

Harold Weisberg
Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
8/21/74

Dear Sal, Panzeca

When Clay Shaw died the Washington Post carried a respectable obit. Natural causes. But radio reports this morning are of a different character. When they quote protests by public officials I am not inclined to reject them out of hand. So, I write in the hope that you will be willing to take the time to ask a secretary to send me copies of whatever the papers carry and a bit more I'm sure you can if you will.

No, that this is past I can tell you what I could only indicate the last time we spoke. My interests in New Orleans were never Shaw. And Garrison never liked me, in part because I expressed myself uninhibitedly. Moo can tell you. I was there when the jury was being selected but I never once entered the courtroom. The Sunday before that I learned the doctrine of the case from Oscar and predicted he would lose, said I thought he should, and although I had agreed to be the technical expert, I was not thereafter there or even in the courtroom. And all the solid assassination evidence you faced, including all the medical stuff, was mine. Once the judge ruled it admissible I had no reluctance in either the airing or the loss of my rights that could be lost. That was not related to Shaw but was related to the question of conspiracy.

I told you there was perjury not charged and that Shaw was not the only perjurer. My proof is beyond reasonable question. I still wonder why. But I never told Garrison or any of his staff what it is. As I also told you, had the civil suit come to trial, in the interest of justice I would have made it available to all the defendants.

Garrison disliked and dislikes me because of the influence I tried to exert on what went on down there. Once it succeeded, his merely increased his dislike of me.

As you may remember from my writing, I never cast Shaw in the role in which Garrison did. And I always had suspicions about Perry Russo. When Kirkwood's book came out, I wrote and asked for a copy of his interview with Perry. He never responded. I remain with this interest, know that you also have a considerable file, and now that you have no client to be injured, I do hope you will elect to let me see it or will send copies of what you may consider most relevant. Unless, of course, this poses another conflict to you. I did treat your firm this way when it first wrote me about my books, sending more than was asked for.

At some point, in at least one book partly written and laid aside for other work, I will be returning to my New Orleans work. Mine, I said, mine alone and not Garrison's. I really mean what he should have done and didn't. To date all my work has stacked. My work on the King case has won Ray an evidentiary hearing. I want it to be this way when it appears and in my files, which universities are already asking for. This also requires that I be able to address Shaw, Russo and your defense as without your assistance I will not be able to. And above all of this there is what I hope would appeal to you, the interest of history and a full record to be made, now that you have no client to be hurt.

I'd like to know all you can tell me about Shaw's death and if you think it was not natural causes, whether I may be able to be of any help. If anyone wants it, with Ferric's, I imagine the papers are having a field day! Especially the undergrounds.

Helping me will, I think in the long run, help your dead client and the cause of truth, if that client appeals to you. In return I'll send you a free copy of my next book, which will be out soon and Louisiana News will not distribute. I guarantee you surprises if not more. If we have a deal, please have a secretary send me a label so I can get it out faster and send it as you want it sent.

Sincerely,