

6/5/69

Dear Greg Pierce,

When Epstein's piece was about to appear in the New Yorker, I asked for the opportunity of presenting the other side and got only the promise of a letter from the editor that I have now yet received. I wrote a challenge and answer that received but slight use (except by Epstein, who added the pretense of an answer to the deficiency of his knowledge of the New Orleans evidence to the book). I wrote the Times a long letter, pointing out the egregious error and libel, have been promised a response that I have yet to receive. Epstein, as usual, for he is quite a coward, is also silent. I have not seen the Thompson letter and would appreciate a copy.

What you say of Boxley is essentially true. Not only did the rest of the staff not "scrutinize" it, it was not committed to paper so it couldn't be. Most of the staff knew little or nothing of what he was doing.

I do not know when or how Garrison came upon Spiesel. I did in the winter of 1967, decided he was paranoid and stayed away from him, although I am satisfied there was such a party.

I think it likely the perjury case against Shaw will be tried. This is not a direct answer to your question. The original indictment was deficient. So is this one. It is also inadequate, as was the first. I have no doubt Shaw did perjure himself on several material grounds, aside from those with which he was charged. I met the witnesses you name and believe them to be truthful men, without ulterior purpose.

I do not think Appel's testimony either impartial or dependable. He is parti pris, as I see it, and it strikes me as strange that Shaw's lawyer's did not arrange for such expert testimony.

I think there is and was no validity in the charge against Bradley.

I have written POST MORTEM III; SECRETS OF THE KENNEDY AUTOPSY. It is one of three limited editions I have published (xerox) but cannot afford to print. It is the basis of what has come out regarding the Clark pen, including the expert testimony at the DDC proceeding. I cannot sell a copy because it costs me 20¢ a page for xeroxing. The appendix is incomplete and I will be adding a chapter on the trial. I copyrighted it because I was giving others permission to use some of the material and wanted, as best I could, to protect my rights. The same is true of the other two books.

Andrews never directly said Shaw is Bertrand. I so interpret an elliptical thing he told me 11/67.

Bud Fensterwald is well intentioned but I refused to join his group because of some of those in it. One is in large part responsible for the misdirection and deception of Garrison and is a notorious literary thief. Aside from Bud, none of the others connected with it will do anything, have done anything, or are capable of it had they the desire, alas. The address is 927-15th, NW, DC.

Excuse haste. Best regards,

1005 Piper Rd.
Wilmington, Delaware 19803
June 2, 1969

Mr. Harold Weisberg,

I would like to ask you several questions concerning the Shaw trial and events following. I hope you can give me brief answers since I know you are an extremely busy person.

1. Have you written a response to the N.Y. Times concerning Epstein's article of April 20, 1969? The only thing they have published so far is an exchange between J. Thompson and Epstein.
2. Is it true that a Mr. Boxley? worked independently of the rest of the Jim Garrison's staff and that his work was largely unscrutinized by others (staff & critics) for accuracy?
3. Where did Mr. Garrison ever come up with Charles I Spiesel? How does one explain that witness?
4. If nothing else was proved beyond a question of a doubt during the trial, it seems to me that Clay Shaw knew Oswald and Ferrie. (witnesses Corrie Collins, Edwin McGehee, John Manchester, H. Palmer, William Dunn and Nicholas Tadin etc.) Do you think Garrison will get his perjury trial against Shaw off the ground?
5. In your opinion how valid is Charles A Appelis testimony concerning the handwriting on the guest register in N. O, Airport, Aug.66?
6. In your opinion is Garrison on thin ice concerning the charges against Edgar E Bradley?
7. Have you written anything concerning the report released by the Justice Department on the eve of the Shaw trial of the autopsy? If so, where might I obtain a copy?
8. Did Dean Andrews ever state that he thought Clem Bertrand was Clay Shaw?
9. What is your opinion of the group entitled, The National Committee to Investigate Assassinations, executive director, Benard Fensterwald? Do you have an address so I might contact this organization?

Sincerely yours,

Gregory Pierce
Gregory Pierce