

Dear Richard,

2/3/94

If the pictures of the rifle in place cannot be obtained from the Dallas archive, which should have clearer pictures than the National Archives, it will be clearer, if Gary Savage's book is used with an offset camera than if the picture he made from the book and I cannot now find is used. My yesterday's search exhausted me too much for me to resume any search now and that exhaustion lingers, strange as this probably seems to you. But I am that weak and my legs are that troublesome.

I gave you my word and I keep it. But I had no idea that by editing you mean the total elimination of most of the content of the book and most of what it had on the assassination that is, among other things, not available in any book in the bookstores and aside from its importance would have been new to the readers. Frankly, I do not understand this. But as a practical matter there is nothing I can do about it other than hope that if half a loaf is better than none, what remains is half a loaf.

What remains is, as you said in your note, strong, I hope it may accomplish what I intended and with attention and luck, it can, to a degree.

My real purpose in writing is to call to your attention some of the omissions I believe hurt the book as it now stands. Of these I regard as the most important your total omission of the Hartogs business that in his book and in his appearances he says is its most important part. As Loomis also did. It is in fact one of his more flagrant dishonesties. I believe it is no trick and all and will take but little time to put the two parts of that back in, the part as I wrote it in haste ridiculing Hartogs and the addition I sent proving that Posner even lied about what Hartogs said under oath when he swore to what utterly destroys what Posner and Loomis say is the most important part of his book. It is also a part that got major attention in the commentaries and reviews I've seen.

I hope this was only an oversight and that you restore it.

I know there now is little time having found out from a friend who learned from his bookstore that the book has an April pub date.

I think you make the book and me look bad by eliminating ^{I said about} all what Posner said about me, leaving it uncontested in any way. I have written and enclose something small to address this. I think it is in some form necessary. I leave the form and wording to you. I am confident that there will be serious criticisms if both these things are not done.

My purposes in writing the book were serious. This is not to suggest that your purposes are not. I know they are. But to serve my purposes I drafted a long book. I would like you to say somewhere that there is the longer and more detailed version that scholars of the future will be able to consult through Professor David Wrone,

professor of history, ^University of Wisconsin, at Stevens point, Wisconsin; and through ~~Professor~~ Gerald McKnight, professor of history, Hood College, Frederick, ^Maryland, as well as in my own files.

There is a little New Orleans stuff I think should be restored for a number of reasons. Posner does all sorts of dishonest things to make a phony case that Oswald was all alone. He lied about what Charles Hall Steele said, attributing that to Steele's testimony, and he lied about Oswald picking up the handbill ^{at} the Jones Printing Co. He gave no citation for what he attributed to Steele's testimony (158n) and I used Steele's actual testimony. And the very record he cited on Oswald's handbill is explicit in stating that it was not Oswald who picked that printing job up. I doubly confirmed this in interviews with Douglas Jones and Myra Silver. So where the actual evidence is that Oswald was not alone, basic to the book being that he was, Posner lies and is stupid enough to cite what proves he lied to hide the fact that from the official evidence alone, Oswald was not alone.

I think these two things, especially together, can be important in making the scholar ^bAmrose a laughing stock in academe, which can be helpful, and ^mdoing that with the other puffer-uppers. One in particular is working on a book, I understand Random House, to compete with the Newman/C & G book on the Oswald records. So, poking Wise where it hurts has its own separate value.

But no place in the literature is there any proof that Oswald was not alone. Here it is for the first time anywhere and it is a powerful, separate indictment of Posner. With any attention it also is utterly destructive to his book and the coming reprint.

To say nothing of the NDC-TV miniseries.

Bringuier is an important part of Posner's book. I'm sorry you took that out because also important and gone is the fact that Posner used his interviews not to bring fact to light but to be able to misrepresent the fact. Bringuier and Badeaux are not only important in this as I had it written, but Badeaux ~~is~~ can have an added importance because of that crazy condemnation of the late Hale Boggs as a red. His daughter, ABC-TV and PBS commentator, Cokey (Boggs) Roberts, might not like that and might say something about it. Given the chance, that is.

If you do this, although I'd rather not have it omitted I will not object to eliminating the Geraci part other than the part that proves Bringuier lied even about when that incident was.

I think these few small things will take little time and will strengthen the book and provide a solid basis for getting it attention.

Best,

Harold

Posner's small-minded effort to diminish my work and ^{question}~~question~~ my character has the effect, to those who really know the subject matter and the work done in it, of making himself even punier.

The minor detail he selected from all my work to allege is inaccurate is ~~truth~~ distorted and ~~is~~ as he presents what he says ~~is~~ the fact, is grossly in error.

In some of his criticisms of me, typically for him he misrepresents what my books were about in order to contrive an entirely irrelevant criticism.

Where his criticism is extraneous to his book, and he does this not with me alone, he knowingly misrepresents what he knows to be the truth to accomplish his dishonest and disreputable ~~and~~ objective, which is to defame me and to question my character.

As he well know in his little-man's dirtiness, there is nothing that can be done to remove from the minds of his readers the character assassination he intended.

But that does not and cannot make him any larger than the small man he is.

The truth is that each of his contrived criticisms lacks honesty^{of} intent and of expression. In this he has characterized^{ed} himself for the record for ^{our} history.

In terms of the nature of his criticisms to which he seeks to give an importance they do not have, in personal terms they are worth no more time and space than this categorical statement that they are all in varying degrees dishonest and he knew it ~~in~~ when he ^vrote them.

Dave Perry
4601 Ainsworth Circle
Grapevine, TX 76051

2/3/94

Dear Dave,

Glad you may be able to find a few minutes to be of help with the pictures for the book. I enclose my last letter to Cindy Emolovik. It explains the pictures I'm anxious to get. But if possible ^{in a/c} not from the copy negatives you refer to, not for use in a book. The pictures were not all that good to begin with and that ^a added loss of clarity will be hurtful to them. If possible from the original negatives.

Exhibit 376 would not be suitable because most of it has nothing to do with Dealey Plaza and what I want the reader to be able to refer to is the parts of the Plaza that have significance in the assassination story.

The only pictures of the rifle that I want are as found, in place, before it was removed. The police pictures were not taken for quite some time. During that time part of what hid the rifle was removed. Some of what was removed is still visible in a Studebaker picture but isn't in Day's.

I once had an excellent aerial view of the Plaza, I think given to me by Penn Jones. It was of the Plaza only, just about.

Because suddenly there is a need for a rush I just turned all of this over to Co-publisher Richard Gallen. If you can get the pictures or see those that will be printed, the pictures should go to him, at 260 Fifth Ave., NY 10001. I'd like to have xeroxes of them for captioning.

I wrote ^{twice} Alyea. He did not respond. I've asked Mack to direct me to the proper person at WFAA-TV to see if they can provide prints from the remaining Alyea footage that includes the firing of the rifle, rather the first views of it after it was found.

Of course there may be some pictures the Commission did not get or use that might be better. I really want to show that the rifle was not only hidden but that there is photographic proof Oswald could not possibly have placed it there after shooting. So, if there are any other pictures of the rifle as found, please if they show anything at all ask for prints of them too, clearest possible because for possible printing, and the money will be sent promptly.

If you know the proper person at WFAA-TV, would you please phone him? Or get the name from Gary and then please phone him? Thanks very much!

The weather here is as you've probably seen on TV. I suppose the weather there has heated up a bit since Norv Turner left?

Our best to you both, and thanks again,

Harold

National Archives



Washington, DC 20408

4
January 10, 1993

Jonathan Meyers
Assassination Archives & Research Center
918 F Street, N.W., Suite 510
Washington, DC 20004

Dear Mr. Meyers:

We have received your order form for reproduction services regarding one 8x10 black & white print of Commission Exhibit 718. However, we are not able to process this order at this time due to the Special Media Preservation Branch (NNPS) closing for the relocation to our new building in College Park, MD. Bulk photocopying, still photography services, and microfilming services will be interrupted during the move. For additional information and details regarding the reopening of NNPS, please contact Anthony Fantozzi at (301) 713-6713.

Your order will be held in a pending file with the JFK Liaison Office until NNPS reopens for reproduction services, at which time it will be forwarded to NNPS for processing. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact the JFK Liaison Office at (202) 501-5313.

We apologize for the delay in processing your order.

Sincerely,

Steven D. Tilley
STEVEN D. TILLEY
JFK Liaison
Access Staff