was duplicated in a sketch attributed to the FBI, I gave a copy of the picture and of the sketch to the FBI. It was forced to make an investigation seven months before those made for me. Same basic conclusions.

The police records on those tramps were made public more than a year ago, with their correct names. Nonetheless a fake book based on identifying one as Watergater E. Howard Hunt was recently republished!

The sketch was hoked up in Mexico and in my later tracing I got a picture of it being put on a plane in Mexico City by the artists who did it!

I'd intended using some of my clear-sided paper to give you a notion of fragments of the new book and forgot on the first page. I wrote the very large book on such paper and have three times more than that many pages as the result. The xerox I made before sending the rough draft to my dear friend Dave Wrone, who retyped it on his computer, the xerox of the corrected retyping I returned to him and then of the added corrections.

I am a little encouraged about the book's prospects of being published today. I have no agent and no publisher and in writing the book I had leaving a record for history as my primary objective. I spoke about it some months ago to a dear friend who ^{is} ~~is~~ counsel to a small publisher and a large book distribution organization, among other things of which I do not know. He'd been busy and he phoned me today after getting my letter asking its status. He'd been too busy. His editor likes it and the earlier chapters that he read months ago he liked. He described some of the first-person writing, telling stories to set the stage, as beautiful and as telling the stories that well. He plans to read the rest of the monster at home during the coming two weeks. So, I am somewhat encouraged.

It is a very tough book and it will take courage to publish it. It names names, so to speak, and documents each and every one. No, it does not name assassins. But it does allege and document a conspiracy not to investigate the crime, which ^{also} means to see to it that in the future it could not be investigated, and it makes a prima facie case for believing

3
there is reason to believe that there was a military conspiracy. Again, names ~~named~~ named, and documented.

The book also covers an enormous amount, ^{largely} medical and scientific evidence, mostly ballistic. With the most shocking new information as well as so much of the old that is so widely unknown. *A broad and deep overview,*

Historian Wrone says it is "unprecedented." My local historian friend, in recommending my wife and me for honorary degrees, told the college president that it should "revolutionize ^{about} thinking ~~of~~ the Kennedy assassination." Both says it is the best yet, ^{including} ~~including~~ my earlier books. (The rest is not much competition.)

After the meeting of the college ^{trustees}, the president phoned me to tell me that they had ~~to~~ "voted unanimously and enthusiastically" ^{to}ward the degrees. At convocation ^{8/22}. And we are being invited to the high-society type of shindigs attendant to the ^{100th} anniversary, this year. It means I had to go rent a tuxedo for a May ~~7~~ dinner. ^{It} will be the first time I've worn one in more than 60 years! Were it not that I feared declining the invitation would have been regarded ~~as~~ ^{as} insulting, on the ~~to~~ ^{to} alone I'd have declined.

So, as I grow weaker, having made my last target, my 80th birthday, my next one is the awarding of the degrees.

I cannot answer you question about McGeorge Bundy. The allegation is consistent with his record. It is not new. But I have no information about it. The allegation is not at all new.

Supper time. I'll read and correct this in the morning.

Thanks and out love,

Herb