

12/10/70

Mr. Ramsey Clark
1775 K St., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Clark,

Here are two quotations from a single interview you granted about 10 days ago:

"Mr. Garrison endeavored to subpoena the autopsy photos and X-rays of President Kennedy for use in that trial. They could have had no possible relevance to that trial. (The question was about "certain information that I believe you did not want sent to New Orleans")... "They've (that is, this film) been examined by the foremost pathologists and neurologists in the United States and those men have given sworn statements that they support the findings of the Warren Commission. I think that's adequate."

These responses are false. They are deceptive or outright lies. I am not saying that you are a deliberate liar. I am taking up with your silence of months ago, when I first wrote you after your official capacity ended (you never responded when you were Attorney General, either, but when others did for you, they also lied).

Of course, it is always possible that speaking extemporaneously, one can err. But I suggest that in your case, as in other, you were misinformed by those you trusted. I also suggest that you, not they, will ultimately pay for this. And that some are still misinforming your successor.

With the first excerpt, you should know that only part of what Garrison subpoenaed is the pictures and X-rays. Moreover, you undertook to supercede the decisions of two different judges, one in Louisiana, the other in Washington. If you felt that was your right and obligation, how explain this representation of both judicial decisions against your decision pretending neither existed? Do you consider this an honest way to deal with such questions, an honest way to inform the American people?

Your description of the pathologists, with one exception, is subject to question, but I pass that over. You appointed the panel. You did not name a single neurologist to it. If you did, there are still secrets where there should be none. Either you spoke other than the truth in saying "those men have given sworn statements" or still more is hidden, for no such sworn statements have been released. Further, I suggest you could not now get those men to swear to their report. And to say that these non-existent or suppressed statements or anything else your panel did "support(s) the findings of the Warren Commission" simply isn't true.

Here you get into an area where your position can less easily be defended as a busy executive with multitudinous duties, so many of which he had to delegate. Your assignment to them did not include validating the Warren Report, from the representation of their report itself. You asked them to make only the most limited record, like an inventory, and in even that simple chore they failed. Nor did they actually say they supported the Warren Report. The document they gave you and you sat on for a year is one of the most remarkable semantics and falsehood, but it doesn't say what you say it does. It was phrased to seem to do this, and the use you made of it was designed to further this deception (whether or not you so designed it), but your experts didn't say what you

say they did. Not only did they not dare. but their work actually says the opposite.

The truth is that report you sat on for so long, in itself a dubious procedure, utterly destroys the entire Warren Report, beyond any salvage. Those you selected for the task you and they both misrepresent had to have known this. Perhaps you didn't. I can show you this, in their own words, and more, the designed dishonesty of their work, in a few minutes, long as it is since I have looked at it. Your record does not encourage belief you will look into this or that you will dare to. If I am wrong, I am at your service.

But where does this leave you, as a friend of the assassinated President, as the man in whose name certain things were done, as a former Attorney General with his public responsibilities, or as a man who is now said to have political ambition? Here you are, attracting public attention to yourself and selling a book by telling lies.

If you do not now know these are lies, that is your fault; for I alone have made a number of private efforts to inform you, not one responded to (except by lies by your former subordinates, when they replied for you at all).

Nor is this the only area, or the only political jeopardy. Those you trusted when Dr. King was assassinated did the same by you. Obviously, you could not have had knowledge other than was imparted to you by subordinates. But you said what you did, you did what you did, and the responsibilities are those of the man in charge.

In both cases, there is good prospect at least some of the truth will be both public and in receipt of some attention before another election.

And in both cases there is reason to believe your successors will be - I believe are - looking for someone to blame. These are matters in which my knowledge is not second-hand.

I am suing for what was suppressed (the word withheld is a euphemism). I have filed some of the actions. Right now I have reason to believe that your successors have already designed their frame-up and that its airing is not far in the future. If I have no personal interest in some of the intended victims of this frame-up, I do have an interest in truth, so I will do what one unimportant man without means or influence can do in an effort to establish truth and frustrate falsehood. But I do not deceive myself, for I know I am without influence. I fear there may be other casualties than truth. And not one shows any sign of wanting to defend himself.

The very least that can be said of your failure - nay, your steadfast refusal - to learn the truth from others than those who made you their creature is that it is unfortunate.

Perhaps the day will come when you will feel you should respond to my letter off more than six months ago. Whether or not it does, the day when I will be wanting to call you as a witness is close. Your successors seem to have decided that of the cases I have filed, one of these is one they want to be tried. They have carefully avoided filing the formal motions for dismissal or summary judgement. And I, too, want it to be heard. The question is, can I, entirely alone as I am, prevent the establishing of an entirely false record?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg