

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
7/5/75

Mr. Allard Lowenstein
c/o Gov. Edmund Brown, Jr.
Sacramento, Calif. Please forward

Dear Al,

Our meeting is one of the few encouraging things having to do with people that has happened to me for years. Most of those who have the same interests are self-seekers, self-defeaters or just plain irresponsible.

Beginning in 1968 or 1969 I'd tried to arrange it through a young man who had worked in your political activities but I got to New York infrequently and he never did try.

One immediate purpose of this letter is the hope that one of your people in Washington this summer is a law student with a little free time. There is a project on which we need help. His participation will teach him something they'll not teach him in law school.

Subconsciously I'm the creature of my generation. It can, of course, be a woman. If either can take the time, not many days, I can provide a private room here for the work and all the necessary materials.

What I have in mind can be done ~~with~~ by any reasonably bright student. It is that I think the benefit will be considerable to a law student.

We have finally gotten the record in the Ray evidentiary hearing. I have a copy. Jim Lesar will have to do the appeal for all practical purposes as the only lawyer, despite what generally appears in the papers. It will have to deal heavily with fact and evidence. It will be a J'Accusé. Despite enormous handicaps we did build a good record. But we had a phony liberal judge who assumed racism and corrupted everything, especially the evidence, to which he referred from alleged notes, there then being no transcript. His mistakes are so serious accidental error is not possible. And so numerous.

Meanwhile, as I believe I told you, we took a novel and effective (save for the judge's preconceptions) approach to effectiveness of (Percy Foreman as) counsel: we addressed all the evidence alleged against Ray. We destroyed all of it, the entire case against him, when it was subject to cross-examination and rebuttal and the State avoided both.

(The assistant attorney general is such a monster he was finally fired but he got away with much dirty stuff in this case simply because Bud let him and the judge took it, even threats against the judge!)

What I'd like now for Jim's use and for future uses is an index of these 14 volumes of transcripts. It is not a large order. Name and subject.

There is, I believe, no evidentiary hearing like this one in several ways, so the one who does the index and is studying law does have a chance of getting personal benefit from it. This is not the only novel approach we took and we had established a new precedent, discovery in a habeas corpus hearing, ~~so~~ so it is neither dry nor the ordinary stuff that is taught.

You probably lead a very busy life but I doubt you can imagine the hours Jim and I put in and how much we really must do lest it not get done and then don't get to. This includes cases for me that can yield the money we both need for mere survival. I've had copies of CIA surveillance on me, for example, for some years. I've been wanting to sue for years but could get no lawyer. Now that the subject is open and I have even more proofs after denials by the CIA and Jim is a lawyer we have to give priority to other matters. There is also money owed me, open and shut cases. And the FOIA suits. So, neither of us will be able to do this and it should be done.

It will have permanent value in the history of the King assassination, too.

I believe I told you that I'm trying to arrange for as much material to be available in the future as I can. I'm keeping files for which I have no personal use to this end. If I had the foundation support there are colleges now interested in it. I'd love to be able to work with these young people. I think I can show them ways of doing things not taught and I know I have materials for many socially useful theses, some also with commercial promise. My own published work is all indexed. As I can get volunteer student help I'm consolidating the cards to each of these so that there will be a single index to all I've published, including the xerox editions. In time others can be added to it. (Sylvia Meagher did not do hers on cards.)

We are dealing with one of the major turning points in history and with vast obfuscations, so there is, I believe, added need for the future for this kind of basic research material.

If you have a recommendation, please let me or the person you have in mind know. I mentioned it briefly to Ed Burns, if that is the way his name is spelled, the other day when we were together. I mean the student who drove you here. I had other things on my mind and forgot to ask him how to reach you. Or him.

I had to finish one of them before writing you. It is the draft of much material from which Jim will select what he wants to use in still another affidavit for me in the current FOIA suit, for the scientific tests.

It is a critical case. If we lose the new law will be gutted again. And it actually was the best of possible cases for precedent. But you know the attitudes.

We fight tough, not with the typical lawyers' prejudices against saying the unpleasant. I've charging the FBI with repeated perjury and I've solid, really solid proof. They have to be desperate on this one for some of the stupidities they've pulled. But we have a prejudiced judge, the one recently overruled on his decision that the FBI can wiretap indiscriminately.

I told you that their initial response to my charge of perjury was to seek to explain it away by saying I know more about the subject than anyone in the FBI. They then dumped an enormous load of the mostly incredible on Jim earlier this week. Several hundred entirely uncollated pages not even stapled together. With it was another affidavit by the same FBI agent and sure enough I spotted perjury all over again and have the absolute proofs in hand.

But you also know the Washington press. And perhaps you have encountered the typical "liberal" attitude. So we've had and will have no help. Not even an audience in the courtroom. So, we'll be fighting it alone, without any help. I have no idea how we'll finance an appeal. (I think the judge will rewrite the law to mean that whatever he means by "substantial compliance" is full compliance under the law.) We'll have a very solid record for appeal. And the future of the law will depend on it. The reason is that the FBI can't give me what I seek without blowing the whole JFK assassination case. You have an idea from some of the proofs I showed you. There was no time to show you the proofs in this case. But the FBI actually faked all the evidence. The pictures I think I showed you are relatively minor proofs. prebative as they are. In this case some of the evidence was faked by an agent. We have forced him to take early retirement. I think their hope is that they'll thus not be compelled to produce him. I'm trying to get him under oath. He's probably an African safari by now.

All of this and much more is in the book I'm so anxious to be able to get printed, Post Mortem. While I don't know where the money will come from I am getting estimates in the hope it will be available. I'm trying to sell ancillary rights to minor elements of the press with the stipulation ^{that} payment be the cost of a 5,000 print. There is more substantial interest in England but it has come to nothing.

In my opinion all these cases are tied together. Success of any kind in one will have a good effect on all the others. What may appear to be side issues really are not.

We have proofs of improper intelligence files on political assassinations. The claim is that some have been destroyed. Not only do I doubt it but I'd made requests for them prior to the alleged dates of destruction.

The CIA had and probably still has a front for a special kind of intelligence on this. I have that all reconstructed, with solid proofs: names, bank account, bills, payments and copies. Even an envelope with the cover address. The Army had such files now claimed to have been destroyed. I have the identification of a special Air Force file on me. The CIA domestic involvement in this is quite heavy. Some of the proof is in hand. The possibilities in a suit are fantastic because of what I have that is not solid but holds reasonably good prospect.

So, this is merely one of the other suits for which we have to find time somehow. We'll need experienced co-counsel, if you have any Washington lawyer friends willing to help. And unafraid.

All these things are intertwined. With the JFK materials out situation really is that one good break can take the whole thing apart. One of the reasons I want that book out because it can do the job with Congress. The current FOIA suit has the very clear potential of doing it. Our major problems now are the dubious characters who are exploiting the subject and decent people and federal power. My reading on the federal agencies is that they are now fighting a rearguard action with their backstep position blaming the Kennedys for the suppressions. That, in fact, has been the second line from before the Commission really got into its work. Had I not been unwilling to compromise on this Post Mortem would have been out years ago. The friend of a friend who had inherited wealth would have paid for the publishing of the unabridged work and done a condensation for popular sale if I'd have agreed to his taking this line. Later I learned that he sits on the board of a CIA foundation, with a man who had been close to RFK yet.

The crunch on the FOIA suit comes 7/15 with the next calendar call. I've drafted what Jim needs for the newest affidavit and it will go out in the mail with this. (As will a letter to a friend whose name is masked in some CIA files along with mine and reference to information I gave him and people I put in touch with him and things I alone gave him. Don't be scared. This is all very real.) In these affidavits I'm not only directly challenging the government. I'm building a solid factual case for other than the immediate purposes. In this one I've already taken apart just about all the ballistics evidence under oath and without even pro forma challenge. Among the collateral uses now possible is by those in Congress who are getting flak from important constituents.

One more thing before I get to other work. I have had another meeting with the Senate people, here. They saw what you saw and will be back with their Member for more. If this works assume your case will be included. Do not misunderstand my approach. It may seem to be exclusionary but it is not and it will, without so stating, clearly include all the cases. It is the one way I can now see of getting around your major stumbling block with what I know about the RFK case.

Not unrelated to all of this is something on which you may be able to be of help. There is a major Department of Disinformation operation based on Hugh McDonald, formerly L.A. County Sheriff's chief of detectives. If you hear anything about it and more, about him, I'd welcome it. There is much effort and expenditure behind this fake book. Motive is not clear. But without the motive it is another black book.

Best wishes,

Harold Weisberg