

Dal McGyirk
93 Pah Road, Epsom
Auckland, 1903
New Zealand.

1/10/95

Dear Dal,

Your New Year's day letter came yesterday. We were late getting the mail because we've both been a little ill, I under the doctor's orders staying pretty much inside. Lil went out for the first time in two weeks to get the mail. It had warmed up to 35F. When I got ^{up at 4:12,} the warmest it has been in several weeks is this morning's 25F. A student I'm helping with an honours paper has been my chauffeur to and from ^{at} blood tests. But we ^{are} making out, albeit with a little less energy and easier tiredness. I've ~~be~~ been diagnosed as having a chest infection. Yesterday it seemed to have started to ease off to the degree I can bring the junk up easier. But I've not felt too bad to write and yesterday morning I did a 20-page letter to David Belin. I've told him I'll be using ^{it} as a chapter in Inside the JFK Assassination Industry. I also told him that if he makes any response I'll use it in facsimile to assure that it is untouched. Plus that if he does not respond I'll report that. Good clean fun with that Judenrat who wrote a rabbi he knows and is ^{one} of the two dearest friends of my youth still alive that I am inaccurate. He said he could not take time for details. ^{Ha!} And that is what I did! using two oped pieces he attached to his letter. Involved in it I did not think of the mail. Until yesterday it and the papers have been brought in by friends. I'd intended driving out for it, only 350 feet, ^{and} but ^{for long} that would not have had me in any cold. The student who has been so thoughtful has a pickup. The wah heats up more rapidly than the interior of a car so I've not been in the cold at all. That will be a second Belin chapter, after one he shares with Specter on how they abused the youngster couple of the Rowlands you may remember for WWII. I did not write that letter to be a chapter to Belin because I wanted to get even. I've had ^{his} it since August 92. Rather because it provided an appropriate frame to fill out and give another perspective on how the JFK Assassination Industry was begun by the Commission and continued by its Belins.

Before then in recent weeks I did none chapters over a Posner-like book from the same publishing empire, Knopf's Wedge by Mark Riebling. His theory is that because the FBI refused to cooperate with the CIA over assorted insanities he regards as solid info that made the JFK possible. So using him as a frame I filled that out, becoming a defender of the FBI thereby.

Following that I did two, not, ³ three chapters on how the major media is part of it, including by major attention to trash while suppressing legitimate news. I used a lengthy critical analysis I sent the Wx Post, ^{to which} ^{which} neither it nor the authors, to whom a copy was sent, has had a word today. I used the false stuff they wrote, ^{scrimshaw} ² had ^{to know how} ~~to~~ be false, as an illustration. The La Fontaines, man and wife, free-lancing specialists on assassination sensations, are making a book titled Oswald ¹ ~~faked~~ of their

contrived falsehood that Oswald was a police snitch in a gunrunning case.

This is say that while I've been slowed down I've been able to continue working.

First I must say that as they have all been, your calendar is magnificent. But the numbers are too small for me to see the distance from my desk to the only wall space I have for one. I used a drab on fro^g our bank with black numbers an inch or so high. But Lil has already taken it, gratefully, so we both thank you. If you know any of the people of the organization that prepared it, please extend our thanks and appreciation - and yes, envy to them. We never see anything like it, true also of those you sent us earlier, in calendars of domestic production. As advertisement we got about a dozen that size and 8-10 pocket diary size. Give them all away. Not one really attractive.

It was close to suppertime when Lil thought of going for the mail I'd forgotten. I had done almost a page to integrate the new stuff I'd just written into the book when she did. I knocked off for the day when she returned, read the mail, examined that beautiful calendar with care and appreciation, and when in the bathroom preparing for the early retirement I require the phone began. Two calls made me an hour later retiring. This business I have had me up twice for a half hour each time, and at midnight I was wide awake. So, I got up and by four had the draft of the memo I'll enclose on Salandria done. I did it separately for my filing and any use you may want to make of it. I'll have to let it wait maybe a day or so to reduce the confabulation with so much to correct and so much of it in my mind ^{see 1 day} and not see in mistakes on paper.

I read the Summers' Vanity Fair piece when it was published. Like all that Tony does, none of it can be believed without independent confirmation. All that stuff about the mafia and the Cubans is at best deceptively misleading and without basis in the fact of the assassination, the prerequisite for responsible writing about it not ^{one} ~~is~~ their self-conceived Sherlock Holmes take the time to master, even to understand. A friend, one of those who called last evening, is not far from Tony's alleged source on the second rifle. ^{He'll check it} Of which in fact there were two others in that building about which Oswald told the police. That was a day or two before the assassination. Innocent Warren Castor had bought himself and his son new rifles and showed them off at work.

I'm very glad to have that pair of sheets of pictures of the rifle. I suppose you identify the book in your letter and it did not stay in mind. It is not new that the Manlicher was a copy of the old Mauser but I do not recall the source if the book has the source of the bottom photo on page 221 I'm interested in knowing it. I did not know of that one unless the cropping deceives me. I gave my rifle to Wood years ago. Jerry uses it in his class. My recollection is that the stock ^{seemed} wider from top to bottom.

My and large Craigs in a very good piece. I caution, though, that at times Lies of Our Times is just that. As with Oliver Stone, for ~~exam~~ example. I detailed that at some length, taking each piece apart, sent it to them and got no response. They have political motivation that when they want it to overwhelms truth.

I know of no relevance for "the Cuban data on the Kennedy assassination" for which he gives Audos to NZ radio. That is all theory without any substantiation of which I know. It is an obvious suspicion and was my first one.

The existing evidence that the theorists do not take the time to master pretty much rules the anti-Castros out. There was so much that was done they could not have done, for example. It is rubbish to think that Castro did it after the solution to the Cuba Missile Crisis. In it JFK guaranteed Castro as Khrushchev could not, against any invasion, not only against any by the US. But again, had he been utterly insane and gotten rid of his most able protector, could he have had done all that is relevant and so few have taken the time to learn? No.

There are few less dependable source on the fact of the assassination that Oglesby and his theorizing, attractive as it can be to people of good intentions like Craig, is no more than his political thinking about what he wants to be and isn't. His Yankees and Cowboys is myth of his invention, not mature and informed thinking. He was one of those who organized the Assassination Information Bureau, which it never was, in Boston. They laced the campuses with the most exciting bullshit and in that killed all possibility of any others reaching that audience. That was a great disservice and it was morally and ethically irresponsible. But it is the way then financed themselves. Since his first book I've not even gotten the others. I did take his writing about Oliver Stone's movie apart without a peep of denial or refutation.

If I think of it I'll send you a few pages I got from the CIA on that mafia plot. Summers is a straight-out liar in attributing it and the other plots to kill Castro to either Kennedy. Bobby was for a while in charge of overthrowing his government efforts but that is not the same as assassinating him and when he first heard that the CIA was trying to that he ordered that it be ended. Neither he nor JFK knew of those plots, especially not that of the mafia. Only six high officials in the CIA knew and they saw to it that nothing was on paper.

Artime of that unnamed Congressional investigator- and it is not worth the time to get my copy of that story out, is an outright liar in saying that JFK told him of JFK's plans to get Castro done in, knocked off. Or as is not impossible, this is that special Summers' touch that is hardly journalism. They can't even get the well-publicized ~~Kennedy~~ Cubela story straight. Or what is more likely, wanted to change it for their own political ends and to make it appear to be their own work rather than what they present as that when it isn't.

Why wrote everybody he knew asking for contributions to that piece? And used that as his won to from the lack of crediting in his piece. I had more experience with him than I wanted and I ignored his letter. He is neither an honest nor a truthful nor an appreciative man, civil and polite as he presents himself. When in reading his first

book a Swedish schoolteacher who has been a correspondent chided me for refusing to help him, I replonded that I had invited him here and given him permission to use some of my stuff for which I did not ask acknowledgement (I never do) and Tony used it as his own. I sent my teacher ^{and} a copy of my letter of invitation. And that dirtbag ^{summers} after that, not knowing I knew it, wanted help on his Hoover book ^{which} he made a mess for a cheap sensation, when he asked for help on it, I invited him and his two assistants, both young college professors from London. He and they spent days on end here, many days, and they copied whatever they wanted. In return for which Tony gave me other problems and was too cheap a scumbag even to send me a copy of that book.

He had this young American woman/English professor, typing up his interviews. He was too cheap to get her a transcribing machine, cheap as they are. I tried to get him to go where I got mine here in town for very little. He refused to do that. So out of sympathy for that poor woman, who was transcribing his interviews from a tape recorder, I asked Tony if he'd like to borrow mine. That he grabbed immediate. It took an interminable amount of time ^{and} unanswered letters or evasive and false ones before I got it back.

This is the kind of person he really is, not the fine gentleman he projects of himself with politeness. Again not that I care but in the Vanity Fair piece he uses as his own work what he cribbed from my long Article Senator Russell Dissents, that in Lesar let him see. He changed the words within direct quotes to say the same thing less succinctly than Russell did to make that appear as his own work, too.

There is neither scruple nor principle behind his gentlemanly manner and smiling face and he is not a trustworthy writer. The net result of the article and the piece of which you sent me a copy is to deceive and mislead a great number of people worldwide. ^{For} fame and for ^{money} for him alone. By twisting them to say other than they had said and to conform to the theory he thought more exciting he had ruined those who could be important witnesses. And one of the things missing after he left was my copy of the handwritten version of the Carolyn Arnold statement in Photo WW. That refuted what he got her to say, or at least says he did. She had made corrections in her own handwriting on the original of which I was able to get that xerox. I examined the original when I could.

While I have no real resentment about it, having become used to it in various forms, what kind of man, what kind of writer is it to begin with a fat advance and with me alone ruins at least two weeks of my time and then not even sending me a copy of his book for which he had free access to all that cost me so much in so many ways in all those FOIA lawsuits and then presented that also as his own work by not crediting it. I knew enough about Tony not to want his book. I did not buy it until Jim Lesar told me I should. Jim is his lawyer and goes for all those theories. I might the time I wasted on it more than what the book cost me.

The well-intended Craigs may have trouble believing these things but they are unexaggerated and not by any means all. And the net result is that he does the government's dirty work for it with his crooked writing that misleads and disinforms people. As Craigs article says it does. It did more than that, the CIA. I have a prima facie case of its preventing my publication twice in England and once each in Germany and the US.

By the way, I've arranged for there to be a disk of Waketh the Watchman for you fairly soon. The young woman who is retyping that was here after three weeks of my next seein er-the holidays and she has a fulltime job -and she picked up a few corrections and additions. When I can get to it I'm adding an epilogue and she's volunteered to add that.

You begin your letter with a charming story of you little boys experience. It reminds me of my once having a billygoat that three nephews who loved to summer on our farm of his age. They used to get down on their knees to butt heads with him. He was young, just entering maturity, and he always stopped just short of their heads. Scared the hell out of me first time I saw it. Instinctive he rears back for the thrusts as they usually do, too!

In your continuing ed thing, may I make a suggestion that may do you some good with that unthinking establishmentarian who does not realize that he is being anti-establishmentarian? Send him a copy of the that 1/22/64 transcript and perhaps a small selection of documents from Jerry's manual telling him he may in the future be interested in the fact that there are people who eschew the misleading theories and work entirely from the released official documents. It won't do you any good now but if he hears good things about the course when you teach it it may occur to him to change his mind. He may not be amenable but if you do not suggest you are asking for him to change his mind and agree to the course, do you think he is capable of facing reality as few are here?

We've had a similar experience in cleaning up to get space I need but we are handicapped by our limitations as you are not. But we did clear about three feet of books from the shelves in Lil's office and I have boxes of ~~xxxx~~ manuscripts there now.

If the JFK assassination had been by the CIA it would not have been via ZR Rifle. Publishing that kind of childish conjecture misleads the people which you hear me saying often and it true, and it helps the official miscreants who phoned up a non-investigatio and to a degree the CIA because nature minds recognize it for what it is and tend to sympathize with the unfairly accused. I do not have a high opinion of Fonzi's book. In part it is an expose of the HSCA and although little of that was not known it does help the people who were not aware of that understand it. One problem with that criticism from Fonzi is that he was talking plain bullshit, basically. In part this is because no spook would meet with one working for him in such a public place in daylight in particular, another is that he would dream of doing that when he brings two of them together

in public and so that they meet each other. Moreover, it begins with nothing but unsupported supposition on Fonzi's part. He does not even quote Veciana as saying that he worked for the CIA. There were many groups that did work with it, but the odds are that those the CIA trusted practised the basics of spook tradecraft all parts of Veciana's story violates. And it is the most basic tradecraft. By accident, by my helping the son of a friend with his doctoral thesis and by opening closed doors for him as I could and did, I learned that as of the late 60s Veciana worked for the AFL/CIO Latin American Division of the Confederation of Free Trade unions. That Washington office was headed by one Seraphino Roumalid, who I knew slightly socially. That info was in his files. With that group the AFL/CIA was an important part of the overthrow of the democratically elected Chedi Jagan in Guyana. In the end it turned out that the fink who won turned around and the US objected to him also.

HSCA was even more restricted ^{IVE} that Fonzi says. He signed an agreement no honorable man would sign, of perpetual silence about CIA records. ^{AND} if I remember correctly about the committee's work. I spotted them for what they were at the outset and I had nothing to do with them other than ^{to} through major papers and syndicates ~~and~~ expose their dishonesty and mistakes. The media was opposed to anything so I was welcome on that. I was the credited and uncredited source. When I was not credited it was not because I asked for that. I never have. Fonzi could have gone farther ^{GIVEN AN} and ^{were} account how all the hearings, including those he was part of, ^{to} refute named critics who were identified by Baakey's narrations with which they began. He never mentioned one, even though he knew I was exposing him. He did not tangle with me, ever. And then there is what they had and suppressed. I have a telling and I think powerful account of that on the medical evidence in the ^{MEMO} after word of NEVER AGAIN!. I also mention ~~his~~ his passionate disinformation in the Salansria ^{MEMO} enclosed. There is no reason to find Salansria in any genuine bibliographies. And he has been discouraging everybody since no later than 1968.

With your book do you think you should have a short preface explaining the difference between committees and commissions and what is done in court, which they may have a notion of? If you decide you do and want something ^{NOT} at the beginning of Whitewash ask me.

I think you should address the "missing" evidence with care and make it clear you are talking about the ^a ~~the~~ ^{past}. I'm certain that what was withheld then is large ^W not withheld now and that what was missing now exists in the files disclosed by the FBI. Perhaps a single illustration for the point would be that they never kept the Zapruder camera until in WWII I embarrassed them. Ditto on the Moorman picture from Photo WW, but in that case, as I ^e learned in CA 78-0322 the FBI made a print and kept that fact secret and dutifully returned to Moorman each time the WC wanted it. More important, I think, is the avoidance and misrepresentation of the evidence. I think a good and readily comprehensible case is getting the rifle into the building. 100% of the witnesses were

7

~~It~~ just ignored with the statement the Commission did not believe them when at the same time it had confirmation of the impossibility of what they wanted to say, ~~not~~ saying it eliminating the case against Oswald. The FBI tested the blanket in which that rifle was allegedly wrapped and the paper of the bag in which he allegedly carried the rifle that morning. Not a trace of oil on either. The bag held a single print said to have been Oswald's but not a single one on all the many places he was seen carrying and holding it. There is no crumpling where he is supposed to have held it by the top, was actually seen doing that. No prints there, and the bag as photographed allegedly in place show no ~~creases~~ or bulges or any other indication of having held anything with any weight. All the creases were still clear. I don't remember if I gave copies of those FBI records to Jerry but I think I have duplicates in my basement subject file that I can have someone when here fetch for my copying and then return. I am inclined to think that students will regard that kind of handling of the actual evidence like reading a detective story.

I have no reason to believe that the missing specimens were destroyed. I think that ~~Bobby~~ was concerned about making ^{indecent} spectacles of them, as Groden did of the pictures -for money, quite a bit of it.

I do not know how much evidence you want to go into but I think that you can show from ~~W~~only that they could not even place Oswald at the scene of the crime at the time of the crime and that their ~~construction~~ proved it was not possible.

If you add that all the evidence is that Oswald could not have taken that paper and made the bag elsewhere and the truth about the alleged sniper's nest of book cartons you can wipe the official mythology out to that point.

You will find in WW that the best shots in the country could not duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald, who was officially evaluated by the "arines as "a rather 'poor' shot."

You might also want to use ^{what} ~~what~~ I think they can understand from Zapruder's testimony in WW and the Howlett memo in PW, that Zapruder said ~~the~~ shot was from over his right ~~shoulder~~ but was talked out of that by Liebler. But he did not talk Zapruder out of saying he saw JFK hit earlier through his zoom lens. I think the truth about the paraffin tests in WW and PM, that they proved Oswald had not fired a rifle that day, is comprehensible enough. Then the timing on the "Lippit killing, from WW and from PM, the Bowley ~~EE~~ affidavit that I remember is on 493 from just having clobbered Belin with it. Also from WW, Tomlinson on the finding of the bullet. You can be literally truthful and give the kids a laugh they'll enjoy and is not inappropriate.

There really is nothing new in Six Seconds other than the Z film sketches. Wherever he has a general note, "according to document recently found in the Archives he took that from WWII. ^W, in that the Willis film timing of the first shot -when it was impossible from that ~~xx~~ window. If you take this approach you might want to consider the subtitle

"The Actual Official Evidence," something like that if you use ~~that~~ ^{the} ~~writing~~.
this approach in your writing.

I think you can succinctly summarize that Jan 22 transcript to give them an insight into the Commission's tortured head and from QWIV, what the back cover says of the contents. Russell's disagreement, too. And the phonying of the transcript of 9/18.

I think you should make clear that absent their ability to place Oswald at the scene of the crime and at the time of the crime all the so-called scientific evidence said to link him and his rifle to the crime is meaningless despite the knowing misuse of it. And on the curbstone, do not forget the "allagher" analysis which ^{mentions} only two of the ingredients he tabulates from other tests, I think, you'll see that near this all in PM, that he shows the direction the opposite of from where Oswald was, and that in covering his own ass, Frazier said in his note what he did not testify to, that the so-called smear could have been made by an auto wheel weight. Use the scientific study and report from Case Open then.

If I do not mention the paraffin tests above, important because there were no traces that show the firing of a rifle on Oswald's cheek, whereas in the Oak Ridge tests there was some on each and every firer's cheek. I am trying to limit myself to what is at once the body of the crime and what kids should understand easily. I think rather enjoy if you make a text-type account that is actually a detective story.

I now do not remember what you ask about 374. It may have been Perry telling me about the calls from Humes. You can get that from WW, Kemp Clark swore to it. I do not recall anyone else at the autopsy who spoke to those doctors.

If what you think is correct, then my source on the blocking of the wound on the back was a radiologist at the local hospital whose name was Lull, Cliff Lull as I recall. He left Frederick years ago. Sourced: leaked B & W autopsy picture of it, the back. Prone. Lull braved the 25F and just brought ^{the} papers in.

Dear Best,
Hardy