

Dear Bruce Kurek,

12/10/93

This morning I found the letter I wrote you ^ufor days ago buried on my desk. Sorry.

I hope you will please try to understand that I can't take time to respond to letters like yours of the 6th, here today, and still, at my age and in the condition of my health, continue to write, as I have been, with ever minute I can devote to it.


I did read your letter. Some of what you write reflects a lack of familiarity with what I published in the 1960s. As others pick it up and use it as their work.

I doubt that under the privacy act the Bureau of Prisons will give you a Harrelson picture that would serve no legitimate purpose in any event, but you can ask for it under the Freedom of Information Act. Merely write to the BP and tell ^{them} that under FOIA you request it.

I do not have Madeleine Brown's book.

I did look into the Bloden story years ago. Nothing that can be determined in it.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD 21702

734 Coronet Road
Downers Grove, IL
60025

Mr Weisberg -

Dec. 6, 1992

Thank you for the brief and concise acknowledgment of my letter to you.

FOIA

However, you may think that it was a waste of time, perhaps you could give advice on the means of acquiring Bureau of Prisons or FBI photographs of any person incarcerated or arrested? In particular, I have Charles Harrelson in mind. That is, I am wondering what your friend Fensterwald was up to - in spending so much time with/on Harrelson, in re the tramps photos.

Unless he had a terrible eyesight problem, why wasn't he able to identify or disidentify Harrelson very easily and swiftly? He has the ears, the forehead, the nose, the fingers, the dark colored skin around the eyes or he doesn't.

no incidentally, do you have a copy of Madeline Brown's Texas in the Morning?

(the fact that only a foreign publication, Match, would print such a Del-tex window peep sight down the street is indicative of a manipulated and non-independent press here.

You should contact Naom Chomsky and spend some time with him; persuade him to take an interest in pursuing the assassination. Invite him over for lunch.

Richard Reeves' A Question of Character is a very fine book; however, in a years earlier magazine (travel) article he explains that in studying JFK for years he is unable to perceive a conspiracy and attributes such theories to "nuts". Thus, a fine mind run amok (seemingly) really reveals a disinformationist at work. Nobody could conceivably be either so negligent or stupid.

I just remembered what I additionally wanted to comment - in knowing the manner in which agreement was reached on going to Texas, when the consensus agreement was reached (cont'd)

(cont'd)

and by whom, and by allowing or disallowing the agreement participants as conspirators, one may logically infer the planning of the killing. That is, given that there was a conspiracy (evidenced elsewhere) do elements of conspiracy pre-existing June 3, 1963 contradict an impulsive, extemporaneous kind of ^{political} outrage in Nov '63; or did the 6/63 decision merely facilitate something planned in general and adaptable to favorable locales, already active prior to 6/63?

I have recently alleged to Privy that that copied document in Summers' Conspiracy, dated 6/20/63 with the name "Sward" on it has been short-sightedly been neglected and not accorded its full value. That is, BEYOND showing somebody "fooling around with LO's name and implicating him in something, the date, alone, is extra-significant.

It proves that virtually as of the inauguration day, without JFK's having committed an error of thought or deed, "somebody" was lining LO up for "something" (without his comprehension or authorization).

Thusly, Dalgle the assassination began consequent and subsequent to JFK's winning the election (honestly or dishonestly). Somebody didn't like his winning the election. It's not that BOP, civil rights, Viet Nam didn't add additional fuel to the fire; but they were not the origins of the conspiracy. The election was the origin. I don't think that I said this to you before; this may give you a new and valuable perspective on what you already know and realize.

You may use this, but do not attribute it.

If you are so moved, I confide the TV thing to Jim Lacey. I'd do something. (I wonder why no Afro-Uran has investigated in depth the Abraham Golden story, another in a line of coverups, and written a small book on it, assuming Golden is alive to enliven the story.)

Best wishes (and stay healthy).

Bruce Kurek

(cont'd)

(cont'd) 12/6/23
 as a "PS": I have spent reasonable time studying Earl Warren;
 beyond my conclusion that he would have made a very fine president,
 I conclude that it is inconceivable that he would have knowingly
 and consciously have participated in a conspiracy to obscure the
 truth. Very odd - despite all the controversy surrounding Earl
 Warren, finding fault on him is difficult. There is a plethora of
 books about everything else.

Bruce Kuker

(PS You're older than I am; did you vote for Henry Wallace?)

Something critical concerns the LO job at T5BD. That is, one could
 have from 6 to 11/63 to accommodate oneself to a particular
 shooting site and to practice a simulated site somewhere else.
 But, what if LO got a job somewhere else? Would the shooting
 have occurred still using T5BD? Still using LO? Using LO
 but somewhere else? Did LO get the job, and then the shooting
 site was moved accordingly; or was he moved to the planned
 shooting site?

He actually didn't begin working there until Oct 16, only about a month before.
 First indication is to ~~surmise~~ surmise that the site was chosen and
 then that he was fitted into it.

I would guess that one, in a conspiracy, strongly prefers having more
 than a mere month to plan the event. One has to see who's in
 the building at certain times, in neighboring buildings... (can't
 have a shooter surprised by somebody walking into the same room/
 space. Have to divert potential intruders...)

Shoot from where there are no other people (a rooftop).
 (See policeman in uniform, behind the fence.)

It's important to investigate who established the route of travel;
 the tentative variations. Perhaps conspirators were flexible and
 didn't require extensive site manipulation; or could have waited
 for another trip to Texas or wherever, when LO would be in
 good location. Even in another city. It's important to talk
 with sportsman shooters, even criminals. What would they think
 on the matter.

(cont'd)

No space

(4.)

(cont'd)

The Eddowes book Oswald File is valuable in this respect. Suggestion: read Contract Killers, William Hoffman and Jake Heady; Thunder's Mouth Press - to gain a feeling for how these things are planned; the details considered; the time element factor. It will be a valuable experience.

Bruce Kurek

(Either Marina and/or established written records would reveal attempted employment sites since or prior to 6/3/63.)

(One thing one could do if involved somehow with the Thurston camera, inadequate for nightseeing and common portrait work, was in a Watergate like setting, photograph the T56D. Others involved could examine the building beforehand, without attempting gaining illegal and detectable access. A building plan helps. Did anyone somehow procure a copy of the building's plan? Would the designer know? Building Dept. of Dallas? Nobody wants to walk into a strange building to do something so serious. Only a psychotic wouldn't make a plan in advance.