Mrs. Paula Appsell (phon), Executive Producer
Nova
WGBH Radio/TV
125 Westin Ave.,
Boston, Mass. 02634

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21701
11/16.88

Dear Ms. Appsell,

When I wrote you some weeks ago, without even acknowledgement, I was concerned that you were about to mislead the nation and defame yourselves and your programs and stations with your grossly misrepresented "Who Shot President Kennedy" show. My concern was, in part, that you would do these things innocently and I specified how you were already doing them.

Your show was aired last night and there now is no question at all: you did a remarkable, a deliberately, a shameless and shameful dishonet job.

From beginning to end this is true. There is nothing really not dishonest in what you aired and there is no indication in anything I have seen or heard since you were cautioned that you made the slightest effort to learn the truth. You did lie throughout and this was deliberate not only because you had the responsibility not to lie but because you were cautioned in advance and ignored those cautions.

Not entirely, but entirely dishonestly. You did not ignore my caution about your use of the knowingly false Lifton fabrications. Instead, you merely omitted some obvious dishonesties in his fabrications/theory. Thus you have him and the misrepresentation that the President'd body was toyed with while eliminating what in his book and presentations he could not ignore, some access to the body to fool with it. Now how could you, as responsible journalists, allege that the boy was tampered with without even alleging that it was possible for people of evil intent to get to the corpse to do those things?

I was specific in warning you that Dr. Vincent Guinn had freely acknowledged that he could not validate the alleged specimens he allegedly tested for comparisons and that he also admitted that these specimens did not meet their official descriptions. Yet despite this you aired him representing that he was talking about authenticated and unquestionable specimens.

It is truly remarkable that aftwer 25 years you restrict yourself to what was known 24 years ago with two minor and entirely dishonest exceptions, the Guinn and Lifton misrepresentations yet you represented your show as a thorough examination of the scientific evidence. (Your treatment of the police broadcasts and the House committee's ware not scientific so I do not include that.) You not only ignored what you were informed about in advance and were told it was available to you, you pretended that any subsequently disclosed scientific evidence did not exist. Consistent with this you made no reference at all to the original and basic criticisms of the Warren Report (of course, you entirely ignored the FBI - it didn't exist at all in your account) and instead presented as the only original critic one whose work was neither original nor entirely his own. Yet throughout you referred to "critics" as though all were one, as though all agreed on everything, as though all said what you said they said, which is not true. All are faceless to you and your audience, without any identifications and you present a commercializer who was also a plagiarist as the only critic. This is to say that you were limited to the state pf Richter's ignorance and prejudice as of the time that, knowing better, he went along with the CBS propaganda of which he was part. Nothing happened since then. No suits were filed to end suppression, no suppressions were ended, no scientific evidence, nothing relating to the autopsy, was mentioned on your show or considered in its preparation. So you can get a glimmer of what I mean, it was Bob Richter who leaked the actual results of CBS's effort to duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald, tests that refuted the Warren Commission's theory. He

on this basis alone was deliberately dishonest in the show he produced and you aired because he had you saying, through poor old Walter Cronkite for whom someone is always writing dishonest lines on this subject, the exact opposite.

He and you lied in representing that the President was shot in the back of the neck and that a bullet went through his shirt collar and nicked his tie. The wound was in the back, not the back of the neck, and it was above the shirt collar, some of the old evidence you and he ignored and some of the new evidence that supports the ignored testimony that was not available in 1966 but that Richter refused to look at in preparation of your show.

You claim to have, or at least represent that you have, examined all the autopsy and scientific evidence, yet you made no mention of the official death certificate? Does not a cub reporter today know that there is always a death certificate? This also Richter refused to see and he is older and more experienced than a cub reporter.

There is more but I think this is enough to inform you and for you to inform those above you on Nova and, I would hope, for you to inform the stations that trust you to be truthful and whose audiences assume you are always truthful.

In time I'll see a transcript and perhaps I'll annotate that as at the least a record for history. As I believe I told you and as your staff has to know if it did any serious research at all (I have to admit your show does not encourage this belief) mine is and has been a study of how our basic institutions worked in those times of great stress and since. TV is, certainly, a major element of our information media, so your dishonesty on this subject, after being cautioned and after 25 years is appropriate to this study and appropriate for study in the future. More so because you are public and not commercial TV and because of your self-representations.

I apologize for my typing. I'm not older than Walter Cronkite, I'm recovering from eye surgery and do not see well. However, I believe it is important for me to tell you what I say herein as soon as that is physically possible. I cannot demand a response of you but particularly because I did take the time to warn you in advance I believe that your collective integrity, what I addressed in the first paragraph of that letter, does call for some kind of effort to defend what you aired and to refute what I allege and am quite prepared to go into in much greater detail and with official and irrefutable documentation. I think you should forward this and whatever you may say in response to Richter and I think you should, and I ask that you do, forward this, your response if any and my original letter and any record of any attention you paid to it to those who are responsible at the top of Nova. I ask also that you send me a copy of how you do this. I think you owe it to them and to me and your public. Feel free to do anything at all you may want to do with what I have written you as I also will, although I have no present plans for any use.

I do not know your age or previous experience but I do ask you, how could you get repeated cautions and ignore them entirely and yet consider yourself responsible and honest, as meeting your professional responsibilities?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg