

5/27/70

Dear Ed,

Beginning with Thanks for the great kindness of sending me the Hue book, which I ruined (who knows it?) in advance of publication and very much look forward to reading. I suspect it will help get Ray a trial, simply because he is so much the creature of an enormous ego and has one of the great journalistic stupidities of all time to justify.

But I must address your pessimism. Those things you say, those questions you ask are valid. All these things hurt. But they are temporary and we will yet bring forth enough truth to accomplish something. I now have much more of it than I can tell you and I fully expect to get much more.

The New Orleans investigation got sidetracked because Garrison was suckered by self-seekers who are also incompetents and who may have been worse. He never did any real New Orleans investigating, which is the only reason I had to spend so much time there, spending money I didn't have and have no chance of getting back, and turning up important things that did not interest him I suppose because he didn't do it or because they didn't put a noose around Helms or Hoover or, as I suspect he'd also have liked, Warren. I gave him enough to jail people who were involved and what can fairly be described as more than a beginning point for other, serious investigations. When people who would not talk to him did talk to me, I was not thereby endeared. Everybody else was busy telling him how great he was—and doing no work and he was busy making speeches in which he genuinely believed but not based on his own work and exaggerated beyond reason, including his best and best-known speech, which comes from the introduction (uncredited) to PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITENASH. How much of this is Wood-Boxley's fault and how much of the bad things he did because Garrison wanted them done I don't believe I'll ever be able to determine and I now have no intention of trying. In 11/68 there was a much greater disaster pulled back from the cliff's edge. It is too incredible to attempt to recount, and I doubt my nerves will ever ~~xxx~~ be restored to what they were before that affair. Chapman was of no influence, and while the crap he used in the Enquirer is just that and while what Garrison used was without warrant, there was an important couple of things Chapman did for me that Garrison just didn't pay any attention to when he saw the potential sensation in the misuse he made of the e sewers bit. I think it has hurt me more than any of the others, but I also think it is but temporary and we will overcome it.

Sprague also is well-intentioned, and the work he did in collecting so many pictures is important. But he invents endless conspiracies, in every one of which he is certain he is right and in none of which is there ever any legitimate basis, confabulating when he is without probative evidence. This stuff also belongs in the sewers. There was no need for radios, there was no evidence of any, including in that picture, those famous tramps, all variously and erroneously identified in a number of ways, were not arrested where he says, if, indeed, they were every technically arrested at all. He simply ignores what is uncongenial to his preconception and sees what is not there to support it in his own mind. There is little one can do about this, except suffer through it. The press has an unerring instinct in publicizing the foolishness so there will be an ample basis for its refutation if anyone takes the trouble to do it. What doesn't get reported is the solid work.

Your letter doesn't make clear whether the Gurvich@Cube thing is in Aulse's book or if you have it from another source. It is fascinating, and if it is from elsewhere, some time I'd like to go over it.

In telling you to keep the faith, baby, I do not think I am being Polyanna. Remember, even if thus far unreported, we did win the first case of suppression in the assassinations, as ultimately you will read in POST MORTEM III, and, on the court record, in doing so, we did end the official fiction as a matter of court evidence. Despite the Shaw decision, there is a good record there. It is woefully less than it could and should have been, the material being that rich, but fairly decent use was made of the material I gave them from POST MORTEM and some of the witnesses, including some I lined up, made a probative record contrary to the Warren report, including some who were also Commission witnesses. The fault here is not Garrison's but the dishonest Press'. I want the second case on more than the record, for this one did not become moot, and I did force Justice to give me suppressed evidence in the Ray case. I expect to do more of this, and in the not distant future.

So, don't give up.

Gotta get to bed. Again, sincerest thanks for your thoughtfulness, for I'd not be able to buy Aulse's self-indictment.

Best,

Edward R. Williams
42-55 Colden St.
Apt. 15H
Flushing, N. Y. 11355

May 25, 1970

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route 8
Frederick, Md. 21701

Dear Harold:

I will send under separate cover a copy of He Slew The Dreamer.

As I previously noted, the investigation was superficial and the conclusions simplistic.

There is an interesting corollary to the story, however.

Huie, while compiling an earlier work, The Hiroshima Pilot, employed the services of Bill Gurvich to explore a bizarre but evidently well financed operation to invade Cuba in 1947.

The "Invasion" was aborted but para involved military adventurers named "Prominent Citizens" of New Orleans as co-conspirators.

Huie (or any other source) does not reveal any names but it's interesting to speculate whether this earlier domestic operation finally culminated in the events of Nov. 22.

In any case, little documentation exists of this fascinating historical episode.

Any real chance of solving the J.F.K. puzzle, probably terminated with the acquittal of Clay L. Shaw.

Garrison made many sensational allegations but what did he produce?

The William S. Walters story of an "F.B.I. Telex", the "interview" with one of the assassins, the "proof" of CIA complicity, the Ruby "Link" etc.- None of this was even alluded to at the trial.

Thus, people made the natural assumption that no new evidence exists.

How, and why in your opinion, did the New Orleans investigation get sidetracked?

Was it the influence of charlatans like Chapman and Wood or were there other factors?

Sincerely,


Edward R. Williams