

4201 Peachtree Place, Alexandria, VA 22304 June 22, 1991
Tel: (703) 751-9080 FAX (703) 751-3243

Prof. David R. Wrone
Dept of History 7100
Univ Wisc-Stevens Point
Stevens Point, WI 54481-3897

Dear Dave,

I am not certain; but I can not recall whether they have ever settled the old argument that the power of coincidence is stronger than that of nuclear power. I'm inclined to vote for the former...at least this month.

I have spent the past several days at the annual convention of the Society of Historians for American Foreign Relations held this year at The George Washington University. It was well worth the time...but somewhat discouraging on one count that I'll mention later.

A day or two before I began that series of meetings...all day-long meetings...I cleared up some correspondence. I am working with Oliver Stone on his "JFK" movie. I had received a FAX from his office asking if I could "come up with names of 'experts in their fields' who have good credentials and don't follow the party line on the assassination." In my response, I included your name, even though we had not met for several years I felt certain that you continue to fit the parameters.

I have no idea whether or not they will contact you or what they may want if/when they do. What is amazing is that we have not corresponded since "Who's The Savage" days and all of a sudden something arises from two sources to bring us back together.

I have never forgotten my visit to your campus. We were having a dinner before the event, in a dining room across the road from where I was to speak. The dining room had big windows and one of the biggest blizzards I have ever witnessed was taking place right outside. The snow was flying by horizontally and I was sure the meeting would be called off.

Not in Wisconsin! We crossed the street in the gale and there was a line of buses full of townspeople and as we went into the building they were wiring up extra rooms so that the over-flow crowd could hear the speeches. That's Stevens Point. Much has taken place since those days.

I'm pleased to find that you were with Harold and sorry that I did not know you were here. He may have told you that we have been in touch with each other quite a bit recently.

I am pleased to find that more and more people are beginning to see that the JFK assassination requires a study of his times and of the pressures on him and his administration. I wrote rather extensively about this in a twenty-article series I did for a small magazine called FREEDOM in 1985-1986. I have been quite surprised to find that the series has been copied and re-copied by people everywhere and it has helped to stir up interest in this way of looking at that event.

In the course of things Oliver Stone came across that series back in 1985-1986 and it gave him the idea for his new movie. He would use the stereotyped data from the Garrison trial to bring the viewer up to date on all the lore. Then he would use my material to work up the climax. I believe it is working out fine.

I am not aware of the new Beschloss book and would not have picked it up. I do not have much regard for his "party line" approach to his work. I can't imagine him doing a good job with Kennedy at all.

I'd be pleased to discuss that work with you. This is an area I know from first hand experience. As you may recall, I was in the Office of the Secretary of Defense at the end of the Eisenhower era and was there when Kennedy and McNamara arrived. I stayed there, and with the JCS until after JFK's death. I know that period well...perhaps as well as anyone.

To open our work: I'll send you the more pertinent articles from my 20 piece work. At least they will serve to open the subject. I am at work right now in converting these 20 articles into a manuscript...now that I have them in the computer where I can get to them.

I can't imagine Beschloss doing the U-2 properly. I'd like to see what he did with that. I'll send one of my articles on that too. You may have noted that Allen Dulles in his May '60 testimony before the Fulbright Committee said that the plane was not shot down by the Soviets from its cruising altitude (any other altitude would not matter). At lower altitude they just circled it and forced it to the ground. Eisenhower's story, in his own book, of how it came down, i.e. emphasis on "not shot down" gives much more detail. In that event the agency had nothing, I'll repeat for emphasis, nothing to do with sending that plane out that day.

Just for today, as openers...among the most important JFK directives on foreign policy were his National Security Action Memo #55 and one in Oct 1963, NSAM #263. The latter was most important, and was--most likely--the reason he had to be killed. Weisberg and Livingstone have been writing me almost daily about NSAM 263 (I did much of the actual writing on that document). I have been amazed how they have all of a sudden realized that things like that are crucial to understanding that murder whereas in all their prior writing they never mentioned such things.

If I may add a suggestion? I would not so much be concerned with "the mechanism of control of the investigation" as I would be with "the method and world-wide power of the cover story that was created before JFK was killed and that persists in full strength even today." That is the real control and it gives the whole story. Newspapers and radio broadcasts gave the Oswald story, around the world, even before the police had charged him with any crime in Dallas. (Oliver Stone has recreated a newspaper I purchased in New Zealand on Nov 23, 1963--across the date-line--that was printed as an EXTRA and had the Oswald story in detail on the streets, before the police had charged LHO. It will appear in the movie.)

Delighted to hear from you. I hope you'll hear from the Stone people, and I'll send the articles by separate cover. I may have copies. If I don't I'll have them copied.

Ciao,



L. Fletcher Prouty

P.S. Noticed I said I'd say a word about the SHAFR Covention. I am absolutely fed up with the profession of Historians...I should say with all Educators, to see that they permit...even condone, such things as the "Thirty Year" rule on the release of classified information. This is ridiculous. This is worth a new battle at the bridge.

By keeping such material under control they permit every Tom, Dick and Harry who wants to write lies to do so. They permit government agencies to pay prostitute writers to write the agency line and for thirty years at least no one can prove otherwise because they sit on all data arbitrarily.

This is terrible. We had a meeting on this during the convention and I really went after them. I can see no valid reason to sit on data that is known to exist. If it "is known to exist" it is no longer secret. On the other hand, if no one asks for such data because no one knows it exists, then it may be held for a reasonable time. In such a case it is a true secret. I still know of certain covert operations we did during 1955-1964 that no one has even found out about. They are secret. I don't write about them and others do not.

The ridiculous nature of all this is that rarely is a covert operation the work of one country. People in the other country talk about it at will. They have no "Thirty Year" rule and they use their information for "blackmail" etc. Think of the tons of lies the Cubans have spread about the Bay of Pigs. I have yet to see a true story about that operation...least of all Wyden's.

This is a ridiculous situation and I wish I knew a platform big enough and important enough to get up on and to shout about it.

Of course this situation makes it easy for dishonest historians to write books at will and to louse up the brains of younger generations for at least 30 years. There is a sort of Gresham's Law in history too...the worst books appear first and the worst books set the course of history for decades.

Oh well...one man's view.