

not file

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

Mr. Weisberg:

March 6, 1992

I will write at least this one more time; you needn't respond for any good reason that you may have that is rational. If these letters to you are so foolish, you have no need or desire to file them.

What I read, that is exactly what Jones wrote, is not that you acted on behalf of the interests of the CIA (as you have related the matter in your letter of 21/81/92)

Even if Dean had a talent for (in your estimation) "fibbing", what he said represented an explanation that was circulating elsewhere; while it is conceivably a reasonable perception of a believable answer (and he may have believed it), it is, nevertheless, logically a false explanation (based upon unthorough consideration). In any event, the false perception or fibbing, whichever, has great easy utility in explaining things away to a guillable public, that is not as subject literate as you and others.

Boxley, himself, wrote a public explanation of his Army background and CIA background that is consistent with what Garrison himself wrote and explained; so when you write and say that Boxley's being CIA was a Garrison "invention" (and a hoax), you misrepresent things. In any event, unless Salandria is also nuts, he should be able to (not that it is worth the effort, just to try to understand what's really in your mind) substantiate the reasonableness and veracity or contrariwise of what Garrison represents about Wood in Trail. Too, apparently Wood wasn't fired (unless that is a Garrison/Salandria hoax); he just didn't show up subsequent and consequent to a phone call from the boss, with Salandria present. And, he engaged in minchievious behavior, subsequently. Your defense of Wood mystifies me (and I think that it would equally well puzzle others).

(You know, another fine subject for somebody's book would be other people's tall tales and errors and omissions...and explanations of what makes them so.)

Regarding Holt, there is compass value in knowing and analyzing deceitful or black information--so long as it is detectable as such. There must be a rational basis for regarding or disregarding a matter, not just capricious willfulness. What CH says, regarding "his own" hypothesis as to why he and others were there, is not only fascinating, it is exceptionally realistic. It would explain Milteer's presence (although he wasn't as in the dark as CH and probably did not receive an order to be present). Milteer fits into the CH explanation just as Braden does; the confusion and conflict alone fits into a clandestine agency activity subterfuge.