

John Christian

CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM

To: O'Gara, McGuire and Nestel
Attorneys at Law
536 Mills Building
220 Montgomery Street
San Francisco, California

Re: ALFIE ENI, LIMITED
and HAROLD WEISBERG

Date: September 5, 1967

From: John G. Christian
Postal Drawer 2850
San Francisco, California

Gentlemen:

Under the guidance of your firm, I have just completed the formation of a Limited Partnership, ALFIE ENI, LIMITED, which has been conceived for the purposes already outlined in previous discussions and detailed in a special Prospectus, also in your possession.

Inherent in this project are matters purely legal, matters which will require the kind of Counsel I believe available only through firms of your stature. I propose that you undertake the representation of this unusual matter.

Prospective client Weisberg has two immediate and projected situations that must be legally resolved, without litigation if possible. First, he has Publisher and Distributor commitments that are being evaded or avoided by firms under written contract to him; this situation has his financial affairs under severe duress. I have requested Weisberg send me particulars for both our review.

It is particularly important that an effective accounting procedure be devised and implemented on Weisberg's behalf; ALFIE ENI, LIMITED is about to expand Weisberg's distribution/sales on a far broader scale than to date; this expansion will require a considerable cashflow to amortize its implementation and promotion, which will be borne by gross profits.

Weisberg informs me that the publishing business is notorious for its tardiness in paying royalties to authors; it appears, however, that the case at hand is much more than mere tardiness; perhaps a little notice of pending swift legal action might correct some casual bookkeeping.

Let me background the second area of possible litigation: Weisberg's first work - WHITEWASH; The Report on the Warren Report - is the first (and resultantly the only original) published works on the subject from this source. Generally speaking, his contention is that the Warren Commission's own best (ignored, obfuscated) evidence refutes its ultimate

conclusions; this is substantiated by the only comprehensive examination/collation of raw evidence made by anyone, which was thus translated into (copyrighted) theories in all of his (four) published works to date.

In other words, the National Archives, from which Weisberg obtained the raw data for his works, contains no "theories" per se; this, of course, does not include the Warren Commission's "fantasies", or as Jim Garrison calls them - "Fairy Tales".

Subsequent to his (private) publishing of these original works, there have been several writers, publishers, broadcasters, etc. that have heisted (and profited from) this assumed-to-be proprietary material; in several cases it has not merely been the unauthorized use of his theories - the theft has been almost verbatim.

In several other cases, Weisberg has been maligned, libeled, and openly slandered in both the press and broadcasting media; he has requested "equal time" (and space) under appropriate provisions of legal and ethical procedures normally available to offended or challenged parties; he has been ignored or semantically avoided by every source to date.

I have already seen examples of the above transgressions, some of which I have in my files; I have asked that Weisberg prepare a broad profile of these alleged violations of his rights, with exhibits, for presentation to Counsel.

While Weisberg appears to have substantive cases against the likes of Associated Press, Columbia Broadcasting, and other equally imposing "institutions", it is my immediate opinion that the real culprits are akin to those we encountered in the California BankCard Association: a group of ambitious, arbitrary, and arrogant non-hierarchy jerks within these organizations, AAA all the way.

Once we examine the clinical details of these matters, it should be possible to follow the same strategy devised with our friendly banks: Behind-the-scenes confrontation and demand for settlement.

Let me reiterate Weisberg's (and my) feelings about suits involving plagiarism and libel, etc. While preparation can be implemented at this juncture, no suits would be filed until after some public forum - such as Jim Garrison's trials in New Orleans - achieves a re-opening of the investigation via Congress or some similar agency. Otherwise, the "cause" would tend to suffer, albeit there is no concerted efforts by the critics as a whole. It's been tough enough without a public bloodletting, so it would be foolish to confuse issues now. This does not, however, mean that Weisberg's interests will depend wholly on this aforementioned factor.

Finally, I propose a discussion between ALFIE ENI, LIMITED and Counsel to discuss the terms, conditions and areas of remuneration for such an undertaking, to take place within the week.