

5/14/75

Mr. Tom Susman, Counsel
Administrative Practices Subcommittee
Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C.

Dear Tom,

I had several things in mind when I phoned in your absence yesterday and the day before. Jim Lesar will phone you about one today, with the limited information I gave him about one last night, too late to phone you. It was not until then that I got confirmation of what I'd been told earlier.

What if anything will appear in the print press I don't know. I do know that it could have been in last night's papers and on yesterday's electronic news and I have had no such report and heard and saw nothing myself. There is some kind of internal scrap over it at the NYTimes. Yet it has attracted international attention. My reporter friend, who is one of a number with whom I work throughout the country, has been using me as devil's advocate and evaluator of what he is getting, is being fed both good and bad stuff.

What is now filed in court, whether good or bad, relates among many to Senator Kennedy. It was my feeling that someone would want to know exactly what it is yet might not want to be asking questions overtly, thus Jim's call to you. My friend is not asking me the use I intend but he is sending me copies of an affidavit filed in Las Vegas Vegas that in essence says that among many domestic intelligence targets of the CIA through the Hughes (Susman) asset was Senator Kennedy. This includes an effort to involve him with a woman in Las Vegas. Many other liberals are involved, including Hubert Humphrey and Tom Douglas in Canada.

As soon as I get this I'll remail it to you. I have had excerpts read to me by phone. The affiant is one Virgino (phon) Gonzalez, a naturalized Cuban. He is not the Gonzalez of Watergate (but what connections there are!). He claims to have been a CIA agent from 1959 until the end of last year and to have worked both in South America and the U.S., under DDP, which could have been Helms. The affidavit was executed in Mexico about the 5th, with a lawyer named Villanueva handling it. About 19 pages as I recall. The case is that of Johnny Neier.

I have an enormous amount of work already done that could be relevant and I think is. I had to lay the book The Unimpeachment of Richard Nixon (completed in rough draft) aside for my work on the Ray case last September. I have not been able to get back to cutting and editing it. It does have what I regard as a very large amount of very important information not yet reported, including a very considerable amount on the CIA and its domestic and Watergate activities and connections, including fronts and Nixon and Ford connections, prior to Watergate.

Although the coming election was not in my mind when I started and finished the draft (completed before his resignation) I believe this book and Post Mortem can have an enormous impact in the coming election, I wish I knew someone who would take The Unimpeachment and edit and print it! I don't know when I can get back to it and there is much in it that should be out and known.

The other purpose was to let you know that I now have what I regard as positive photographic proof of what I've earlier said, that the FBI deliberately and knowingly faked some of the "scientific" evidence in the JFK assassination for which I've been suing. Until last night, when I learned of a UPI story out of Kansas City,

I expected an AP reporter to come here today on this. I don't know if that one of the maggots I've been contending with and his crazy story will kill the AP's interest or not. I'll be mailing this before the AP reporter's working day starts.

If that story is in today's papers, the man who made the crazy statements is Dr. John Nichols, an egomaniacal self-seeker who has in the past gone so far as to copyright work with which others trusted him. The story read to me by phone is not worthy of consideration except that I believe he will again file that insane suit he lost all the way to the Supreme Court. What he got and claimed as his own work in this case he and another forensic pathologist both got simply by asking Kelley for what I'd sued for. The other also will be sounding off. I've only deterred him, I fear. Neither appears to have all of what I've received because neither seems to have been smart enough to ask the right questions. And neither has known what to do with it or how.

While I've probably explained part of this before I put it together for you so you'll understand. I'm talking about this overt FBI faking.

Indispensable to the official account of the JFK assassination is one bullet that missed and struck a curbstone at the diagonally opposite end of Dealey Plaza. James Tague, a bystander, was slightly wounded by the spray of concrete. (This story begins at the bottom of p. 157 of Whitewash, if you want to read it.) For 10 months the FBI pretended a) it could not find this curbstone and b) it would be useless if it did. When it could no longer be avoided the FBI got the curbstone. It says. I have referred to the meaninglessness of the alleged results of the spectrography. That particular page I do have refers to two tests that have been withheld but were made. We are going for them. Meanwhile, I now have the following pictures that are relevant and official:

Two contemporaneous of the damage to the curbstone, with a mark or a hole clearly visible in both;

Two negatives of this same curbstone made for me yesterday of this same curbstone, allegedly, showing no such damage, mark or hole. (Archives prints are to be mailed to me when they are made and dry, probably this week.)

The only alternatives I can see are that the FBI knowingly took the wrong section of curbstone or what I can be certain of until I can examine the prints, repaired the hole. There is a spot where there is a difference in color and texture but I can't say it is the same spot now.

There is no doubt that the wrong spot was knowingly subjected to spectrographic examination and avoided in neutron-activation testing. The pictures and the FBI sketch do prove this.

And with the set of negatives I have if it is necessary I can make my own enlargements.

Jim Lear joined me at the Archives and made his own examination of this curbstone and can assure you that nothing like what is clear in the two Shaneyfelt Exhibits 29 in Volume 21 can be seen. I now have SX10 prints of these two exhibits. If AP comes and is interested in this I'll lend them the pictures and negatives. If not I'll have the negatives printed, with enlargements of the spot marked in the two exhibits.

It was my intention to be silent about all of this until I learned ~~stark~~ that these two self-seekers were asking for what I filed for and would get and misuse it. I had wanted the whole thing to develop in court and without a public word until then. Or, also without alerting the Department of Justice or the FBI to what I knew. I'm sorry my choices were eliminated. We are next in court on the 21st. By then we are to have answers under oath. They'll probably wait until the 20th.

Sincerely,
Harold Weisberg