

52, GRS, MF, SM, PH, JNS, EW, JP, HR, JW

Memo for Ed on Salandria's Revised Assassination Revisionism 12/22/71 H Weisberg

Yours was not the only respectable judgement of Salandria's Boston speech I had heard or read before getting the copy you sent me. Last night, when I went to bed, I took it with me. I have to leave early this a.m., so while I'd like to do a longer analysis, complete with citations, first of all I don't think the crap is worth it and second I don't have that time.

It is a skillful dishonesty, less heavy-handed than most of his ravings. By the time you finish with this you may think it is my purpose to establish that he is some kind of agent (which he still says of me). This is not true. I neither suggest it nor believe it, if I could make out a helluva case, and you know in advance that the worst I have said of him is that he is paranoiac. I here make no change.

The error permeates, from overall concept to details to citations to the sad and sick device of proclaiming his own guilt. Let me begin with that. What is this work of which he says he also is guilty? The last significant thing I know that he had to do with the assassination, aside from an evil influence on Garrison, was to deny WHITTEWASH attention in several small magazines where he had influence. Other than that, he "helped" Tink (who could and would have been wrong enough without it) and "proved" that Connally was not hit until Frame 297 of the Z. film (which he also misrepresents in his speech). Before that, his last serious writing was dedicated to Frazier and the FBI, and it is not, even for early 1865, good writing or good research. So the proclamation of his own guilt is no more than a rhetorical device and can be called a dishonest trick to claim for himself credit not his due.

He used lots of words. I read them once, six hours ago, and all I've done besides sleep in between is shave and make a pot of coffee. When there is such haste, you should understand that I may be less than fully faithful to his representation. However, I do not think I will represent any of it seriously. The work is bad enough so that can't really happen anyway. Example. McGeorge Bundy just stayed in that (his) situation room. The only authority for having there for even a second is no authority on anything but unconscionable error, Jim Bishop. From this he weaves his own conspiratorial fabric. Based on what? What he had to omit, his own efforts to do something with a quote from Salinger, which is fascinating in its potential but dubious in its accuracy. And what does he cite as proof? Henry Wade-misinterpreted. The last word of that early quote, dominated as it was by problems I have only recently come to understand and intense emotion, as should be obvious, is exactly opposite what Vince says it says. It is "killers", in the plural - hardly a basis for a lone-assassin attribution.

In alleged fact of the assassination he hasn't progressed from the understanding that had him rave about the great work of the FBI men, of all things, The Minority of One. He says that Humes said he burned his notes of the autopsy. Humes did not say this. His citation is not to the testimony but to the first page of the Specter appendix use of certain of the autopsy papers. This is research? The N.O. testimony was, initially, that an Army general did dictate, but Finck corrected that, so Vince uses the uncorrected and wrong-testimony because his own limited understanding makes that more significant. When you read FW you'll find that Vince would have had a much better case if he'd stuck to the truth.

His opening, that there has been no such thinking, is to his knowledge false, for he refused to help when it was possible for him to help with exactly this. Matt Herron suggested that I ask Vince for this help and I did. Vince refused it. You know about TIGER. That research was almost entirely completed before WHITTEWASH appeared. So, Vince knows his basic tenet is false. He knows and knew about this book and the completed research, and it was very early.

I suspect that Tom Katen, who can't really be a "Professor", did most of this research. Some is typically Vince, like the misuse of Isaac Don Levine and the heavy use of something I've seen Vince misuse before, when it served a good purpose, his kind of an Assassin. But the quotes are misused and exaggerated. The selection used on Levine is

quoted accurately, ~~xxx~~ but there fidelity ends. There is no reason to believe that Dulles ever spoke to him, and there certainly is no basis for the rest of what Vince has woven out of this. It is true that the transcript says LIFE had him with Marina, but even that doesn't mean it was LIFE. As for Levine's writing, that ended with his book, which was ended when David McKay gave him the ms. of WHITEWASH to read in early 1965. If he killed that possibility of the appearance of WW, he also saw the end of his own work. There is nothing conspiratorial in Dulles knowing Levine, who was a first-rate intelligence source on anything redbaiting.

One of the sicker parts is that garbage about the government feeding us critics all that proof of conspiracy just to distract us. Aside from the illogic, this is false, and if he read and understood those executive sessions, he has to have known this. They make it clear the Commission had no such intention. Its plan was for a magazine-format report and nothing else. They decided that if anyone else wanted anything else, fine, let that anyone do it. They decided that if Congress wanted more, Congress could print more. It was only on the insistence of the Bureau of the Budget people, as I recall it, that they switched to the expensive format and to the publication of the "evidence". They did not print their best evidence of the kind Vince says they did, and he did remarkably little to bring it or anything like it to light.

Despite his earlier contrary pretense, he has Johnson in the role of chief conspirator, and his figure soon becomes out "rulers" as the conspirator-assassins.

Can you really believe in this combined US-Soviet intelligence operation? That is childish, if seriously intended, a political immaturity not easily explained by paranoia.

How I hate to have to defend Dulles, but Dulles did not suppress Oswald's intelligence connection, and the Commission had no such proof, and what Russell was talking about was the literary, not the factual potential, should LIFE come out and say what he anticipated. It would also have destroyed the expected credibility of the Report, that there was no conspiracy. There is no evidence of any kind, no matter how remote, that Oswald had any Soviet intelligence connection, what Vince here alleges, and all evidence is quite contrary to that.

Vince's unfulfilled ego has been eating him for years. Whether or not it accounts for his mental illness is not really material. You have to have been with him as I have been to begin to understand how sick he is. He was a major obstacle in the suit in Halleck's court, and his permeating ignorance was something to behold. He actually believed, after the panel report, that the government could hurt us and would by producing fake autopsy film. Can you conceive of the production of film not in agreement with that report, or that the film used in that report was faked to make the Warren Report wrong, which is what that panel report says? Had it not been for Vince, the Court of Appeals would have had time to act on the government's appeal from our significant victory in court before the issue became moot in the New Orleans thing.

So, what he has done is to take a few things that are correct and make a falsity of them. Elsewhere he has carried this further in a formulation that separates the CIA from the (rest of) the military and in his current formulation, described to me at some length by Garrison, who has gobbled it up, has the CIA the good guys and the military the bad.

Perhaps you can begin to understand that the kindest thing I can say is to say Vince is no more than sick. Consider the alternatives! The evil he has done in N.O. alone is, I believe, beyond the concept of most. Even when regard it, it seemed as impossible as it was unreal. He really did go off his rocker. His influence there lingers, and it can never be any more helpful than it has been.

Hurriedly, HW