

The Mrev Griffin Show

When you syndicated the sequences of your show with Charles Roberts, author of what for lack of a better designation is called a book, euphemistically entitled "The Truth About The Assassination", you presented and promoted one and a grossly and not accidentally inaccurate side of a very controversial subject. As he addresses me and my writing, Mr. Roberts achieves the ~~pinac~~ pinnacle of dishonesty and a perfection of misrepresentation.

To a large degree, a show such as yours must take <sup>on faith</sup> those who appear on it ~~on~~ faith. However, when your show was aired on WMAL-TV I wrote them. They phoned and said they were forwarding my letter to you. I have had no response.

I am, therefore, writing to demand equal time under the "fairness doctrine". This is certainly a "controversial" subject, and the personal and incredibly inaccurate misrepresentations of me and my writing by Mr. Roberts are beyond question.

I ~~make~~ <sup>offer</sup> you an offer Mr. Roberts could not have made, else you'd never have aired him. I will document these things for you in advance of taping. I will go farther, and ask you to show on the tube those excerpts which Mr. Roberts prove ~~the~~ deliberate error. By this I do not mean I shall insist upon it, but I think it would be an honorable and effective way of showing your audience the real, not the propaganda truth and of establishing your own integrity in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Should you desire, I will send you copies of my own writing on this subject, Three of the "WHITEWASH" series <sup>(of books)</sup> have already been published.

Mr. Keith Fuller asst gen mgr, AP, Rock Ctr, N.Y.

Dear Mrs. Fuller,

Twice since the appearance of the grossly inaccurate and highly-advertised and promoted writings of Sid <sup>M</sup>oody and Bernard Gavzer on the subject of the Kennedy assassination, I have written to you calling to your attention the gross inaccuracies of their personal attacks on me.

Your only reply, to my first, was entirely unresponsive. You have failed to respond to the second at all. In this I gave you photographic proof of their and your error, which is of such a nature it cannot be accidental.

There is little one can do about the deliberate dishonesty of the AP where it is syndicated to newspapers. However, on a controversial subject like this, where dissemination is by radio and TV, the FCC and its rulings, supported by court decision, does provide a partial remedy. I am, therefore, writing to demand equal time for response and defense under the "fairness doctrine". You did make special distribution for radio and TV use.

Mr. Juliur Fransden  
vp UPI Net Press Bldg Wash

Dear Mrs. F,

Prior to the appearance of the fiction in the form of a polemic in the guise of a news story to commemorate the assassination of President Kennedy by Merriman Smith I wrote you to point out its gross inaccuracies. This story was intended for Sunday use. Some papers used it the following Sunday. It was widely disseminated.

You did not reply. Mr. Smith's reply was to run away. When the magnitude of his error began to become apparent UPI distributed a correction which did not in any way correct his permeating error <sup>or</sup> ~~and~~ the personal and libelous nature of his writing, of which, by then, UPI had been apprised.

Instead of letting it go at that, UPI thereafter repeated these libels, inaccuracies and personal attacks by radio, by Mr. Smith personally. At the time of this radio use, UPI had been fully informed of the inaccuracy of Mr. Smith's literary lickspittle.

More than a half year has elapsed without correction or retraction by UPI or Mr. Smith. His attack on me was personal and quite wrong, even in the plagiarism that I am a chicken farmer. Even that he could not get right, delivering it by UPI radio as "turkey farmer".

I am, therefore, writing to demand equal time under the fairness doctrine, so that I may, to the degree possible, correct and answer this personal attack on me and the gross and deliberate inaccuracy on this issue, which certainly is controversial.

Mr. Ed Harvey, *WCAU - Phila*

It is now two weeks since I phoned your office asking for time to respond to Charles Roberts under the "fairness doctrine". You have not in any way responded, so I make this formal demand.

In your case, this is a particularly grievous offense. It is almost a year since I accepted an ~~offer~~ invitation from your producer to face Arlen Specter on your show. He apparently did not accept, as I predicted to ~~her~~. In that time, you have not, as then indicated, asked me to appear without him. More recently, you aired Charles Roberts. His views may coincide with your own, but they are grossly and not accidentally inaccurate, they damage me, and at the time you aired him your staff refused to air calls from people who phoned in opposition and demanded I be given the opportunity for response, which could then have been accomplished by phone. I know this because they phoned me and informed me of it while you ~~show was being aired~~ were airing Roberts. He has repeatedly refused to confront me.

Your policy and attitude are not those of your station, which I freely acknowledge. On other shows there is a conscious effort by WCAU to present both sides on this very controversial issue. However, you reach ~~an audience~~ a special audience.

I will be in Philadelphia September 19 and I herewith make formal request for equal time <sup>on that day</sup> to make response under the "fairness doctrine". In this I will specifically address myself to response and refutation, and it will be specific. If there is anything in addition you would desire, please let me know. Copies of my three published books are now available at WCAU. if you wish additional copies, *I will send them* please let me know.

~~By that time, my fourth book will have appeared.~~

Mr. Leon Brooks, vp and gen counsel CBS 51 Westb42nd St.

Dear Mr. Brooks,

You have not replied to my letter of July 11. ~~meanwhile~~ the damage done me by the broadcasts in question mounts. I renew my demand ~~adequate~~ ~~for time for adequate response~~ under the "fairness doctrine".

~~And I anxiously await your response to my letter.~~

It is now more than a month since I wrote Mr. Midgley. I await your and his responses.

Mr. Hugh Downs  
Today Show, NBC, NYC

Dear Mr. Downs,

I am the author of the first book on the work of the Warren Commission and the Kennedy assassination. It was offered NBC when it was available in only a limited edition, in 1965. It went into general <sup>distribution</sup> ~~circulation~~ in early 1966.

~~Since then~~ my writing and research in this field have <sup>been the</sup> ~~become~~ most extensive.

*THIS BOOK IS ENTITLED "OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS: CASE OF CONSPIRACY."*  
I have published <sup>in previous</sup> about a half-million words and more than a third that many more are now being printed. My format is unique: I restrict myself to the

official evidence of the <sup>Commission</sup> Commission. In my most recent book, PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH: SUPPRESSED KENNEDY ASSASSINATION PICTURES, I ~~print~~ reproduce

150 pages of documents most of which, until then, had been suppressed. *I include it.*

Early last year, a number of people who had been attracted by my writing and who until then were total strangers to me, made a number of efforts to interest people connected with your show in airing me. You refused, which, of course, is your right. ~~I am sure that some of your staff said they had heard me on other subjects but not this one. Because I do not seek just publicity, I did not accept this.~~

and speaking  
Now, however, you have presented others whose writings are not only on the other side of a very controversial nature. They are also personal and <sup>by</sup> ~~a~~ deliberate <sup>the</sup> ~~and~~ inaccurate attack on me and my work. Most recent of which I know is Louis Nizer.

I am, therefore, writing to ask for equal time under the "fairness doctrine" to make response and to the degree still possible, undo the damage done me.