

Jeffrey Frank, Outlook  
The Washington Post  
1150 15 St., NW  
Washington, DC 20071

4/2/94

Dear Jeffrey,

It is not why I write but Case Open has been manufactured. After a supply gets to New York I'll be sent some and I'll then send you and Morley copies. If I'm then short on time I hope neither will object to my making a single package.

The Hood student finally finished retyping my lengthy article about Podner and his book. She did not do as well as I'd hope<sup>ed</sup> but it is infinitely less difficult to read.

Now I want to try to do something with it.

All the indications I have from New York is that there is no interest in promoting it. For example, my request for copies ~~an~~<sup>n</sup> of any announcement of it that I can include with my correspondence (in yesterday's mail I responded to six inquiries about the books I published) has been ignored. I've had no response to my ~~send~~<sup>send</sup>ing the rough draft of the article on Russell and Vooper and their refusal to endorse the single-bullet theory and how the record they made for history was memory-holed. I asked if there was any interest in trying to place it. Having no agent, which is a long story, beginning with the curse of being the first, I'm rather handicapped in this. *For other reasons, too.*

You may remember that I asked you if The Atlantic had a Washington editor. When I decided to write the article I had hope to be able to interest a magazine that does long pieces. I would like to be able to get some meaningful discussion going, ~~especially~~ especially about the media, in the broadest sense, including book publishers. If you ~~struggled~~ struggled through the rough draft you will have seen what I mean. I hope! Of the magazines that when I was able to read them did carry long pieces, from what I remember of them then, possibly The New York Review of Books might be more likely to consider it. Do you know anyone there or the one I should address, and how? Or have you any other suggestions?

You mentioned someone named ~~Peters~~ Peters at The Washingtonian, as I recall. If you think there is no possibility of placing it in a national magazine, would you please tell me the rest of the name and where to send it?

I hope I am not asking too much from you. I will appreciate any help or suggestions.

Sincerely,

*Harold*

Dear Jeffrey,

4/5/94

I wrote you early yesterday morning but did not have time to read and correct what I wrote. Then the mail came, with your letter of the 29th. I appreciate it and thank you for it.

You, singular or as plural as you'd like, will be welcome almost any time. I have not driven out of Frederick since 1977 because it is not safe for me. We are away from home only, usually, for shopping or medical appointments. But try to remember that because I cannot avoid being wide awake quite early I try to be abed by 6.

I do not remember if when you were here I'd written an Afterword for NEVER AGAIN! or not. I know I had the material I used in it. In general I have the book's editor's approval for it and as usual I've written more than I think will be used, to leave a fuller and better record for history. (Did I tell you that with the onset of so much that I've been lucky to survive I decided that the best use I could make of the time ~~for~~ that remains for me is to try to make such a record as best I can? I'll be 81 Friday.) When the student can resume typing I'll give that to her first. I think the new and formerly suppressed information in it is important. It is an unpublished hearing from the House assassins committee's medical panel and a few staff investigatory reports and memos. And, I'm happy to say, it confirms what I'd written. I learned from my source <sup>Cal. An. 410</sup> when he phoned me yesterday <sup>Washington</sup> that his source was a woman of whom I'd never heard. And I've never met my source! <sup>the contact</sup> It is what on almost any other subject could be expected to be headlined.

Perhaps to the degree possible I have answered your question, will someone stumble on that important piece of ~~information~~ incontrovertible truth... "If you mean by this a solution, I think not. But an understanding of what happened, I think so. Better understanding because enough of an understanding has long been available outside the books that theorize solutions. When you are here I'll tell you about it, what is new in NEVER AGAIN! Fantastic how this formerly suppressed information confirms what I'd written! And how many it incriminates in lying about the assassination, officials, or those in official positions.

On the new information, Jim Lesar believes that much is what had already been disclosed. However, some of it is new and he tells me that John Newman is working it over industriously. Good man to do it!!

If you can help me place <sup>on it</sup> these lengthy articles that would be a big help. The one, "Senator Russell Dissents," goes into his and Cooper's refusal to agree to the single-bullet theory, known but little known, with new information from their files. It also goes into how they were coned, how the record Russell believed he was making for history was memory-holed by Rankin at least, it has what Russell prepared for reading at an executive session he'd forced, and it even has Russell's AA's of LA's

evaluation of my books agreeing with him, the way it was put. I have these documents if a magazine would like to use them.

The way Rankin did it was to pretend to have the <sup>y</sup> court reporter there when in fact he avoided that. Russell and I presume Cooper thus believed that their words were being taken down when they were not. And then Rankin had a phony transcript prepared. I did use that in my third book but so few people have seen it. The only good story on it that I remember was John Hanzahan's in the Post and I think he made no mention of that, that his story was based on the transcript of an earlier executive session I print in facsimile in that book. *Got it by FOLA.*

Rankin early on pulled the same caper, when they had the Texans up on reports that Oswald had worked for the FBI. No transcript but two of the Texans, Dean Storey and Henry Wade, former Dallas DA who remains my friend, told me they believed Rankin had a stenographer taking it down. He did not and then the phony story of that S172 or 479 number was used. Rankin substituted a memo I got years ago for the transcript, and he had the correct number in it. I gave that to Newman last year. It fits with what he is working on. Was then in any event. It was not an FBI number and it is consistent with CIA numbering. Confidential for now. Everybody seems to have missed that. My copy and much else like it was ~~stolen~~ stolen, apparently by the Baltimore cop working for Harrison Livingstone. I remember the number and the record and Newman was able to retrieve it from the Commission's files.

But we do not yet know the meaning that can fairly or responsibly be given to that information now. Perhaps Newman may know by now. I do not. That is why I did not use ~~it~~ for now 27-8 years.

To simplify an answer to your question, I doubt the crime will ever be solved now. But unquestionable proof that the government never investigate the ~~real~~ crime and never intended to and to a large degree, those involved, those with guilty knowledge, those who went along with it, are named, most of all now in NEVER AGAIN! Include in this those who knew the official mythology was exactly that. New names on that in this Afterword, with specifics on the evidence lied about. All those at the autopsy knew, I have a relevant affidavit by one, and a fair number inside the FBI knew almost immediately. Or, I think this Afterword, particularly after what is in that book, is both important and exciting. Shocking, too.

I think your understanding of all will be <sup>enhanced</sup> enhanced if you read the transcript of the Commission's 1/22/64 executive session in Post Mortem, beginning on page 475. When the government decided to give it to me rather than risk the attention it could have gotten in a lawsuit they did not use the court-reporting firm whose stenotypist took it <sup>down</sup> down. They used a DoD stenotypist who did not get all of it, like some of the names and a few words straight, like "experimental" for "supplemental". But it is clear. They were terrified of the FBI and went with what it said. Best, *Harold*

I've read through Chapter VI, Never Again!-Again of Case Open and I write because I will not have time when I get them to mail out. So I will not forget, I believe that aside from the ssassination, and on that this is ever so much less than is in the manuscript, I raise two questions I think should get some public discussion. One is the misuses of "science" Failure Analysis style in criminal/political cases and the other is such endorsements as Random House got from those with reputations but without the knowledge required for honest opinions. When you've finished what remains of this chapter, and pictures and citations are eliminated, you'll see enough of the first of these questions.

It may not be easy for you to believe, but believe me I had the book completed and sent before your review appeared. As I did with other information, I sent adds and inserts up. Some were included, most were not. You were both ways, added and not added.

The book is shot full of errors I caught twice and were not corrected. I ask you to keep all of this to yourself. I want no arguments or this kind of controversy about which nothing can now be done. I caught them in the retyped and really gutted ms. and in the page proofs and I returned both rapidly. I have no explanations. I had agreed in advance to editing because I became aware of repetitions I did not intend for emphasis and wanted them eliminated. They were not. Instead about 80% was just cut almost all in the form of entire chapters. Where the "as we have seen" refer to what had been eliminated I noted that for correction, too. But those corrections also were not made. More than I'll <sup>now</sup> go into were not made. Including the omission of any table of contents. Of the most graphic pictures, too, as I'll show you when you are here. If you question my opinion of the power of the uncut ms. please ask Dave Wrono, history prof., Univ. Wisconsin, Stevens Point, 715-344-3148. He is one of two history <sup>and subject experts,</sup> profs, friends to whom I gave copies of the rough draft and constituted the peer review I, not any publisher, sought.

Based on some rather difficult experiences when I was rather young I think, work and act in terms of what I think of as using the opponents's strength against them, as intellectual judo. In this case the strength is Random House's and Posner's, with all the attention he got. With any controversy not diminished by such petty things as exits in the book as it appeared, the possibility of attention to it was considerable. That would have meant attention to the book as written without this unexplained cutting. And that, among other things, could have placed assassination controversy in terms of the official evidence itself on a vastly different level. I used Posner to exculpate Oswald, with the official evidence itself. And did that, too. Although I had never done that with such explicitness earlier. I think ~~the~~ New York thought was that it was so powerful it would be powerful enough cut to hell so it could be sold for less. ~~But~~ not having been told I do not know. But I do assure you that I did catch the added mistakes some of which are directly attributable to the retyping being done by someone who had never used a computer before. You should see the copy I had to work with!!!!

# The Washington Post

1150 15<sup>TH</sup> STREET, N. W.

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20071-5530

(202) 334-6000

OUTLOOK  
(202) 334-7573

March 29

Dear Harold, (if I may call you by your first name),

Many thanks for your two letters. The visit was terrific, and both of us were enormously impressed by what you know and what you've gathered. Your observation that massive disclosure may prevent meaningful access seems to me very wise; you also seem to have found a way to avoid that problem.

One wonders what will become of all this; whether you or someone else will stumble upon that one piece of uncontrollable truth that will make what seems to be obvious to people like me ~~obvious~~ obvious to others.

It will be good to visit you again, when you have time and the weather has changed. Let me know if I can do anything to help.

Best wishes,



Jeffrey Frank