

Michael Gordon
3060 Salisbury Drive
Alpharetta, GA 30004

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702
10/18/97

Dear Mr. Gordon,

I'd like to reply to your thoughtful letter as once I undertook to reply to all but I'm now 84 and my health is seriously impaired. I'm feeble and continue to work to the degree possible for me to leave what record I can for our history. Publishers are still reluctant to consider serious, factual work about the assassination and I can no longer print my books. I can keep several available only with xerox editions that have been satisfactory. No compliant to date after several years.

Much of what you've seen and read is not factual. This is not easy to believe but it is true. I have restricted myself to the official evidence, without misrepresenting it, and I've had not a word of complaint from any of those of whom I have written so critically.

Our only basis for even thinking that Shaw asked Andrews to defend Oswald is Andrews. There is no confirmation. We can only guess why if it happened. I do not believe Oswald was homosexual. Not from the evidence.

It was in my Oswald in New Orleans that the question of that 544 Camp address came to light. I know of nothing added to what I then had save a few words from a few people who were in the building, like the fellow with the language school, Ernesto Rodriguez if I remember correctly. Oswald rented no space there. I also interviewed Sam Newman who owned the building.

Martin was a strange man and what he gave Garrison was not important leads. I knew Martin. It is a wonder he wasn't killed, a charge on which he was reportedly wanted in Texas. Banister pistol whipped him into the hospital.

We have no way of knowing who was behind the assassination. Why is how my NEVER AGAIN! begins documenting. Your book store can get and provide it and Case Open, which I did not publish and cannot sell. There are no leads because the crime itself was never investigated.

To answer your question, I think the assassination was to change policy and while I like Fletch Prouty he really knows nothing about the established fact of the assassination and his theories, while attractive, do not stick in the assassination story.

Please excuse my typing and writing. They cannot be any better.

By the way, Senator Russell, with whom I had a relationship I kept confidential until after he died, did not believe the basis of the Report, the single-bullet theory, and he was not convinced there has not been any conspiracy. His records are on deposit at the university at Athens.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

.....
October 14, 1997
.....

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Maryland 21702

Dear Mr Weisberg:

I would like to order your book *Oswald in New Orleans: Case for Conspiracy with the CIA*. I have recently read your books *Selections from Whitewash*, and *Martin Luther King: The Assassination*, which I found very interesting. If possible, please call or write to tell me how I can order the above book about Oswald. Also, I may be interested in some of your other books, including the book *Photographic Whitewash: Suppressed Kennedy Assassination Pictures*. Is there much information in your other whitewash books that is not in the *Selections from Whitewash* book? Any information about these books, would be greatly appreciated.

My interest in the Kennedy assassination began with the movie JFK. This movie concerned me greatly. After I saw this movie in 1991, I decided to read more about this subject, to learn if the claims in the movie could possibly be true. I have since read many books and articles, and my perspective has changed a great deal.

While the New Orleans activities of Oswald just prior to his downfall are fascinating, I have questions about a few key points. Why would Clay Shaw contact Oswald to defend him after the assassination? This would suggest to me that he did not know about Oswald' destiny until after the assassination. This would mean that he did not have prior knowledge of Oswald' true purpose of being "sheep-dipped" as a communist Castro sympathizer, to blame the killing on the communists. Perhaps he was Oswald' friend, and only later realized what was going on and backed out. Perhaps someone else was intentionally generating a false trail to Shaw. What do you think about this?

Also given all the suppressed, ignored, altered evidence which found its way into the Warren Report, how can it be that the address 544 Camp Street, just happened to get into the report. It almost seems to me that this could have been done intentionally, perhaps to misdirect a real investigation. How is it that Jack Martin managed to live so long, if he really was providing Jim Garrison with such important leads? Perhaps this is no accident. Finally, if anti-castro people were behind this, then why didn't the U.S. policy toward Cuba change drastically. Castro is still in power. It seems the real policy change was with regard to Vietnam, and Southeast Asia. Maybe the anti-Castro cuban angle was all a false trail. What do you think about this? What do you think of Fletcher Prouty' theories?

Thank you so much for your contribution in exposing these terrible crimes. I look forward to your reply.

Yours truly,



Michael Gordon
3060 Salisbury Drive
Alpharetta, GA 30004
(770) 663-4450

.....