

Jim Lesar  
918 F St., NW #509  
Washington, DC 20004

1/13/93

Dear Jim,

Last night you suggested that I read Russell's Nagell book again using the index for Marlowe, Masen and Snipes. This morning I copied the index entries and went over about half of them and found nothing at all that was both credible and relevant.

When I got as far into the book as I did before laying it aside as a waste of time I was looking for something relevant that did not depend exclusively on Nagell's word. I found nothing and I saw nothing this morning in the parts I'd not <sup>read</sup> read earlier.

None of this is real. Nagell is persuasive and to those willing to be impressed, impressive, but at each step in his story there is a question or a presumption or a conjecture or a Nagell/Russell conclusion that is without foundation or even reason to believe for those not already hooked on the conspiracy-theory literature.

Russell treats as real phony sources, clear fabrications. People like Morrow.

Which is all I need to know about Russell and what I mentioned last night, the established fact of the assassination. He and the others like him are and persist in being ignorant without making even a perfunctory effort to establish that their theories are at least compatible with known fact in official files.

Basically, Nagell's story makes no sense in any part. That was my impression when I first heard it, when I read the little then available, and it certainly is my firm belief after the dose of Russell I got before giving it up.

One of the evils of all the ignoramuses writing about what they know nothing about is that their ignorance has been fixed on the minds of the like-minded and what is not even rational is accepted as fact. They cite each other as authorities and they are not.

In Russell's case, with all the junk and fake books in his bibliography he is not even aware that I published Post Mortem. And it has content indispensable in any honest approach to Russell's theory, which is Nagell's to begin with, the content on Nosenko. It makes no difference to me whether Russell is ignorant or dishonest, that he is not aware of that information or that he ignores it, it in itself is enough for me, by itself, to believe his work lacks any credibility at all.

All he has gone to so much trouble over so many years to collect and put together may be attractive to those whose taste in spook and mystery novels is rather low but it has no established relevance to the JFK assassination, there is no reason to believe this could be established, and they all avoid the obvious, that Nagell was not 100% straight in the head. That he was Army intelligence means nothing at all re the JFK assassination. It does not establish any CIA connection that is relevant and their statement that Nagell worked for the KGB, which wanted to kill Kennedy, is rubbish. There is little the KGB or Khrushchev wanted less. Or, it is not worth the time I took for it this a.m.

Best,  
Harold

to Jim Lesar, 1/13/93, re The Man Who Knew Too Much/Nagell/Russell second page

I thought about what acceptance of this kind of literary garbage and evidentiary nonsense really means - that those ~~ya~~ of you who accept it have parked what critical faculties you have for the Fensterwaldian notion that if it is critical of the official mythology it has to be good no matter how bad it really is.

How can this Nagell concoction coexist with the books on which Russell draws when he disagrees with all of them on the only purpose of any of the books, what he and they write about a single assassination?

Except that in general Davis and Scheim have mafia theories neither bothers <sup>- a con</sup> to prove, they all have different "solutions" to the onetime.

It is bad enough that they are all fake books, but they do not agree and one can't regard them all as dependable sources when they disagree with each other?

Have any of you who embrace all this sick stuff ever asked yourselves or others what impact they can have on those who are not Fensterwaldian conspiracy theorists?

Can reasonable people who are not hung up on theories conclude other than that all the criticism is undependable, no matter how much some of them may not agree with ~~it~~ any official version?

Do not all these books do what the government is being criticized for, substitute theories for fact?

Is that wrong for the government only - not wrong for those who criticize the government for it?

And how can any one who has accepted any one of the earlier conspiracy-theory "solutions" accept Nagell's fabrication, which is contradicted by all of them?

Can none of you step back and face the contradictions and what they mean?

And how many of you believe that Oswald is guilty in some way, which all these books presume, without one making the effort to prove it?

You regard Oswald as guilty and not guilty?

Is not this what you do in accepting these bad books?