2/11/69

Dear Jim Alcock,

The Morgan testimony, as I just read it in the S-I, perhaps offers some possibilities, especially in connection with your original idea of calling Ramsey Clark as a witness. Morgan testified he was interviewed by the FBI. Clark said there was no Shaw investigation. Ricardo Davis said he gave the FBI a signed statement on Shaw, that he, in fact, initiated a complaint against him. So, there is reason to believe the FBI had Shaw reports and that these can be among the suppressed Ferrie documents.

The changed situation, especially with what I now have and have on paper about what the autopsy really shows and what Clark really knew, offers possibilities to the Nixon administration the Johnson administration did not have and Nixon's may not again. Here the focus can be on Clark and not the five of the seven members of the Warren Commission who were Republicans. When Clark blew his cool he also set himself up beautifully as a fall guy. Why not let the new Attorney General see this possibility?

To a degree he will with the Washington proceedings. He would be helped, I think, by a simple letter of request for the withheld Ferrie documents, which might be accompanied by a general statement you have reason to believe they can relate to your case. Possibly he might appreciate a letter more than a subpena. Remember, also, that Vinson told me a review was then being made - ahead of schedule. You also have one of the suppressed documents that cannot possibly be properly withheld, so there is reason to believe this was true of others. Thus, the request puts it squarely up to the new AG. to make a decision. There is no reason to assume he will want to smear himself needlessly with the filth of his predecessor.

You can make him a cooperative offer, that you have people in the area who work with you and who are familiar with the subject and can show him what might be relevant (meaning Bud and me). If he sees us, I'll have a copy of the "Guidelines", which will quickly show him the impropriety of the withholding and he can determine, rather quickly, if what he has been told and what the record of his predecessor ruled is properly withheld can be. Or, you might say you can have men who work with you look at them for you and let you know immediately what they show, after which you can be in touch again.

We know there is a Shaw file. We do not know what it has, other than is in the memo I gave you. We have here a chance to get the cooperation of the new administration on a level and a basis that is not hazardous for it. That will not long continue. I hope you can see your way clear to take advantage of it.

Because this would be a proper request, it also puts the new regime in the Department of Justice in a position where it can, without hurt to itself, behave as it should toward local law officials. This is at level of approach we have not been able to try. By Friday the new DJ will have a pretty good idea of what it can get involved in and may be willing to be cooperative. Meanwhile, they do not know what we do or do not know about this stuff, and may be afraid to turn you down on the chance that what comes in court might hurt them, smear them. Why should they want this?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg