

Like all assassination commercializers who begin with a merchandisable formula, Summers is a ripoff artist who pretends to be generous with credit and isn't except to a few friends to whom he is more indebted than he indicates.

In order to hide his unoriginality, while hypodroming his own supposed investigations and research, he rarely gives primary sources.

With HSCA, nobody having drawn on that source, he cites their repetition of the work of others, for all the world as though it all began with them. There is no word in the book to indicate that he intends anything else.

With the Warren Materials, he cites them instead of the books from which he cribbed what he uses. He thus pretends that this also is his original work.

He is uncritical of those he uses, like Epstein, covering up Epstein's fakery and lies, as with how and when Oswald got out of England. Because of his heavy use of its material he is virtually entirely uncritical of the HSCA and at no point indicates that so much of its work and so large a percentage of its expenditures were devoted to an effort to put down the entire critical community.

The practice extends to those he uses as probative when they aren't, like John Wilson.

There is little on the assassination and what little there is is not always accurate. (All is unoriginal.)

His formula is guilt by presume indirect, alleged association. In some cases, where it is important in his theorizing, it is not accurate. Ferris, for example, was not Marcell's employee. He was hired by Wasserman, chief counsel, on G. Wray Gill's recommendation. Ferris's prior association with Gill is forgotten and thus it all comes out, when Gill represented Ferris, that Ferris was represented by Marcell's lawyer. (Of whom there are many, not just Gill.)

In some instances, where his thievery is of more than usual importance, he goes to greater efforts to hide the source from which he stole. Example is Carolyn Arnold.

Another is the New Orleans addresses in LHO's notebook. He is careless enough to have

2

errors, without citing a source for it. He made a big thing out of Arnold in his TV appearances, exaggerating what he did and in fact misrepresenting what was done before him.

Where researchers have made documents available to him he uses them only in accord with his preconceptions and, incredibly, misses their importat, as with the Oswald/Mexico-Alvarado Ugarte and similar things. Here he does it to the point of dishonesty. The truth is not in accord with his own conspiracy theorizing.

As I read I indicated a few pages for copying, as illustrative, when it occurred to me. Not necessarily best examples.

On page 10 he thanks "Others who have helped unselfishly" and includes me. We had almost no contact. He stayed away when he was working on the TV show, even though his colleagues wanted him to talk to me. He asked for permission to use the Bolton Ford material from Oswald in New Orleans and then didn't credit it. He asked nothing else of me except that I send him a set of books, which also does not qualify as unselfish help. The only real way in which I was helpful to him is in what he stole, in almost all cases attributed to the sources I cited, where attributed at all.

On page 16 he says that the Committee "discovered" that the Army destroyed its files. The committee's "discovery" comes from the most widely distributed column in the world, Jack Anderson's, to which I gave the information long a ter I obtained it from the Army. (He does not report that his damn investigating committee investigated how the Army came to destroy its files and got an answer.)

22- His diligence in personal investigation did not yield the correct name of one of his more important characters. As listed in the Cast of Characters Ernesto is give as Ernesto Rodriguez. And he appears not to have tumbled to the fact that his father is the electrician referred to or that Ernesto tried to rent space from Sam Newman at 544 Camp. Which is a big if unoriginal deal with him. (He even attributes correlating what he read in Oswald in New Orleans to Bill Turner, that the Lafayette and Camp addresses.) On the same page, his reference to Capt. Sapp, Miami, and Miltear/Somerset reminds me that he quotes the transcript without giving its source, Frame-Up.

His cast of characters is so i:

152-5 Here he takes, uncredited, from WW and O in NO, ~~says~~ uncredited, adds Epstein, and says it is at the heart of the continuing inquiry, to which he adds nothing of substance.

257-8. His total lack of political understanding and the willingness he has to make facts up as he goes to advance his theories is illustrated by what he says about Howard Hunt, to embroil him and the CIA. He says that it is under Hunt that "the refugee leaders formed a united Front, eventually to become the Cuban ^Revolutionary Council. Actually, Hunt withdrew from his political role because he so strongly opposed unification, so strongly opposed the moderates who to him were reds, and the Cuban ^Revolutionary Council was formed of the amalgamation only after Hunt was off the project.

327. His stuff on LHO's notebook and the specific addresses and what he says of them is a unique selection from O in NO only, uncredited and here presented as his own work. To hide this and his stuff on 544, also cribbed from my book, he attributes the latter to Bill Turner.

464. Because he wants to us an at best undependable source, the Britisher ^John Wilson, he says no more of him that he'd had a "checkered career" and does not include in it intelligence or the character that evolved in the CIA's ^London investigation. All of that is in the same documents from which he makes selective use. My recollection is that the CIA's records raise questions about his sanity also, but a bad one he clearly was, and totally undependable. Magnifying this he presends, careful not to make it explicit, that a John Wilson in Dallas means he is the same John Wilson because he is in Ruby's notebook. (This is the kind of thing ^Mary would have assumed and believed.)

527, note 37, cribbed from me and attributed to my CD source and his duplication of Dan Christensen's work afterward.

531. His 59 originates in PW. I told Gals about Arnold (new name) after I put the ^National Enquirer onto it. His attribution to Gals is OK but his pretense of originality and his efforts to hide original source are not. in 60 his Zapuder comes from PW, where I print the page of the CD he cites in facsimile. in 62, what he attributes to HSCA, comes right from my original work in WW, confirmed by Itak for Life. His 63 note, on Rather's description of the Zapuder film, is stolen from Penn Jones, who added the Rather description to a Zap. print and used it as a sound track.

532. His note 7 on 66 illustrates the totality of ignorance of basic facts based on

which he pretends such authority. He states that "Dr. Guinn was not able to test one fragment found in the car, as it was jacketed in copper rather than lead," and he quotes HSCA. Minor but showing how much he has bothered to learn about bullets: they are not jacketed with lead. Rather have they a core of lead alloy. However, the major error is that copper could not be tested by NAA. It could and had been. Guinn, in fact, was funded by the Department of Justice in a study of using the jacket material as a superior means of identification in NAA testing and his work was published in the Journal of Forensic Sciences. The truth is that HSCA did not want the copper tested and Guinn's impartiality extended to forgetting his science and doing as asked and no more.*

533. My interview with ~~XXXXXX~~ Senator Russel was not really an interview and I did not pretend it was. I gave an entirely different history, which he avoids and does not mention, and it was not for WW IV, which he says, but for other purposes. I mentioned it in WW IV. My point here is that he improvises rather than reports, on one of the ~~xx~~ rare occasions of his giving credit for what he takes. He is more accurate on 549, where he attributes this to my conversation with ~~XXXXX~~ Russell. (No source cited but FW)

His note 38 on 150 on this page is of the impossible. He uncritically accepts Jones Harris's attribution of a CIA source to a disclosed CIA document which reports what the paper said but he omits the CIA's proof of the impossibility of that report.

616. While he uses my books as part of his biblio, he fails to credit them in his notes, where he uses them extensively, without credit, in his text. Page 640 reflects the extent of his blacking out of his thievery: he does not have my name in his index. But he has the mafia thug Willie Weisberg with his name spelled incorrectly, reflecting not using the original sources. Actually, it was all in the papers, leaked by FBI, and I believe including the Anderson column.

* How he managed not to use George Hardner's excellent story on Guinn, based on his own questioning after my backgrounding, I don't know, except that it would destroy his argument about the unfairness of the press and would reflect badly on HSCA. He had this available from all those who helped him but it reflects inadequate questioning by HSCA and inadequate testimony from Guinn, who actually said the specimens he was given are not authentic.