

Dear Gerry,

8/31/96

When Dennis told me that you found the subject "overwhelming" I suggested what he seems to believe was a simple approach that eliminates or at least reduces this, handling the institutions separately. To the degree that is possible.

Yesterday Jerry told me of his conversation with Dennis Thursday night, including what he had learned, of publisher preference for short books. That is in general true but not always and not with all publishers. I have no reason to believe it is true of university presses, for example. It may be. I do not know.

However, I believe as a book is conceived and as it is written it should be <sup>with</sup> written as the material justifies, not condensed in advance of the writing. It can be condensed in concept, of course, as I'll soon suggest, but within that concept it should be written as the material warrants. If necessary it can then be shortened. If necessary it may still be <sup>a</sup> valuable to have drawn together what is eliminated.

It is my belief that several of the institutions can be dealt with adequately with a few small samples to justify general statements. One of these is the House assassins committee. They can be dismissed with a few items like the Guinn testimony, the tabulation of records they got from the FBI and the breakdown compared with what <sup>(and with all the texts)</sup> I got earlier and was available for it free, the Ebersole, ~~Gallagher~~ Frazier, Galloway, ~~Sibert~~-O'Neill stuff Dennis got and perhaps you can use the Dolce material here. If you use it with the Commission a mention of it here is enough. (Most of what HSCA got from the FBI is irrelevant mafia stuff that ~~By~~ <sup>By</sup>key was hung up on.)

Likewise the major media can be handled the same way, with print and TV separate and with CBS as representing commercial TV. Here there is overlap with the Guinn material, that it was totally ignored by the papers after they knew what Guinn testified to and its meaning, that the <sup>basic</sup> ~~basic~~ evidence had been tampered with and destroyed.

Likewise with the courts. Book publishers, too.

This approach lets you devote most time and space to where it should be, to the Commission and to the FBI. With both you will have to decide in advance what you will not go into but that will leave more than enough whatever you decide. However, I would not omit what you believe should be included merely for the shorter book. Instead write it to make any such cutting easier.

Jerry had borrowed the 133 pages of the CIA Mexico's summary of its assassination communications with headquarters for copying. There is a Staples about 10 minutes from here, closer to Hood, where he had it done. Cost a little more than six dollars @ 5¢ or less a page. That rate is with what can be fed automatically.

So let one of us know if you'd like that file and we can get it copied that way. That is faster than having the college do any of that copying.

When I told Jerry, when he told me he was reading and liking parts of the incomplete ms. of Case Open, originally Hoax, that he had the full thing to the degree it was retyped, 782 pages of it, he found that in the box in which I think I gave it to him. I do not know if you'd like that, or if Bill will. I'll ask him. I am certain that in it I followed more of the evidence than exists in the shorter printout the shortening of which is a mystery to me. I raise the question not only to learn if one of you would like it but also to be able to take advantage of any reduced rate for greater volume, if Jerry's belief is correct. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~  
 I'll enclose the Lardner story on the Guinn testimony. I have the full published ESCA testimony if you need that. Or want it.

If you want to explore the Russell archive more that may be worthwhile. It may be possible to get some of that done for you by a student, perhaps a law student. A member of the law faculty, Donald F. Wilkes, at Athens, has been in touch with me. He has written several articles about the Russell position for the local papers. For them he did little or no research of his own but what he had was adequate and he needed no more.

I have some of what Selby got. I'm sure he'll let you have more if he has more that you can use. He is at 13301 Overbrook ~~xxxx~~ Lane, Bowie, MD 20715.

If you do not have <sup>(vol 1 - 58 pp)</sup> it you should get it. Using a child you can get 100 pages of it, about what it is free. That leaves either of you free for asking <sup>for more</sup> for yourself. You can have real fun with the table of contents and the index alone! It is a diatribe against Oswald that barely mentions the crime and does not mention all the known shooting or all the wounds—even the cause of death! If you cannot find what McNaughton of the Defense Dept. said of this and what the FBI then did in my files ask the archive for it. He alone had any questions and they went after him in return. I think he was general counsel. Check my subject file on this and on what Hoover did to the Dallas police after blackjacking Jesse Curry to retract the truth he told—broke off all relations with them. Even training.

Jerry had all the executive session transcripts if you want any of them. His manual for his classes will tell you more of what he has, in part.

I think you can safely indicate in what you write that the vastness of what is available makes it impossible to include all of it. What you will write will make that apparent. Thus you can safely not include much and still have an impressive work.

Perhaps it might be a good idea if you were to carry a small pocket notebook in which you can record subjects to include because when you get to it it ~~xxx~~ they may not all come to mind *later*.

Going back to Guinn and his testimony, he stated that the specimens he tested were not the official specimens of the FBI's original testing or those in the Warren Commission's evidence. Yet he testified about them as though there were pure. The Commission, rather committee, treated his testimony as though he testified to the genuine article in the evidence when he was specific in stating under oath that it was not the genuine evidence. I do not suggest that ~~he~~ <sup>you</sup> include expert witnesses as an institution but it is obvious that if he had been fully honest what testimony could have been based on what he testified to only toward the end of it and then when questioned. I think lawyers might argue that with any of the samples tested invalid he could not really testify at all to anything other than the invalidity of the samples tested.

The committee ignored this testimony in ~~its~~ <sup>its</sup> alleged deliberations and in its report. The Post, while reporting what he did say, also angled it out of meaning in the story and the headline on the story. Actually, despite the words he used, his testimony was not to a "match" when what he tested was not the original specimens.

*is* The can get to another Commission failure. It did not get ~~from~~ <sup>from</sup> the FBI the ~~right~~ <sup>weight</sup> of the specimens it removed from the evidence. It did not get from the FBI what the ~~weight~~ <sup>weight</sup> is of what remains of these specimens it took or even where those specimens may be, rather that metal may be. All that was needed for spectrographic examination was as little as a millimeter in size, of postage-stamp weight. But Frazier removed ever so much more than that from the base of 399, as its picture shows. We questioned him about this on deposition in 75-226. He did not weigh that bullet other than when he received it and he hadn't the slightest notion where all the excess core material he removed may be. It could, and we do not know and cannot allege it, have been the source of ~~what~~ <sup>what</sup> could have been substituted for the actual original specimens. In which event they obviously would seem to be of common source! *for they would have!*

Guinn also could not have testified honestly, if that was his testimony rather than Lardner's interpretation of it, that "there was no evidence that any other bullet struck the presidential limousine." There not only is such evidence that he was not aware of, was not given to him for him to testify about, ~~he~~ <sup>he</sup> has no idea what caused JFK's nonfatal wounds. Nothing he was given is in fact rather than in fabrication connected with his nonfatal injuries. And then there is the Commission evidence that there were 40 "dust-like" fragments in JFK's head. They could not have come from that ammunition Guinn tested.

The press as an institution ~~failed~~ failed in this, as it failed in many other ways you may want to keep a list of because they require little more than mention.

It should not have let the matter of the substituted, the unoriginal, the phony in any way evidence go without comment or demands and I know of not a single one.

It accepted the Report and the 26 uncritically, too. As it did secret proceedings, not being able to attend and cover any or to get transcripts. Compare this, as I think I mentioned to Dennis, with going to court to have the O.J.Simpson case shown it live in TV. And that was after the press was ~~in~~ in the proceeding from the beginning with a pool arrangement, what is the norm.

In a sense I am suggesting compartmentalizing it. That way you can do a compartment and lay it aside and do another, etc. until you have pretty much of it written. You ~~will~~ <sup>will</sup> both have other things taking up your time and keeping you from being on this constantly. That makes me think that doing it in chunks you can pretty much clean up as you go can be the best approach for you.

I believe there is nothing arcane or complicated in the legal/evidentiary matters I mention above and I believe that Bill, who has always been very helpful and very willing to be, will help you on it and anything else like it. Ditto for his wife Petsy on medical records. She is a recognized expert in the field.

It will take time and it will not be as difficult as it now seems but it will be worthwhile.

Best,

Hard