

3/5/69

Dear Dick,

Many thanks for your kind note of 3/1 and the corrections to PM III. Lil will pick them up on the master set.

There is a very strange twist in the Shaw case. Garrison has shot from the hip again, charging him incompletely. He had in the files certain material ~~ix~~ had given him in advance of the trial, one an interview with a friend of both Garrison and Shaw and the other some of the unpublished FBI reports each proving a separate additional perjury. I wish I could understand why Shaw was not confronted with this evidence on the stand. I am also satisfied he perjured himself on the VIP register. He lied about it, very smoothly, and then slipped out as easily when he was caught, because lawyers must lay a foundation for their questions.

the accuracy of

No other verdict was acceptable. But how I regret/what I have been saying since about July or August, such as we needed a judicial determination of fact, we would wish to still not getting one. That is what I hoped. The corruption of the other side was enormous. I not have proof that still another key witness was corrupted. They reached a man for whom I have a certain amount of responsibility, having urged him to accept his offer to work inside the office. He gave the entire case to the junior of Shaw's staff of lawyers. I had been warning them about him for more than a year. He has also done this in other areas of which I have knowledge.

I told Garrison, Alcock, Oser, Scisambra and Alford each that they had no chance of winning without provision for a false Oswald, which meant using the indictment charge of "others unknown" for it. It is no fun being right. One of the things no one stopped to think about is what this lack made the jury think of Garrison. On the one hand he charges Oswald as a conspirator and on the other he proclaims Oswald's innocence.

There is no basis for your optimism about PM III. I cannot begin to think of printing it. I owe too much. There will be no other edition I fear for some time. If you would like to copy it and can, please do. Otherwise, after you have made the effort you have in mind, I do need it. I have a request from Germany, from someone who thinks he can arrange or at least is willing to try and arrange publication there, others needs for the few other copies.

If you have a manuscript copy of Coup, there is no hurry on that at all, and this is my recollection. It is not quite complete, but it does have most. The quotes, in some cases, are missing.

Please excuse haste.

Best regards,

1 March 1969

Dear Harold:

Here are the final corrections on Post Mortem III.

It is a great study. I doubt whether it will bring you any good financial return. I regret that, but it is hardly a consideration in so far as history is concerned. This book should be a part of the public record, and I am sure that no one else would or could have done it. For ~~the~~ what little way in which I can represent her, in the name of mother Truth I bow to you most humbly and most sincerely.

The verdict is in on Shaw; I am pleased with it, for I think it was a fair verdict, regardless what is the truth regarding the type and degree of Shaw's involvement. Perhaps my reasons ~~are~~ are different from those of the jury (I have not yet heard their comments), but I would have voted with them. Garrison's case was faulted from the beginning, with his tacit assertion that Oswald committed an overt act in furtherance of a conspiracy (why can't they leave that poor man alone?), but as I review his presentation of the case, I see that the efforts to ~~xxxxxx~~ prove a second gunman were nothing but razzle-dazzle, and I am glad that the jury was not blinded by it. One accomplice, Oswald, is all that Garrison had to prove. Whether he satisfies the jury that two, ten, twenty people were firing upon the President, it means nothing to the case unless Oswald, Oswald, OSWALD was part of it. Not Garrison, not anybody can prove that-- not in a fair fight, anyway.

I rejoice in the jury's wisdom. But it's a gloomy kind of joy. Yet not so gloomy as the despair that I would have felt if the jury had convicted, for they would thereby have convicted not merely Shaw, but the legal forms that make it possible (sometimes barely possible) for us to have justice.

Let me know what to do with my copy of Post Mortem III. I'll send it back to you, if you want it, but I wonder whether it will be worth it, since the bound copy will be coming out soon. When it is printed, please send me two copies; I'll send the cost after I receive them, unless you want it before. I am strapped for cash right now, and can't send money until the beginning of next month.

I would like to hold on to my copy of Coup for a while, for I would like to try to interest someone in financing it. I expect little success, for I do not have good contacts, but I will try.

Still,

Juk

Bernabei