

3/12/76

Dear Robert,

Thanks for the fat package that came yesterday. I didn't get to go over it until last night, when I separate it by subject to read when I can before filing.

I'm getting along okay, working more than most people still. I can do less physically, but I still travel and speak. (Was to have spoken at Hunter this coming Wednesday but that has been postponed until April 21.) I've had to learn to sleep longer and eliminate some of the work I'd undertaken. Suits coming along okay, some better. Oral arguments in spectro appeal not yet scheduled.

I'm glad when any of your generation are perceptive enough to spot the kind of thing Lane does better than anyone else, meaning worse because it rips minds off. Wow! I had no idea they ripped the pockets as hard! I'm also happy when the nuts like the former Weberman friend expose themselves. These people have done much harm. Motive becomes immaterial. But I think I've said this before. Now, in Congress, you can see the end product: more failure, more fatality and reinforcement of the executive lust for increasing authoritarianism.

Playboy is uptight about me. Last year, before they decided on the sick sycophancy of the assassination series- No, year before last, I think -they hired me as their consultant on that series. Then they never consulted me, despite my repeated suggestions, until the cruddy stuff was written, with the first two in type! They went through a terrible crisis on the first two on JFK and are headed in the same way on King. I've torn all of it up. They would have been worse. The King piece is miserable. I've seen the first 27 pages only and analyzed and criticized them. The last hunk is overdue. If it comes today I'll have a helluva day. They are so embarrassed they haven't sent me a copy of any of it...I saw Schweiker the day I learned I have or had phlebitis. I was in agony but I took the entire morning. I left encouraged that he'd be responsible only the next week he was in Penna. with the same crazy stuff. He has stayed out of touch. I've written him only infrequently, with unheeded cautions. I expect him to blame the assassination on 'astro, with no basis at all except fakes I exposed in 1968 and 1969...Belán had one dose of me, at Vanderbilt the Wednesday night before he asked for a new inquiry. That night he'd read only part of Post Mortem. I laid out a case of his own suborning of perjury, hard and to his face, not as the others have written, with the relatively minor aspects but the most basic evidence in his area. The combination did it to him... I agreed on principle the let those anthologists-really commercializers - use excerpts from my work without checking it. When I did I was shocked and asked Random House not to use any. Although I later found out their schedule did permit it they said it was too late. These characters have imposed a commercial doctrine on the selections. Scot is in some areas brilliant, in this subject a nut and confabulator. I've had enough contact. He has started some of the sickest stuff, like giving a meaning to Nixon's being in Dallas the day before...Crap on Lane's line that Batchelder had a connection. He was then assistant chief....

Hope this answers your questions. I'm most of the way through the draft of a new book about which I'm saying nothing until it is ready. This, the daily mail and orders and the court cases make a full day every day. But Jim is great on the legal approach and I think it time it will have significance. It has pressured much and is at least partly responsible for the increasing declassifications.

Best to you both,

Dear Mr. Weisberg, (Early February 1976)

Enclosed are clippings from the last few months. For the most part, the clippings deal with The King Assassination, which has been more in the news lately. I assume you saw TIME magazine (Jan. 26) which had an article which in essence said Ray was the lone assassin. I had it but somehow misplaced it and will try to get you a copy. If you have it let me know. I feel bad about losing it, but if you have it I won't have to worry (although I'll try to get a copy anyway). I also passed up an article in an obscure scandal sheet claiming JFK was killed by a jealous husband. There was also an article by Shana Alexandra in Good Housekeeping or Ladies Home Journal on why the JFK assassination should be looked into again but there was nothing of substance just the usual "since Watergate and revelations about the CIA perhaps we should reopen..." etcetera, etcetera.

What I do have in here is the OUI article on the different critics of the Warren Report, which portrays you in a flattering light for the most part. It was entertaining and I enjoyed the story about Mark Lane threatening to punch you. Also included, are several things from The Village Voice: One ~~on~~ on the CBS assassination special on JFK, another a review of Robert Sam Anson's book, concluding Oswald was guilty and another on the progress of Schweiker's committee. Is Schweiker's committee still at work? I also have a review from The New York Times' Book Review section of Anson's book and Hugh McDonald's book. There is more on McDonald in a couple of other articles from scandal sheets. Also enclosed are a few interesting editorials from The New York Times. On the Crowdaddy article you'll note (Jan. 1976) they lifted the blow up of the Altgens photo labeled "Lovely or Oswald" right out of whitewash II.

On the King assassination, I have a couple of articles by Dick Russell of The Voice enclosed, as well as a good number from The New York Times and other sources. I was in Cincinnati about a week before the arguments for the new trial were heard in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. Had I been there I would have gone down to the courthouse but I had to be back here for my new semester of school.

A New Times article by Anson on JFK and the Mafia is included and I found it and its conclusions to be absurd. I also have an ESQUIRE article by Nora Ephron on Hugh Aynesworth and Bob Dudley of the Dallas Times Herald - they still believe Oswald to be the lone gunman. I should mention Argosy had a recent article by Allard Lowenstein on why the JFK and RFK murders should be reinvestigated. The article was a rehash and not worth the dollar that the magazine was priced at, so I didn't buy it. If I thought it had anything you might want, I would have bought it.

One of the articles I think you'll really enjoy is the review of Anson's book by David Belin from NATIONAL REVIEW. One interesting point is that he
(over)

criticizes every critic of the Warren Report but you. You'll also note he refers to the back wound as a back wound not a neck wound. And as usual he criticizes the critics by using the Warren Report as the gospel truth. Doesn't he realize its that Report that's in dispute. It's like defining a word and using the word in the definition. He tries to shoot down the critic's arguement by citing the Warren Report, which is what is being criticized.

There's also a number of other things. Recently PLAYBOY has been doing a series on American assassinations. Coming next month (April 1976) is the first of a two part article on the JFK Assassination. I will send that in my next package.

I haven't finished POST MORTEM yet but I must say you've outdone yourself and you've certainly offered many new revelatations. I want to read it whenever I have the spare time but I have to keep up with school work.

- March 10, 1976 -

Since I began this letter, a month has passed. In that time, I got a hold of the Time Magazine (Jan. 26) on the King murder. I have also enclosed a new article by Anson in New Times on the Schweiker committee. I have also noticed ACCESSORIES AFTER THE FACTS is back in print with a forward by Schweiker. Peter Dale Scott has edited a book out now (the chapters include only reprints from other books and articles and since the chapter on the Milker tape from FRAME-UP is included, you must be aware of it). The Scott book also has an article by Jim Lesar. What do you think of Peter Dale Scott?

The April PLAYBOY is not on the stands here. If it should come out before I mail off the package, I'll xerox it and include it. If not, I'll save it for a future package.

One last subject. I went to see Mark Lane when he was at NYU. His speech is the same as it was a year ago, with a few new things (like the Oswald letter to Hosty) to bring it up to date. I was with a friend and I often finished Lane's jokes before he got to the punchline causing my friend to laugh and annoying other around me. Lane often is sloppy on details and isn't a stickler for accuracy. He can manipulate an audience. He said that ~~the bullet~~ the bullet from JFK's back wound fell out during the heart massage, but doesn't tell where it went. He then talks about the bullet found on the stretcher (399) and says it is a plant. He says the man who changed the

motorcade route and the man who let Ruby into the courthouse to kill Oswald was one Charles Bachelor who later took over Jesse Curry's position. Do you know of Bachelor? I didn't have a pen to take notes but he made many other accusations. He still claims the bullet that hit Kennedy's neck nicked the tie, so he hasn't read POST MORTEM yet. He tells of Oswald's statement of "I am a patsy" in this manner: A reporter informed Oswald that he was charged with the President's murder, after Oswald told reporters he was only aware he was under investigation for a police officers killing. Oswald then replied "Well then, I am a patsy (emphasis on am)". He embellishes and exaggerates to put things in his favor. There is enough evidence to point to conspiracy without him having to load the issue. The real excitement was during the question and answer period when a "Yippee" named Dauberman or something like this started plugging Coup D'ÉTAT IN AMERICA. Lane handled him well, but some of the audience wanted to hear the guy. He claimed that none of the critics discuss the Dallas-Watergate connection. He also said those pictures are Hunt and Sturgis but they've been retouched (the tramp photos). He says he worked with Richard Sprague on this. It ended with him claiming Lane an agent for the government. At this point Dauberman lost his credibility with most of the audience but he wouldn't shut up. Afterwards at a reception he claimed Lane was a Bulgarian agent named Boris and that Lane's past could not be traced past 1959. Lane filled in his past for the guy and then ignored him. Later, I cornered Dauberman and he was saying Weberman has turned into an agent but the book was written before that. I asked him if he had read your books. He said no, but you worked for the O.S.S. so you were a double agent. He then said you and Lane and others purposely ruined Garrison's investigation and he suggested I read Heritage of Stone. I told him I read it and if he will notice there are references to WHITEWASH, RUSH TO JUDGEMENT and many of the other assassination books. He said, "Well Garrison only printed the true stuff they said." Everyone who wasn't a "Yippee" was an agent. I was arguing with the guy and getting the best of him. A crowd had assembled by this time. Whenever I scored a point he would start ranting and raving. At one point he accused you of trying to make money from the assassination. I blasted him on that explaining that you went into debt to publish and you could only print a limited amount of books. He said you did this purposely because limited books are worth more in the future (for example ~~some~~ some people are willing to pay \$100.00 for Josiah Thompson's book). I refused to argue any more after that.

(over)

One final note, Zenger publishers in Washington D.C. have reprinted all 26 volumes of the Warren Report (\$465.00).

I hope you are feeling better these days and I hope you find these articles of some help. I was wondering, how is Post Mortem selling and have you found any ways to promote it?

If you have time to write back, I'd like to know what kind of progress you are making in various court proceedings. Thanks.

Best of luck.

Sincerely
Robert Bruce
