

Dear Harry,

4/2/92

Lil left me a note about your call after I was asleep. I do not know whether she told you but I was again hospitalized overnight for further testing of my sleep apnea. Aside from that stress it meant that at my age I was u p for the previous 24 hours and that leaves me more tired. It and ensuing medical appointments have me farthur behind in what I must do day by day and in what I want to do. So rather than phone you during the day and risk an argument I write you now. Before 2 a.m., after I've been up for an hour and am as wide awake as I ever now am.

David Gallen was thoughtful enough to send me a copy of High Treason 2 and I've started to read it. I've had little time for reading, read slowly and am only in the third chapter. As we both know, I do not believe your underlying theory and you have not answered the simple question that is controlling for me, why would anyone risk the great risks involved in faking any of the autopsy film only to evolve faked film that destroys the very purpose of faking by destroying the official story?

I do look forward to what you told me about, those new interviews, but I'll read my way to them. While initial impressions may turn out not to be justified, I at this point have the feeling that you may have undermined their effect by parts of what I've to now read. For example, your second chapter, with some of which I disagreed when you first told me about it, your bald statement that JFM would have died a natural death before a second term was completed. Aside from the fact that you do not really make the case, it also is entirely irrelevant and a diversion. In not making the case you undermine your own credibility. I do think that some of the content, like the Nicholas interview, is useful for the historical record.

While I've known people to object to the emotionalism of the kind you reflect in the first chapter, I think it is honest and serves an honest purpose, to declare yourself, to tell the reader where you stand, what you believe, in general where you are coming from. I share your belief, or perhaps it is the other way around, that JFK was on his way to becoming a great president and that he was trying to turn the world around and did care as few presidents ever did and that he was of remarkable personality, vision and ability.

I also find a weakness I've called to your attention before and urge you to think about in any further writing, your reflecting the influence of other writing and your writing without personal knowledge and without citing sources.

For example, it was not the military that planned or was behind the Bay of Pigs, as you say repeatedly. It was the CIA, with the military reluctant and standoffish but involved under compulsion. And, except in Oliver Stone terms, this was not essential to your book. LBJ and Hoover were not personal friends and for this and your statement that the Kennedy family was silenced by Hoover, which has no basis in fact at all, you cite no sources. I've reached the point where again without need you again say that many witnesses were killed to silence them. This is undiluted bullshit as I'm sure I told you before.

And for serious readers and reviews and in particular for the well-informed I think that with such unessentials you have undermined your credibility and willingness to credit what is new, the new medical witnesses you dug up and interviewed.

I do not know why in what I last read you acknowledge the possibility of the theft of the body and believe it was of no usefulness where ^{of} you used it but it is entirely wrong and there was no possibility of you. You at this point err in saying that General McHugh was the only person guarding it. All the Secret Service detail was there as well as the rest of the JFK party. Only Jackie and O'Donnell were not there. I think this, too, undermines your credibility with the informed and possible reviewers.

From the table of contents only I find myself wondering why you took time for such nonsense as the Ricky White fabrications that never had any credibility and why you refer to the ¹¹4/91 gathering of the nuts in Dallas at ASK as new evidence. There was no evidence produced there and what did get attention of which I know was palpably false. Some of this you should have known. Like the fiction of those "tramps" because I told you about it. If you took them seriously the recently-disclosed Dallas police records that did get some attention and are known to competent and informed reporters and reviewers again would undermine credibility. But as far as I've read I see no need for your purposes, as to this point I've perceived them, in going in for such crap.

I assume that C & G will be sending you around and will have you on ~~shows~~ shows. I fear that if you encounter informed people, able reporters, not that I believe this is really likely, and they go into some of these things, it will hurt not help sales and credibility, acceptance of the rest of what you say. That I've not yet reached. I hope this does not happen but I alert you to the possibility.

Moreover, if you are asked about some of the things I mention above, that takes time ~~xxxx~~ no matter how you respond and that diverts attention from what is new in your book. Instead of being able to tell people what is new in it and why they should want to read it you'll be spending time defending what I regard as unessential in the book. We can't any of us know all there is to know about anything and in general it is a mistake to go into what is on the one hand not essential and on the other hand we do not really know about.

Think, for example, about being on a major show that reaches many potential readers and opinion formers and you have to spend all your time defending what I regard as entirely unessential, your representation that JFK had Potts disease when in your honesty you prepared questioners to refute ~~you~~ you. Or you are questioned about the ^{my} military responsibility for the Bay of Pigs. Or an informed reporter goes after you on the nonexistent "cover-LBJ close friendship of Hoover's silencing of the Kennedy family. You won't get a chance to tell people why they should want to read your book. ...I have to knock off. I do not want to take time I do not have for discussion of what I have not read and will ~~sh~~ be able to read only slowly so please do not ask this. If when I finish I think your new evidence is significant I'll certainly tell you and praise you for having dug it up when others didn't.

I did not have a chance to read and correct until now.

4/3/92

I hope that you get sent around as you indicated C & G is going to do and that what I say about helps you prepare for the kind of questioning I hope you do not get but may face.

Lil says that Fox TV last night advertised a JFK program this coming week.

May I also suggest that you think of your own ways of avoiding being diverted from what you want to say in the too-little time you'll have if asked about other books, like Donaghe's and the Giancanas? You can always say you've not had time to read them.

I was able to read a few more pages and to skim a bit, looking for pictures, documents, etc., and the subhead, "The Calls and the Throat Wound" caught my eye. So I read that page. It confirms what I thought your interviews could do and that or those quotes from what Bell told you are important.

I'd appreciate a copy of those pages of her interview if the interview itself is too long for you to copy when you are busy.

What you quote of Perry does not really address what you quote Bell as saying. Did he avoid that? I'd appreciate a copy of his letter also.

May I also suggest, prematurely but so you can think of it, that you can get a nice tax deduction from making a deposit of your tapes of your interviews and the transcripts of them? I do not know whether this has occurred to you or if it did if you have any plans or if in thinking about it you have any preferences, but if you do not come to a different preference I can ask Hood. I think they'd very much like to have them in the archive of my material, where Meagher's already is. Only they cannot give you an estimate of their value, by law. If you want any suggestions on this I think I can get two accredited academics (not McKnight, who is at Hood) to give you the estimates required for the tax benefit. Our accountant can best tell you whether that is to your advantage this year with the income from the book.

Thanks and good luck!

Harold