

October 1, 1979

Dear Bruce:

I have dipped into Tony's manuscript, given most of it a quick perusal and parts of it a deeper reading. I feel it's the most impressive collation of information on the Kennedy assassination I have read. As far as my own knowledge is concerned, I think it's amazingly accurate in detail. I also found that his analyses and conclusions involving those areas of the investigation in which I personally took a part to be on target. I have only a very few gratuitous critical comments which don't weigh for much in light of my overall very favorable reaction to the job Tony has done.

For instance, I raise the question of whether or not there is "too much" information and detail, especially in relation to the plethora of names related to the mob and Hoffa's activities, only in relation to my feeling that the public views the Kennedy assassination field as already "too confusing."

My feeling that the book is perhaps a bit over-weighted toward the role of organized crime is counter-balanced by the realization that the Committee Report is also. But that's my perspective. I found Tony's preface excellent and, related to the above, was pleased that he pointed out -- although I wish he had done so more extensively throughout -- the basic incongruity of the Committee's position concerning, on the one hand, Oswald's "political" motivation and, on the other, his right-wing Mafia "involvement."

Like the Committee Report, I feel the book strains in its collation of detail in an attempt to link Oswald to the Mafia. Despite contentions to the contrary, Uncle Charlie was a low-level numbers writer.

Here are some comments with reference to specific page numbers:

Fonzi
m> 4A. like) 21: I'm fairly certain (but not sure and can check if you'd handled the autopsy photos was a she and not a he.

Hoch
m> 10 strikes me as an unnecessarily hanging description. 27: The reference to the "hostile newspaper," left unexplained,

yes-
ADD
m> 19 36: In reference to the bullet fragments in the car and taken from Connelly's wrist, as well as to so much of the other evidence obtained from the National Archives: The incredibly unsecure environment in which that evidence was kept over the years -- altho painfully obvious to the Committee, it did no special sub-study of that -- taints, I feel, any objective analytical conclusions concerning that evidence. I wish Tony would have made much of it

2.

my 165

156+. This gets to my feelings about the contradictory element in a point of Tony's later conclusions. In lieu of the CIA's prevarication and deceit concerning its relationship with Oswald -- most specifically, Helm's lying -- it seems waffling to advance the contention that the assassination involved a possible "renegade" element of the CIA. (In the case of the Castro assassination plots, wouldn't it then follow that it was CIA Director McCone himself, as one of the few in the top echelon who didn't know about them, who could have been termed the "renegade"?)

where is this story? looked?

Jerry Patrick

266 284. It bothers me that Hemming's quote heads the chapter. I find it acceptable, but only flinchingly so, that Hemming's story regarding his encounter with Oswald in California be accepted on face value, but that may be one of Hemming's more plausible stories. He has a wide reputation -- and I have confirmed it -- as a promulgator of disinformation and to give him the status of a top-of-the-chapter guru does not enhance, I feel, the book's validity. Granted, that may be too provincial a viewpoint.

Hemming is not credible

Change London HK Sewell

272 290. I believe JM/WAVE was not the name of a program but that of the Miami station itself.

the my

Change: Speculative

my 277 297. My understanding of Operation 40 was that it was an operation concurrent with the Bay of Pigs -- with an assassination capability and, perhaps, primary mission -- and that it did not survive afterwards.

(DRY) OP 40

my 279 299. Re: "the Cuban Revolutionary Council...created two years earlier by the CIA in the shape of Howard Hunt..." There may be some confusion here. It was the CRC's predecessor, the Frente Revolucionario Democrático (FRD), created as the political wing of Bay of Pigs operations, which had the direct Hunt connection. Hunt resigned his political liaison post prior to the Bay of Pigs. I'm sure Hunt was very much in touch with the CRC, but, strictly speaking, it was the FRD which can be said to have been "created in Hunt's shape."

the my

(EMEND)

my 367 405. As a point of information which ^{be} interest Tony: Cubela's contention is backed by Manolo Ray, whose information came from a third party source.

my 368 406. The reference to me is inaccurate. I was an investigator for Senator Schweiker, not his Committee or Subcommittee.

my 376 418. Interesting re Gauden's reference to Archacha Smith. Although Archacha was interviewed by the Committee, it was a perfunctory interview done on a moment's notice by myself because his lawyer successfully managed to finagle the Committee out of forcing Archacha to ^{its} subpoena for a formal and extensive deposition in Washington. His testimony remains unsworn.

William J

ADD

3.

457 519. Hunt, I'm sure, could be termed a "propaganda expert," but his official position was as the CIA political liaison with the Cuban groups. (1/11/57)

Sturgis claims that he was, for a short time, the overseer of all gambling operations for Castro before Fidel closed them. Calling him an inspector at the Tropicana is a bit misleading. (1/11/57)

457 520. Although Castro claimed Martino was arrested for flying into Cuba on a private plane, the evidence indicates he was actually flying commercial airline. His son was with him but was released almost immediately. (1/11/57)

526 597. Phillips was first head of covert operations and then Cuban operations in Mexico City, not both at the same time. A fine point only in theory. (1/11/57)

525A 599. No Committee inquiries were made of the Belgian authorities re the name of Frigault. The only checking done in that area, and not as deep as it could have been, was by Senator Schweiker's staff. (1/11/57)

Aftermath: I found the listing technique led to an intermingling of associations and information which produced a scattergun-like confusion, but I appreciated the effort at the point.

Again, what bothers me the most is the contention of a "reegade" element, which I find a weak thesis in view of the book's awesomely effective compilation of evidence against it. I perhaps would have found it more acceptable if it were presented in a "some contend"-way, followed by a lengthy discussion of the pros and cons, but, as it stands, I feel it weakens a bit so much of what is so strong in the book. On the other hand, pragmatically, I'll buy anything it takes to crack open the slightest fissure in the wall before the truth.

I wish Tony would have gone on more with his comments regarding the press' attitude toward the assassination. What he did was done so well.

Again, I am awed and impressed by the depth of Tony's work. He has my admiration; please pass on my congratulations.

Regards,

Gaeton Fonzi

It can be argued at least as reasonably if not more so, that any of these are more likely than the most other

Don't know if it is

10/1/79

Tony:

I realize you requested any corrections be sent directly to you, but since there were so few of consequence and Bruce seemed anxious that I respond to him urgently and directly, I hope you don't mind that I did so. Although I had some critical comments, I don't believe they are of consequence enough to disturb your editorial relationship, nor weighty enough to shade my tremendous admiration for the job you did.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "A. J. ...", written in dark ink.

Phone(024) 6210

Still Point,
Dromore,
Aglish,
Cappoquin,
Co Waterford,
Ireland

GASTON
~

October 3rd 1979

Dear Gaston,

I wrote you on the enclosed card, but decided you probably wouldn't be able to read it. So here goes again, enclosing the card anyway.

Bruce Lee tells me he's heard from you that Veciana has been shot - as I understand it he survived. I shall obviously want to include that fact by adding Veciana to the list of 'where are they now?' items at the end of the book. I'd be very grateful if you would let me have a few lines running down what you know of the incident and the circumstances. Where? Situation? Did other witnesses see the killer(?)s. Which ear was Antonio hit in, how serious an injury? You know what I need...

I find A.V.'s comment that "the Cubans did it" consistent with his past comments that Castro's people were after him. Does he really believe that was the cause? What think you? I hear from Bruce that you are perusing the ms. right now, and am very glad about that. Please express the final results to me, with your comments. Better to send direct to me on all specific points, as time is now of the essence. (Incidentally, I trust the ms you are now reading is the final one, which I delivered to Bruce on Sept 10 or thereabouts. The front and end are different from the old one - with a multitude of alterations to take the Committee into account, running through the body of the material. You have the new front but I would like you to have been able to read the altered version now that you have in any case embarked on the reading later in the day than we planned.

Can you send me a good print of Veciana (making him look as nice as his ugly mug will permit), and one of ~~Rick~~ Phillips (which I can run next to the "Bishop" artist's impression I have obtained a picture of Veciana - from summer 1963. However, he is photographed in the midst of a violent piece of oratory, and does not look like the rather believable calm man you and I know. I want to better that if possible, and (given his injury) would rather not now go direct to him.

I look forward to hearing from you soon. Jesus, how this subject eats up the weeks and months!

Cheers,

Still Point,
Dromore,
Aglish,
Cappoquin,
Co Waterford,
Ireland

Phone: 024-6210

*Copy sent to
Veeber Oct 4^m*


EMTL

August 12 1979

Dear Gaston,

Thanks for your letter alerting me to the fact that you did not yet have the ms. I hope you have now, as I called NY. Bruce was on vacation, and I can only suspect he intended you to wait for the emended ms. Since I don't know that, and since my deadline is the end of the month, I have fixed for you to get the old version in his absence. However, since it includes the most important and obvious changes, I enclose the new front to the book. Let me know your reaction as soon as you like. There are of course other changes in the light of the HSCA report and volumes. I think I have spotted most of them, so I suggest that you do not - initially- go to the trouble of detailed notations. Just write note-form comments, alerting me to things wrong/missing/ worth emending in one-line comments. I'll then respond on what I already am aware of, and what I need telling in detail. Will that do for now? I'm working flat out here on the HSCA material, and incorporating. I very much hope you are still on board. I need your help, and forwarding of material to those who can swiftly come back at me.

Yheers,



Anthony Summers

GOLD COAST PICTORIAL

August 19, 1979

Dear Tony:

~~Sarah~~
Sarah

I told ~~Sarah~~ Holland I was going to call you last Friday, as she suggested, but I went out of town earlier than I had expected, on Thursday, and did not return until this evening (Sunday). Now I was about to pick up the telephone and call and then thought it would just be a waste of your dime since, as I told Sarah, there's not much that can be done at this point, in lieu of my schedule. I was speaking with Bruce Lee last week. He told me there was some kind of goof-up at McCraw Hill while he went on vacation. As I had mentioned to him when we made the initial arrangements, I thought the time prior to the release of the report was most critical because it would have given me the opportunity to do a lot of checking quite easily. Now it would be more difficult. That is not, however, the key problem. When I initially made the arrangement with Bruce the manuscript was to be sent to me the following Monday. That was a month and a half ago. I arranged my schedule around working on that. Now I just don't have the time to give it the initial big bite of time I feel it requires in terms of checking with each team area. I suppose I could wing it, but I really don't want to do it at this point without being absolutely sure I would do an adequate job. I don't have the time to do that now. I really regret it. I'd be most happy to help you on critical and specific questions if I can, so please let me know. (Speaking of specific questions: Yes, it's Ragano who was Trafficante's lawyer, but I don't know whether Marcello used him; According to news clips at the time, it was William McClaney who owned the property at LaCombe; his wife then said he had been in the "tourist business" in Havana; his brother Mike, who owned the Hotel Nacional (and the International Casino inside it), said that William managed the ~~place~~ place)

As far as Bishop goes: I've done a lot of thinking about how best to handle it and the release of the supplemental volumes has opened doors. I feel I must open them myself, as I told Bruce, and on an immediate national level if possible. Once I do that, it will all be available to you, but until I can firm up plans to that it would not be in my own interests to release it. I hope you understand.

Meanwhile, I hope things are going well for you in Ireland and your window is free of cracks.

Regards,

