

Auckland, 07/05/93

Dear Harold,

Many thanks for your two letters received over the past week and a half. I enjoy (if that is the right word) reading your letters carefully because of what I know you have learnt from a very unique perspective. I have said it before, but I say it again, I feel privileged having this correspondence with you. You will know already what I mean without elaboration I think, but to dwell on it a little, it stems from the ways my own thinking on the history of the last 40 years has changed with what I have learnt through looking at the implications of the JFK assassination, and their affect on the modern world. Much of this learning I have taken from you, and from your books. Thus, if my own insights into these events have been sharpened and my appreciation of what has happened in modern world history has shifted, how much more must you have found in all your research and writing.

I find your assessment on Hoover's level of prior knowledge (or lack of knowledge) of the assassination most credible. I think you are right in pointing out that Hoover could not by himself have known anything significant without others in the FBI organisation also knowing, e.g. those involved in the chain of collecting and passing information on up to the top. And if there had been such information, how could Hoover have been sure of their silence and complicity. How indeed.

I am assuming here as Hoover did not hobnob with the power elite in the USA, the top military leaders and industrialists of the day and most likely those who may have known of the assassination and let something slip, that he would not have come by any information personally? Did any of these people confide in Hoover? Apparently not. Hoover seems have lived and mixed within a very small social set.

This raises the question though of what the FBI agents who were handling the evidence being fed to the Warren Commission thought they were doing. Surely there were some who must have realised some sort of cover up was being created? One can only assume they heard the same sort of story presumably given to other people who went along with the cover up. Maybe it was something like a frightening view of "a nuclear war if the real (sic) truth came out", or "we all know Oswald did not do it but the consequences of revealing this would be to let the world know the KGB that was behind it, and that might push us into a war, just what the communists are hoping, to see us start a war as the aggressor".) What do you think? Surely a lot of patriotic and relatively straight people involved in the coverup must have been told something like this to make what they were doing seem the 'right' thing to do at the time.

I saw Anthony Summers being interviewed on TV here last night. He has written a new biography of J. Edgar Hoover, the most sensational passages alleging not only was Hoover homosexual but that at some time in the 1940's he even went to a few secret parties in drag and was known as 'Mary'. Summers says the Mafia knew of Hoover's sexuality and blackmailed him, and they had compromising photos taken of Hoover with his partner Tolson too. I must try to get hold of the book, but I fear with publicity like this there will be a long waiting list for it at the library.

I appreciate your problems in getting a copy in manuscript form of your new book sent down to me. It is a pity, I would very much like to read it now, in its unedited form.

Thanks for enlightening me about the photos of the 'tramps' being led through Dealey Plaza. But you mention something else in this connection that I am not aware of- who was it Garrison 'was going to charge as an assassin' (your words) but who later was killed in New Orleans? I am missing something here, and I do not understand your reference to this person. Or was it David Ferrie?

I am very happy to hear of your optimism about the chances of the new book being published, that is great news. Of course I look forward to seeing it, and I wish you well with it.

Now the \$64 question. My letters always seem to finish with a leading question, do they not? You have said on balance it was most likely the US Military behind the assassination. I assume you must have some idea of just where in the military the decision to kill Kennedy must have come from. The phrase 'the US military' is a wideranging one and to my mind points nowhere in particular. Do you mean Military Intelligence, or the wider leadership of the US Armed Forces? Who are we talking about? Do you think the impetus for this conspiracy originated within the military? Were the military the ones who both planned and carried it out? Exactly where was the top Military hierarchy based? In the Pentagon? In the White House? Who did these people have the closest links with? With the Army? Air Force. Navy? All three services? With the CIA? With the defence industry? Were these military activists connected with clandestine agencies of other (friendly) powers? Are we talking about the 'special ops' people? Was there a secret military 'dirty tricks' department? Or was there some secret funding, a slush fund, to pay for covert action against 'enemies'? Fletcher Prouty mentions somebody called Lansdale in his book in such a way that you are left feeling he may have been involved, but for some reason Prouty does not come right out and say so. Was Lansdale in your opinion a likely conspirator? I will be most interested to read what you have to say in reply to these questions, and even if you cannot give me any answers I know I will find your comments informative and interesting.

Regardless of who it was, the implied assumption of that much power by whoever it was to put into action a plan to kill the President of the US still takes my breath away. Nobody is safe in a world where the ethics of 'might is right' prevail. In this case it was not any visible and known might but an unseen and secret might or power, as far as ordinary people like you and me are concerned. I have wondered more than once since reading your books why you were not killed. It would certainly have been well within their power to do this. In a couple of the many books I have now read the point is made that many of the witnesses to the events of 22/11/63 died since, many in circumstances that could be seen as suspicious. You must have been fearful at times?

Congratulations, to you and your wife, on your honorary degrees. Which university will be conferring the degrees? It is well worth hiring a tuxedo for such an occasion methinks. I see reading your letter it is today, May 7th, although we are some 18 hours ahead of you in time. My thoughts go out to you both. I hope it is a special time, and an enjoyable time.

Autumn is here now, and one of my jobs this weekend will be to rake up the leaves from the deciduous trees growing in our front and back yards. I read in our paper that there was a TV crew from the USA here this week filming a breakfast news show called 'Good Morning America'. Maybe you watched some of it? They apparently travelled around to different parts of New Zealand over the four days they were broadcasting their programme from here.

Please take good care of yourselves, and of each other. As always, I look forward to hearing from you again.

With love and best wishes,

Pat