

Dal McGuirk
93 Pah Road Epson
Auckland, 1003
New Zealand,

3/8/94

Dear Dal,

Because your letter of 26/2 was not postmarked until PM March 1, that it got here yesterday says it made excellent time. Much better time than my last two letters from Dallas, both on pictures for Case Open. Which is much on my mind and the reason I begin to write you now when I know I'll have to lay it aside before I can finish it, having other things I must do when the excitement ¹ Now feel eases off.

For one thing I have to drive into town to rush a small package to the publisher in New York.

Although what remains of the book is powerful, what remains is about a third, perhaps less. Probably less. I've not tried to figure that out. The incredible cutting and reorganizing—no editing at all—has ~~me~~ baffled, uneasy, really apprehensive. Most of the chapters by far, almost all with the assassination documentation that clobbers Posner, are eliminated. In toto. One had the last part cut off. What remains of more than 200,000 words is about 130 small pages, about 8 1/2 by 5 1/2. And it was allowed to just poop out. The conclusions were also eliminated! So I've just finished a new and shorter Conclusion that I'll express mail up there when my wife, who is a tax consultant, finished with the daughter of a client. He is 90 and this is the first time, although he has been virtually blind for more than a decade, that someone did not bring him.

Like me, neither Wroner nor McKnight can understand why this ms. was cut that way. Cut at all, really. Wroner's opinion is that it was the best of all. And I did it in less than two months. And a month from today I'm 81. And can't walk a short flight of stairs without stopping to rest.

Uncut this was probably the most thorough and documented indictment of a writer, a publisher and the media ever. Not perhaps individually of the media. But of the three collectively. So, with what such a book can be, and with new information on the JFK assassination at that, we are at least ^{unable} to find a rational explanation.

Fortunately it was so overwhelming to ~~be~~ begin with what remains is very, very strong.

But it has been upsetting and I got emotionally wound up in writing this Conclusion.

I'm waiting for my wife to be free, by the way, so I can take her to lunch. And with her the relatively new neighbor next door, which means about 350 feet away, with her infant and her bright six-year old daughter. She and her husband were magnificent when the weather was dangerous for me and my wife was due at the hospital for a cataract to be removed, for taking her home, and for bringing the mail and papers in when I should not try to walk 350 feet to the mailbox with the ground covered with snow or ice. The woman took us to the hospital and brought us home and the next morning her husband drove us to the ophthalmologist's office. We've had the hardest winter in many, many years. When

we look through some 20 feet of Thermopane livingroom windows downhill to our pond, through long-needle white pines, we ~~see~~^{see} only snow, ice on the pond, except where the water flows from it after a big thaw.

Under those particular pines- and we have hundreds of them- the snow has melted, as it did a month or so ago. White-tail deer then browsed and rested there. Haven't seen them there since the more recent heavy snows. We loved it and will when they return.

When the woman^{neighbor} was on vacation in Florida we took her husband with us to the Oriental restaurant of friends, the woman Japanese, the man Korean. The food is the best, the price very reasonable, and the servings are so generous we return with leftovers that do exceptionally well in them microwave for usually two more meals. They also add a few things, which we like, of course! (The woman regards my wife as a surrogate mother, calls her mother, and has her helper, the young Vietnamese woman who looks like a girl and is the daughter of an American black soldier who did not bring her or her mother here, call my wife grandmother! She is teaching this young woman how to restaurant cook.

I've ~~not~~ yet read the enclosures with your letter. Or those with two others I got from old friends yesterday. I'll do that soon. I did look at Craig's reading list. I spoke to Wrono Sunday and forgot to nudge him. I'll try to remember when next I write him, but I think a letter from you that he'll see from time to time would be best. He is now quite busy, in addition to having the severe Wisconsin winters to cope with, over his Lincoln research in downstate Illinois. He's back from it only a week now. He'd formed the opinion that Lincoln was the most radical of our political leaders of that century in his economic thinking and is going to do an article on that.

On Kellerman, I think the obvious is the explanation: he knew the government was lying and believed there was nothing he could do about it. I have no reason to believe he knew any assassination secrets. He was a relatively uneducated man but I believe an honest and dedicated one. He had been a state trooper in Michigan when the men who got those jobs were not prepared for much else. His daughter was a beautiful young woman who dressed conservatively and in good taste. ...

With the forecast for rain turning to sleet during the night I had to switch to make the outgoing book packages to take to the post office because I may not be able to

get to our mailbox in the morning. But I've returned to typing to explain that at my age with my medical problems I have to be careful, not to slip and fall, so ~~ice~~^{ice} and snow require caution, and when I did not heed my doctor's words about windchill, I soon learned that I should have. I could have driven to the hospital but the parking was too

far from the closest door because of the windchill and the yonkers of the building where the ophthalmologist has his office never cleaned the area of the parking lot near the sidewalk and most of the winter it has been icy. When I place a copy of the Columbia Journalism review in a plastic grocery bag this morning to carry with me to read when resting

during my walking and the edge brushed against my hand, it actually cut the skin and I bled. I do have to be careful about what most people need pay no attention to. ...

I think the Greg Ansley article is good and basically correct. There is little that can be said in such small space and he did say much. Nothing with which I disagree. But full as the US responsibility for the Cold War is and for that fallacy of thinking about it Ansley refers to, I believe it would not have been if FDR had not died. Truman ~~is~~ was an easy mark for those who for various reasons wanted the cold war. Including Churchill, who may have been that bastard's father. Have you read the book "C", on Menzies when he headed MI6? He reports that as soon as France was invaded Churchill pointed British intelligence at Moscow. Our ally then. Many in the US agreed, fearing the success of any other form of government, of any non-capitalist economy. The USSR was not capable of starting a war after WWII even if they had wanted to, as I believe they did not.

Many of those who supported it in this country did so from greed, from the profits to be made from it. They made the profits and it remains to be seen whether the USSR was alone in being ruined by it. We were, economically, morally and politically. I have not been persuaded for years that short of a terrible calamity and genuine effort will be made to make the changes required for ending our steady deterioration.

Our cold war scholarship wasn't scholarship at all. It was the phony scholarly support of what was certain to be self-destructive for political and profit reasons. The greater danger was that we would heat it up.

Palenski's reviews are correct with regard to Groden, wrong as it applies to Posner, and unthinking in general in that he assumes that all there is, all that matters, is conspiracy theories or the official mythology. He is wrong in saying that the only disagreement with the Commission is by conspiracy theorists and wrong in saying there is no evidence that stacks against it. Its own does, of course. And there is no relevance ⁱⁿ that bit about modern technology analysis. As you also know.

When Ensor tells you he will not buy into any conspiracy theories a short rejoinder is why does he then buy into the non-conspiracy theories? If you write him further, ask what effort he had made to determine whether the Warren Report is supported by its own evidence and how much that disproves it does he need to ask questions himself.

McKnight never mentioned to me what he has on the White House tape recording system. Also, I've never seen what he put together. I'd assumed it was his selection ^{from} of the volume I gave him. He says the students loved it, having copies of originals, of raw material.

I suppose it was someone on JFE's staff who ordered the removal of the taping equipment, maybe ever Robert. But I have no knowledge of it.

It is no comfort to recognize the profound implications, is it? Perhaps you get from it a better understanding of what drives me at this stage of my life and health.

Craig will not welcome my opinion that most of his ~~rest~~ is trash, bad stuff, because

it reached him, he liked it, he saw nothing else and having been influenced by it has thought of nothing else. The Roffman and Meagher books are fine. Roffman did another fine ~~one~~ one on the early history of the Cold War. In England, on that, Dennis Pritt did an early book and a good one for that era. Victor Polancz (?) published that paperback before, just before, WWII broke out. Or it deals with that period and is good on England's desire for Hitler to wipe the USSR out and its refusal to live with the international agreement to defend Czechoslovakia, between the USSR and France. What little is good in ^{the other} ~~the~~ ^{books} is available in other books that do not have the liabilities of those that are not good. Some of them are overt frauds, as I think he will not want even to consider. And most of the authors, in varying degrees, do not know what they are talking about, including the political theorists like Oglesby.

To the degree I can I stay away from them.

Lane's Plausible Denial is knowingly false. There was only one issue in the lawsuit it is supposedly about: malice. With sources that Marchetti did have, under the law, no malice. That Lorenz woman has no creditability at all. I can't understand why the judge permitted that deposition. It was irrelevant anyway, besides being all bull.

People like Epstein imposed their political beliefs, his of the far right, and he was 100% wrong in saying that there was a later autopsy ~~prot~~ protocol. Some like di Eugenio, have no fact at all.

Nagell's story has no credibility at all. Morrow made all his up. No fact in any. There is no real case for any mafia involvement and Davis is an undependable writer too. Livingstone is nuts and undependable and has no basis in any study of the real evidence. Blakey began with that preconception he could not prove and didn't prove it. Lifton's book is a fraud on his theory and nothing else in it ^{was} ~~was~~ new despite his taking credit for discovering sex and inventing the wheel. Schein's book is not about the assassination, about which he knows nothing, and he has no case of mafia involvement. All in his writing. Melanson's books are outrageously bad and Spy Saga is really crappy and a collection of the assassination junk. I am not familiar with some listed under ~~spy~~ activities but those I've read are good, Wise and Stockwell in particular. Garrison's book is fiction. I was there. I know. Even in writing about himself and his staff. I.F. Stone is excellent. Kwitney, too, and Sheehan and Bagdikian. But I just can't find time to ^{write} ~~write~~ the book adequate ~~comment~~ ^{comment} on so many would take. And, unfortunately, using these that are bad in teaching misleads and misinforms, even misdirects, the students.

Our best,

Harold