

Dear Gerry,

6/12/89

Dave was here parts of Friday and Sunday and all day Saturday. We enjoyed the visit that is always too short. We also were able to introduce him to Vietnamese food and did he love it! And Mexican. Both are small restaurants, family operations, and we not only enjoyed the food, as usual, but we enjoyed his enjoyment of it! Many peoples have come to Frederick in recent years and most seem to be doing well. Some in small businesses. He also has to teach summer school this summer, beginning very soon. Today he was driving David to Madison to arrange for his specialization there this summer. Dave's daughter. His, was magna cum laude with many other honors at Brown.

From both experience and observation Hertzgaard is entirely correct. Particularly on the subject of political assassinations. It is especially true on foreign policy. On the NBC News last night the TV audience was told that all the right-wing Latin American dictatorships are democratic. Only what is not right-wing is to the major media not democratic. Been that way for generations. Only not as totally as today. In the past there were a few exceptions.

Like some others, the anti-Castro connection does seem to be compelling and although I doubt it would have been official, it does not seem to be impossible that some self-starting spooks could have been connected or involved. However, there is not an iota of proof, real evidence. Only suspicion. I remember years ago when confronted with such questions on talk shows and I had to be spontaneous the first time, I saw the possibility of such spooks setting fellow spooks up. For example, those involved in Vietnam making it look like the anti-Castroes and vice versa.

I believe that Dean Andrews has been dead for several years. Several years ago I saw deBrueys on TV. Maybe last year, but I'm not sure of that. When he quit the FBI he remained in New Orleans, which is where he started and was educated.

Most of Garrison's leads were his imagination and insubstantial. HSCA did nothing with those that weren't like this. However, it did not entirely ignore CIA. Only let Helms and others lie their heads off, feigning indignation at even being questioned. The John Lemon Hart testimony for the CIA about its treatment of Nosenko was quite embarrassing to it. They didn't really ask the CIA for testimony other than Helms' on how so many Oswald records disappeared without, allegedly, any trace. If there was anything else I don't recall it.

In fairness to the press however, Garrison abuse it to begin with. He lied and pretended he didn't, he exaggerated and he really asked for critical treatment from it. He just made things up as he went and assumed what he imagined was true and that those to whom he repeated what he made up were obligated to believe every word of it. He's an extremely bright, personable and articulate man. Writes very well and can be eloquent when he speaks. He was very persuasive at the beginning. But don't bother to get his current book. It is crap and it is quite dishonest.

We knew you'd gotten the books from the BOM Club because we got the freebies. I've read Sheehan and it is a magnificent job, for the most part, but he, for whatever reason, is wrong on JFK and fails to realize that JFK underwent a complete change via the Cuba Missile Crisis. He was a hawk who turned into a dove. When you are here I've some new info on this in correspondence with The Nation, so check that file. And Fletcher Prouty, my source....Be sure to keep an independent record of your points or credits if you buy books from them. I found computer error. These points give you discounts or freebies. The special rate for two books this month is for two good books. We didn't need one so we bought only one.

One of Prouty's letters was unfiled, in the clutter on my desk. Here is a copy. (I don't agree at all with what he says about the so-called tramps, who weren't even tramps but were wins. But perhaps what he says about what he knows about, the NSAMs, will interest you.)...We look forward to your coming. I think Dave may be back before the

fall term starts. Hope so. Best to you all,

Heard

WOFFORD COLLEGE

FOUNDED 1854

SPARTANBURG SOUTH CAROLINA

29301

(803) 585-4621

Dear Harold,

June 9, 1989

With the first session of summer school just around the corner I thought I would write before I get too wrapped up in my classes. I finally got a chance to read Oswald in New Orleans last week. I found it fascinating and informative. That part of Oswald's background is now much clearer to me. The anti-Castro Cuban connection in the assassination seems compelling to me. I couldn't help but think about the so-called "Iran-Contra Affair" as something of a parallel to the covert support for the various Cuban exile groups intent on invading Cuba at that time. One can only imagine what kind of stink would have been caused had one of these exile groups been linked to Kennedy's assassination. I was also struck by the weird assortment of characters that are part of the story. I wondered what may have happened to two of them in particular: Dean Adams Andrews and FBI agent Warren deBrueys. Also, although I ~~would~~ can guess what the answer might be, what, if anything, did the House Select Committee on Assassinations do with some of the leads Garrison developed? I imagine that just as with the Warren Commission the role of the CIA was almost completely masked or ignored.

In reading Oswald in New Orleans I was again struck by the role of the establishment press in attacking Garrison and defending the government. Several months ago I read a book entitled On Bended Knee by Mark Hertsgaard which is a critical account of the press's relation to the Reagan Administration. The title tells you basically what that relation seemed to be. Many comments he made about the press in general seemed applicable to the Kennedy assassination. Let me quote one in particular:

"It was an article of faith within the American press that everyone was free to say whatever they liked; there were no limits on opinion, and all serious views were given fair representation. In fact, however, subtle but definite limits were imposed on the nation's political debate by the press's definition of who constituted responsible, and thus quotable sources. As a practical matter, the definition of who was worth listening to was limited to official Washington: administration officials (past and present), members of Congress, the occasional, well-connected academic specialist...."

"Emphasizing the statements and actions of officials above all else often resulted in woefully one-sided reporting and reduced the press to little more than a nominally independent mouthpiece of the government, a stenographer of power."

Do you believe that is a fair assessment? Does it aptly characterize much of the reporting on the JFK assassination?

I received my first book-of-the-month order last week, and I have gotten into Sheehan's book, A Bright Shining Lie. It is indeed excellent. That account of the funeral of Vann in the opening

WOFFORD COLLEGE

FOUNDED 1854

SPARTANBURG SOUTH CAROLINA

29301

(803) 585-4821

was incredible -- it brought out so many different facets of the war. One thing that troubles me, however, is the extent to which Sheehan attributes what was going on in Vietnam in the early 60's directly to Kennedy as if Kennedy had the kind of day-to-day involvement that Johnson later developed. It seems that the prevailing view of Kennedy these days is that he was much more of a hawk than a dove

I will be in touch. Hope you are fine. And please give my regards to Lillian.

Yours,

Berry