



Lillian & Harold Weisberg

Coq d'Or Press ~~HYATTSTOWN, MD 20784~~

Code 301 / WA 6-2034; TR 4-4246

3/9/69

Dear Sylvia,

The enclosed letter to Cyril is largely self-explanatory. The "we" with reference to Andrews is not the Garrison office.

Sorry you are unwell. Bud has a touch of something not yet diagnosed, though I expect to see him tonight on a WWDC radio show. I am well, but yesterday I unhinged my lumbo-sacral problem doing a simple, non-arduous chore. It will linger and slow me for a while, impeding concentration, but little else.

The same offers relate to you about the books. Let me know when you want them. COUP requires no knowledge of the content of the others. I have an extensive appendix for each one. For PM III I plan the entire Washington proceeding, with all the relevant court documents. That appendix already includes all the pleadings save Bud's brief, the reports, etc., and a local radiologist is supposed to be preparing an annotated head X-ray, plotting the different versions of the allegedly singular fatal wound. He has been a long time, I presume because he wants to get X-rays that do not create additional problems.

I'll be making a speech above NYC 3/28. I hope to get to NY intime to have a few minutes, but the priority on my time will be on legal needs. I'll try and keep you posted.

Perhaps, in the course of time, our respective New Orleans positions will resolve themselves and their significance will diminish. I, too, agree with the verdict. Let me interpret it this way: it is "not guilty", no more. While I was surprised at the speed of the charge of perjury and would not, myself, have done it in such haste (and with such incompleteness), I also recognize Shaw and his protagonists may have triggered it with their also-improper chatter about suing and the open threats to involve others, as for the bar ~~associations~~ associations (which have no jurisdiction). I doubt if his enemies have the right to expect Garrison to roll over and proclaim "dead". However, he did present a case that overcame three motions for a directed verdict. This means that, regardless of the speed of the jury, regardless of the inadequacies, it is a prima facie case and all this talk is inappropriate and serves other purposes and interests, not yours and mine. I tell you I am satisfied there are not fewer than two additional Shaw perjuries, at least one by another supporting his, and I also believe these may have had some effect on the jury. That he was not caught up on them stuns me, for I had developed this evidence and had given it to them, not anticipating perjury but for other reasons.

The ultimate effect will be both positive and negative. There is no disputing the negative. I have been concerned about that and doing what I could to eliminate or reduce it for many months. There also should be no doubt about the positive. Sorry as the record is in terms of what it could have been, it nonetheless is more than enough to give a legal destruction to the WR, its concept, authors and assorted handmaidens.

You could not make an analysis of Garrison's case two years ago, Sylvia. You could have appraised him, but not it. It is here that we have our major disagreement, for my interest is and has been what did happen in N.O., and every time I go there it gets deeper and I develop more. It is so unfortunate that the case that

could have been was ~~either~~ developed nor presented. More and more <sup>I</sup> become convinced that Garrison had been ~~(and helped those doing it)~~ convinced he would never be permitted to bring the case to court. Therefore, he was, as he saw it (also with such "guidance"), devoting his efforts elsewhere. It is incredible, but believe me, there was virtually no significant N.O. work done at all after Mark and Turner got there.


It is no less incredible that Bethell was in a position to do what he did. More than a year ago I stipulated that as a condition of my sending them anything it be agreed it would be kept out of his hands. I then had sufficient reasons. Even more of an indictment is his professional incompetence. Paul and I ~~even~~ spent much effort and money in the too-late last minute providing some of what he had not gotten from the Archives.

At least two more perjurers may well be charged - I think they should be - and three or more should be charged with other crimes of which I have independent knowledge. Having nothing to do with what to me is the incompetence of the trial, there were a number of intrusions of the kind that not even you have charged to Garrison. This does not count such things as Gurvich who, I believe, was with the other side all along. I have some of the things he kept out of the office, out of any record of any kind. I am astounded that some of it, when I ultimately developed it, was not used. I suspect that what controlled here was personal attitudes.

For whatever it is worth to you, I know of two DU investigations of Shaw. Clark lied. I have a party to one on tape, voluntarily.

Nor can I conceive of Shaw and Ferrie not having known each other. Not with their interests, not in New Orleans. Not with their mutual friends.

Hurriedly,



P  
Y