Dear Robert, 12/3/75

Thanks for the fat package. It and your thoughtful letter of the 29th came yesterday, when I read it. I know it includesmany clippings I did not have because I've had more time for reading and have caught up on all clips. I've phlebitis and it has reduced my activity while increasing the time I have to just sit. With my legs up. That is when I read and when I package the books. (Your mother's went yesterday or the day before.)

Mailing and record-keeping take much time th and there are now but 1 1/2 of us. My wife is correcting the mailing list as she can, now with returned mailings to those who have moved. When you write again please include a notation of you you should be listed, although until I am completely recovered, which may take some time, I doubt I'll be able to return to continuous writing. Soon I'm going to have to find some ways of promoting this new book. All the major papers suppressed the decent wire-service stroies. If I succeed that will mean more wrapping, all of it beginning the first of the month, when our only regular income begins with my wife's work until 4/15/76.

You are right about the committee possibilities. However, those I castigated at the NYU speech are active, well financed, self-promoting and have been a bad influence. With a proper approach, which these types don't know enough to persaude any committee to take, more could have been done. Two have been in touch with me. One held one hearing that is entirely my uncredited work, which gives you an idea of politicians. The other is crapping around with minor stuff. The thind laid Lane's egg somply by not knowing what it was doing or to do. I have no choice but to sit back and wait and see if they want to go about this in a way that can succeed. Success is not and is not going to be in one-shot headlines. Meanwhile, back at thecourts, I'm active still. A promising situation on the spectro appeal and two new suits filed while I'm going through the steps on many others. This kind of real work has to be done so there will be something for the parasites good at promoting themselves only to have something to steal and talk about without full when any understanding.

Of the books you mention I don't have Freeds, which can't be worth anything except for a collection. Groden is not doing a book. It is being ghosted from nothing by another I know. I've out him on notice aboutplagiarism because Robert has nothing except the film, misinterpretation and a heavy ego trip. Part of what enabled me to pay the considerable cost of publishing Post Mortem was fees from publishers who consulted me on the McDonald fabrication. I killed it twice. It is complete fraud. I did not look for a publisher when I came out with PM. I have often enough earlier and at the time I printed decided there was no time to waste. If the Senate uses this book wisely and soon the case is over except for a full investigation. I never wanted to have to print my own. I could have written a dozen others during the time I've been packaging and shipping. Tought straight writing is not welcome. Go over what is coming out.

As you will see in PM, losing the suit for the NAAs was quite a victory and we are on appeal...There is going to be news interest in the King/Ray case and Jim has filed a brilliant appeal with 6th circuit....I hseard of but havenot seen the Phelan piece. I'll be glad if it is in what you sent. I had not chance to read yesterday.

The real Belin story is not your footnote. I had a debate scheduled with him (we both have the same lecture bureau) for 11/19 at Vanderbilt. The Friday before I held a press conference to announce PM and used the occasion to charge that it proves perjury and subornation and challenged any orall those named to get oath-to-oath with me before any properly constituted Congressional commitee, both of us subject to the penalties of perjuty. They Belin bought PM and I rushed it. The I laid 45 minites of his own devious record, his tricks with witness and evidence, his personal suppressions- and here I put the evidence in his face- a case of subornation right up to him. I also ridiculed his pious pretenses and noted that he did nothing but talk now that there was great interest and his ego was hurt while I a non-lawyer filed suit after suit and he filed none. So, while he originally refused to join my demand for a full Congressional investigation by the end of the week he realized that was his best course. He also had this record to live with so he filed a suit. My suspicion is that while hebis a lawyer the approach he took is not proper and his case can be tossed out unless the

feds elect to use him to leak some and suppress the rest. But the suit is incompetent. It gave him a news break only.

CBS shows deserving of contempt only. First was straight fraud. They knew better.

I think you said something about a Lane speech there. He has his own booking agent and effective propaganda. But save that the Warren Commission is wrong his audience can be sure of nothing else he'll say. It was always this way. He'll say anything and he has never done any real work. He steals and improvises attractively.

If there is any chance these people can change their minds, the FBI has now certified to a federal court that I am the world's expert, that I know more about the subject than anyone in the FBI even.

I've had a series of slides made of the new evidence I've dug up.

Last night I had a call from a NYC lawyer who is an amateur expert. He read the book for the second time and describes it as the most definitive, an historic work. He looks at it as a lawyer does and finds it this much.

Thanks. I've taken this time, which to the minute is the time I have before breakfast and returning to packaging. I can't often take this time but I owe you thanks. Hope things go well for all of you.

Sincerely,

Nov. 29, 1975

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

I've taken your advice and waited until I had a sizable amount of clippings to send to you. I think a good deal of these articles will be of value to you and some should be of at least passing interest. Included are clippings about the review of the RFK assassination case and a few things on recent disclosures of FBI harrassment of Martin Luther King. But most of the articles concern President Kennedy's assassination. As you can see in only two months I have collected a good many articles — this is hopefully an indication of an increasing interest.

The Schweiker-Hart subcommittee of the Senate Intelligence Committee seems to be the committee that could lead to a new investigation. Another current investigation is Rep. Don Edwards of the Civil and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee. They are looking into possible FBI links to Oswald and Ruby. Have you had any personal contact with either of these two committees?

Also enclosed is a two part interview with Cyril Wecht that appeared in Physician's Management. The most irritating article - at least for me to read - was TIME's (November 24th) issue with the article on the assassination. The article dismisses conspiracy and bases much of its argument on Dr. Lattimer's findings. This article was worse than Newsweek's coverage last Spring. Ironically,

(over)

this same issue of TIME had a letter to the editor from Mark Lane congratulating TIME for their coverage of the FBI's destroying of the Oswald letter (TIME, November 3rd). Both Lane's letter and TIME's November 3rd article are enclosed. There was an article on Ruby in The Village Voice and I have sent that. Most of the articles are self-explanatory. I am sure many were carried in The Washington Post or Star. One story that is in here but was never followed up after the original story was the one dealing with the FBI's bugging of Marina Oswald in 1964.

Not only have articles increased in number but so have new books on the assassination. There are a few reprints: The Day JFK Was Shot by Jim Bishop, Rush to Judgement by Mark Lane, and UNANSWERED QUESTIONS ABOUT PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S ASSASSINATION by Sylvan Fox (all in paperback). In paperback for the first time is Jim Garrison's Heritage of Stone. Donald Freed has a fiction book of the Executive Action type called The Killing of RFK — it's a horrible book with nothing to offer anyone. Robert Groden's book Case for Conspiracy will be out around January. One new book is called Appointment In Dallas by Hugh MacDonald and I've enclosed an article from the Village Voice about the book. MacDonald claims he tracked down the real assassin of JFK, who is known as "Saul", a nickname he gave to the man. He claims "Saul" is the man in the photographs at the Cuban Embassy in Mexico. "Saul" supposedly killed the President

(pg 2 →)

for $50,000. "Saul" does not know who he was hired by and gives no clues. "Saul" also explains Oswald thought he was working for the CIA and only fired at the motorcade to alert Secret Service that they were not doing a good job. You would think there was an easier way to alert the secret service. Have you seen this book? I would like to know what you think MacDonald's motive for this book is? I saw him on a local television show and he seems to believe his story - although I find it totally ridiculous. He worked for the CIA at one time. Another new book is Robert Sam Anson's They've Killed The President. There are some obvious mistakes in his book that he should have found in proofreading his manuscript. He does provide some insights to organized crime and how and why they might have been motivated to act against Kennedy. Other than that he duplicates other critic's whose books are unavailable. He also brings the events up to date with information on Garrison and recent disclosures about the FBI cover-up. I read the book and I thought it had some good moments. Have you seen any of the books I've mentioned?

My mother (Helene Moskovitz) has received the ad for POST MORTEM - she's going to send for it, and when I visit Cincinnati next month I will read it. I'm glad to hear it's finally out. I am sure it will provide some new information which I find sadly lacking in the onslaught of new books. Did you look for a publisher for POST MORTEM or do you just prefer to print

(over)

your own books at this point in time? The reason I ask, is because I have found more information in the WHITEWASH series than in all the others. I've looked around at used book stores for OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS with no success. But I wish your books were more readily available to the public. They can only find them by word of mouth (unless they have purchased a book from you already). So people pick up junk like MacDonald's book and learn nothing, while the books with actual documentation backing up what they say are harder to get. POST MORTEM was mentioned in Jack Anderson's column recently (article enclosed).

There were two articles I saw but did not buy the magazines in which they appeared. One was in PEOPLE and it just gave a few lines about four or five of the critics (Howard Roffman was included). I also did not buy a recent COMMENTARY with an article by Jacob Cohen on the assassination. COMMENTARY costs $2.00 and after I saw the article lauding Dr. John Lattimer, I decided not to buy it.

Jerry and I were wondering if what he sent on the NAA were of any help. We also were wondering where you are in your legal battle for the Kennedy information as well as where you are in the Ray case (especially now that Attorney General Levi has ordered a review of the FBI's investigation of King's assassination).

(page 3) →

I also wanted to mention, neither Jerry or myself received an ad for POST MORTEM at our Henry St. address. Jerry got one at his Bruce Lane address and as I said my mother received one I did not get one at all (I suppose I'm not on the list since I never purchased the book in my name). Now that POST MORTEM is out, will you be confining your work to legal work or do you have other plans?

I was talking to a person I know at NYU who is on a committee for getting lecturers. He told me Mark Lane was scheduled for next semester. I mentioned your name and he had read WHITEWASH I. I asked him if he could talk to the committee about inviting you to speak. He told me the others in the group didn't even want Lane but he finally convinced them. He felt Lane could draw a crowd and that not enough people know you. I argued with him - giving him your credits but I don't think it helped.

Belin

Another plus for a new investigation is Belin's call to take another look at the case (this article is included). The November 23rd New York Times Magazine had an article by James R. Phelan which calls for a new investigation but it attempts to discredit the critics (you are mentioned and are described as a "Maryland farmer" so your background as a Senate investigator is totally ignored). The article also tries to discredit you by linking you (and other critics) to the Garrison investigation. Phelan feels the new investigation would only support the Warren

(over)

Commission Report. This worries me, writers calling for a new investigation are starting out on the wrong foot. Here we are in 1975 and even before a new investigation writers are starting where the Commission started some 12 years ago — presupposing Oswald's guilt.

One interesting footnote to the Belin story is his filing a F.O.I. suit for suppressed autopsy materials and other suppressed materials.

In President Ford's recent press conference, [redacted] in regard to question on the JFK assassination, Ford said recent developements should be fully investigated, "without reopening the entire matter". And as I'm sure you know the King assassination investigation by the FBI is being reviewed (I saw Mr. Lesar on CBS news November 26th speaking about this).

I did have a question I wanted to ask you with regard to the Zapruder films, although it is a minor question in light of other more important ones, I am curious. Has anyone ever found out if the motorcycle that leaves the motorcade and drives off towards The Book Depository was ordered to do so?

One last subject I'd like to touch on, the recent television coverage of the JFK assassination. I saw a Tomorrow program (Tom Snyder host) - it was fairly interesting. Josiah Thompson, Peter Dale Scott, Robert Sam Anson and Senator Schweiker were on. Schweiker was most interesting because he talked about what

his subcommittee might do. He sounds sincere and truly committed to getting to the truth. The other television program I saw was the CBS special. I'm sure you saw this - I'd be interested to know your opinion of it (Dr. Weston and Itek's conclusions). They didn't show the whole Zapruder film and the original doesn't look much clearer than Robert Groden's bootleg copy. After the first show, I was quite angry. The CBS special ignored evidence that Oswald was not on the 6th floor. They showed a film of a man casually placing a Mannlicher Carcano behind some cartons - the rifle when found was hidden [redacted] in such a way it couldn't have been casually dropped. They misrepresented the CBS reenactment by experts shooting from a tower at targets. They did not mention "Oswald's rifle" was in worse shape and that "his" (if it was his) scope was off. How the scope being off made it easier to shoot the President, I'll never know. All I know is all of the sudden, Dan Rather was answering bold "Yeses" to questions of Oswald's guilt with no background data being supplied. Jack Ruby was ignored by the Special. Dr. Wecht confuses me. Every time I hear him he has different findings. In the CBS special he said the wound was in the President's neck, not his back (as he said previously) and that the bullet did pass out Kennedy's neck. He also stated there was no shot fired from the Knoll. The interview I enclose does not rule out a

wound from the side of the President. Another thing ignored was in a blow-up of the 6th floor window in the Hughes' film. They show a blow up of [redacted]' what is said to be Oswald's window showing something in that window moving from frame to frame. They fail to show the window next to that window (in the same room but the other window) which also shows a figure. CBS tried hard but could not make the single bullet theory sound plausible. The second show on the CIA and FBI coverup was better. CBS did uncover two new witnesses (one FBI man who received a cable on November 17th saying there would be a murder attempt in Dallas, another a gun runner who claims Oswald and some Latins tried to purchase four high powered rifles from him). CBS concludes Oswald could have been the lone gunman - that no evidence of a second gun can be found. The only logical conclusion they made was the one calling for Congressional investigations into the FBI-CIA coverup. And again CBS like so many others, continue to point to Castro-Cuba as the culprits. They gave serious consideration to Cuba (in retaliation for CIA plots against Casto) as being behind the assassination. (As did President Johnson and Jack Anderson still thinks this). On the whole I was disappointed with this special. They can only improve on the others. Do you know when the King program will be aired?

This should bring the letter up to date. I just read the Village Voice will review

all the recent books on the assassination next week. I'll save that article for the next time - I want to get this out. I've waited long enough to send it.

I'm sorry my letter is so long but there was much ground to cover. I know you are quite busy and I hate to waste valuable time. As much as I do look forward to hearing from you to answer some of my own personal questions - I understand that you are busy. If you are unable to answer me, I know you'll be doing something more important. I do get guilty feelings about hogging your time but on the otherhand there is no one else in my mind who is as reputable or consistent of a critic of the official version of the JFK assassination - so when I write you I feel I can trust your answer. Over the past couple of years, I have found people such as Mark Lane, Cyril Wecht and even Josiah Thompson inconsistent in their findings. They say different things all the time. I don't want you to feel I am trying to hog your time, I feel much better sending these clippings - that is, knowing I am helping even though it is not any big deal. I want this investigation reopened as much as anyone and I want to help - so although I'm not doing important investigative work I like to think what I am doing helps if only a little bit.

As always, I wish you the best of luck in your work. I will send more when

(cover)

I get enough articles. And since I won't have a chance to send anything until after January, I'd like to wish you a happy new year with much success.

Best wishes

Robert Bruce