Dear Ed.

Got the mail early this a.m. before leaving for DC, was there until late, and will not read your letter. Of 4/2/

You have the idea better than the title, which if TIGER TO RIDE. Maybe TIGER BY THE TAIL would be better, Have to thing about it when I get back to that. Largely, your presumption is correct. How ever, with the problem of a \$10.00, I'm going to have to think of abbreviating all that follow. *t reduces the markey much to much.

My own retitling of Eisenhower, as of several years ago, is CIA-Military-Industrial complex.

I did enjoy our meetings much and, as always, wish there had been time for mere.

In the Garrison letter I have gotten to Garrison's having dug in "sterlie soil". There is no appriopriate comment I can make, considering that he was in no soil that hadn't been well tilled and spent mosy of his time with the organic fertilizer. As it comes out of the bull, there is a more popular and no less expressive term. What he didn't say he couldn't say and didn't -ever- have. And what he used in the trial that was of any consequence was never his. Need I comment on the irrelevance before the jury of what had appeared in the press, whether or not true? That he did not comment on "the case", as he terms it, "ahead of trial", is not precise. He did not, after the very beginning, comment on Shaw, which is not the same thing, especially with what he presented as his "case"....He is correct on the penetration of his office. It succeeded only because he ignored what I told him. I knew a year and a half before the trial and made my own arragments with the one man in his office I felt I could trust. Eben then 'im got some of what " dug up and gave it at to others, his particular ethic ... That bit about arresting him at an aitport is unfamiliar, and I never heard of it in any way, I'm sure. ... The contempt for the jury is not new. It was omnipresent. But note that he here is not talking about Shaw, but of Dallas. And what did he bring from there anyway?

He may be right where he talks of "reasons" for the conspiracy, but the fact is that even if he established what he alleged against Shaw (and he didn't), that was a different kind of conspiracy, and he never really charged Shaw with being part of the successful one. The one overt act, required by law, that I recall, has to do with the righe at Ferrie's, which lacks credibility. Even if Shaw knew Oswald, that is not conspiracy (and I believe Shaw did oerjure himself)....His comment on the intellectuals and the Senators, while irrelevant, is accurate.

He never gave any thought to "caution"? He died when " used the phone or the mails! And was never without bodyguard. he postponed an overdue surgery until he could find an empty clinic, and then had his own men on guard around the clock! He thought I was crazy not to be afraid. Snd said so.

"Excuse to evade prosecution"? He dropped the charges against Martens and hasn't moved against Thornley, Bethell or Gurvich. And so far as not backing up one inch is concerned, he has been turned off since the Shaw trial...That concluding line is the best commentary on Joesten-who doesn't even have the 26! I have doubt that the "government accomplished" the unavailability of the book...Strange way of "validating" work the only significant part of which is incomplete, inaccurate and unoriginal!...I'll be interested in what he says of the "Panel Review", kowing nobody else who has written of it.

It's a treat, Ed. Thanks. No time for more.

Sincerely,

Mr. Harold Weisberg Route 8 Frederick, Md. 21701

Dear Harold:

Enjoyed our talks very much.

The difficulty of presenting the issues is now one of communication. The Indo-China War, the Assassinations, the rise of an economic oligarchy, the spread of a military - industrial - educational complex, the media "sanitizing", and other factors are parts on an indivisible chain.

Unless, this material is grasped as casual and symtomatic, events appear as isolated acts.

No doubt Tiger By The Tail addresses this problem.

Best Wishes

Edward R. Williams 42-55 Colden St.

Apt. 15H

Flushing, N. Y. 11355