

4/10/70

Mr. Bob Rogichian
National Editor
The Washington Post
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bob,

And I know the time the news would take Friday when we spoke briefly. I'd have mentioned you at the point I have that Klainbaum and others in Justice are deliberate liars, continue to rephrase questions to answer the question as that they say, like precisely as today's media-for editorial says, and that Justice even commits perjury.

As have all of this, in official correspondence with my/ours or my lawyers and in court records where I see you so, some of it is in the final chapter of FRANK-87, which I showed you. I have copies of just about all of it in my possession. I also have the originals, but my publications, whose economy of presentation and advertising is indistinguishable from that of the former press staff, left insufficient all of the book when it was under the planned number of pages and in several months have not been able to complete the writing of slides for my use in planned public appearances (one one of which they have yet to make in my event). In fact, it has been two weeks since I asked for a set of clear records for a Congressman who had expressed an interest and those also I do not have.

In my reporting days of the dining part, those things would have been considered news. That to the Washington Post this has not been has been no disappointing as it was surprising. However, all of this material is available for examination. If the development of the very recent part do not make them somewhat especially because of what they deal with - then there certainly is no "news" as it relates to dishonesty, misrepresentation, deception, even law violation, by government.

The subject matter is in suppression of official evidence in the JFK and Martin Luther King assassination, and I am talking about public, official evidence, I am aware of the media language on the subjects of political assassinations, but if Klainbaum has not given them the opportunity to escape their self-imposed captivity, it will never happen. What does this say of the possibility that a representative society in function at all? Can it then incontrovertible proof of this character is not "news"?

The perjury is planned, was committed by a Justice attorney, then suborned by Justice and by the head of an agency of Government, the National Archives, I have made both charges in court, both are worthy of, both are to this day unaided in any way manner or form. And, I think, are beyond possibility of doubt.

Justice has not been unable to retaliate. Two years ago it agreed to attempt to negotiate an out-of-court settlement of a damage suit, the agreement being made in the office of Judge Joseph Thomas, in the evening time they have failed to keep a single appointment, answer a single letter, do any of the things they promised by phone. So, I've been forced to ask Judge Thomas to compel them to negotiate in good faith, to his entire faction, or set the case for trial. The facts, as he noted to the federal attorney, are not in question, for I was an identical suit for an earlier period, one of the basis was

ecological decisions (on noise). The sole question is: the extent of damage or, perhaps more precisely, evaluating it. The fact the Federal attorneys in Baltimore have agreed to this suggestion but neither seek a single step in implementation of it, essentially, essential witnesses become unavailable, Klinefelter needs no lecture on justice delayed.

I do hope that while we are still in what is only a semi-chaotic state, the major elements of the press will stop kidding themselves in their noses with Agnew's feet and honestly face one of the major issues, what is not reported at all, what is reported inadequately, and what, when it is reported, is reported out of context.

With one aspect of the foregoing, let me note for you what was not news.

I filed a Freedom of Information suit against Justice and State for confidential and suppressed public evidence used in the Bay extrajudicial. I held a well-attended press conference, on the WFI wire. I made perhaps two dozen personal calls to report what I would produce after filing it in court. Three reporters showed up (one: this included Klinefelter as liar). One, from the Post, filed about a column. Not unusually, you were over-up, and that story did not appear.

When it could no longer delay, Justice capitulated. That it then admitted that Klinefelter had lied obviously was not news, for it was totally unreported. Then it stalled before finally delivering almost everything to me, again not news. Finally I went back to court and got a summary judgment (he: conceal and: they?) against Justice. Still not news, still not evidence reported.

There is much more, please believe me. But I have learned by lesson it is not news.

Yet I despise the hope that by their conceals, evasions lies, distortions, mis-
representations and general abuse of society and their positions, Mitchell, Agnew,
Klinefelter and Nixon say yet make it news. If this time has come, I have what I
deserve and more.

The "New Left Notes" differ from the thousands of pages of FBI reports I have in
two major respects generally news are alleged and generally all bear code identification.
I presume this is true, and these are of local origin and intended for distribution within
the jurisdiction of the local office only. Yet it seems a bit odd to designate instructions
as a "newsletter".

Should any of the foregoing interest you, I will be glad next of Tuesday, in
Baltimore, where my final appointments are at about 2 p.m., TV news with Art Glickman,
3 p.m. radio with a Mr. O'Connell.

Sincerely,

Harold Weinberg