

10/29/69

Mr. Milton E. Brener, Atty at Law
National Bank of Commerce Bldg.,
New Orleans, La.

Dear Mr. Brener,

Possibly no one better realizes one of the problems of the writer who depends upon others for his information than the lawyer, unless it is another writer. Particularly if the writer in the first instance is a very busy lawyer can this be understood.

My purpose in writing you is, again, so that if and when your book appears you can eliminate the inaccuracies in the serialization. That of "Monday the 27th" has just reached me.

Two questions interest me. On frangible bullets, if you make further inquiry you may find that compressed graphite may be the least common. Some are made of hard plastic and the most common are those made for hunting. In the latter case, there is a special combination of design and metal that accomplishes the purposes.

You say of the finding of something on the south side of Elm Street, in Wesley Plaza, within 10 minutes of the assassination, "In December Garrison had discovered new facts..." It was not December but November when he released these pictures (plural - a series), and I was there. You say "The object is not shown in the picture", but your information cannot be complete, for whatever the object is, and it bears a remarkable resemblance to a .45 slug, it is very clearly shown in a picture in which the hand of a man believed to be a Federal agent is just about to pick it up. This is shown in the next picture in the series.

"The source of this 'knowledge'", you say, "was a letter from a resident of Van Nuys, California." False. The source is a Dallas man, who informed me of it in August 1967, when he also took dated pictures for me.

One of the papers not deemed necessary for reference in its definitive Report or inclusion in the rather large 26 volumes of appended materials, where such items as Jack Ruby's hard-faced and soft-bodied strippers were vital, is the instruction to the Commission lawyer who (if you'll excuse the expression) was sent to "investigate". His name is Wesley Liebeler. He was told to question (the late) Deputy Sheriff Eddie Raymond "Buddy" Walther. (A year ago Mr. Walther's was so unwise as to enter a motel-room in which an escaped murderer was naked, in bed, with a woman. It would appear to be immaterial that this woman was not his wife. The murder was committed with Mr. Walther's own weapon.) The words of the instruction of July 22, 1964, are "He should be questioned as to exactly what he saw the day of the assassination with reference to the bullet he claims splattered... One time Walther was quoted as having found a bullet..." In the context of your obvious disagreement with Garrison, expressed thus: "The objective was to keep the people of the country thinking they were still living in the best of possible worlds..."; and (the Warren Report) "was, in effect, a careful concealment

of the facts", let us consider the foregoing and your writing in a manner one ordinarily might have expected a lawyer to employ.

I begin with the frank acknowledgement I do not know what the object in question is. To the Warren Commission and the federal investigative agencies, especially to the Commission lawyer told to look into it, I freely extend full credit for my lack of knowledge.

You say, "One of the Dallas officials appearing in the photograph (sic) stated publicly that the object being picked up was a fragment of skull". As between a .45 slug and a piece of human head, I agree with your anonymous source, probably the late Deputy Walthers.

How can you account for the total lack of testimony on this point in the record? For the total lack of reference in the Report? For the careful avoidance in the testimony about the autopsy and the evidence upon which it allegedly was based? More, given the entire official story, how in the world can you support any part of the official accounting and have this a) entirely unexplained officially; and b) a piece of the President's head found so far to the front and wide to the left when his head was entirely undamaged on the left or in the front?

It is not that the government was not in possession of these pictures, did not have the knowledge. One of the series was used as an exhibit, to lead in an entirely different direction and for entirely different purposes. And we have seen the lawyer-investigator was directed, if very, very late- nine months to the day after the murder- to look into this most basic of evidence on the crime.

How is it unfair to describe this as "a careful concealment of the facts"?

If you were to ask the paper to print this and my previous letter as a gesture toward correcting an erroneous record, I would have no objection. When the subject is the assassination of an American President and its official investigation - need I add by the government that came into power by that assassination alone?- I would hope you would desire this.

When you, busy as you are with a large practice, undertake to defend the Warren Report, I feel genuinely sorry for you, Mr. Brenner. Compared to you, King Canute undertook a lead-pipe cinch.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg