

JL: As I told you, I think Jerry Williams is hung up on Frank. If his changed attitude is from Mark Lane's poison there is nothing I can do about it. However, he has a vast and good audience over WBZ, Boston.

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
301/473-8186

Dear Jerry, *Williams*

Having been told today that one of my oldest if not the oldest friend in your business and his producer neither received letter I wrote them prior to the appearance of my new book, I can believe that in the volume of your mail you and your producer may both have missed mine.

And the Washington Post's story and any syndicated version, as well as those of both AP and UPI.

I can also believe that you have decided against me and/or this.

Whichever way it is, I think you should be aware of the content of this work. What you then ~~me~~ do or not do is, properly, your decision. I would think you would want your audience to know of it and how they can get it so that, for the first time ever, they can see the actual documents, an actual transcript of what goes on in secrecy expected to be perpetual, what is allegedly "TOP SECRET" because the "national security" requires it, plus the content about the JFK assassination.

A really sharp and careful reader will perceive more than this, much more. Especially how the manipulation started and who was manipulated by whom and how. It is there. In this sense, to, what I have is unprecedented. So are many other things about it. I am avoiding trying to or appearing to condition, but if you read the transcript, on this aspect the key word is "argue." Other things are more obvious.

The book has been out a little over three weeks. In that time, I believe for the first time ever, there has been no single aside remark, no attempt at refutation, no slanders, no allegation of error or exaggeration.

This time I was not able to go farther into debt. At 61 and after the kind of life I've led it would also be irresponsible. In order to bring this book out, even after wealthy people saw the transcript and said it had to be made available, my associate in it and my lawyer in the suit borrowed to pay the printer. Despite the fact that we are both without means or regular income, all the other expenses have been ours and without any kind of subsidy. These costs are not inconsiderable and the time required to ~~put~~ get this was enormous and extended over a long period of years. When radio and press people learned this, almost without exception they paid for the book. His, too, is close to unprecedented. We appreciate it. In turn, we are applying 100% of the gross to the debt im incurred. We are doing this on so thin a shoestring and with so little possibility of commercial distribution that I've not sent out and will not send out an unsolicited review copy.

What is also new in my experience, every radio station on which I've broadcast by phone, whether news beeper or talk show, has said how to get the book and the price so that the audience could just send a check and I could just send the book, without having to write letters back. There really are very few people who really are doing any real work in this field, despite all the noise, so each letter I do not have to write permits me to work in that time. I hope you will agree that obtaining and making available documents of this kind and their history is worthwhile work, that this kind of evidence should be made available to the people.

Jim Bezar and I have become a team in other ways. He has done most of the legal work in the Ray case and I the investigating. The reporting of the recent hearing could hardly reflect what we did there or before it. It is entirely other than the major attention of the past was, or all the money. Neither Perov Foreman nor any of the sycophantic writers would appear, despite what he may have told you, in addition to this Gerold Frank would not even honor the order of the court to turn records over. If you doubt this, call my bluff and you'll get the court order and the Frank responses.

For the first time ever there was "discovery" in a habeas corpus case. We have already exercised it with result you would not easily believe in a novel. The abuses make the violations of W. Isberg's rights seem tame and decent, by comparison, that is. And this where I doubt we were 10% successful, where there was open contempt of the court's orders that because we are all volunteer and without funding we have been able to do little about. However, the State has appealed, we prevailed on appeal, and the Supreme court is considering whether to grant cert. to the State. It is a precedent to now. If the Supreme Court does not grant cert. or if it does and we prevail, then the meaning of this new right to the petitioner is hard to imagine, it can be that important in crooked cases, especially in political cases.

If you doubt any of this, let me know and I'll refer you to dependable sources. The clerks of the 6th circuit court of appeals or of the Supreme Court will tell you the legal situation.

In the course of addressing effectiveness of counsel we put in a case of prima facie framing by officials and Foreman, solid exculpatory evidence, a case that the FBI agent perjured himself, and there was no rebuttal and virtually no cross examination. None of the big-name writers appeared to defend his work or produce his so-called evidence. The FBI did not supply anyone to defend its agent's sworn word and that agent himself was and remains silent after charges that he swore falsely. The record is extraordinarily voluminous so I do not know how much any one reporter caught but I think that if this is of any interest to you, either Mo Kinross (that is, Martin) Waldron of the Times or Mick Chriss of the L.A. Times, both of whom live in Houston, will give you enough confirmation. So will stories from the prejudiced (against us) Memphis papers I can send you.

I take this time when quite obviously it will sell nothing for me because it seems that you believe other than this and because when there was a chance to move it into open court and out of the control of flacks, all the others blinked, not we or I. Besides this, I think you would want to know.

The judge may decide soon. I think we will win. I am confident we should and this is the consensus of the major-media reporters who were there and to whom I spoke or who have since written me. If this happens and if as I think the decision is interlocutory, then there will be a trial and then there will be another chance for people to stand and be counted. Those who have more than mouths, that is.

Because of this past that I think bothers you, should you be interested I'll lend you my copy of the 6th circuit court of appeals' decision in the habeas corpus. The Supreme Court - Nixon's Supreme Court - upheld it by refusing cert. You'll find that in legal language it said what I said, that the whole thing reeks of commercialism and cries out for a "full scale judicial inquiry." And the record is clear: none of these so accused appeared to defend himself except the racist former mayor of Birmingham, the man who turned those police dogs loose and the fire hoses on. He did not fare well. In its closing argument even the State admitted he had a conflict of interest, one of the issues to be decided. And even he said "ay was not the killer. Or guilty."

I do hope you find the time to read if not all of this book then the transcript and perhaps some of the documents in the suit for it.

best wishes,

Harold Weisberg