

Harold Weisberg
Route 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
2/19/73

Dear Mr. Kirkwood,

I've just finished your Shaw book. Don't take this as an insult. Rather it is because I never saw Shaw as Garrison did. Sal Panzeca understands this and, in fact, has no complaints about my treatment of Shaw, which is in a book you did not mention.

May I suggest that you gave Sal less than his due and in underplaying him missed some pretty good stuff? Like why was he in the case when it took him from other work he preferred.

Perry Russo was right. Sal did have many books on him, much more than he felt he had to use. I regret this. I'd like all to come out.

As I never cast Shaw in the Garrison role, so also did and do I regard homosexuality, of which this is but one of many cases in the federal investigation, as utterly irrelevant. In fact, some homosexuals took exception to my attitude on this in some of my public appearances and insisted I went too far in trying to say that homosexuality was irrelevant.

You see, Regis Kennedy dissembled. There really was a Clay Bertrand in New Orleans. Dean Andrews, who is not a literary type, did not invent the name. Kennedy found proof of a real man using this name when what Andrews had said was still secret.

I conducted many investigations, in New Orleans and elsewhere, but never one of Shaw per se. This does not mean that I did not come across much information about him, good and bad. Good and bad information and favorable and unfavorable to Shaw. One of the more meaningful leads was given to you and you quote it without understanding it. However, you began with an understandable bias and without an investigative background. So, this and other things were lost upon you.

Of and on I spent much time with Perry Russo, but never in a formal interview. There is much you never realized and Sal never levelled with you. He could have told you much he clearly did not, for what I know you'd never have omitted if you knew it. I made the mistake of assuming all this would come out in the trial, so I used what time I had in New Orleans for other purposes. As I said, Shaw was never a major interest for me. This was but one of the basic disagreements between Garrison and me. (You may have noticed that while accredited, I was not at the trial. I was in New Orleans then, never once entered the court room, and left before it was well under way.)

Ferris was a major interest for me. It is I, not Garrison, who found the first official and suppressed reference to him as "Ferry". Garrison learned of this from my second book, where it appears. Actually, I conducted much more of a Ferris investigation than Garrison did and found much that he did not and to this day he does not have. So, I have the continuing interest in Ferris and, with the defects of the trial, an interest in what did not come out about Perry. For these reasons I have considerable interest in what was irrelevant for your purposes in your Russo interview. I have no interest in the sex stuff. I probably know more about that than Perry does, but again, not because I sought it. In babbling about it, Perry, knowingly or otherwise, might have dropped some valuable clues or, to one who knows much about Ferris, information. I disagree with Garrison, by the way, on the reason for Ferris's flight and what Ferris then did and why. And there was a Ferris-Oswald relationship, beyond doubt. Thus I would like very much to be able to read the full text of your Russo interview. If you feel you should impose any restrictions, I will respect them. Thanks.

Sincerely,