

George Lardner, Newsroom
Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20071

6/6/91

Dear George,

Important as it is to my health I cut my morning walking in half to be able to write in time to make the mail pickup without having to drive into town to mail it. There are several reasons for my writing rather than phoning, like having what I'll say in front of you so you can think about it, not interrupting you if you are busy on a story, and perhaps because you may want to discuss this with or show it to Ben.

When you phoned last night I was quite pleased at the reception of my letter to Ben. Then I got excited. I digress for a moment about this. Years ago when I got excited I could handle it and still function well. Now it lingers and I can't handle it well. So, unless it is necessary, please try to avoid phoning me with anything that can excite me after 8-8:30 because I can't help getting up early, even with medication to deter it, and I'm now so weak I do require an amount of sleep I never got for so many years-decades. I was not able to fall asleep last night until about 11, and when you phoned at about 9 I was about to go to sleep.

Last night I began for the first time to give you a glimpse of the potential of the book, its political, historical and journalistic importance. I want not to further that, sort of like I've been showing you how beautiful the trees are and now the forest.

As I told you, if my purpose had been to wreck Stone's obscenity, that could have been done by a major magazine article. It did not require a book. For a book to be justified it must be more than a magazine article. Without what I began to introduce you to last night the Garrison/Stone book was important enough and will hold more than enough to make this clear to any interested publisher.

The formula I suggested and you picked up immediately and started asking me questions about for the book enables making it a much more important book and with greater value in every sense, including what it should yield. I think you do not begin to understand this and I am certain that Bradlee has no inkling of it. In a sense it involves what for some years I have thought of and in the FOIA litigation practised with some success, what I think of as intellectual judo. I intend this in more than one sense. One, however, involves using Stone's strength against him, Garrison's, too.

If I had wanted to do something about Garrison and his wretched book, you have been able to see from the notes I made on it for Dave Wrono that was easily possible. That did not interest me. Years ago I learned that doing something merely to do harm, be negative, too often is not constructive and I don't want to live or work that way. Thus I have been silent about a number of bad books none of which had the potential in disinformation

and other evils of Stone's project. They also did not hold the probability of being the means of applying this intellectual judo, of achieving what means much to me. If I do not forget I'll go into some of this.

Among the other things I have learned, believe and practise is that some of the things we all learned as children sometimes are valid. Like the casting of bread, like what I've mentioned in a different context ~~to me~~, Polonius' advice.

I also learned not to be able to hate. I think I can date that to my guarding of Nazi and Italian prisoners in World War II, despite my hatred of the Nazi and Fascist systems. I was well aware of what Hitler was doing. I had contacts with the anti-Nazi underground and I did a definitive series of exposes of Nazi cartels. I also was an "unregistered agent" for British intelligence, suggested to me by the DJ anti-trust people. I fraternized openly with the prisoners I guarded, catching hell for it and nonetheless continuing to do it. My CO once took a fit when he saw me walking back with a work detail of Italian prisoners with them around me singing their heads off. So, for all the evil he has done I do not and cannot hate Garrison and for what he is doing I do not hate Stone and what my larger objective is does not include indulging any hatred or any feeling of vengeance.

I have also learned that ^{what} ~~was~~ might be called intelligent^t unselfishness can be quite rewarding and yield more benefits, in the broad sense, than being what is ordinarily thought of as seeking selfish ends.

Thus, for example I have given you all I have given you without a word on paper. I continue to have no concern at all about that.

Thus also, without asking anything of you, I have given you full control over the content of the book.

And to help make it possible as rapidly as possible, believing that the advance rights can be of considerable value, I have given my share to the Post if it wants ^{it} them to facilitate your getting the time you need. If he is as wise as I think he is and the excellent editor ^{he} without question is, he will do more than give you the time. He will find ways of helping you, as he began to do by urging one agent in particular on you. I have such faith in his judgement on this that if the one you have been dealing with does not get an immediate reaction for you you consider speaking to her and doing that by adding to what you have prepared as a summary/outline some of what I'll be going into of which ⁺ gave you only a glimmer last night.

I think it is possible that before this is over ^{Ben} will come to see that as he nears the end of his career he can have an accomplishment comparable with his great one of Watergate - and this is not what he'll get from a Stone/ Garrison exposé.

I also remind you that I have taken all the time I've taken at the cost of taking that time from the ^{King} book that means much to me and I believe will have its own

historical, political and journalistic importances when my energy grows less and my time shorter.. This I am convinced is an exceptionally valuable and important property whether or not I am able to complete it and if you think he could have any interest in that I'll be glad to cue him in. There is the possibility I may not be able to complete it and there is the certainty that if I am able to I ought not expect to be able to do it as well as I did my earlier books. I remind you and if you discuss this with him that despite the close scrutiny all were given by those who do not like me and by those in government who wanted so much to fault it they've not been able to and that there are no significant errors in them and remarkable few that ^{are} insignificant. It is not to jeopardize this that I have not written the King book by writing one off the top of the head and that I have not written other books I regard as having some of the same importance and values part of which I'll be giving you for the what Garrison and Stone would have been able to do ~~part~~, limited to what as I said last night, Garrison could have done if he had been responsible and what I have learned he cannot be, a real investigator.

This reminds me of your proof copy of Mangold's book. Would you please not send me the bound proofs you have and instead send me an unbound, unstapled xerox. Remember, I have to keep my legs up, can't sit as others do at a desk. When I read and correct I have to use a clipboard I hold in one hand and write with the other. Individual pages will be much easier for me to handle and highlight and/or annotate. I'll give that to you, perhaps making copies also of the pages I believe important, and you can then return it to me when you have no need of it so I can include it in the archive I leave.

I have been saying all along and you now also say that there is the significant difference lost on all conspiracy theories, specifically for us Garrison and Stone, between whether or not there was a conspiracy and who conspired. Whether or not there was a conspiracy, as the government says there wasn't, is a question of fact that just cannot be questioned. I went into this in its simplest form last night, that official records I have leave it without question that the crime was beyond the capability of any one man. (Of the top of the head, I urge not saying that this same evidence exculpates Oswald. This is some of what I had in mind in urging earlier that the focus be as limited as possible.) As I told you last night the FBI and Secret Service account for all three shots they admit were fired while insisting that no more were fired without admitting that there was what both knew there was, the missed shot. I have documents on this and pictures. Garrison/Stone could have had this and didn't. Didn't have the interest./

Saying this reminded me of the case he filed IN DC Superior Court, before Judge Halleck. I've checked my fourfive inches of Garrison files in my office and have no separate file on it. I suggest you get what your morgue should hold on this. It may be enough. It was the week before Garrison started influencing the jury, that Friday. Checking Post Mortem (133ff) jury selection was 1/21/69. Garrison had a subpoena for the
✓ nobody has been able to duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald

pictures and X-rays. It was 1/17/69. Without taking time to read it I see that I did go into Garrison's withdrawal at the moment of his success. Your morgue may hold more. But ^{this} opens up Garrison/Stone for what the government ^{the autopsy} tried to withhold until delivering it in Hallaag's courtroom, the official reading of ^{the} film that it is an undestatement to say meant the end of the Warren Report had it gotten any real attention. (I started writing that part of Post Mortem 1/19/69 after telling Oser and the other assistant DA off that afternoon and early evening, in Oser's home.) In and of itself, and it is not by itself, this official interpretation of the film by the most qualified of experts, makes at the least a strong case for there to have been a conspiracy because, again at the least, the most conservative interpretation of it, it destroys the single-bullet theory that is the basis of the official mythology. And Garrison not only had it - he forced its production after about a year of its suppression! And then proceeded to ignore it even when it is his copy that I marked up working on it until about 3 a.m. for the use of his expert witness, the eminent and well-qualified pathologist, Dr. Cyril Wecht. Wecht did not have time to read and digest it the next morning before court. He had to proceed blindly on what I'd underscored and annotated for him and his testimony was untouched on cross-examination by those who were thoroughly familiar with that expert official report on the autopsy film. I hope that in my haste this does not require more explanation. I have a chapter on it in Post Mortem that, as you know, was almost entirely ignored.

Now here is Garrison, spending days ⁱⁿ end going over the 26 volumes looking for conspiracies in postal box numbers while ignoring the proofs of the conspiracy he was charging in court and to establish which he had that subpoena and that trial only to abandon his efforts at the very moment of his success. (This is what it is important to get from your morgue, his copying out so irrationally at that moment of all moments!)

If he had spent that time in going over the testimony as I did he'd have seen the further destruction of this single-bullet theory and the entire official "solution" in the testimony of the only doctor who saw JFK before his clothing was touched or treatment begun. Dr. Charles ^{twice} Garrico was asked a question ^{by} Dylles that Specter, creator of the single bullet, was sharp enough to avoid asking, the location of the wound in the front of JFK's neck. It was above the shirt collar. The official solution requires that it have been caused by an exiting bullet, ^{that struck the tie and shirt collar} Garrico went farthur with me (all in Post Nortem and since then entirely unquestioned) and explained to me how under his supervision two nurses cut the tie off and in doing this made the two slits in the shirt collar that the mythology ^a says were made by the exiting bullet that became what we all called "the magic bullet."

Were this not enough, do I have pictures? Including one faked by the FBI! ^{To show his tie.}

You did not cover my suit for the evidence used to get Ray extradicted. Paul Valentine did. But I got what at least then was rare, a summary judgement ^{against} DJ. While Klein-dienst was reeling from this he got my FOIA request for the FBI's pictures of JFK's clothing. He asked the FBI to give them to him, he looked at them and actually sent me

FBI originals. They included a closeup of the shirt collar. The damage is not holes but slits and the two sides of the buttoned shirt have slits that do not coincide. One is relatively much longer than the other, one is not even in the neckband and the other goes up into it.

I filed a pro se suit for pictures to be taken for me. I lost on getting copies but won on them to be taken. The Archives whose photographer told me that the FBI pictures were remarkable for their lack of clarity, those it gave the Commission, took very clear pictures for me. They can be examined, of course, and I think that a request of the JFK estate may now yield a copy of just the tie. There is no hole in it! You can't make out even the pattern in the FBI's pictures, true also of the shirt, where three parallel stripes appear as one, but the pictures taken for me are excellent. The only damage to the tie was by the scalpel wielded by the nurses, Bowron and Stenohcliffe, exactly as Carrico told me.

This is part of what Garrison rejected at his moment of triumph and it is proof so very positive of the knowing contrivance of a false "solution" to "the crime of the century" where there was no innocence.

There is much more on this that I do not take time for now, unused, what the supporters and defenders of the official mythology clamored for, "new" evidence, their way of avoiding the "old" evidence the Commission had and it and the FBI misrepresented.

Understand, I'm talking about existing and unknown documents, well some are known & slightly but were ignored, that Garrison/Stone could have had and didn't even want, not just my opinion and interpretation.

I won't now take time for what I told you about Nosenko that the House assassins did not have and Hart did not volunteer for the CIA to ^{HSCA} it other than to assure you that I have copies of the records that reflect the immediate CIA effort to discredit him by a series of the most transparently fraudulent reasons the moment he walked into its office in Switzerland. Unusaged, unknown. I add that what Hart also did not testify to and HSCA did not ask about, the immediate change in Nosenko's treatment from princely to so very inhuman coincided with the CIA's receipt of the FBI's reports I have and refer to at the end of Post Mortem, using four pages that would otherwise have been blank to get that on the record. Nosenko stated that the KGB suspected Oswald was a sleeper agent and did not trust him, ordered him deported at the expiration of his visa, and had him under surveillance. He was openly anti-Soviet in the USSR as he was in his writings. As Dulles said at an executive session, he would have been CIA and wasn't. My paraphrase.

What Garrison and all the other nuts could have gotten once my Oswald in New Orleans appeared, #11/67, is more on Oswald's career. He did as a Marine have Top Secret and Crypto clearances and his favorite book was Orwell's "Animal Farm." He had no active-duty assignment that was not connected with the CIA. None of this is on his personnel records, which the Commission published. I put much of this on paper when Jean Davison's silly

See note on next page

book appeared. When he defected, so-called, the Navy immediately cable^d the Moscow embassy. I have that cable. It says that Oswald's records show no security clearance by "confidential" was possible. When Oswald was the accused assassin, the FBI immediately went over those personnel records and reported no security clearance and said it^s reported all that was of any significance in them. The Marines and the Commission finally acknowledged he had confidential clearance, automatic on his completing his basic radar training at Jacksonville. But from there he was sent to Biloxi for advanced training. No records of that allegedly exist other than that he did well there.

How I got the proof of his Crypto clearance, which required Top Secret, is an interesting story I won't now take time for. Briefly, it is in the court-martial in-quest into the death of PFC Martin Schrand. Two of the nutty "Marines the Commission took testimony from, of whom I remember Nelson Delgado was one, got the Commission interested in their belief that Oswald had killed Schrand. The Commission dropped it quickly when I presume it learned the truth. Garrison's close and endless examination of this published Commission testimony did not include any interest in the Schrand inquest. I have it.

The FBI was aware of the possible significance of this 11/63. I have its cable ordering an investigation.

Here you have Garrison/Stone alleging it was a CIA job while ignoring the actual and existing evidence of a possible Oswald/CIA connection.

The student who'll make the searches you asked for should be here in a few minutes so I'll have to suspend and later drive into town with this after I read and correct it.

I add one element to the foregoing, what I mentioned last night, that Lonnie Hudkins got the report that Oswald had had some kind of FBI connection and fearing FBI surveillance arranged to mislead it by phone, expecting it to be tapped. He made up the phony S379 as I recall, which is not a number the FBI uses for informers. The Commission had and I have the six-digit number, consistent with CIA numbering. Garrison had a man at the Archives and he could have gotten it had he been looking for proof or what suggests proof of what he was faking up and Stone admits using. There came a time when this was topical and I used a Post reporter whose name I now do not recall but may have a record of. I got him to phone Lonnie, who later became a friend, when he was on the Hearst Baltimore papers. Lonnie started repeating this identical number to him when he did not finish it. Not proof but provocative, especially when considered in the light of what Nosanko said and what then happened to him.

I've rambled but I've tried to give you a notion of what Garrison/Stone make relevant and how exiting and important it can be. Factual and in official records I have. I do want to add that I have redundant proof Garrison could have had that there was never a real official investigation and none was ever intended. You know of the Katzenbach memo and published it. I believe it is forgotten. I now have even K's holograph, a DJ and FBI

file copy and even FBI records that may interest Ben but I do not recommend for the book on how and how extraordinarily fast the FBI started imposing on the Post's trust. Ben was not involved. Al Friendly was. The FBI went ape over K's recommendation that a Presidential Commission be formed. It wanted to retain control and feared losing it. Instead it controlled the Commission. On that I'm really loaded, including the Commission's confession of it and its fear of the FBI. Before it was over K was opposing his own idea and as he was preparing to appoint the Commission LBJ was assuring the FBI he would not or did not want one.

I also have records Garrison could have had for his book leaving it without question that from the first moment, before there was the likelihood of any orders from FBIHQ, ~~that leave without question~~ its determination not to investigate the crime itself.

The student is here, I've gotten her started on the Russo transcript search, so I'll stop here assuring you there is much more and that in addition to innumerable documents some of which may be desired for an appendix I have some photographs, some excellent, even of the visible impact of the "missed" shot on the carbstone, another showing that despite its visibly being patched-when Oswald was confined or dead, the FBI dug it up and went through the charade of scientific testing-which actually proved ~~it~~ that the patch it knowingly tested ^{could not have been} ^{caused by} a bullet.

I hope that in dashing this off I have made it clear that what the book can do, in the Garrison/Stone formula, is of considerable historical and other importances, including journalistic. I think it will be exciting.

Stone, basing his movie on allegations that there had been a conspiracy in turn based on Garrison's allegation of it, has gibberish and nonsense only.

But he could have had a significantly important movie if he had had serious intentions, as Garrison ^{could} have had a significantly important book if ^{he} had had intended that. And this is part of what they could have had.

I may be repeating myself but I don't want to forget. If the agent you've spoken to does not get a fast deal for you, and I mean real fast, I not only respect Ben's judgement but ^{as you can see from what I've said, a person with her background may well have the best} ^{background} and added interest in the book.

* As I read and correct, on 5-6, the name Davison: The Moscow embassy doctor ^{alexis Davison,} who gave Oswald the address of his mother, as violently anti-USSR as can be imagined, a White Russian refugee who met and married his father when he was in the US army of occupation after World War I, was involved in and expelled over the Penkovsky case.

Please ask Ben for the time and get started! Best,

Harold