

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
WA6-2034
GENERAL OFFICES - 12500 S. WESTERN AVENUE, TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA
DISTRICT OFFICE - 1001 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, WASHINGTON, D. C.
RECEIVED 7-2-66

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
WA6-2034

YEVRAH
and sales? *mirrored*

REPLY TO DISTRICT OFFICE

20734

March 4, 1966

Dear Sylvia,

The sequel to which I referred has nothing to do, directly, with the book it follows, but I believe it will help make the entire horrible thing more comprehensible. Perhaps this may sound cryptic, but I do not so intend it. When we meet I'll tell you about it in detail. Perhaps if I tell you it is related to some of the things set forth in "The False Oswald" you may get the idea. Tentatively I call it "A Tiger To Ride".

Having heard nothing from Ramparts rather surprises me. I hope there was nothing in my letter that gave them offense. I hope I mailed a copy to you. I had forgotten to, although it was in an envelope, the night I wrote it.

The material on Ruby is, of course, voluminous. I decided against that early, treating it as you know instead. I have read two books on the trial, one of which is excellent. It is the Kaplan and Waltz book, Macmillan's. I have the Belli book, but I have some many doubts about him that, not being a lawyer, I wonder about his book. You are welcome to borrow it if you'd like. If you go into the alleged trip to the hospital (which I did not, other than to read Kantor's testimony), and you'd care to conjecture, could you conceive of him throwing "evidence" into the car, which was, from time to time, not carefully watched. Well, I believe had a picture showing this. My recollection may not be as sharp as it should, but I believe that, despite the Secret Service contrary testimony, there is credible testimony that, in fact, the front seat was not under constant observation. Of course, the possibilities with the stretcher and "found" bullet are obvious. I have thought of this, haven't made up my mind, but would be willing to consider it a possibility that he was at the hospital and did things he should not have. He was able to do many other things he should not have been able to do. Eyewitness testimony, especially in times of great excitement, is never too dependable, and experienced newsmen are also humans and susceptible to emotions, but Kantor knew Ruby from before. I find it difficult to believe he could have made and insisted upon such a mistake, and I can conceive of no reason for him to swear falsely, especially when he knew he would not be believed. I think there could be an interesting and an important book on Ruby, as you suggest.

Unfortunately, I do not often see the Times. The AP moved a small story suggesting criticism in almost the exact words I used, but also saying the critic agreed with the Commission's basic conclusions. If, after you get it, this item in the proceedings looks interesting, would you tell me how to get it, please? There was no indication in the story I saw.

I have been working on a few other approaches. If anything interesting develops, I'll let you know. I have heard nothing since I last informed you. I understand that the initial printing of more than 10,000 copies of "A Mother In History" sold out immediately. I read the magazine piece and found it a piece of intellectual depravity, a female prostitution of the mind and senses for profit. The book is it's inflation, with double-thick paper, wide margins, heavy leading, etc. That publisher first told me I had something, then that it was "important and historic", and then that he would

All information contained herein is confidential and should be controlled by the Bureau of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is to be disseminated only to those individuals who have a valid need to know. It is to be destroyed when it is no longer needed.

Minimum Extractions
Bob
Sat
Page
Taping
Date

REVERSE

not print it because I "argued". I told him merely that he had other reasons, that it required little physical or intellectual courage to assault a trouble and bewildered lonely and isolated poor woman who was so deep beyond her depth but who had more courage and despite her rambling was closer to right than her critics. He did not protest. He sent me a dust jacket but not a copy of the book, although some 30 years ago I was his assistant when he was the administrative head of a Senate investigation. As a much younger man he had displayed a certain intellectual courage. By the time I knew him the evidences were not obvious. Time has not restored his youth.

In your WHO work please keep you eye open for anything on noise, especially the effects on any living things of any kind, especially ultrasonic, and the many different noises associated with aviation. This work interrupted still another book in which I have not lost interest. I roughed a chapter out two months ago. The book is called "No Peace", the chapter "The Happy Eggs". It deals with the dishonesty of so-called science by the government, intended to "prove" that noises are not only not harmful, but in this case, actually beneficial! It is unbelievable - the "study", that is. My chapter has been read by a recent head of the Poultry Science Association who flattered me excessively. The Air Force work enjoys none of the attributes of scientific inquiry. It is a minor version of what you have been working with. People do not stop to analyze or even just to think anymore. It has been without criticism, which is surprising because it clearly states it is incomplete, and what it lacks if the histopathological examinations, completed about a year ago and not, as of two weeks ago, reported! Of course, it also lacks any relationship with reality or fact. I wrote Dr. Svann Forasman and he referred me to Michigan, and I have written them and thus far received nothing except encouragement. I have a great interest in sonic boom, which is officially entirely misrepresented. The so-called University of Chicago study is no study, was not done by the University of Chicago, was neither scientific nor factual nor in any way honest yet still proves the opposite of what it concludes. But, you know how that can be done also. My analysis, still in an unread rough, is at least three times the length of the report.

Back to "Whitewash", my first and possibly my second Japanese approaches have yielded nothing, so I have initiated a third. I have also left a copy with an Englishman of high repute who is a friend of a British publisher. Collier still has not answered my letter, and a friend has interested a book salesman whose company has already rejected mine who thinks he might do something with it elsewhere. He now has a copy also. So, I keep plugging, and it takes a lot of time.

And back to "No Peace", so you may perhaps understand more, our poultry operation was ruined by low-flying military helicopters and sonic boom. We filed and won a precedent-making decision and are again suing, this time across the board, seeking another precedent in the effects of these noises and their consequences upon us. They are clear, but whether they are legally actionable I do not know. We are like Pavlov's dogs. I've had enough experience in certain aspects to have been a consultant to other and larger farmers, drug houses, etc. and have addressed some of the government's veterinary medicine staffs.

If you think I can in any way help you with the Ruby part, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED DATE 08-14-2001 BY 60322 UCBAW/STP/STP

3/2/66

Dear Harold,

To answer your question, I am not on the UN secretariat as such, but on the staff of the World Health Organization stationed in the small office we maintain in the UN Headquarters building. I am afraid that I would not be in a position to help you with UN documentation.

I haven't heard anything from RAMPARTS either and am beginning to wonder whether they intend to go through with the plan indicated in their letter to me. It will be a dismal disappointment if they change their minds for any reason.

You say you are working on a sequel--is it a sequel to your book on the assassination? If so, what ground do you intend to cover? I am now working on the Ruby part of the case, which I had not touched on at all (except for the alleged visit to Parkland Hospital) in my manuscript. The material is so massive that I am beginning to think that the Ruby section will have to be a separate book.

There was a brief item in the NY Times last Saturday indicating that the Warren Report was criticized during the annual meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences; I have sent for the proceedings.

Best wishes,

Yours sincerely,


Sylvia Meagher