

Charles Drago  
12 Stephen Hopkins Court  
Providence, R.I. 02904

4/10/91

Dear Charles,

I can't take the time I'd like to reply to your 4/5 because for the first time in years I have part-time help and have returned to a book I had to lay aside years ago because I am limited in using stairs and most of my records are in the basement.

I have no recollection of any Kaland "Bud" Culligan but I do have a file on him. A fellow prisoner I'd met wrote me about him 7/22/61.

In a 12/30/81 letter to Admiral Inman Culligan refers to "Admiral Turner's visit to my house" and to other things. You might try Turner.

In a 9/25/79 letter to Christopher W. Farrell, P.O. Box 1117 Jensen Beach, FL 33457 the CIA does refer to him repeatedly as "general."

Culligan phoned me about publishing and the problems in self-publishing. I wrote him 7/26/82 offering "to evaluate the information relating to the JFK assassination and to indicate any potentials in it if you could care to get a copy of it to me." He replied 7/30 saying he'd have friends get a copy of his records to me but they are not in the file so I suppose I got nothing. Among his handwritten additions to the typed letter are his cryptonym, AF serial number and, marked "Confidential Congressional Record "Congressional license to kill dated 1 May 50" and one to "bear arms dated 1 May 50." I saved the envelope. He was then at the James River Correctional Center, State Farm, Va. 23160.

Some unclear recollection returned as soon as I said I had no recollection so I checked the files.

Having heard nothing from him and not having gotten what he said he'd have friends get to me may at the time have made me wonder if he was all there.

Whether or not to pursue the matter should begin with his delivering something tangible, as he said he would to me and didn't. And didn't after release from jail, either. Not a word from him since then.

I have an additional problem with the statement or inference that a general connected with the CIA would have knowledge <sup>of its</sup> ~~etc is~~ assassinating any president. I am confident that if the CIA had done it there would not have been anyone who was not essential to the deed having any knowledge of it.

With regard to your script, I'd like to read it but cannot now promise to write in detail about it. I'd also like a copy for archival purposes.

Excuse my rush. Lately I've been highlighting when + read for response. "The president meant for the invasion to fail..." Not possibly applicable to JFK. So, are you "true to history" in this?

Was there a "purge of intelligence services by the Kennedy brothers...?" Aside from

the delayed Dulles departure I am not aware of any. It was later, under <sup>*a Schlesinger et al*</sup> Carter, by Turner,

There has been much mythology foist upon us, some by those with political purposes, some with other interests, and some just fictions.

I am not aware of any Bay of Pigs "betrayal" although there have been some fictions.

That it impended was known to all the world except the people of the US. The Cubans were talking about it openly at the UN, the lies about the advance bombing were perceived and reported immediately by our papers. Rather than "betray" the scheme JFK personally convinced the NYTimes and <sup>W</sup>WPost not to <sup>W</sup>publish the stories they had.

My own view is that the CIA hoped only for a beachhead held long enough for a government in exile to be recognized.

JFK did not back out on any promise. He did relent and OK another bombing this time by our Navy planes and the Navy goofed on timing and it went for naught. But he had not promised it and then changed his mind.

The prospects of success were so slight the military avoided any responsibility for the advance planning.

So, to what history are you being true?

You have one US agent on Cuban soil then. Did you know that despite the prohibition on this there was one who did land and did escape?

Best wishes,

*W. J. ...*

12 Stephen Hopkins Court  
Providence, Rhode Island 02904  
April 5, 1991

Dear Harold,

I feel that this letter is long overdue. We last corresponded in August of 1990, at which time you offered invaluable advice as I began the writing of my screen treatment of the assassination of President Kennedy.

I'm most pleased to report that that project has been completed. More about it in a moment.

First, I'd like to ask you about a certain Air Force officer whose story recently was brought to my attention.

Roland "Bud" Culligan was an inmate at the Adult Correctional Institution in Cranston, Rhode Island approximately ten years ago. At that time, a casual acquaintance of mine was performing missionary work at the prison, and he met Culligan, who was claiming to be "born again."

(There's a sucker born again every minute. But that's another story.)

My friend was intrigued by Culligan's story, which was told to me just last night (April 4) as follows:

Culligan was an Air Force Brigadier General. He worked for (with?) the intelligence community, and was privy to many deep, dark secrets! He spoke at length about the murder of the president, claiming that it was indeed the work of elements of the CIA and military intelligence. The reason: the president was about to "sell us down the river."

When my friend checked out Culligan's story at prison administration, he learned that the so-called general was not listed on any official prison rolls, and that he was a federal prisoner in the care of Rhode Island authorities. The reason for his imprisonment: "classified."

Culligan eventually was released, and attempted to secure employment with a radical right wing preacher named Ennio Cugini. Cugini's church is located in northern Rhode Island, and has been at the center of some controversy over the years. At the time of Culligan's erstwhile employment, Cugini's church was burned down in a to-date unsolved case of arson. Prior to the fire, Cugini was informed anonymously that Culligan was NOT to be given employment or any other support. It was only after this warning was unheeded that the arson took place.

Or so I am told.

My friend was informed by another clergyman, this one a non-political and relatively unbiased pastor, that Culligan admitted to being "something of a 'con man.'" Big suprise.

It did not require Holmesian intelligence to track down Culligan's last known whereabouts: New Mexico. Before I go any further, I wonder if you would have any information about this character, and/or advice vis-a-vis the value of pursuing this matter.

page two

Even if the assassination lead amounts to nothing, evidence of federal prisoners being held in state penal institutions without official cause is most interesting. And if Culligan is what he claimed to be ...

In any event, I would appreciate your input on all of this.

Now back to my film treatment.

I have created a character called "Victor Gladio." He is an agent of an unnamed U.S. intelligence service, and we first meet him on the beach during the Bay of Pigs invasion. There he makes contact with a U.S.-run double agent who happens to be a close friend, too. He asks the agent if the highly touted indigenous revolt is taking place, fully expecting to see an army of counter-revolutionaries come marching out of the jungle. But his agent says that no such uprising in support of the invasion can be expected, and that reports to that effect have been offered more than once.

To make a long story just a little shorter, it is apparant to Gladio that, somewhere along the line, a betrayal has taken place. The president will not send air and/or ground support in the absence of indigenous revolt, and such revolt never should have been expected. Gladio's conclusion: the president meant for the invasion to fail, and set up counterrevolution as a sine qua non that he knew could not occur.

Then, in March of 1963, this same Victor Gladio, who has lost his job in a post-invasion purge of the intelligence services by the Kennedy brothers, is summoned by a "Harvey King," who offers what purports to be photographic evidence of Soviet ICBMs still in Cuba.

I am necessarily encapsulating my story for the purposes of this correspondence. And I don't want to give away what I trust will be as suspenseful and troubling an ending as the events in question might have inspired.

I do wish to tell you that I have tried to remain as true to history as drama will allow. I have changed the location of certain key events, and I have filled in certain "blanks" in the story with the stuff of drama. But I never forgot your admonition to treat this subject honorably and with the special considerations peculiar to its significance.

As I write this, my screen treatment is being read and considered for production by the likes of William Friedkin, Michael Douglas, HBO, etc. (Please keep this under your hat for now.) It has nothing whatsoever to do with the work of Oliver Stone, which I understand is in production.

The treatment runs to 91 typeset pages. I can't even imagine how busy your schedule must be. But if you have any interest in reviewing the work, I would be proud to forward a copy. Your comments again would prove invaluable.

If not, please know that I understand, and that I continue to look upon your work as being among our century's most important contributions to history.

Warm regards,  
Charlie Drago