

Dear John,

12/26/91

I'm the last person to whom anyone should feel like apologizing because he was interrupted while writing a letter. Or anything else. As I'm about to demonstrate. Beginning with an apology for using this old paper to be able to use more of the few moments before supper. Much mail has accumulated and I'm deep into other things. But the conditions of my life and that I now forget so much prompts me to write not about your letter but about what I think reflects a remarkable and perceptive grasp of much and very complicated material in your oped offering to the Post. In all ways it is excellent.

I may not be able to respond to your letter for several days but when I do I read it with a highlighter and won't have either to remember or reread it. We were both too busy to go out to the mailbox until I took mail shopping. I read the mail while waiting for her.

I decided against saying anything about the Belin crap to which Ford's name was added. I am responding, in all probability entirely or almost entirely to leave a record for history. So I pick and chose.

I began to write an oped offering to the Post in response to the article on 12/24 signed by Stone. I put it this way because for the first time of which I know he reflects some knowledge of the evidence. He has faltered ignorance of it to this time. One of the few people associated with him who is not a nut, not that some of writings are not a little on the extreme/unjustified side, is Professor Peter Dale Scott. I am certain, without any proof at all, that Scott wrote the powerful and persuasive Stone oped article in the NY Times of 12/20/ I did write the Times about that, without a single mention of the one topic that permeated it, Vietnam. May sound strange but I told the Times how criticism of Stone began, enclosed copies of the letters, and said there is no mention of Viet Nam in them. I then addressed some of what is.

As with what you wrote the Post, there is a good probability that it will be read and thus, in addition to leaving a record for history, where it may be entirely lost or at some point be used, someone at a major newspaper has a chance of being correctly informed.

FYI, Belin is irrational on this subject. He has made a Judenrat of himself on it. And in addition to what you perceived, to my surprise, I interject, he was even more wrong. Halmes was not the last person to talk to him in that last session. Tom Kelley was. And I have a copy of that WU money order from WU's files. One of the managers became a fan and he had taken it for himself and he gave it to me.

It depends on how much continuous time I have after doing those things I must, like making and mailing packages so they will not accumulate and to provide the service people ought be able to expect. I'll use the odds and ends of time for odds and ends of responses.

Dear John,

12/28/91

I've enough time before a friend is due to respond to your 12/24.

First I've forgotten to ask you - if you see anything on the Oliver Stone movie other than in the Post I'd appreciate copies. No time now for explanations but I am the one who began the exposure of the fraud and travesty he commercialized and exploited and not only might the information be useful now, it will help perfect the historical record.

Including, of course, in your travels.

I've not been to the Archives in years so McMonough is unknown to me. Her behavior is not in keeping with her responsibilities, to say the least. If she does not know the truth she is on that basis alone unsuited to her job. It is well known.

That one transcript is withheld by decision of the D.C. federal court. The given reason, by the government and agreed to by the judge, is to protect Norman Redlich's privacy. I believe the real reason the government withheld it under 7(u) is to protect Gerald Ford in particular and a number of other politicians, of whom I remember Sawyer,

who was on the HSCA, for their virulent anti-Semitism at the behest of the right extreme. I have all the other ex. session transcripts as a result of that suit. this session, apparently forced by Ford in an effort to get Redlich fired.

The government's claim was spurious because it had already disclosed to me some 300 pages of the filth that Ford used to get Redlich fired. The Commission would not do it.

So, first it would do no good to file under FOIA and then what could be obtained is of little significance compared to other undisclosed records.

The records are in the suit you identify. Lesar and I have all the records in it.

Thanks for your good wishes. We both hope the coming year is better than realistic indications promise.

Sincerely,

Harold

Resumed 12/30: I've forgotten what I wrote you about Specter but nobody is more responsible than he for the tragedy of the Warren Report,

You ask about areas that have not been fully explored and additional or new investigations of them. To this I think worthwhile areas only should be considered and then where there is or may be new information available and that there seems to be some possibility of accomplishment. It is possible to spend a great amount of time and having nothing in the end.

Then there is the matter of how much time can be devoted to it and does it require any specialized knowledge. If it does, is that absolutely essential of can it still be done with common sense and research.

While in the past I've never given this much if any thought because I was already, and always, into to much and while at the moment I'm more than usually tired, I suppose from a combination of a second transitory ischemia last evening, there is what would be a rather large project that, if you do not have the technical education or training, you'd still be better equipped for than most: the FBI's scientific testing of ballistic-related evidence and so-called evidence. I think a very sensational book could emerge from this.

I say "large" because it would require, among other things, careful examination of the court record in the second of the two suits I filed for this information. Congress amended the investigatory files exemption over that suit, meaning over government corruption in it. The second such suit was the very first filed under the amended Act. Jim Lesar saw to that by being the first to file anything the morning it became effective.

There is an enormous amount that would justify ridicule, sometimes contempt, and could give light touches to a very grim subject. To simplify this, if the FBI had not been deliberately dishonest the Warren Report we have could never have been issued. I used only a few items from this in Post Mortem because the litigation was ongoing and because there was no time later to add more. It went to the printer when I was suffering the first of my venous thromboses.

We deposed Frazier, Gunningham, Gallagher and Shaneyfelt in that suit, later Kilty as I recall. If I'm not confusing the suits, we have transcripts and there was a fair amount of relevant data in what I got in other FOIA litigation. I have the Dallas and HQ Bulkies but never had a chance to go through them carefully. They total about 75,000 pages.

Jim Lesar does not have the bulkies but he does have all the court records and he might lend them to you. The bulkies are here ^{only} alone. As are copies of odds and ends of records in other files, copies under subject headings, like Shots, Other, NAA, etc.

To again simplify, without question the point of impact on the curbstone was patched when Oswald could not have done it, this is apparent to the naked eye and feel and I have an expert opinion of it. The only spectro film that cannot be located is this one. The FBI actually conjectured in court that it had been disposed of to save space!

Frazier's and Gallagher's Warren Commission testimony would have to be read, Frazier's with care and Gallagher's without laughing out loud. I have relevant scientific literature, probably in the lawsuit files, on the capabilities of the tests used.

Gallagher was the last witness deposed. In response to leading questions he testified that paraffin tests are not conclusive and thus not depended upon. They are not conclusive in incrimination only. They are on exculpation.

The dirty tricks the FBI used are incredible, as is the fact that it got away with it, in court.

If this might be of interest, including with a book as the end product, perhaps we should discuss it and tape the discussion, because I believe that there is too much for notes only and that one thing may remind me of another when it is not responsive but pops into mind.

Believe it or not the judge actually threatened Jim and me when we proved that the FBI had given him perjury, undenied perjury, one man swearing in opposition to himself on the same material point.

You might also want to read Sanford Ungar's book on the FBI, where he discusses the degree to which lab agents are trained to frustrate cross examination. Countless instances in our deposition records.

I have to knock off now. I'll read and correct this when I can resume and perhaps add more. But I do think that a worthwhile and successful book could result, with a more than adequate number of pictures and documents suitable for facsimile reproduction, which I favor when possible over quoting them.

I'll put this in the morning mail and will resume when I can.

I hope you have a good year!



Resumed 1/15/92, with all fingertips cracked and only one not too painful to use.

We have no record of any order from Africano. Suggest he check to see if any check was cashed.

12/21, you ask about coverup. I think it was more basic, to cover bureaucratic ass, particularly FBI's, for now knowing what was coming.

I think that coinciding with this, on the higher levels, particularly in agencies like the FBI, Secret Service and CIA, they knew there had been a conspiracy, knew they had no inkling about it and that they could not/would not confess this ignorance.

Then there is what Warren told staff, see Eisenberg memo in WM IV.

Whether LBJ really believed it is another question. Warren seems to have.

If LBJ said that to Russell, Russell did not tell me and what he did tell me leads me to believe that he did not.

I'm getting a transcript of the other night's Nightline ^{is} what was said, particularly by Belin and 399, interests you. It could be used as a peg on which to hang that monster in a chapter of a book, there is that much. ("The Puerto Rican")

If you decide to do a book may I suggest for thinking if not for a title a chapter title from Post Mortem- Magic, Mystery and Myth: ^{Science} ~~since~~ in the JFK Assassination Investigation.

Also that you read, for use, for questions, or for files searches, what I've published. You are free to use anything I published, including pictures.

It might be good to read the court cases, both. Second 75-0226. For it and since then I have some copies of FBI FOIA records in what I call my "subject" file.

AND HSCA's coverup and deceptions on this. They deserve real attention! On this do not forget my ^a Guinn, Vincent file, a poor-quality tape in it and a news story reporting what Lifton, who made the tape, almost ruined ^{Guinn's} his response to a question I'd planted. He could not validate the specimens he tested! On this the Prazier 226 deposition is important: he removed more metal from 399 than was needed and can't explain what happened to the rest or what it weighed. We have the current weight.

There is so much! You may want to tape what we discuss. Also, I now have a professional opinion, the curbstone was patched.

Would "The Magic Bullet" be a good title?

I'm to hear after the 12th when a New York writer is coming for perhaps a week.

Sorry about the delay. Best wishes,

Frank

5530 Eastbourne Drive
Springfield, VA 22151
21 December 1991

Mr Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr Weisberg:

Thank you for your letter of the 3rd instant. To avoid confusion, I need to tell you at the outset that this letter was written in two parts on different days with differing intents; its odd construction therefore is not a result of faulty construction or logic - at least in this instance.

I contacted the President's Box Bookshop re. Meagher's *Index* but it had been sold by the time I had inquired. I shall continue to look and may at some point accept your kind offer of reproducing your copy. However, I was able to acquire, from Greenwood Press, a copy of Guth and Wrone's book *The Assassination of John Kennedy: A Comprehensive Historical and Legal Bibliography, 1963-1979*. This should prove to be of some worth as it will save a lot of time searching card catalogues.

I've just about completed an initial and rapid reading of your books. As you can imagine I'm overwhelmed by the wealth of material contained therein. Of particular interest were your comments regarding Arlen Specter and his role in the work of the Commission. I was particularly struck as I remembered his pursuit of Anita Hill, during the recent Thomas confirmation hearings, and his suggestions that she had committed perjury.

I would be very interested in your thoughts as to areas which have not been fully explored or which you believe require further or new investigation. I have become interested in the mechanics of the *Whitewash*. The *how and why* of it are significant beyond measure. I am not certain whether I missed it or not but I am compelled to ask the question...do you believe the cover-up to have been accomplished simply to protect, after the fact, those agencies whose responsibility it was to protect the President or do you suspect that there was a more sinister motive linked to the crime itself. That is to say, do you believe that there was conscious and intentional participation *before the fact*, by individuals who were then participants *after the fact*, in the coverup? Or, did the coverup initiate or evolve *after the fact* unrelated, in a direct sense, to the murder or the murderers.

Your views would be most appreciated.

I attempted to contact you this morning (21 December) in order to provide you a copy of the inclosure. It was my immediate response, prepared on the evening of the 19th (on a flight from Europe - thank goodness for portable computers) upon reading President Ford and David Belin's *Kennedy Assassination: How About the Truth*, which appeared in the *Washington Post* on the 17th. I trust you have seen it, if not I can provide a copy. My intent is to offer the inclosure

to the *Post* as a counter-point to the Ford-Belin article. I have few illusions as to their reaction. However, since I cite you in the article I felt required to permit you to review it. Unfortunately, I am departing again on business and must dispatch the article to the *Post* prior to departure in order to not lose the initiative. Therefore, I must apologize for not getting your review in advance of my submission, but hope that you will empathize with my predicament. Obviously, your comments would be of great value.

Hoping your holidays are joyful.

Sincerely,


John

John W. Masland
Box 1131
Springfield, VA 22151
703-323-7970
144-36-3463

NOW, ABOUT THE TRUTH?

As but a simple citizen of the Republic and a less than proud owner of the *Report of The President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy* with its attendant twenty six volumes of *testimony and evidence*, it was with considerable astonishment and dismay that I read President Ford and Mr Belin's 16 December *Oped; Kennedy Assassination: How About the Truth?*

The fact that Mr. Ford and Mr. Belin are sensitive to criticism is understandable to anyone who has expended any effort in reviewing the *Report* and the accompanying morass of material offered as *testimony and evidence*. The authors should recognize that the cumulative criticism, of which they protest, is possible only because of the unresolved issues and the almost unimaginably poor performance of the Warren Commission. It is not my desire to debate President Ford and Mr. Belin on the merits, if any, of either the A&E series or Oliver Stone's film. However, there are disturbing aspects of the article which need to be addressed in order that Mr Ford's quest for truth be served.

It is important, prior to any discussion about the Warren Commission and its *Report*, to understand some simple facts. The Warren Commission was not a court of law. It did not afford any of the advantages of the American system of justice. The proceedings and production of evidence were not held to the standards of the courtroom. In fact, there is not, to the best of my knowledge, an established and verifiable chain of custody on any single piece of critical evidence directly related to the assassination. There was no verdict resultant from the adversarial passionate and/or dispassionate give and take between prosecution and defense. Of the 552 persons providing information to the Commission only 94 actually appeared before the Commission and of those, not one appeared before the entire Commission. That President Ford

was present for 70 of these individuals can be viewed as praiseworthy except when one considers that if, during a jury trial, a juror is absent from testimony there is a high likelihood of a mistrial. To some credit, the *Report* addresses this issue in its *Forward* but then does nothing to ameliorate the problem. The fact that there was no investigation, no trial, no prosecution, no defense counsel, no cross-examination, no jury, no judge, and no verdict is permitting history to serve those functions and it appears to be dealing with the Commission's work harshly.

While one would expect the authors to maintain the imaginative depiction of the assassination they helped create in 1964, I was immediately struck by a sense of desperation permeating the article. Desperation born, I suspect, of the knowledge that when subjected to history's appellate court the Warren Commission's work can only be viewed as astonishingly incompetent, if not intentionally deceptive. Since space will not permit a complete point by point challenge to the authors, I therefore selectively offer the reader the following for their consideration and to redirect the question *How About the Truth?* to President Ford and Mr Belin:

With respect to the autopsy photographs and wounds... Which photographs, which experts, and when? The authors certainly know that there is no verifiable chain of custody on either the autopsy photographs or X-rays. That there is considerable discrepancy between the records of the FBI, Secret Service, and Naval Medical Service as to the types and numbers of photographs and X-rays exposed and who had custody of what types and in what numbers is no longer a secret thanks to the independent and meticulous efforts of Harold Weisberg. The group of physicians empaneled by Attorney General Ramsey Clark in February 1968 described wounds differently in both magnitude and location than the autopsy physicians who differed amongst themselves at times. While the autopsy doctors have stated under oath that the President's body was X-rayed *in toto* the Clark panel could not find X-rays of the lower arms or legs or any corresponding photographs. The lack of photographs of the President's brain which had been destroyed by gunshot and was the fatal wound was not questioned. The authors continue the canard of describing the non-lethal wound to President Kennedy as a *neck* wound. That there was *no* rear neck wound was established by the autopsy physicians

themselves and documented by FBI agents present at the autopsy. That there was a wound in the back of which the end of the opening could be felt with the physicians finger and that no continuous path of transit was physically established, explored, or dissected for this wound was ignored. That the wound was not explored because the autopsy physicians were ordered not to explore it has been attested to under oath by Dr. Pierre Finck, one of the attending physicians at the autopsy and the only military doctor present at the autopsy with considerable pathological experience with gunshot wounds. This physical wound has been manipulated semantically by the authors and the Commission and represented as a neck wound. Why? The authors address the issue of the President's rearward head snap as a result of the fatal head wound observed in the Zapruder film at frame 313. They state *...that wound ballistic experts unequivocally testified that the movement was not caused by the impact of the bullet but...* rather by neuro-muscular reaction. The Report lists three witnesses as *wound ballistic experts* and offers their testimony in Volume V. Not one of them was questioned or commented on the President's reaction to the fatal head wound.

With respect to Jack Ruby and the Oswald murder... The authors make much ado about Postal Inspector Harry Holmes and the extension of the interrogation of Lee Harvey Oswald on 24 November 1963. The authors would have us believe that Holmes' questioning of Oswald delayed his transfer to the County Jail. One does not get that impression from Captain Fritz of the Dallas Police or Holmes' testimony. In fact, Holmes suggests that the interrogation was an *informal questioning* with questions coming from most of those present in an ad hoc fashion. President Ford and Mr Belin would have us believe that Holmes' decision to not attend church and his questions lengthened the interrogation and delayed the transfer. This, when coupled with Jack Ruby's dispatch of a money order at 11:17 a.m. they offer as proof that there was no conspiracy to kill Oswald. If they are so certain of that today why was that not offered as proof in the *Report* in 1964? That there is highly credible evidence that Ruby was present

at Parkland Hospital simultaneously with President Kennedy being treated in Trauma Room # 1 on 22 November 1963 and in the Dallas police department during police interrogations and the public press event with Oswald on the evening of 22 November 1963 are of no interest to the authors. Likewise, Ruby's associations prior to and during the period 22-24 November 1963 with Dallas police officers L.D. Miller, Blackie Harrison, and Harry Olsen have been assiduously avoided.

With respect to Ruby's polygraph evaluation... The authors suggest it *confirmed that Jack Ruby was not part of any conspiracy?* Hardly. In the first instance, a lie detector (polygraph) doesn't detect lies or the truth. In the second instance, a polygraph examination is inadmissible in a court of law which is why the Commission refused Mr. Belin's suggestions to polygraph Marina Oswald. In the third instance, the *Report*, on page 815, offers J. Edgar Hoover's assessment of the Ruby polygraph which concludes that *no significance should be placed on the polygraph examination and it should be considered nonconclusive as the charts cannot be relied upon.* How about the truth Mr. Ford?

With respect to Howard Brennan... There is nothing I, nor anyone else, can say about Howard Brennan's *vivid testimony.* President Ford suggests that he was the *single most important witness to the assassination.* I propose you take him up on this statement and go to your local library and read Mr. Brennan's testimony. It is to be found in Volume III, pages 140, 184, and 211, and Volume XI, page 206. In this instance you be the judge. You determine the value of Mr. Brennan's testimony. Should you do so, I suggest that you write to Mr. Ford and provide him your perceptions of his *single most important witness.* He is not expecting your letters.

With respect to the timing of the shots... One wonders where the authors obtained the 10 second figure; it appears nowhere in the *Report* they had a hand in crafting in 1964. The *Report*, on page 117, suggests a range from *approximately 4.8 to in excess of 7 seconds.* The Commission's and the author's problem is that no one

has established precisely how many shots were fired or how many bullets impacted on the President and Governor Connally. The five volume FBI report provided to the Commission stated that there were three shots; the first impacting on the President's back, the second wounding Governor Connally, and the third inflicting the massive head wound on the President. The FBI knew of, but ignored, the shot that missed and ricocheted causing a wound to bystander James Tague. The Commission, caught in the quandary between the number of shots and the time span of those shots decided to retain three shots but suggested changing the sequence to the first wounding both the President and the Governor, the second missing, and the third impacting the President's head. That this sequence does not correspond to the photographic evidence notwithstanding, we are left with the Commission's figure of *4.8 to in excess of 7 seconds*, but no mention of 10 seconds. The truth is that the authors choose to semantically misrepresent the photographic and corroborating eyewitness evidence to avoid dealing with the central issue of conspiracy. More than three shots or even three shots in the truncated time span define conspiracy at the mechanical level. When the tests the Commission authorized tended to undermine the theories they were offering they hid behind the mask of obfuscating semantics such as *in excess of 7 seconds*. What is the truth Mr. Ford?

That the assassination of John F. Kennedy is one of the enduring tragedies of our time and of the Republic cannot be overstated. President Kennedy's evolving views on South East Asia and our involvement there has been well documented. The legacy of his murder is that our government, by not telling you the absolute, unvarnished truth about the events in and around Dealey Plaza on that horrible day in November 1963, broke its bond with those who empowered it. The citizens of the Republic, for whom the Commission ostensibly worked, were cheated and continue to be deceived by the very government they trusted. Is it any wonder that Mr. Stone makes films or that A&E televises documentaries that differ from the *Report*? Since the truth was never revealed the fictional field is open to all, including Mr. Ford and Mr. Belin.