

2/6/71

Dear Jim,

The delayed mailed did arrive after we spoke. Glad to get the American Mail decision. If you ever get a clear copy (some of the vital lines are missing from this one), I'd appreciate that. I expect I'll have more use in the future.

I think the wrong date was put on the Canale story. That date must be 1/15. not 25. Bob told us about it that day after it happened, and that was Saturday, 1/16, so it is the same speech, only something Bob didn't get on tape.

I've started to read the Shaw clips until supper. If I am as tired after it as I am now, I'll continue and continue to make notes that I want you and Bud to keep entirely to yourselves, please. That is a hassle best left alone at this point, and any loose talk of any kind can be hurtful in ways we cannot anticipate. Besides, there are other reasons that will be apparent.

I've read only the S-I 1/25 story now. It proves that when Garrison and Andrews disagreed when they gave me different accounts of when Garrison began his "investigation" and how, Dean was truthful. The first note, for \$25,000, was dated Nov 25. Now that is ~~glt~~ three months before the ostensible reason for Garrison's getting help, publicity on the use of public funds, which was in February, about the middle. For him to have needed that much money at about the time he says he started is not reasonable. One of Wegmann's questions seems to out the date at September, for the beginning. Dean told me that in September Jim walked into his office, threw a copy of WW on the desk, and told him he ought to read it.

Wegmann is wrong in alleging "these funds would have been used in the prosecution of Shaw" (accidentally I omitted on "only" here. Practically, if not entirely, all of the money of which I know was spent otherwise, and I don't know of a cent spent on any Shaw investigation of any kind. Robertson was wrong in saying Garrison was not prosecuting any others. They were indicted. Andrews was convicted.

That Robertson regarded Ivon as a bookkeeper is understandable. Louis kept tight control over the funds, which were in a special account, with a special, invented name, printed on the checks. To the best of my knowledge, Jim didn't draw any checks on it.

The next story is dated 1/26. It refers to the previous day's testimony of Alcock, which apparently you do not have, not having included it. If most of the information in Jim's book came from his "investigation", need more be said by way of describing that "investigation"?

I had always assume he had other witnesses than Russo, but the first time I was down there, when I cast serious doubt on Russo and indicated that it was not impossible he had known Oswald in an entirely different way, I was challenged, phoned home and produced the proofs, and nothing else was done with it. They never, to the best of my knowledge, checked Russo out. If Speisel was put on the stand because of Alcock's insistence, it changes my estimate of Alcock or tells me that he was by then desperate. They never checked that poor paranoid out or they'd have had substantiation for him when he was on the stand. (I wouldn't even talk to him.)

Cute touch, one of Jim's more subtle, describing his feeling for the papers there as "warm", and sneaking the ^{pub.} ~~first~~ the first copy of his book. Aynesworth is not alone in having a pre-trial list of witnesses he and other intimidated. I knew of this then... Ferris's landlord, Plotkin, to whom \$312 was paid, claimed his legal fees for representing some in whom JG was interested came from the ~~EL~~...Shaw's lawyers not as good as they seem.