

12/20/70

Dear Jim,

By the most remarkable and pleasing of coincidences, your generously inscribed copy of your book arrived the day after I'd slipped the State of the 14th as a reminder to write you, for reasons to which I'll return.

I have working company, younger men still asleep, which gives me time to begin a letter that will have to be interrupted, if not by their awakening, by the unwelcome need to limit the periods of repetitive use of my right arm because of an attack of arthritis. This first hit me the morning after the night on which Rayton Martens asked me to intercede with you to cop a plea for him.

There has not been time to get far into your book, but the beginning is, even for you, lucid, easily comprehended by the most unsophisticated, which is important with matter not within the experience of the unsophisticated. I especially like the last I've been able to read, the good-as-Orwell Orwellian, "Justice is whatever they want to happen. Truth is whatever they announce has occurred."

I'd be less than candid if I said the picture in the paper makes you look as well as the story quotes you as saying you feel. I hope this is something the healing of time will mend.

The story also quotes you as saying that what it calls "the alleged plot" can't be "covered up much longer". Less of it now remains concealed. If we look calling cards, we do have more facts and they do involve more identifiable, live people. In that area, my work has progressed far from what I gave to Oscar and Alford and they used so well with Fiack. Slowly I accumulate that with which the Commission could not be entrusted.

I am still spread thin, by the exigencies of a marginal existence and the scope of what I seek to cover. I have filed a number of suits, have others planned, mostly with the administrative remedies already exhausted, and several will be filed as soon as I can revise the drafts of the Complaints and fill in a few gaps of my own knowledge. I have tried to break these down into relatively simple and limited cases, each restricted to a special item or items or a particular element of the law.

What was beyond my control prevented the filing of a suit for withheld New Orleans data. I drafted it months ago. Soon I will return to it. I plan for it to be the next filed. Possibly in the coming week I'll be able to start the revision. If it does nothing else, and I believe I will accomplish more, this will make a solid court record, for instead of bare-bones complaints where I act pro se, I will have lengthy, documented additions, doing what the law does not require, explaining with care why I want what I seek, the meaning it has or can have, and presenting direct challenges to government counsel and the judges. There are indications some of the legal eminences are a bit up tight as a result. There are evidences of the official (Justice) structuring of a new frame-up that while not intended to facilitate the revelation of truth may have this effect. I have reason to believe that they intend using one of my suits to put the hat on the fanny, which should be interesting if they do.

Those many long letters over which you used to chuckle (and I think privately regarded as futilities) have begun to pay off. Even Mitchell now answers me. If I get around to respond to his last before mailing this, I'll enclose a copy. It may interest you. I have

enticed, if I may employ a polite word, him into disclosing, officially, Justice's intrusion into your work. I think this is the first written and official such disclosure. If I can get this into court while your book is still on the shelves, there may be a synergistic reaction. They did not question Ronnie Caire, for example, for the Warren Commission, but they did, persistently and redundantly, before your investigation was a matter of public knowledge.

Now it happens that the exemptions of the law are well-defined. The one here, rather vehemently, invoked requires, among other things, a law-enforcement purpose. As you will see, I will be asking what law, what enforcement. To only a corrupted judge can there be an answer that can be accepted.

I've had to take one break in this (and during it rolled a few of your words at the beginning of Chapter 2 over my tongue), and now must suspend as I hear the waking noises of my guests. Before doing so, I remind of you of previous, unanswered letters about one specific thing: what was ultimately promised me when Moo fell silent, the HOPD Intelligence Unit reports on both Oswald and Ferris. Their existence had been denied to you. I proved they do exist. Moo said he would send them. I've had no word since. When, as ultimately you will, you see the Complaint, you will see their relevance. If I neither suggest nor encourage it, I think it is possible they can provide you with the basis of criminal action after I work them in with what I already have. I do have some of the vice squad reports (not from your office). It would be helpful, with the Ferris aspect, to have all of them. I have established an FBI knowledge of and interest in Ferris back to the early Castro days. It is not impossible that I will be able to place him with Oswald after the CAPC membership in N.O. and prior to discharge from the Marine Corps. These Intelligence Unit reports can be of greatest importance, certainly of greatest value, in this action.

12/22, and the promise of that for which Moo longs, snow. It is falling lightly. A year ago this time he kept saying he wanted to come up when there is snow on the ground, something he apparently has never seen. He then also said you have lost interest in the assassination, or perhaps in attempting to do more about it (them). If my recollection is correct, this is understandable, with your other obligations and the very serious health problem that, I hope, is now past. But if it is the case, I also hope that you will do what you often promised, let me have that which you may that can help me in my work. There are fewer and fewer of us, almost none doing original work, and my capacity is diminished by accelerated aging, the inevitable consequence of the pace at which I've worked. Your preoccupation with the Boxleys and Turners were always a barrier to communication between us, as was my own unwillingness to be, as I saw it, diverted. I had and have many New Orleans leads that should have been followed. It was beyond me. Some of these lead me to believe that you may now be the unknowing recipient of St. Edgar the Indispensable's attentions, for there is no doubt in my mind that he is responsible for much of the black turmoil today. I went into this at length in the book originally titled COUP D'ETAT. I had the first part of this completed 6/68, then doubled that a month or two later, then wrote a longer second part in early 1969, only to have to contract the enormity of close to a half-million words for commercial publication, which will be some time this coming year, under the title FRAME-UP. In this form it is restricted to the King/Ray case, reduced to a mere (remarkable coincidence!) 544 pages. However, in the early work I developed new dimensions on Bringuier and some of your other blessings from Castro. He and they tie into the recent NOLAS troubles. There is little doubt that Ben Golddano got a payoff and that these fascists, honored by Nixon-Agnew, can be behind it. They tie to Walker, to Hargis, to the phoney attempted red smear in the RFK assassination, and there has emerged another one of them who was a would-be Bringuier in the JFK case. I have 15 pages of FBI reports on his efforts, and he is the guy behind the same thing with the RFK assassination, which I also have documented.

This had to be edited out of COUP. So did other and N.O. work. Which reminds me of, one mix of the simple, unanswered questions: what is the name of the Cuban group to which Shaw provided space? Do you recall my mentioning of Gaudet to you? This remains of interest.

If you can provide more than the name, fine. But the name alone could be helpful. I believe Josephine Hug gave it to you.

I have developed some sources in "the other side". I possess the most significant evidence we have yet been able to get. I have every expectation of more. Strange things happen (for the good). I think these suits I've filed and am known to plan (I do have to exhaust my administrative remedies) are, at least in part, the cause. Let me give you an example: As soon as I won the first Freedom of Information suit for what I could identify that was withheld in the King/Ray case, getting what Justice has repeatedly denied, in writing, even existed, I immediately asked Kleindienst for a single picture. Instead of turning me down, he sent it, almost by return mail. I studied it, asked him for more, and got them, without even having to file a single paper, engaged in a single formality - even pay the cost of copying. Thus I now have the most graphic, single destruction of the official mythology. I will be using it in court, for others are withholding what is relevant and I have already filed for it and now await the hearing.

In all of this I have shunned public attention. However, in my own relations with the media (and I've known some of the reporters for years), I find a changing attitude. I do not deceive myself into believing this betokens a changed attitude on the part of their masters, but I believe these men do not advance far ahead of their generals. The NBC "First Tuesday" show may be in point. That is unlike anything TV has done, and it may relate to our work. By the way, I can provide a transcript, if you'd like it. This story has not died. Ervin is not the only committee chairman interested. Today there is still another followup not in that bastion of liberalism with which my day begins, the Washington Post, but well-reported by radio. Night before last I was with an old friend who has been a major correspondent for all three networks, at the Christmas party of another. He kept after me about my King/Ray work and wants to be backgrounded. He has known me since 1937, has never had this interest in my JFK work. It may be that the King/Ray case provides a by-pass around the Establishment JFK hangup. And it may be that those who have been our most persistent enemies are now frightened.

I am satisfied the King assassination may involve acts within and near your jurisdiction. Whether I will ever be able to prove it is doubtful. There are some viable leads, but I am without the means of pursuing them. However, if any rumors reached your office, I'd sure like to know what they say - and who they involve. The second almost certain point is Baton Rouge.

Unless what I cannot anticipate comes to pass, that I am asked to make a speech in H.O., there is no present prospect of my being there in the near future. So, distance and the undependability of normal communications, perpetuate the communications barrier between us. Thus I also remain without knowledge of any interests or plans you may or may not have, whether you will take the cases filed to trial and whether, as you may plan them, I can help you (as I think with several is possible). So, I close with a note of optimism, telling you that the time may come when we have allies we have never expected (a kind of intellectual judo holding the possibility of hastening this day), a number having already helped me in some ways; and telling you that while for most of the past we have had to content ourselves with working with what did not happen, in one crucial, evidentiary area I now know beyond peradventure what did happen and have the suppressed official prove in hand.

And, of course, with my best wishes to you all.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg