

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
10/1/75

Mr. Tom Sysman, Counsel
Administrative Practices Subcommittee
U.S. Senate New Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C.

Dear Tom,

The wisdom of Senator Kennedy having added to what he had been saying about his brothers' assassinations a "new evidence" provision will soon be more apparent, I think, the reason I write. I have been able to obtain the balance of what I need to print the work I described to you two years ago by selling some ancillary rights to the National Enquirer. And I have made the printing arrangements. I do not know when the book will be out or how much attention it will get but I expect it to be fairly soon, a other reason I write.

I do not expect the Enquirer attention to be extensive. However, if the major papers and wire services give the rest of the material anything like the attention given the last two executive session transcripts, there had better be some preparation. No assassination story in years has received this amount and kind of attention. And none of my work has been ripped off as extensively, so the attention outside the major media is much more extensive.

(I have filed for the remaining transcripts, C.A. 75-1448.)

In the years during which I could not finance the printing I continued to press for more data. Part of it I thought justified the separate book financed by Jim's borrowing now repaid. Part of the rest is now in this book. It is a monster, 660 pages. Close to 200 are documents.

The book has many literary liabilities, by normal standards. There is nothing I can do about them. But it is definitive, absolutely solid and by several legal readings entirely irrefutable. While there never was anything wrong with the unused and misused "old" evidence" I do have more than enough of the "new evidence," what the Commission did not have and of this more than ample in g facsimile.

Aside from this content there are other reasons for someone being familiar with the contents before printing. I mean for someone to be familiar with the meaning of this "new" evidence" as well as other aspects.

You will remember Mike Epstein's reaction. Since then I have heard from two Members of that committee and met at his invitation with one. I have every reason to expect that this work will be used, its documentation will be used, and that more will follow. One is going to come to look at more than some of his staff did come to examine. The other has asked for my cooperation and the material. My approach from the beginning has been that the committee seems to have taken, how did the agencies work. It is the one I suggested in meetings and the one I believe proper.

There now is going to be no way of ~~avoiding~~ avoiding unpleasantness and I suppose more pain. However, there are ways in which both can be reduced. Because virtually all those laying court to the Hill are this are self-seekers and none really expert, there are other possibilities for other kinds of embarrassment. Last night's CBS TV news is a minor example.

I believe some preparations ought to be made. I am willing to take all the time I can when I can. The documentation can be examined here almost any time. I will have to work in Washington Monday and Tuesday of next week. After the end of this work if nothing unforeseen develops I can take time Tuesday night. Once that work is past time pressures on me will ease some.

Sincerely,
Harold Weisberg