

Hil
Jmm

5/21/67

Mr. Joe Dolan
KNEW, Oakland, Calif.

Dear Joe,

The representation of what I told you the night before my phoned broadcast on the series you did on the Garrison investigation is as unlike what I told you as your subsequent comment was unlike the Joe Dolan I have known and respected. If you were dismayed at what I told you, no less am I, for I did not just "pook pooh". Not a single one of the things I told you did you give your audience. I think the net result is both unkind and unfair.

I told you I did not go to New Orleans to check up on Phelan and that I did not undertake an investigation of him. I did testify before the grand jury and I did look into other aspects of the case that were of interest to me. Some, because I am confident you are the kind of man I think you are, will ultimately interest you. I told you I had completed my own book before going there. I gathered information for an exiplogue I wrote after my return. I left here the evening of the 27th and I left there the afternoon of the second. While I was there I tried to make the best possible use of the time. You are entitled to think perhaps I did not, but until you see what use I did make, I believe you have no valid basis for judgement.

With regard to the Saturday Evening Post, I told you I had had experiences with them that lead me to believe they have a policy to be implimented and that in their treatment of me they had not been honest. They did not keep their word, based upon which I performed services for them. I have not and do not intend to publish this. Perhaps some time in the future you may be interested in the story.

About Phelan I told you that I had certain touchstones to the integrity of his writing and that I was suspicious of it. He is the SEP expert on crime in New Orleans. He wrote "The Vice Man Cometh" for them in 1963 (Want a copy)? He did refer to David Ferrie in the recent article. The things he had to know, to have competently done both pieces that were left out are important and leaving them out prejudices the reader against Garrison and for Ferrie. Ferrie was the investigator for Carlos Marcello (Mafia) and was in attendance on the court in which Marcello's then-latest immigration case was being tried, in conversation with FBI agents, at the moment of the assassination. Marcello's lawyer was Ferrie's lawyer. Marcello's earlier lawyer was Dean Andrews. There is much more you'll see when I send CIA WHITEWASH to you, assuming the interferences I've already experienced do not prevent its publication. Ferrie was a degenerate. Independent of Phelan and Sciambra, I have reason to believe that Russo did report on the party at their first meeting. I do not guarantee it, but I do believe it. Now, to say that because I have reason to question Phelan's single-minded devotion to the untainted and total truth and reason to believe that Russo did, in fact, report the party at his first conference with Sciambra, is not to say merely that I "pook pooked" Phelan's article. Whether or not you credit my reason, they are more than just dismissing what Phelan wrote.

What he and you seized upon is but part of the Garrison investigation. That, in turn, is but part of the entire picture. I think judgements should be based upon more than a nibble of a thin slice. More so is this true of the Newsweek piece, which eliminates everything about Beauboeuf that was publicly and readily available and to which the Newsweek readers were entitled. Both articles were biased and dishonest. Again, I ask you to wait until you see my own and entirely independent book.

What you have become part of is a vast campaign against Garrison and what he is trying to do. It is a parallel of what happened with the Commission, when the wells of public opinion were carefully poisoned. As Dushay(?) told you, until this campaign forced a change, Garrison was not available to the press. He has sought to avoid trying his case in the papers. It belongs in court. Whether you like and approve or not, a panel of judges and a grand jury found probable cause. Is it possible they knew what Phelan didn't say?

I do not know on what basis you selected him to interview of those available members of the New Orleans press, but there are others more actively interested in the case and covering it, known to me and not in accord with what he says. You will not have difficulty finding New Orleans newsmen who believe other than he does, skeptical men and men who are well informed. I promise you an account of this for the future, when next I am in California.

The net result of this campaign against any public figure is to compel predictable actions of him. It also compels the division of his time and the loss of investigative and case-preparation time, as you certainly know. I think it is past time for an untainted case on any aspect to go to the jury. If there is anything wrong with Russo, the simple and able defense counsel did not bring it out to the satisfaction of the judges. It is not simply as Phelan put it. Read the testimony, much of which is available in the public press. Defense counsel did conduct an intensive investigation and did present a vigorous case. Garrison had no puppets on the string. He has fought the New Orleans judges, all the way to the Supreme Court. They are not his automatic partisans.

Whether you believe it or not, there is a prima facie case of the involvement of most of the people whose names have recently come out with Oswald and with the Cuban exile groups. Whether you believe it or not, there is much more to the Sandra Moffett story than you aired. Leave her alone or you'll needlessly embarrass her to no worthwhile end. Whether you believe it or not, there are separate and independent threats against the President.

There are things I know that I now cannot tell you. There are things I have written that I cannot give away piecemeal. I have a book, written pursuant to an agreement with a publisher, who changed his mind although his editor's liked the book. Let me get it out and send it to you. There will then still be more than I can now say, but I think you will find enough. And there are things that should be left for a court and jury. I am serious when I say this is the greatest need.

There are things I specify in the new book, about the FBI, about the CIA, about the Secret Service, and about the involvement of the various characters with them. I have all the documents I cite. After reading the book, if there are any not printed in it, you'll need only ask for them. I predict you'll be dismayed the other way, really shocked even after what you now know.

And I think you have been grossly unfair to me, particularly because your audience had no other way of knowing what we did discuss. Remember, you aired none of it. They depended entirely upon your representation of it. You did not go into the Phelan piece when I was on the air. And you did not tell your audience a single thing I told you the night before.

The net effect of the Phelan and Aynesworth pieces, with such scoundrels as they get from such things as you did, is to convince possible publishers that other aspects of the case are tainted, even those things completely independent of the current New Orleans investigation. I do not think you want to be part of any thing like this. This is a really enormous campaign. I regret finding you even an innocent or unintended part of it.

Sincerely,
Harold Weisberg