

1/2/69 69

Dear Paul,

Have you heard the name John Halsey in connection with the FPCC? Do you recall it from your examination of that file? Is it in any of the documents or indexes of which you know?

Do not, now, make an elaborate check through the files and take a lot of time. I'll be in touch with you again on this if it turns out to be a really solid thing. I ask you about it now so you can have it in mind and so that, perhaps, Hal can check some of his sources, who may have some knowledge. It is possible he knows people who may know Halsey, or of him.

If there is anything available without a lot of work, it could be helpful.

I am getting a copy of the entire reporting file, of which I wrote you, without having to pay for it. If you'd like, I'll make a copy for you. There are a number of other things that might well be checked out, aside from what I have written you.

Best regards to all of you.

By the way, spoke to Fern tonight. He is with Boxley, who has him believing the most incredible stuff, like Jim's office has him on docile pills which have destroyed him, made him a prisoner, etc. He tells me that Hans Habe's daughter was killed because of the book he wrote (not that any of the contents would warrant interest in him!) and much else I had difficulty believing. However, for whatever it is worth (and he did not present it as a rumor), he told me that Percy Foreman has been retained to defend Shaw, that this will mean an automatic 6-month delay (Ray case, etc.), and that there never will be a Shaw trial. If this turns out to be true, how fascinating that Foreman, who began by saying Oswald would not have been convicted, is becoming the advocate for the other accused. Almost like someone gave him the idea and the interest. Something like this would explain the absence of any defense motions so close to the time set for trial, when motions are still in order.

Sincerely

Harold Weisberg