

4201 Peachtree Place, Alexandria, VA 22304 Sep 11, 1991

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Harold,

I have wanted to get back to your July 17th letter for some time. Shortly after it arrived the Oliver Stone band of gypsies pulled their caravan into town, and the first morning they were ready to work, they sent a car out here for me at 5:15. That's earlier than I have gotten up for years. But, I made it and for the next two weeks we were busy while they did their filming.

The thing that interested me the most was the meticulous attention they paid to detail. When they had a man sitting at a desk, back in 1963, the calendar in his office was 1963. The visible letters on his desk were 1963 and all the rest. Their art staff is unbelievable.

As far as the filming was concerned about all they had for the Washington scene were parts that were played by Kevin Costner and Donald Sutherland. Of course they used a lot of extras.

It was an interesting experience for me. Then they blew out of town as they had come...heading for California and the task of putting all the film they had taken into some useful sequence. I guess they are going to try to get it ready for December.

Thanks for your words about David Wrono. I have corresponded with him a bit and have met him once, and hold him in high regard. I'm pleased to have his address.

Well, we both spend too much time trying to keep away from the doctors, and you have used the correct word...in the process you get "feeble". Right now I am trying to stay away from the Doctor's office all I can and gradually to regain strength and the ability to eat. I have lost forty pounds (I don't want it back) and it just makes me weak. Oh well, we both know all those stories. Actually I don't feel too bad. I just have to rest and do things slowly.

I like the way you go back to the "cui bono" factor with the JFK and related activity. About two years ago the President of Deutchesbank in Frankfort, Germany...perhaps the No. 1 banker in Europe, and one of the greatest in the world...Dr. Alfred Herrhausen was gunned down on the street as he was being driven to his office. In his briefcase, among other things, was a speech that he was to have delivered in New York City four days later at the "Arthur Burns Memorial Dinner." Herrhausen had just led his bank in the acquisition of the big Morgan Grenfell banking business in London. This was an enormous deal. He was in the leadership for the planning of the new European Community, the leadership of the Eastern bloc, and work with the dissolving USSR. Yet almost nothing appeared in the papers. He was killed. A nebulous gang of terrorists was blamed, and that was that.

I obtained an exact copy of his speech. About two weeks later the New York Times printed his "speech." It was not only edited but

it was drastically changed. Now, who wanted Herrhausen killed? Who was afraid of his speech? Who changed it? Those street "Terrorists." Of course not. Some group wanted him out of the way. Banking structure, in Europe, has changed significantly since his death. How was he killed, and by whom? Cui bono.

It is all too easy to call for a team of professionals, i.e. mechanics. They do the job anonymously. No one knows who they are and no one knows who hired them. No one dares to attempt to find out; but those who wanted him out of the way certainly benefitted, "Take that stone out of my shoe."

JFK was murdered that way. Certain of the Power Elite, as Buckminster Fuller calls them, wanted him removed. Others would not stand in the way. There is no vote. It's a simple consensus. They know how to get to the middle man. He knows how to get to the agent of the mechanics. They do the job. There is no way that any individual can be identified, and at the same time an enormous cover story is created to protect the whole thing. The people who administer the cover story are just doing their job. They didn't kill "Nobody." So it is "cui bono" without question. It is a group consensus...like Canada geese deciding to go south. A decision; but which one made it? As you say, there is not now and never will be any way to pin-point the actual murderer. Even to the point that I believe that the missed shots that hit the grass are the evidence that each person in the team of mechanics will be able to say, "My bullets went in the grass, etc." This is a major, world-wide, highly skilled profession. I have been to a "village" where they and their families live, are trained, and await calls for duty...many duties, not just assassination.

As for the chopper ride I had with Lansdale to Ft Dietrick. I do not believe it was the same one. Our failure was in a bearing and it happened at just about the time we had arrived at the D.C. Beltway end of Route 270. We set down quickly at the edge of the road. The bearing was heavily greased, and we continued. Police kept the scene clear. I recall no visitors, and we went on our way. That was more than enough for me. I do not like choppers.

You mention the Spaniard who had a machine at about the time Igor Sikorski was first flying his. De Cierva actually built an autogiro, not a helicopter. In other words it had a forward propeller, and a rotor that gave it lift above the small wing. It could take off and land in small areas; but it could not auto-rotate, take off vertically, nor land vertically. I saw the autogiro at the Chicago World's Fair, if my memory is correct. I saw Sikorski in Connecticut where he was building his machine. Whereas De Cierva's machine had no power for a vertical lift. It is interesting to have you go back that far into history to come up with that stuff. I taught "Aeronautics" at Yale, and then wrote the first book on the subject for College ROTC use by the newly established Air Force, in 1949.

What I do know about writers paid by the CIA, is that I knew many who were doing that work while I was in the business. When I meet writers later who do not seem to have the experience, and knowledge to do what they are writing...I have a pretty good idea that they have been paid by the CIA to do the best they can. This assures the CIA that they will never write anything that the agency does not approve of. I believe Beschloss fits that

category, and perhaps Mangold.

You have come up with the correct interpretation of the Bay of Pigs plan. First, it was never intended to be an "Invasion." Ike would hear nothing of that. Nixon pushed it because he believed he would be elected in Nov 60 and that he could push it. The training program became an "invasion" plan before Ike left office. Neither he nor JFK were really briefed on what would be done; but the CIA had selected the political leadership for Cuba.

They believed that if the exiles could be put on the beach, any beach, and stay there for 72 hours that an appeal to the OAS would be honored and then the OAS (Mainly USA) could go in there lawfully and back up that new government and throw Castro out. So the operational plan was drawn up by competent Marines. It called for destroying all of Castro's combat capable aircraft first, then putting the Brigade on the beach with weapons enough for 25,000 uprising Cubans (CIA's estimate). All the brigade was supposed to do was exist for 72 hours. Actually they came close; but they lost all their weapons and vehicles because Castro's aircraft were not destroyed by the B-26's from Nicaragua as a result of that ridiculous call from Bundy to Cabell. (I'll try to find that Bundy OpEd item from the NY Times for you.)

When we are close to a country, such as Iran, Libya, Jordan, Iraq, etc. we select men for training in this country. It is all kinds of training: to run an airline, to run a bank, to operate radar, to sabotage and kill. They go back and are placed in key positions in the host country and are called "CIA assets." We did this from 1949 through 1979 in Iran.

Then, when the government of one of those countrys falls by a coup d'etat this training is not wasted. The new leaders, some of whom may be these same guys, make use of all this valuable skill and training. Only now when they are used somewhere in another country, instead of being kept quiet as a "CIA" asset they are now called "Arab Terrorists"...the same guys. Of course they are good. We trained them and equipped them.

I know a guy, from Iran, we put in a key job with a Washington bank. Then he went back to Iran and they got him a big job with the World Bank. He's in a key job and has been looked upon as a Khomeni man. He was one of ours before Khomeni. We have trained tens of thousands of men this way...all over the world. Vang Pao the famous rebel leader, and drug runner from Laos is one of those. I recall Vang Pao coming into our Secretary of Defense level offices in the Pentagon in the Sixties. Now he is one of the biggest drug operators. Same guy.

In your letter, you went back to the Navy planes that were allegedly supposed to have protected the B-26's during the Bay of Pigs operation. That is CIA anti-JFK propaganda. Here's how it was supposed to work.

JFK approved the Marines' tactical plan for the invasion that began with the "Total destruction of Castro's combat-capable aircraft before the Brigade hit the beach." Because the total destruction meant that there would be no Castro combat aircraft in the air there was no need for Navy planes to protect the B-26's. The B-26's would have had no opposition.