

7/6/94

Dr. Gary Aguilar
909 Hyde St., 550
San Francisco, CA 94109

Dear Gary,

Thanks for responding to my 5/28 on it. I do not have to look it up to know what I said in it. And what you do not address.

I said, and until you come to understand the truth in this you will limit very much what you can accomplish by your efforts, "that Rose Charamie is one of the weaker cases to call to an editor's attention...." and that "What is comparable with Charamie surfaces on many major events, including the assassinations, and editors are leery of them."

Your reply is that "The Charamie story is important..." You are entitled to believe that, as you and others are so many things, and you are entitled ^{give} to ₁ it more importance than you might if you knew more of the available information, but that does not address what ¹ told you.

This means you should, I think, try to understand ⁷ that your objectives are.

If they include getting information to the people it necessarily involves the means of getting it to ~~them~~, and that means the editors.

So, make your ~~an~~ effort with the Charamie story and learn for yourself the reaction you get from any editor of any significant means of informing the people.

With regard to "Posner's misrepresentation of the evidence" there is ~~so~~ much that is not more important than what he did with the Charamie story, whether you mean as substantial criticism of Posner's dishonesty or as a means of informing the people about it.

This is the kind of thing that has accomplished nothing ~~of~~ any real value for almost 30 years now. Its importance is inflated to those who attribute great significance to it by their lack of knowledge about other information that with effort they have not been able to make they would know. It does not compare in significance with for example his lying about his interviews, and that would have been more effective if it had been more informed about those very interviews.

I appreciate not having to dig into the file. That is difficult for me.

And the more editors see what they regard as trivial the more they regard the subject as trivial and the more they tend not to look at anything on it. The common attitude has become, "More of that JFK crap," and they throw it away. So again, what are your objectives?

Best wishes,

Harold

Dr. Gary Aguilar
909 Hyde St., #530
San Francisco, CA 94109

5/28/94

Dear Gary,

Thanks for your letter to Cohen of the Federal Bar.

It reminded me that I had offered a copy of Case Open to Costello if he did not get one from C & G.

Not having heard from him I wrote the enclosed.

May I suggest for the future that Rose ~~Wade~~ Cheramie is one of the weaker cases to call to an editor's attention for a number of reasons and particularly when there is so much that will not suggest questions to them?

I'm sorry all over again that the book was as butchered as it was!

What is comparable with Cheramie surfaces on many major events, including the assassinations and editors tend to be leary of them.

Thanks for writing Eason. Expect company soon. I'll enclose what I write him.

Best,

Harold

The other side if a page from the preface to Inside the JFK Assassination Industry.

I use it to let you see that in time there will be a neat and legible copy of it!

ANSWER ↓

DEAR HAROLD,

WITH ALL DUE RESPECT,

THE CHERAMIE STORY IS IMPORTANT!

ON THE VERY PAGES (MISCAVOIX)

POSNER CITES HE MISREPRESENTS

VICTOR WEISS'S CLAIM AND

IGNORES LIEUTENANT FRAGE'S.

WHETHER CHERAMIE'S PREDICTION

IS IMPORTANT, I BELIEVE IT IS,

POSNER'S MISREPRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE
IS THE HEART OF THE MATTER. Gary

world, the Judeo-Christian part at least, has so long regarded as the preferred way to live, to think and to act that changed.

But the change in the attitudes of some does not change the centuries-long recognition of what is right and what isn't in our lives and the way we live them.

It is much easier to look back over eight decades to see this than it is to look ahead without being willing to see.

Our lives are of learning experiences and of living with or outside of what we learn, of recognizing early that what the centuries teach us is right and good and what is not.

For us, for our country, for civilization.

This is I think inherent in what I [^]of those of my learning experiences with which I begin this book. What I there write is explicit in what over those many years helped prepare me for my work, in the broadest sense, on the assassinations and how to do it, what is not learned from a formal education. *write/*

But in fact, in life, the two are inseparable. If we are to succeed in a meaningful way in what we learn to do we also need to live as we should live, by proper standards and principles. Together, the two make a whole and a worthwhile life, a life in which that "portion" is earned and is meaningful.