

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD 21702

24 April 1998

Dear Harold:

I just got your 4/20/98 letter which was postmarked 21 April 1998, this evening. The mail is very strange lately. Having just finished the edits on the *Hersh-it* manuscript, I will be printing it out in the morning. To answer your 4/17 note first, yes, I do my typing at night, generally after 9:00 p.m. which could account for many of my mistakes in typing. While I generally do a spell-check on the document before printing it out, I didn't do it the last time I had the manuscript. In doing tonight's work I made note of the following areas which you might re-examine in the manuscript:

- ✓ 1. On page 32, you have the direction yo delete the y on remarkably. It made no sense until I made into "remarkable." OK?
2. On page 49, you have (*correct*) after Attwood, do you want to keep it?
3. On page 72, you do the same thing after Halpern.
4. On page 76, about 3.75" down I had *Hirsch* which I changed to *Hersh*. OK?
5. On page 105, the words *after after* was replaced with a single *after*, OK?
6. On page 155, rapprochement is this word's proper spelling. I have made the correction unilaterally.
7. On page 206, the first line of the first double spaced paragraph the words *not his* was added. Should a period have been added after *his*?
8. On page 256, you have *assistance*\$. Is that what you intended?
9. On page 297, I interpreted that you wanted a period at the end of the line (already there) and that the next line below be moved up to join it. Yes?
10. On page 339, about 8" down, did you want "Gimme a break" italicized?
11. On page 366, the top line had "getting and rid." You requested I add another "getting" after "and" I suggest dropping the "and getting" to make it read: "...of all reporters to get rid of Angleton..." I have left this edited as you requested.
12. Regarding page numbers of the bibliography, I have deleted the "p."s. I hope to find the missing "p."s at some point in the future and be able to post them to you. For me "the hunt" is more fun than the capture. Talley ho!
13. With regard to the McKnight note: I sent him an Internet note of a few lines with an attached WordPerfect file to test his Internet access. I have not received an acknowledgment that he received it via his Internet provider. I have also enclosed the Internet note to the publishing agent that I made reference to earlier. (I recall you now have a prospective agent so this is merely enclosed for your records.
14. You will note that I have interlaced your edit pages with the retyped

yes
jumbo
Hirsch
Hersh
yes
yes
yes
OK

manuscript pages and have paper clipped each "edit" page to its matching retyped page. This should help you in your review of the manuscript's review and keep you from losing pages on the floor.

15. When you are finished with the manuscript, would you like the manuscript printed two-sided and "bound" along with your diskette copies?

Back to your 4/20/98 letter. Please don't worry about overloading me since there is quite a bit of down time between your manuscripts, I have taken to passing the time by retyping your first book *Whitewash* since the copy I bought from you was of such poor photocopy quality. My thought was to return a clean typed copy to you for your distribution to those who wished a copy that was more legible. Let me know and I'll send it.

Regarding Twyman, I pulled a few pages off Twyman's publisher's home page (enclosed). I would like to post your comments on the Internet back to the publisher if you have any interest in doing so. That is if it doesn't impact your current works in progress.

Is Professor Wrone still writing on the JFK assassination? Can his readers expect a supplement to his bibliographic work on the JFK assassination or anything else?

You have mentioned the utility of an outline twice or more in your recent letters. My mention of an outline was not to inflict the exercise of an outline upon you but merely a suggestion to consider. Please don't take my suggestions for more than any free advice is worth (not much). My notes to you, as you might have noticed, tend to be written in a "stream of a conscious of consciousness" mode. I generally have a general inclination is to "brainstorm" ideas, to challenge ideas and events to see how "stable" they are, and to generally question authority. Please don't take it personal since it is not directed toward you. I have learned that much of what I read tends to be subject to "spin" so I am constantly looking for the "truth" which preceded its angular momentum.


This past week and next week, I have had an auditing team inspecting of the Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office's emergency management program for which I am responsible since last November. So far they have only found nits and gnats which has made me feel pretty good. I am courting them as allies rather than adversaries because I can use their report to help me make my emergency management program a stronger, more efficient and cost effective program. It is what my customers (the workers and the taxpayers) deserve and expect. Perceptions of emergency management by my managers is that because they are equipped with a fair command of the English language they have the necessary background to administer the emergency management program and operations during an emergency. Experience has born out that ego and the English language are far from the only requisites needed to manage an emergency. The two valued attributes of a successful emergency manager are more paradoxical: the ability to act with insufficient knowledge and the ability to not act when you have sufficient knowledge. These two attributes have saved more lives than logic might infer. Some people under go paralysis by analysis in some situations while others go John Wayne transformation and kill more responders attempting to mount a rescue than were people at risk.

The perception of emergency management by my managers parallels how I believe many readers and writers of JFK assassination books, like Twyman, perceive the assassination. They tend to focus on a single logic stream and assume that the logic stream is a simple system. However, as I have come to believe, both emergency operations and the Kennedy assassination and its investigations are a complex web of logic systems operating separately and interactively.

There is no single grand unifying theory that will permit a single logic stream to characterize all the actions of the participants of the scenario.

I'll close here to get some sleep. I expect you will receive this by next Friday, 31 April 1998, if you're lucky.

Clay



P.S. I noted you deleted the Fact v Fiction in the Table of Contents, do you have your notes readily available as to permit the construction of such a table? If they are easy to get your hands on them I can construct the table for you. If not, just let me know.

P.P.S. Enclosed are some mailing labels for your convenience. Some are misaligned, so used the ones you I removed them.

5/4/68

Dear Clay,

This is merely to say thanks for the thoughtfulness of your 4/24, with the package mailed 4/25, which didnot get here until 5/2. I'll mail this so you'll know it came and is appreciated when I'm having the regular blood tests this a.m. and I'll write further in a couple of days when one and I hope two intoferences with longer response are past.

Many thanks,

McCord

That explains why Little, Brown refused to consider publishing the first book on the assassination of President Kennedy, my *Whitewash*. It refused even to read it when I offered the manuscript to it in early 1965.

Little, Brown then was merely meeting its "obligation" not to "repress" information.

And, I repeat, in the more than thirty years since that book appeared, of all the many of whom it is so critical, not one has phoned or written to complain that in it I referred to him unfairly or inaccurately.

Not the record of this *Faking Kennedy* with this *Hersh-it "journalism."*

Hersh-it journalism leads people to believe what is not said but strongly implied — and is not truthful even as presented. This is illustrated in the letter to the weekly *Parade* by one of its readers, answered in the January 18, 1998 issue:

- Q. In his controversial new book, *The Dark Side of Camelot*, Seymour Hersh charges that Joseph Kennedy got his son elected President in 1960 by conspiring with mobsters to buy the Illinois vote. What's your view of Hersh's version of history? — Elizabeth F., Bronxville, N.Y.
- A. Pure poppycock. It's true John F. Kennedy managed to win the 1960 election by a razor-thin margin 118,550 popular votes, but he trounced Richard Nixon where it counted — in the Electoral College, 303 to 219 votes. So, even without Illinois' 27 electoral votes, JFK still would have won. The story that Joe Kennedy bought his son the White House is an example of sloppy research and analysis by the ambitious Hersh, who is 60 and once won a Pulitzer Prize.

It is a kindness on *Parade's* part to refer to Hersh's deliberate dishonesty as no more than "sloppy."

Sometime just before the inauguration, Exner, told me, Kennedy asked her "to take some information to Sam. We had a conversation much like the conversation regarding the money. He explained to me what it was about and he wanted me to be able to say no if I wasn't comfortable doing it." What the documents in the envelope were about, she told me, was getting rid of Castro. "I knew what they [the documents] dealt with. I knew they dealt with the 'elimination' of Castro and that Sam and Johnny [Rosselli] had been hired by the CIA. That's what Jack explained to me in the very beginning.

"I have to emphasize," Exner told me, "That he didn't say anything about assassination. I use that word now because I know more about it now than I did then. I was aware of 'elimination' which in my mind just meant removing him from office. Had I realized it was assassination, I'd have been much more frightened."

Over the next year, as the Kennedy brothers settled in at the White House, Exner made ten or more trips to Sam Giancana and Johnny Rosselli with envelopes from Jack Kennedy. "I wasn't thinking it's high level government activity," Exner said. "I was doing something for someone I loved dearly. It was as if my husband had asked me to do something for him, to carry some papers — if I had a lawyer for a husband and he wanted me to take some papers to a client, I never had the sense of just how serious all of it was, I was far too wrapped up in the fact that he trusted me. It just didn't register (page 307)

(All those alleged "envelopes" and "trips made over the next year" when that CIA/Mafia plot was not his Kennedy had been President for only three months before that plot was exposed by Balletti's arrest!)

Exner explains, if that is an appropriate word, that she knew the documents she says Kennedy sent to Giancana through her had to do with getting rid of Castro but that she did not know then that they dealt with assassinating him. However, it seems to be a reasonably safe assumption that if the President were dealing with Giancana to get Castro assassinated, *he* knew what was in those documents Exner says he sent to Giancana by her, a claim that Hersh credits, without any question. Hersh also, if there was a scintilla of truth in this, knew that the President knew those documents related to the assassination of Castro, which means the assassination of a

at about six o'clock on the morning of the coup he was asked by General Minh to procure an aircraft to evacuate Diem. He checked with the CIA station in Saigon, Conein said, and was told that it would be impossible to get a plane to Saigon within twenty-four hours. The aircraft had to be capable of flying Diem to a suitable neutral country without being forced to land for refueling — no one in the Kennedy administration wanted Diem to hold a plane side news conference. The only plane available, Conein said he was told, would have to be flown from Guam. By eight o'clock that morning, as Conein surely knew Diem was in the hands of the military men who would murder him. In any case, a suitable aircraft could easily have been provided in advance but was not. Jack Kennedy had written off Diem, and everyone in Saigon knew it (page 429).

(Minh is Duong Van Minh, a successor tyrant and murder as head of the South Vietnamese state.)

J / All plans to save Diem required an airplane. As we saw earlier, the colonel who then had that responsibility on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the man who provided all its secret airplane assistances to the CIA, Fletch Prouty, told me years before Hersh visualized this private mint of his that they had a suitable plane at Saigon and Diem refused to take it, even to go to the airport.

But if none of this was true, with the airplanes on the aircraft carriers we had in the area it would not have been any problem at all to save Diem if he had not rejected every effort, as in his left-handed way Hersh does let the reader who pays close attention pick up.

Hersh then makes passing reference to what he says was a Kennedy effort to "separate Nhu from Diem" (page 429). That is mentioned here, distorted here, and then gets a special Hershian twist several pages later.

Congressman Torbert Macdonald was a close and trusted friend of Kennedy's going back to their youth. His mistress, Eleanore Carney, is quoted as having told New York University Professor Herbert Parmet, in a taped interview in which she quotes Macdonald, as repeating what,