

7/2/70

Dear Ed,

Hasty response to the things you raise in your 6/30:

Hue's book is not all honey. That compulsion all the Finks have (in varying degree), for self-justification, has led him into the revelation of things the significance of which, I believe, is lost upon him. I have every hope he may receive the full benefit of them e'er too long. Aside from the bad reviews, it is also a bad book, one not worthy of good sale and I predict poor sales.

I've not yet seen a copy of the Nichols suit. I hope it is better prepared than the one he ultimately withdrew. That one cost me enough time for the writing of a book in my efforts to salvage him. John is very well intentioned, but one of the characters on our side - and arrogant as hell.

Wacht is great, and he can be brilliant. If you, by any chance, taped that Long John show, I'd like to borrow the tape long enough to hear it. I understand he rather enjoys doing Long John when he is in NYC.

Sprague also is sincere as man can be, and about as wrong. He will not listen to what is uncongenial to his preconceptions and is not nearly as well or as accurately informed as he thinks he is. He is not alone in this, alas, and those who see conspiracies in stones and plots in rivulets are all in contact with each other, feeding each other awful crap.

Kirkwood is a pro, but on Shaw he is as biased as Garrison is on the other side. It is my understanding that Kirkwood, like Shaw, is homosexual, which would perhaps incline K to be more sympathetic. I found his piece in Esquire as sickening as some of what is supposed to be "our side", and no less undependable. Some of it was atrocious, like the crack about compromising the lady's honor.

On Shaw: I have never believed he was part of the plot, have always had some doubts about Rusco, as far back as when I wrote Oswald in New Orleans, and never did my Shaw investigation as such when I was in N.O. However, I am also persuaded he committed perjuries other than Garrison charged him with, and I must ask myself why a man completely innocent would do such a thing. I have, from the first, felt he is Clay Bertrand, and my own interviews with Dean Andrews did nothing to discourage this belief. I believe it likely he had CIA connections, which is not, in itself, a complex thing.

Sincerely,

Herold Weisberg

Edward R. Williams
42-55 Colden St.
Apt. 15H
Flushing, N. Y. 11355

June 30, 1970

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route #8
Frederick, Md. 21701

Dear Harold:

Thanks for your kind letters.

He Slew The Dreamer received generally poor reviews.

I understand that Dr. John Nichols is pressing his suit in regard to the autopsy photos and X-Rays.

Dr. Cyril Wecht, on The Long John Nebel Show, gave a brilliant analysis of the forensic and legal aspects of the situation.

The Sprague article in Computers and Automation contained a valuable photographic inventory although many of his criticisms are open to question.

I understand that James Kirkwood, the Author of A Laudatory Article on Clay Shaw for Esquire, is bringing out a book on the subject for Simon and Schuster entitled An American Grotesque.

Do you now believe that Mr. Shaw was involved in the conspiracy?

Hope you are having a nice summer.

Sincerely,



Edward R. Williams