

Dear Joe Rosenbloom,

3/25/93

With the student's return, here is every page I got from the FBI on the Martin and Doyle films. There may be some duplication. There may be some duplication that for the purposes of investigation may not really be duplicative. After so many years I ~~do~~ do not remember. I can't take the time to waste more on this greasy kid stuff of inquiry into baseless theories of conspiracy upon which you and Frontline are engaged, convinced of its significance from the depth of utter and complete subject-matter ignorance and perhaps from being conned a bit by those who can profit personally from that.

Even in the limited concept of a profile on Oswald this is a juvenile interest you have, a connection of some kind between General Walker and the Oswald August, 1963 arrest in New Orleans you say is on John ~~W~~ Martin's film. I think it is not. It is more likely on Doyle's. Which I've never seen. I gave that interest up years ago, when in derisive inquiry it seemed no longer to serve any mature interest.

It is apparent that Frontline has approached the subject without any real knowledge of the factual information available and if they did more than dream without even the slightest effort to learn if it exists or how it may be available for use. It also is apparent that it has employed at least one person with a vested interest in keeping the show this ignorant. Otherwise his ignorance of ^{fact} would be exposed. Indeed, ~~his~~ ^{he is} indifference to fact. This is what also qualifies him to have contracted a book, for which he needed a coauthor.

^{They} So at the top the show has have not the slightest notion of how to approach this subject responsibly and make no effort to and instead ~~hire~~ ^{they} hire to do the work under them those who ^{are} also subject-matter ignoramuses, conspiracy theorists to whom the responsible approach is that of a novelist, and who have neither the knowledge nor the competence to evolve anything that is factual and is responsible and can meet the standards the country should be able to expect of public TV. What we should be able to expect is more than goofy talk-show parodies, ~~not~~ more than idle conspiracy theorizing by those who do not know enough to do that other than childishly, more than copying the worst of commercial TV.

I have no personal interest in being on the show and if asked I would not be. I have nothing to try to sell it. I write in the hope that while there is yet time there may be some rethinking and that public TV will not again betray the trust of viewers and again deceive and mislead them on a subject I consider to be of great national importance. Feel free to give this to the producers. In fact I'd like you to. They should have some inkling of their irresponsibility and their stupidity.

My cash costs on this, not including my time, are \$11.95 plus the postage. I'd appreciate its return to me.

You and your producers should also understand that this is not some indirect pitch for being hired. I don't and I want no connection of any kind with what Frontline is up to.

For myself I make a distinction between making what I have available to others and having any personal association with what they are doing or will do. Most of those who have ~~been~~^{been} here and have had access to all that I have are those I know will do what I do not agree with. But they have all had unsupervised free access.

On the other hand, last year I refused employment by Thames TV, which is in the joint operation with HBO to be aired early next month, on the King case.

I also refused to appear on it. I have no interest in personal attention. When I have appeared on TV shows it was because I received the assurances I sought in advance.

These experiences with TV producers does not persuade me their's is a calling that is conducive to honesty and truthfulness. Or requires either.

I'll be 80 in two weeks and a day. I'm limited in what I can do by a number of medical problems. I consider the time I've spent on this to be wasted where there is much I want to do with the time I still have.

So, from what you have reflected ~~Frontline~~ Frontline is doing and from what I know of one it hired early as an expert on the subject, I'd rather not waste any more time on what I believe will confuse, mislead and misinform the people even more. Like all others, you are welcome to come here, search what I have and use my copier to copy what you want.

I mean this offer and I make it because I have made it to all others. But at the same time I do not expect it to be accepted because individually and collectively you have no interest in fact, and there is much established fact, what is not at all theoretical. I know of no theory that survives examination with the available ~~not~~ fact. By this I mean those that have been advanced publicly.

There is none in any of my seven published books and none in any work in progress.

I don't know why Frontline was not in touch with me to begin with. I can guess but there is no need to. I want no connection with it. But if there is anyone there who is at all responsible, he ought, or she ought, ask ^{himself or} herself why none of them has been in touch with one who has published more than anyone else on the subject and has done more than anyone else to bring suppressed information to light and who wrote a book about Oswald - who is supposedly the subject of their show. *And does not theorize.*

There are only two professional historians/~~or~~ political scientists who do not address this subject in terms of their political preconceptions and they have not been talked to. The published work of those who have written as Frontline reflects is faulted, some atrociously so, all ignorantly so.

I realize this gives you an interest in not showing this to the producers. I will not waste any more time on this to write them separately. I ask again that you show or give it to them. As I told you to begin with, you reflect as they have to the degree I know what they plan and outrageous waste - worse than waste - of public money that is not plentiful.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

