

Dear Sam, to whom thanks for the fine Alan Lupo/Boston Globe article, 2/25/93  
and Joe, for telling me that the Post's David Hoffman is from Wilmington,

Both underscoring what I've been telling you for a long time, Danaeli public relations and information in this country has been grossly inadequate. And with this country applying the major pressure, that is a great deficiency.

Lupo's is the first article I recall seeing saying that there is an Israeli side on even the deportation question. To which he could have added others by this country.

As I see it, now there are two other matters that should be used as much as possible by or on behalf of Israel:

The UN resolutions require what is never mentioned, peace within secure borders for Israel and this has not yet been mentioned by the other side in the negotiations and cannot be possible as long as the millions of available petrodollars are so available to those who want to wipe Israel out, the only reason there is any border of territory question today; and that Arafat did not recognize the right of the STATE of Israel to live in peace within secure borders, substituting what he would change, the people of Israel, in this remaining consistent with the unchanged PLO charter, which calls for the end of the State of Israel in grimmer terms.

I think that particularly under Bush Israel feared anything critical of the US and American Jews shared that fear and avoided doing and saying what it could have done and said. Thus the people, including the media, are underinformed and misinformed.

Joe says of Hoffman that, "I am amazed that any honest reporter could write such a biased piece article—especially a Jewish reporter." Forgetting the Times' Friedman? About whose book I wrote long ago? With Jews owning and controlling the Times? And the editorial and oped pages of the Post controlled by Jews?

It is still often as Robert Nathan wrote in a Depression-era book, "Road of Ages", some of which I still remember, that Jews are primarily something else. Bankers, union organizers, etc. The reporters are primarily reporters, and I do not mean this is the good sense, that they are honest reporters. I mean in the sense of wanting to hold their jobs and to advance — requiring management approval of their writing, at the least, not having it disapproved.

Joe also says, "You know, German Jews supported Hitler." I'm sure he did not mean all did. I exposed one who did in 1941 or maybe early 1942. A German Jewish doctor came here in 1939 and established a front/owned German medicinal operation in Bloomfield, N.J., Schering. Dr Julius Weltzien left his family in Berlin. I do not now recall that he did this voluntarily, I mean the proof of it, but that is what I learned while investigating Schering US. But wasn't his General Milch partly Jewish? And didn't the eminent and respected Morgenthau and other Jews join in influencing FDR not to permit Jews to come here and to refuse permission for the St. Louis to deposit the thousands of Jews who had escaped Hitler?

I think that Hoffman writes what he writes because that is what the Post wants and that,

Knowing it is what the Post wants, he has come to believe it, perhaps even conscienciously talked himself into believing it.

There is a danger in writing him through his parents, of embarrassing them, but if you want to give David something to think about find someone who has access to one of the news retrieval systems and get the Times and Post stories on the PLO executive council meeting in Tunis in which it refused to change its charter for US recognition, get Arafat's statement that still refused to recognize the State of Israel and its right to live in peace within secure borders, along with the Times and Post stories in the siege hell! motif, and if you want to say he is not adequately informed on the recent history, also send him the last chapter, Zio<sup>N</sup>, of Paul Johnson's "A History of the Jews." And on the chance he will not read it note for him all the Arab refusals even to discuss peace and recognition of even a minuscule State of Israel going back to the 1937 Peel Commission and his citation of an Egyptian source for saying the plight of the refugees was the Arab design because they were the artillery against Israel.

Hoffman's recent stories have been coauthored by the Post Reporter, John Goshko. He is for all practical purposes a State Department flunky in the stories he writes- and refuses to write. And he also knows what the Post wants and does not want. He covers ~~state~~ <sup>State</sup> so he covers the secretary, who was in the Middle East when those stories were written.

Tragically, as with Hitler, the major papers mostly follow the government's line.

This is so clearly apparent in the reporting and non-reporting of the JFK assassination and its so-called official investigations.

Beginning with the complete lack of any protest when the Commission operated entirely in secret when it took testimony it was to publish and especially in the uncritical acceptance and reporting of the FBI's leaks, the papers and other media were for all practical purposes, adjuncts of government. And as with Hitler, they knew what they were doing.

At the height of the Iran/Contra scandal <sup>local papers!</sup> the managing editor, who is ignorant of foreign affairs, was on a trip in an army plane, all expenses paid by taxpayers- one of more than 100 such by the Reagan administration - on a weekend <sup>in</sup> of Nicaragua. That the White House had been using these illegal junkets for years was never reported. He also had a first <sup>hand</sup> account of the US provoking a reaction at a demonstration that was misused by the Reaganites. I phoned Goshko and told him all of this and more and his response was quite simple, "So?" And he did not want a copy of the story or the pictures or the direct quotes of our Managua embassy people.

Not like Hitler's day? Only we hate to and never do think that way. As I see it, the Hoffmans and the Freedmens profit as the IGs and Krupps profited. While they do not do the killings, innocent people have died nonetheless because they did not report honestly.

Sam raises another question I address separately for my own filing.

Were the Hoffmans in Wilmington when I was?

Sam <sup>N</sup>wites, "I want your reaction to the writer of the Edgar Hoover bio who says that the mafia had so much on Hoover's homophilia that he didn't get after them (but concentrated instead on the Communists), and that he, Hoover, with the CIA, recruited Oswald and Jsrhan to bump off both Kennedys."

I regret he did not send any clippings on this, I presume from the Times if not also from local papers. But I think he refers to Anthony <sup>my</sup>Suzers' new book of which I'll not buy a copy, as I explain.

Summers is an egomaniacal exploiter of such tragedies. He regards himself as omniscient and for personal reasons as well as the subject/matter is able to get many people to help him and to work for him, for free and as employees. And American woman and her British husband, both college professors, helped him with this book, their own careers not benefitted from it if they did not suffer, and he was inconsiderate of them. He and they were here for <sup>days</sup> days that seriously interfered with my ability to do anything I wanted to do. They copied all they wanted to copy, etc. Tony was so inconsiderate and so cheap he actually had the woman transcribing tapes of his interviews with an ordinary tape recorder rather than with a readily available transcribing machine. When he would not buy one and I offered to lend Lil's, which she was not using, it was only with considerable effort that I was able to get it back. And that also took much time. He did not even think of returning it. Not even when I complained in letter after letter. It was worth much cash to him because of the time he paid for that it saved. Yet he, well off as he is, was too cheap and too inconsiderate to by one, a good one costing less than \$200.

With all my time he took, all the help I gave him, all the copies he got free, he did not even think to send me a copy of his book. Or, you can see what kind of person he is, not the kind he projects, the press describes and the media presents, Not a good person at all.

In simplification, like all those who commercialized the assassinations, he is ignorant of the established fact. It shows that Oswald ~~was~~ was not proven to be an assassin and thus probably wasn't. But for Tony's purposes, he is content to accept the official mythology, that Oswald was an assassin, and <sup>embroider</sup> ~~reborder~~ on that. There is no proof of which I know that Oswald worked for the FBI. There may have been records I did not get. But I'll be surprised if Tony got any and uses them. *proving Oswald worked for the FBI.*

Whether or not Jsrhan fired the shot that killed Bobby, and there are substantial questions about that as about his being alone separate from that, I know of no reason to believe that he worked for the FBI.

I have no knowledge of whether Hoover was gay. I know the statements Tony makes in general and in general I'd be surprised if Hoover even let himself get in any such position and then to be photographed in sex with Tolson and dressed in drag.

I am interested in anything you see on the book, please. *Or on Summers.*

Best to you all,

*Harold  
& Jls*

In reading and correcting I see I forgot to address Hoover's anti-Communism. It had nothing to do with the mafia. He ~~was~~ that way and believing that way then as safe and secure as it was later, as in the McCarthy era. It started his career for him.

If I were to conjecture why he stayed away from the mafia, he knew he'd not be able to do much so he just ignored it, pretended it did not exist. Without hurting his record. Look how many years he got away with it. As he surely expect<sup>ed</sup> to anyway.

Whether or not he was homosexual, he detested them and sought information on them from the records I've seen, meaning mostly have but not filed as homosexual records.

I think that if he had ever been as semi-publicly active sexually as Tony says ~~that~~ before Tony's book some of it would have been out, especially after his death.

While I have no personal knowledge of records indicating it, some years ago I came to believe that he was someone to whom sex did not mean much.

It is not easy for me to believe that through all the years of their close association Hoover and Tolson were lovers without any inkling being detected by any in the FBI where so many had solid reason for wanting to retaliate against either of them or both.

I can't say it is not possible. But I do say I have no reason to credit this and that knowing Tony and his record I do not automatically assume that he proves or can prove what he alleges.

I do have in his ~~own~~<sup>own</sup> writing that he ~~lies~~ lies to protect himself. A Swedish school-teacher wrote him and asked him why he did not come here and use my records. He lied in saying he wanted to and I refused. The opposite is true. I did invite him. He was then staying at Chads' Ford, 2:15 or 2:30 hours from here. I have his letter to the Swede.

Knowing this I still let him come and have whatever he wanted for his current book and took the time he took from me, asking nothing of him.

Most of those who have used my records are those I knew I would not agree with. But principles are or are not observed. I have never refused anyone access to anything.

There are, though, a couple ~~til~~ will not let in the house!