

*Parts under Malcolms
Refer to
short*

John, Scherer

1/29/69

Dear Dick,

Your valuable letter dated 1/15/69, postmarked until 1/13, arrived as I was in the midst of the new business on the autopsy, about which I have no time for explanations now save to say it is the most serious mistake the govt has made and I am busy trying to exploit it. I already have a 30,000-word memo on it, a little more disjointed than it should be because I was in New Orleans part of the time since then.

On that subject, let me tell you the so-called fatal wound, with indications it was two, at least one by a bullet of larger calibre (conjecture) was not in the back of the head at all but close to the top. Also, there are bullet fragments in the thorax wound, despite Humes contrary testimony. These two things are enough, are they not? Some "support" for the autopsy and the "R!"

I'd like to ask a favor of you. You are sending me worthwhile material and I am trying to establish a useable filing system. When you go into so many things as well as in this letter, can you keep each on a separate page or pages? If you can, would you please put your name and date on each, so that when I file I'll know the source? Then, also, I can send copies of what might interest others to them.

I do not know what, if anything, you have sent to N.O. on Frazier and the rifle. Their comprehension is limited, as is their mobility. Rules of law are restrictive. However, I think it is possible Frazier might not be a reluctant witness. Therefore, if you could send a complete memo on this to Andrew Sciembra with a short note attached, or perhaps better, to Jim Alcock, saying you do it at my request, he might find it helpful. Please send me copy in case they ask questions of me. Frazier was not unwilling to go there voluntarily. He was forced to make pro forma objection by employer. I cannot and will not be there. This new stuff is much more important than anything that can happen there and I do not have the means of supporting myself there. I did what I could to get them going and came home. I did a fair amount before going down this time. I am in touch with them by phone and can and have helped them in other ways. They are astounded at the cooperation they are getting in Dallas!

Lomax is a professional Negro. Interesting and valuable as is what you sent on Malcolm X (I do not have time to read the book now but, if you ever see an extra copy, I'd like it) (and another friend, Russ Trunzo, 2721 E. 75th Place, Chicago, has a great interest in and has written about this assassination). Lomax is or at least was a very strong Commission Liebelier supporter. I felt at the time that he was being fed his Galt stuff (and could be wrong).

Lamarre stuff interesting and helpful.

Please excuse haste. Must return to reading what I've got on paper on the new autopsy stuff. If there is an immediate market I'd like to have it used. Otherwise, it will be added as a separate part of POST MORTEM, which I'll have in a very limited edition very soon.

Any thanks,

Harold Weisberg

11 June 67
Dept of Classics
Queen's Univ.
Kingston, Ont.

Dear Harold:

Recently I called Montreal again to enquire about the books which have not yet been sent to me. Mr Sutto was not in, but the secretary connected me with a young woman named Miss Russo who seemed to know what was going on at Tara. The name of the law firm is as follows:

Lette, Marcotte, and Siron
Room 700
60 St. James St. West
Montreal, Que.
phone 844-1066

Miss Russo speaks excellent English, but with a french accent. When I asked about the books, she said that they had been held up "at the boat", some sort of trouble getting the books out of bond. The distribution is being handled by the mailers at Tara. Miss Russo said that they are now in the process of being mailed, but that perhaps my name has not yet been reached on the mailing list. She indicated that there were many orders to be filled; I gathered that most-- if not all-- of them were made ~~with~~ through the Ramparts ad. Distribution has already begun in Montreal, ~~etc.~~

If your suspicions are correct, then the timing of the distribution will tie in with the Shaw trial-- too neat if, indeed, the book is such that it may warrant a mistrial.

The French version, L'Amérique Brule, is being distributed by another firm than Tara. Miss Russo did not give me their name; ~~Tara~~ Tara is accepting the orders for the French version, and passing them on to the other firm.

I have been able to find nothing on Tara. It is not in the Montreal phone book, and the phone company has no listing for them. I learned of a Montreal business directory that I can check, but I have not yet been able to see a copy. It is possible, of course, that Tara was set up just for this operation. If that is so, I wonder whether there are any games behind the name "Tara", as with "James Hepburn". My only encounter with that name is in its occurrence in ~~the~~ Gone With the Wind; Tara is the name of Scarlet O'Hara's family estate.

Ms Russo said that Lamarre has been zipping back and forth between N. America and Europe. Presently he is in France.

An article about Farewell America appeared in the Toronto Globe and Mail during the ~~later~~ later part of December (it was given to be by someone who did not note the date). It indicates that Lamarre's first name is Rene, not Herve, as you said. There is a copy of that included ~~in~~ with this letter.

I advised Gary Murr concerning your suspicions about F.A., but I have not yet mentioned them to Sprague, nor will I volunteer to say anything too him yet. Considering that I may get to see Lamarre, I think that I should play it quiet. As far as he knows, my information about F.A. came only from "someone who was in touch with Garrison's office", which was true when I spoke with him. I did not mention my association with you, but if he knows that I am in touch with you I can say that you did mention the book, but were non-committal about it. If the book is phony, and he believes that I have swallowed his line about it, it will be that much easier to tap him for information.

In this connection, however, do not wish to know about my association in the past, and my correspondence, or that happening, so that say that you merely mentioned the book disparagingly, and that I attributed some attitude to professional jealousy. He ought not to know that I know your true feelings about the book, so if

I am beginning to understand the cause of my sometimes excessive credulity, and I think that I shall be able to control it better in the future. As you know, I got started in this game much later than all the others with whom I am in touch. Although I have read almost all of the relevant material that pertains to the assassination, I tend to think that others know a great deal more than I do. I am coming to realize that in many case my own guess about what is going on is about as good as theirs-- provided I am possessed of the same information. Mostly now I am wary of Garrison and of those who fall strongly under his influence. It took me a while to realize that most of his public pronouncements depend on material developed by others, and that often he is not competent to ~~re~~present the material properly. I really have not settled on a view of Garrison yet, for my opinion keeps changing one way and the other, so perhaps I had better not discuss that now. In any case, be assured that in the future I shall be on guard.

I would have sought corroboration from you about several things, but I knew that you were busy, and I did not wish to bother you. But I shall have many questions when I see you.

I shall certainly make an effort to see you when I go to Trenton. Queen's has a week off from classes beginning February 17; if nothing serious interferes, I shall come down then. Assuming that you will be around at that time (which I understand may not be the case, especially if the trial is still going on) I shall call you from Trenton during the weekend and set a definite date. As mid-February approaches, I'll let you know exactly what my plans are. *I shall probably also be coming down in the Spring*

I have not yet heard from Bretón in Ottawa, and I am about ready to write and ask his sentiments-- or at least learn whether he too is waiting for an answer to pass on to me. He sent back the books that I sent to him, but sent no letter. I doubt whether he will put his ideas on paper, so I may have to make another trip to Ottawa. I do not wish to press him too hard, but I don't want him to forget me either.

If I can get hold of a copy of the book before I send this letter, I am enclosing Louis Lomax's most recent book, To Kill a Black Man. Read especially pp.249-253 of the last chapter. At the beginning of the chapter I have noted the pages of the book that relate to some of the material in that chapter. The book is a brilliant review of the character and careers of Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, but the last chapter deals specifically with the murders. I know Lomax only by reputation, ~~xxxx~~ by a couple of his books, and by his articles on the activities of "Galt" in N.O. and L.A. Lacking indications to the contrary, I am convinced that Lomax knows a great deal more than he tells here, but even the material in the last chapter is fascinating. I think that his reasons for tying the CIA to Malcolm's death are sound: he thinks that M was involved in some sort of intrigue with Ben Bella and Nkruma and that the CIA had him done in. I don't know how much he is guessing or how much he knows, but even the evidence that he puts in his book ~~are~~ convincing. Of the King killing he says: "The evidence will show that Ray had contacts with certain persons in Los Angeles and that these same persons were investigated in connection with the assassination of President Kennedy". On that score I suspect

* I could not find a copy anywhere in town. Enclosed is a copy of the first half of the last chapter and summaries of other parts of the book that bear on material in the last chapter.

that Lomax knows what he is talking about, for he did personally investigate in this area.

I had toyed with the idea of writing to Lomax and urging him to contact someone familiar with the JFK case and the MLK case-- you or Sprague--, but I have no measure of repute and he has no warrant to follow my advice, so I desisted. Perhaps it would be worth it for you to try. Undoubtedly Lomax has the names of some of those he suspects of involvement, and perhaps that will tie in with stuff that you know.

If I thought that I could do so effectively, I would leap for Lomax and seek to learn what he knows.

The Sat. Evening Post has not replied to my two letters regarding the source of the photo from the Dal-Tex.

At the same time that I wrote to the SEP I wrote to that fellow Eisner who bothered me for a bit last March. Eisner works for Curtis publishing, and I thought he might get the info that I wanted, if the SEP ignored me. I shall have to write to him again, for I can't assess the value of the information he gives. I did not explain the significance of the picture, and Eisner did not notice it for himself-- fortunately, for I would like to keep him in the dark about it. Eisner says that Ben H. Bagdikian, the author, had his own photographer snap the photo, but he doesn't explain where he got his information. I'll try to locate Bagdikian and his photographer, and get information from them, if I can.

Meanwhile, I have asked Gary to see if the picture credits are mentioned elsewhere in the magazine (I have a microfilm only of that article; Gary has the whole issue, I think).

I may try to see Eisner personally. I have not stopped believing that he is a faker who tried to fool me into believing things that were not so. If, as I believe, his soul is not his own, maybe I can tap him and learn what is in the wind from the other side-- if he is on the other side. The man is unusually dumb, and somewhat vain, and I am sure that I can dance around him.

He has not tried to contact me since last March when, for a couple of weeks, he was on me like a plague.