

Dear Dave,

1/5/98

Thanks for your 1/1 and the stamps, labels and item in it.

I've most of a book Faking Kennedy: The Dark Side of Sy Hersh, written.

It is as intendedly dishonest a book as I can recall.

That is why he has ~~a~~ no bibliography, no source notes. I have much on what he omitted and said the opposite of from one of his admitted sources.

Hersh is knowingly wrong on the Kennedys and assassinations, on Vietnam and on the Cuba missile crisis.

I've heard nothing more about those Ray rifle tests.

There can be a problem with them from the frequent firing of that rifle once it was in official hands. Each firing made a minute change in the barrel and that could have been enough.

At the time of the evidentiary hearing I asked Herbery McDonnell, who you saw on TV I suppose in the O J Simpson case, to be our expert witness. I took him to the clerk of the court's office. He brought his own microscope and camera and made his examination. As we ~~walked~~ walked back to the courthouse he told me, and these are close to his exact words, "I wish I had as good a specimen in most of my cases." But ^{that} ~~the~~ ^{razier} of the FBI ^{by} score he could not find marks of distinction ^{that} without which they could not have extradicted Ray and without ^{that} which Foreman could not have bamboozled him into ~~the~~ guilty plea.

He did testify the next day. His testimony, which was unrefuted but was ignored by the judge, was that given that rifle and that specimen and the right to test-fire and recover specimens ^{he was} without doubt that he could testify without reservation that the bullet had or had not been fired from that rifle.

What can you do when a judge can ignore unrefuted testimony like that?

Hope all of you have a good year, and many thanks,

sincerely,

Harold

January 11, 1998

Dear Harold,

Your the first I've written 1998 for. Happy New Year to you and Jill.

I caught the tail end of the enclosed on the news last evening and wasn't paying much attention. It seems uncanny.

I did buy the Hersh book and don't have much other information on him except his earlier investigative work didn't seem to be particularly partial to Republicans. So far, what it seems to do is not bring so much news, as we have seen most of this in the Reeves book and elsewhere, but in some cases reveal the source of earlier stories, though in many cases, that is not done specifically by name.

I was curious since the (inconclusive?) rifle testing of Kay's rifle seemed to say many of the bullets fired didn't match, just what have/are they going to do with that information? If nothing, why did they do it in the first place?

I saw Amistad last evening. Though the first part was gory, it did become interesting and from what one can tell, seemed to be accurate and well casted. John Quincy Adams is an interesting human figure.

I have a few more days off before I go back to work at school Monday. Take care.

Jim Aron,

Dave