

2/2/69

Dear Sylvia, Gary and Paul,

In the past two weeks, much too briefly and elliptically, I have indicated to you that I think, in the Clark panel report and related documents, I have the major thing we have yet had. I have not spoken to Paul and Gary, so they know less than the too-little I have been able to communicate to Sylvia, for what I said was in brief, infrequent notes. I regret not being able to afford phoning you about this.

Last night I finished reading and editing a chapter too early to retire and too late to start another, so I spent more than an hour copying for you that latest and rather large batch of documents. This will be my procedure until I get all of that done. In order to prevent the confusion that arose when I sent the copies in instalments, I will mail all at once. Then each of you will know exactly what we/you have, what they supplied of what was ordered. This morning I approached the next chapter fresh and early. I use a few minutes before breakfast to tell you that, although none of us is impartial about his own work and none qualified to judge it dispassionately, I think I have the most destructive thing yet in these 30,000 words I have done.

Thoroughly as so many of us have taken the Warren Report apart, nothing is as absolutely total in saying there was a deliberate, permeating effort inside the government to hide the truth followed by official trickery, lies and fabrications. This also goes much further and shows the truth that was hidden, shows how the panel was a conscious part of it, how the Attorney General contrived it - and why. I think this is not saying enough. I wish it were possible for you to read it now, to make suggestions, for the more time I spend in this, the more I learn (and forget), the more I fear this knowledge results in a lack of clarity in my writing. That, alas, will not be possible until after the final typing, for I just cannot take the time to make the extra copies when I am working at such speed and when I did do much of this away from home it was not possible. I then had to use what typewriters I could cadge. However, I will in the not too distant future have at least one extra copy. That, if you'd like, I'll circulate among you. Should any of you want or be able to make a copy, that would be fine. Perhaps, after reading, you will not think it worthwhile.

Because I do not want all of this to hang on the current court action in Washington and because, even if that is successful, it also is not enough, I have been thinking in terms of a small book that can come out fast. There is, without a major success in Washington, no possibility of magazine attention. With a book there can be collateral attention denied any magazine writing save that in a few of the larger ones that, in the past, have declined to associate themselves with criticism on this subject.

Anyway, yesterday, while I was at a printers getting NCR paper cut to size so that we could have copies without the time-delay of handling carbon paper, I got estimates on the cost of printing alone of what I would regard as the minimum book. It would be larger in volume of content than "Inquest" but thinner in size with the format I use. It was an academic exercise, for I cannot go further into debt. However, with what I can expect by way of some services done elsewhere, where I can have them done at cost, the printing only of 1,000 copies would run about \$800-\$850, 5,000 about \$2,000. This is not an appeal for help or money from you. It is only intended to let you know in the event one of you may know of a foundation or an organization that might be interested.

I began this writing as an analysis for use by Bud, preparation for court work, then switched

to what I intended and still intend as an addition to POST MORTEM. When I have completed this, I will rush as much as I can with the previously-planned other addition of which Gary, having alone of you seen the documents, knows the content. When I have done that I will prepare the appendix, which will in itself be book-length. This will be an enormous volume, but I see no alternative and, frankly, I also see no immediate chance of publication. However, I believe the research and presentation must be done. Perhaps, some day, a foundation will raise a head that is not ugly.


I have already made inquiries at the Library of Congress, and I can (and will) copyright this analysis as part of POST MORTEM even if it should appear separately. I have complied with all the requirements of publication of the extant version of the book, dating to 9/67.

This work will now go much slower. Not the writing and editing but the final typing, for my wife has returned to work and will be away every day and some nights until mid-April. Last night she was able to begin this section. She will undoubtedly work on it today and what time she can find evenings. However, I can predict the completion date.

I've breakfasted and must return to work. Let me ask each of you to please let me have whatever you may have on Jerry Herald, the photographer who went to Dallas from Louisiana for "Paris-Match" and who worked with Lady Jean Campbell. If it is only references to the volumes, it can help. I found he had lived in Gonzales, La., that he had taken some of the pictures that interested Bernabei, and told Dick how to get in touch with him. This now looks as though it can lead to worthwhile information. I am leaving him entirely in Dick's hands. They have already had one long phone conversation. My request is so we can prepare Dick as much as possible. He has been with this much less time than we have. Gonzalez, by the way, is a crossroads marked only by a rundown bar between Baton Rouge and the Carville Leprosarium. I have been there in other investigations. I expect to see Bernabei in a couple of weeks. He may come here.

Since learning the identities of the police in the "tramp" pictures, I have heard nothing more from my Dallas sources. In the course of checking out Sprague's claimed evidence, I find none of it either supports his theories or, in most cases, is even related. The one that is relevant, if it is true, proves the opposite in that it establishes the train was in motion and was stopped by Bowers. Sprague and Turner are developing still new theories and "proofs" about the identity of the men, no less persuaded of the infallibility of this one than they were with the previous ones. I can only hope that they get no attention, for it would be very hurtful. It just does not stack up in any way.

Sincerely,

  
Harold Weisberg