

7/3/71

Dear Mr. Clawson,

You asked me to let you know what I think about the current Garrison case, so here, in confidence, is a copy of my this morning's letter to Louis Ivon, his chief investigator and the one man in his office in whom I had complete trust. Louis is a professional policeman, a sergeant assigned to Garrison by the police department, as are all his investigators. With all the many extra hours of work the JFK investigation required, Louis went to college at night and got a degree in criminology.

I have no objection to your letter Ben Bagdikian or Paul Valentine read this if you think they may be interested.

Unfortunately, I am really into too much and do not have time to read and correct this letter. I hope you will not have too much trouble doping out the typos.

I think it is not impossible that the Post ~~xx~~ may soon have problems similar to but not identical with Garrison's. I also think that a fairly considerable amount of my work might in that contingency be of some value to it. I know how busy everyone always is, especially now. But I think it will be a mistake later regretted if someone like Ben does not come here pretty soon and see some of what I have, subject only to the preservation of my rights and confidence. If it awaits the crunch, it may then be too late, for there may then, again, be much to much to be done. This means overcoming a policy opposition to me, but it also costs very little, an hour's driving each way and as little as an hour or even less here. I suggest Ben, and I ask that you tell him, because I think it should be someone more likely to be listened to than a reporter and because he was not involved in what led to the dislike of me.

I suppose George Lardner's clever but not faithful assumptions about my relations with Garrison may be what, if anything, is in the Post's mind. However, it was not as George assumed, and there are many things I did not give them. Thus my ellipsis to "ou on the transcript. I have no reluctance in telling you, for the moment, not for use, that this is the Sirhan case and you can see it for yourself. And make a copy, if you'd like, if you think it may later be of value to the Post. On what I told "ou, without specification, on FBI framing, it is no exaggeration, and I have enough in hand. The destruction of evidence by the FBI is of pictures of a collaborator of Oswald. This includes both motion pictures, destroyed, and still pictures, withheld from the Warren Commission, plus two amateur movies also withheld from the Commission, of Oswald being arrested in New Orleans. I have a dupe of one, obtained from the man who took it, and statements from him and the father of the boy who took the other saying that the FBI got the originals and returned edited dupes. Knowledge of the existence of the man whose film I have was withheld from the Commission, as was the fact that the FBI had both films. Both have been refused me by Justice. I am "exhausting my administrative remedies" and plan to file for them under the "Freedom of Information" Act.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg