

Dear Dave, Tony Summers' Official and Confidential 5/8/93

That there is little new in this book as far as I've gone, past the midpoint of the text, does not diminish its value but Tony Summers' Being Tony Summers does, ^{although} ~~yet~~ that does not seem to reduce its popular acceptance. To the point I've gone only the bugging of the Supreme Court strikes me as new and there is much that was well known that he missed. But it is a good account of Hoover and the FBI for popular consumption despite its ~~flaw~~ flaws. These flaws may reduce its acceptability to informed scholars of the present as well as of the future.

There has been minor comment of which I'm aware - and there may have been much more of which I am not aware - of his using Susan Rosenstiel as the only source on her husband's sexual involvements with Hoover dressed as a woman. Most responsible writers would not go with any single source on anything as significant as this and she was, from Summers' own account, a vindictive woman seeking revenge on her homosexual husband & her second homosexual husband after a messy divorce. I do not believe the story and I cannot believe that Tony could believe that a Hoover would let himself get in such a compromised position, least of all with a scoundrel like Roy Cohn.

The notes make it difficult to pinpoint sources and some is not sourced. Some are at best dubious, like Bud Fensterwald and Mike Ewing.

That he can credit Gordon Novel as an only source is beyond belief, especially when Novel represents a personal relationship with a careful man like James J. Angleton, who would never have trusted a Novel with anything at all.

Tony is also cheaply vindictive in such things as his biblio. He here credits the most disgusting of trash, like Melanson's books under the assassination, but has no mention of mine.

I think it is also fair to say that lumping me in his credits ^{or} acknowledgement among others of little consequence is hardly an honest reflection ^{of} all he got her and the great amount of time he took. He and two of his assistants were here for days at a time and copied many documents. Along the same line, he hardly represents the great amount of work Jim Lear did for him in all his FOIA matters. Aside from pettiness and vindictiveness that he indulges these things have the effect of diminishing the amount of work done for him and making himself look as the one who did that work. But in the future, to any serious examination of this book, his failure to include my work in his biblio can raise questions about him and his. Which I think does not concern him at all because he doesn't care about the value of his work in the future. His concern is limited to represent and the immediate benefits to him-now.

Later I continued to read, now through chapter 29. Beginning in 22 I started marking marginal notes. Quite a few by the time he got into a thoroughly dishonest attempt to pin the CIA's mafia plot on the Kennedys. The CIA itself proved they knew nothing at all about those plots but Tony, with gross and deliberate dishonesty, wrote the opposite. All of that

and much more than he lies about in this book was readily available to him when he was here. He did not look for it and he did not ask me about it. He preferred being an anti-Kennedy propagandist, which he was always been, to being an honest and truthful writer. He is even more dishonest in other aspects of his fictioneering about the Kennedys, noted in margins.

It is not surprising that he cites the crappiest sources but manages never to cite my works even when they are the only source. Instead he has no source.... He treats Judy Campbell/Baner as an unquestionable source of proven accuracy when she told him palpably impossible things that also made no sense at all. He and others published some of her lies in cheap papers and he cites them as dependable sources when they are not.... He can be and is careless with fact. One minor example is that he refers to the woman Senator Maureen and Maurice Neuberger.

There is nothing too cheap for him to belabor the Kennedys with, even such crap as Ed Becker's on Marcello, which ^{Sutton} he did not tell the FBI, whose informer he was, when he went to it after leaving Marcello.... I do not know whether it is worth it but you will be welcome to borrow the book and make what notes you'd like. ...

I've finished the reading. The numerous other posted criticisms are like the few I indicate here and the greater number posted on the pages. It is, I think, very unfortunate that what could have been an enduring work suffers so many flaws that can be used to deprecate it. Given the money Tony had for researching and producing the volume I'm sorry that he was dominated by his pettiness and his hatreds. His hatred of the Kennedys, for example, is illustrated by his persistence in attributing the silly CIA mafia plot against Castro to them when even the CIA's investigation says they did not know about it, leave alone order it.

There are other records I have that he could have asked for if he did not see them when his and Kathryn Castle and Paul Sutton had unrestricted and unsupervised access to all. If anyone had asked I could have directed them to those records. But there was no interest and no asking. Tony's hatred dominated. And what he wanted to say regardless of fact.

Too much cannot be located in the notes that are awkwardly conceived and executed. He has all those notes by chapter without a single page indicated. This entails reading and rereading in an often futile effort to learn what he has as a claimed source. Quite often there is none at all. Even for direct quotations.

Consistent with his formula for his Conspiracy, the safe formula of assuming Oswald's guilt, he assumes Ray's also, without reference to the enormous amount of totally exculpatory evidence of which I informed him in enormous detail on his promise to get me an agent, a promise he never intended keeping despite a belated gesture at it. He resented my demanding those tapes back. He magnifies the deliberate dishonesty of his unquestioning assumption of Ray's guilt with the gross lie that he knew was a lie, of saying that the alleged (he did not use that word) evidence against him was ~~now~~ never tested in court. He knew very well and in great detail how and where it was tested in court and subject to cross examination with

which he also knew in detail every single bit of it had survived.

I am saying that Tony was deliberately dishonest in many parts of the book. I have to presume the reasons. I believe one was acceptability, which began with his agent, Sterling Lord. Lord refused to represent me on Whitewash, without even looking at me, when the old Saturday Evening Post sent me to him to represent me in the serialization of the book that it told me it wanted. Or, Lord knew where his bread is buttered, too. His knew the prejudices of the publishers with whom he deals. Tony reflects it.

Although some of what he used came from me I saw no single citation of me as a source.

Some he omitted when it would have helped the book because he did not want to cite me as his source. Example, DeLoach's memo on the Manchester interview of Hoover. What Hoover said then would have helped the book and what Tony was saying very much. One that he entered the case illegally and two that he immediately assumed Oswald's lone guilt. But maybe because he also assumed Oswald's guilt Tony did not want to say that!

He ~~like~~ makes unsourced quotation of the 1/22/64 NC executive session transcript without citation of what it holds that is important to what he was saying. I believe that is because he used what he did from a limited use of what I published in Post Mortem.

At this point you phoned and what else I'd perhaps intended saying about this book and about Tony is out of mind. Except one thing I do remember, that he had pictures supposedly supporting what the book says about Hoover and his homosexuality and transvestitism. One of supposed Hoover in a dress was used to promote the book. But neither it nor any other such picture is in the book. Is not the WHY? a very big question? Do such pictures not belong in the book which does have pictures that are of no real significance at all?

On Tony's pettiness, I may have told you that for all my time that he and his two helpers took, for all they copied and all I did tell him, he was so cheap after I complained about his failure to return our transcribing machine after many reminders, none of which should have been necessary, and after my request that he return the King assassination tapes we made for him to use in getting me an agent, which he did not do, he did not even send me a copy of the book.

He was years late turning the ms. in. Lesar told me he had to rewrite it. I find myself wondering whether that was for this dubious sex stuff. If he had indicated he had any such interest I could have told him some usable stories circa 1938. And of Hoover's spying on reporters, of which there is no mention in the book. And about SAs having to spy on each other. And of what they would not do that they should have done. I can't remember that he ever told me what he wanted to do in this book, for all the time he, Kathy and Paul were here.

Heeelp