2/14/70

Dear Mr. Williams,

Thanks for your letter saying you are sending the Goldberg article. I look forward to it.

I found "Special Investigation Senator" especially interesting because it is so completely a whitewash. But, it has clear purposes, goes into no subject not already covered in the press, omits most names, and winds up with an advance apology in case it is proven wrong. It does provide a few good leads that, apparently, were ignored by the police.

I've read Bosch's preface only. It is remarkably close to my own writing a little earlier than his, unpublished for that book has been laid aside. I call it TIGER TO RIDE.

I'll answer your questions about the Shaw trial as best I can with brevity. The "probe", as most people down there and you call it, was anything but that. Very little real investigating was done because Garrison was convinced, at least partly through the persuasion of others, that the government would never let him take the case to court. However, he did have in his files and did not use, I cannot tell you why, evidence that could have convicted Shaw of perjury while he was on the stand. He does not have this included in the perjury charge and again I cannot tell you why. I happen to know this evidence because I gave it to him before the trial, for different reasons. So, what happened in New Orleans is that the officials did very little real investigation there (I did a fair amount when I could, but my interest was never Shaw) and, when the Supreme Court found in Garrison's favor, he set the trial for too-close a date and then had to proceed with lawyers unfamiliar with the case and too soon to look any further.

I do not know when the various perjury and theft cases will be heard. If any has been set for trial, I haven't heard of it. I do not have copies of and have not read the charges, but in at least three cases I believe Garrison is right.

Again my thanks for the worthwhole things you send.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

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

Dear Mr Weisberg,

Today I sent you under separate cover a copy of The Goldberg Pamphlet.

It explicitly states that an internal coup d'etat was feared.

The Goldberg is the Goldberg of The Warren Commission.

Publisher interest appears poor.

Again, Read The

Shaw Trial revealed anything of substance the entire situation would be different.

Was the evidence presented in court the only evidence that the probe uncovered?

I myself, although fairly au courant, fail to understand what did occur in New Orleans.

Sincerely,

Edward R. Williams