



Lillian & Harold Weisberg

Coq d'Or Press HYATTSTOWN, MD. 20734

Code 301 / WA 6-2034; TR 4-4246

8/14/67

Dear Joe,

In today's mail was a tape from one of your listeners including what I think it is fair to describe as your attacks on me. I drop my work, for which I do not have enough time, to respond to defend myself and because of the respect I have for you. I suggest that it is really you who have gone overboard on Garrison and Phelan, each in different ways.

When you phoned me in early May, the night before you aired me, what I told you is simply these two things: that I could not trust Phelan's writing in the SEP because of the things he knew that I knew he knew that he left out of that article, especially about Ferris, and I cited his own earlier piece, "The Crime Man Cometh"; and that I went to New Orleans to appear before the grand jury and help in any way I could, not to learn Garrison's case. On the latter point, I also told you I believed his work followed mine, that I had been careful to write and finish my own book before I went there. I add that unlike others, whom seek to exploit everything for sales, I made no advance announcement and refused to discuss with the press what I testified to. You can confirm this from the New Orleans papers and reporters who were actively covering it. Not the ~~st~~ man you used, who told you he hadn't spoken to me and from San de Pine, of WVUE, who taped this for perhaps an hour.

This is not at all what you repeated ^{as} represented what I said ^{and that} ~~was~~ Garrison, I said he was an hard-working man of whose integrity I was convinced. I then believed this as I do now, and I say the same for those of his staff I had anything to do with. We did not at any time discuss his evidence. Nor did I at any time ask him what his evidence was on anything.

During these shows you used a line (and I believe it) that I went to see back: "My attachment is to the truth and to facts". Consistent with this, I offered help to Dymond, one of Shaw's attorneys, and he accepted it. This is not at all because I do not believe Shaw is not Bertrand. When you read my New Orleans book, which I had completed in early April and the retyped me of which was in the mail 10 days before I was before the grand jury, you will see and I think understand what I believe of Shaw and my sources. I also offered to help Jack Ruby's lawyers. I called to Belli's attention the perjury of Patrick Dean. It is on the misuse of Dean's testimony that the Ruby case was reversed. I offered other help to Elmer Gertz.

When you read this book, you will also find out what I think and then think right or wrong, about Russo.

Now you did not read the things Phelan knew that I think, were his intent and assignment to tell the whole truth, what you should have read there. I have had a few relations of my own with the Saturday Evening Post. I salvaged them on a piece they were working on and they not only did not keep their bargain, then did the opposite. This is the first mention I have made of it, and it is not public. I know that on this subject they are not about to say all their writers and editors think. They almost serialized WHITWASH in 1965. You have heard no attack on them from me.

Worse is true of Aynsworth. You are not familiar with his career on this subject. Let me restrict myself to his Newsweek article and his appearance on your show. He did not say the tape in question was doctored. It had been. There has been an investigation. The charges were found groundless. You are a lawyer and you know that whether or not all of us approve of all the things that public authority does, some are normal.

have reason to believe that some of the things Phelan said were not true. I know that some of the things appropriate to Aynesworth's story also are not there, particularly what he knew about Beauboeuf. It is a simple matter to charge bribery. Let me give you an example you alluded to, for NEC made a big deal out of it. Sandra Moffett is said to have been offered a bribe. The truth is that of those very unpleasant things that can be said of Sandra Moffett (and you will not find them in my book or in Garrison's statements), no public mention of any kind was made except by NBC. This is not because they are not known. It is simply because NEC had no intention of sheltering her. They were using her. Instead of serving her immediately. Garrison's people tried to be kind and considerate, and they trusted her. Her answer was that she was broke, without decent clothing or a place to stay hence did not want to go to New Orleans to appear before the grand jury. She was promised decent clothing and quarters, etc., Nothing else. She fled to a jurisdiction from which there is no extradition.

The John the Baptist story was told me at lunch April 28 by three competent newsmen. I asked them why they didn't use it. They said they would if he would swear to it. He refused. This didn't keep NBC from using it. That story was being spread and Cancellor was being provided by the lawyers opposing Garrison. Cancellor has since been before the grand jury on this and before a judge and was sentenced for contempt. He would not answer the simple question, essential in any investigation of Garrison, which is what Garrison himself immediately initiated: Did you tell the truth on NEC? Please send me a tape of it when you clobber NEC for this really irresponsible thing they did. You will ultimately learn of more. In some, they tried to involve me. Fortunately, with permission, I did make a tape. Eventually, I have every reason to believe you will hear it. If you want my letter offering a copy to NEC (for the voice of their men is on it) and their response to my reporting that their men tried to plant bad information and the most awful stuff about Shaw on Garrison, through me, you can have it.

Whether or not Garrison is right, and I think he is and I also think I know more about the fact of the New Orleans aspect of the case, having written 180,000 words on it in a single book, which has an appendix of more than 300 pages, there is and there has been a powerful and quite competent campaign against him. I do not think voluntarily or intentionally, you have been made part of it. As I told you before, despite the odds against him, I am content to rest the judgement in the jury and the evidence. You have really prejudged, and not on the basis of any fact of the case but on the basis of a partisan representation of an interview with a single witness. I think, in this connection, it is presumptuous to believe the entire case rests on Russo. I think also it is not impossible that when Russo suddenly appeared, he provided a means by which an indictment could be secured without revelation of the rest of the case. You are a lawyer and can readily understand the value of secrecy to either side in a criminal proceeding.

These are a few other things I'd like to take up with you. I sent you and Jim Eason, who then worked at KNEW, copies of PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH, tied together. I would like to be certain you have it. Eason's never reached him. You will find in it 150 pages of photographic reproduction of largely once-secret documents. This book does not deal with New Orleans, but I think it is quite shocking in what it does prove. If you have mentioned it, none of your listeners have informed me of it.

I am interested in why (and if you have no objection, for it is none of my business, how) you selected Ducet among the New Orleans reporters to interview, for he is not covering the case and did not know what had been adduced. The two most likely, if you sought the reporters on the case, are Ross Yeckey and Jack Dampsey. There were more suitable than Ducet would have been Rosemary Ames and Hoke May. If I know you, you would have sought the most knowledgeable. This is not what you aired. Hence, it is quite easy to understand why Ducet said of me what, in context, is not nice and is hurtful, "I can't understand" why I was before the grand jury. It was there to give testimony and present evidence. That I did. Although I refused and have ever since refused, as I believe properly, to in any way indicate what I testified to or was asked about (certainly not the way to sell books), the reporters drew their own conclusions. Ducet need only have read his own papers to answer you and not have been perplexed. Again, this makes me wonder at his

selection over those who did have knowledge from active involvement in the case. Some of these men had been conducting their own simultaneous investigation, and it is a thoroughly professional one. By the time you aired Ducat, there need have been no wonder about the use of the names FBI and CIA or of the phrase, mine, "coverup". It was already public in the New Orleans papers (photocopies on request) in ~~many~~ several forms, including an admission by Gordon Novel that, if he were brought to trial, his service to the CIA would be his defense. At least one lawyer for the other side freely told the local press he was being paid by the CIA.

There is this quote from you that does not make sense to me, for you did not get and did not give any of the fact involved on the case: "If this is all they can come up with after all the sound and the fury..." Aside from neither seeking nor ~~reporting~~ reporting what might be the fact to go in evidence, as a lawyer, you know it is not proper for Garrison to publish his evidence in advance of the trial. Yet you aired, for example, another lawyer, Adelson, with the same complaint. You should both have known Garrison cannot put his evidence in the papers. It belongs in court. Nor, may I add, did Phelan's article address the evidence to be adduced. ^{It} addressed what he perhaps believes of Husec and the way in which Garrison's office works.

Despite your disclaimers, Joe, you have, with a large part of your audience, put your reputation behind these men, especially because at the same time you really went after me, personally, hard, and unfairly.

Aynesworth's creek that this "is open season on the CIA and FBI" is propoganda, and you are wide and mature enough to know it. In any event, may I suggest that for all the time he spent there, he ~~might~~, were he the reporter he pretends and you said, ~~did~~ dug up something besides a tape that was handed him by a lawyer. If he doesn't know the CIA is involved, he doesn't read the New Orleans papers. He did not, in fact, conduct an investigation. If you know his record, you know he went down to do a job. Would you have sent me there to do a defense of Wesley Liebeler, or even to seek what might excuse what he did and didn't do on that part of his commission work? Thus, because he used a handout, and the Shaw lawyer plastered New Orleans and the press with it, he gave you and your audience a sad misrepresentation of "the alcoholic" and what he did know and did and did not do. That is not an FBI but a Secret Service report. You will find it, in context, in my book. Only a thorough incompetent or a partisan would fail to understand this report if he knows anything about the case or if he is a competent newsmen. You will see in it that Ferrie immediately took over the conduct of the investigation of Ferrie. In this connection, what you will not find in the unsuppressed files is the fact that Garrison never charged Ferrie was to be a getaway pilot, for it was then known what the government now suppressed, ^{that} at the moment of the assassination, Ferrie was in court with two FBI men (part of the Marcelle thing I told you Phelan should have used). Ferrie did threaten the President. Liebeler has since acknowledged that to his knowledge at least until early 1962 Ferrie was connected with anti-Castro activity. Want the ~~story~~ in his own voice? Yet this is not in Liebeler's interrogations. He never called Ferrie when he was conducting his New Orleans depositions.

I am impressed by Aynesworth's opinion that the "overall Commission conclusions are as good as gold". Get him to mine some of this gold with me, in front of your mike. Lets see who has "gold", who fools gold, who knows the fact and who fabricates.

This reminds me that at no point in these continuing assaults on me did you question a single fact I gave you. You did not like some of my opinions not related to the fact of the case and about Phelan, who impressed you.

I write you at this length because of appreciation of what you have done and a personal respect. I also tell you I think you were very unfair to me, ~~misrepresented~~ misrepresented what I had told you, and misinformed your listeners. I do not assail you with the Andrews conviction. Before I was on your show, I had some of the evidence in that case and gave it to Garrison.

Sincerely,
