

Editor, OAH Newsletter
112 N. Brain St.,
Bloomington, Indiana 47403

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702
9/3/97

Dear Editor,

Please excuse my typing and my writing. They cannot be any better. I'm past 64 now and, with serious illnesses, must keep my legs elevated when I am not walking.

I am the author of the first book on the Warren Commission. My 1965 ⁶White-wash: The Report on the Warren ~~Commission~~ ^{Report} remains basic and, as with the eight that followed it, I have not received a phone call or a letter from any of the Commission counsels of whom I wrote so critically in which he complained that I was either unfair or inaccurate in what I wrote about him.

I filed a dozen or so lawsuits under FOIA to bring withheld assassination information to light. I got about a third of a million pages and in the course of that set a few precedents. In 1974, when the Congress amended FOIA, it cited my suit for the results of the scientific testing as requiring amending of the investigatory files exemption to open FBI, CIA and similar files to FOIA access.

Because I believe that FOIA makes those of us who use it surrogate for the people I give unsupervised access to all writing in the field and to our copier, as you may have noticed in Posner's book.

All of this and all my not inconsiderable work product will be a public archives when I can no longer make it available to others.


I had to become a publisher to open the subject up, incredible as that may seem, given the significance of the assassination of any president. In the course of getting more than a hundred publisher rejections internationally I did not get a single adverse editorial comment.

FYI, unable to continue to publish, I do, to the limit of my greatly reduced capability, continue to make a record for our history on what I regret the professional historians do not see or refer to as what the assassination of any president is, a de facto coup d'etat. I regard that as the greatest of subversions.

And all the major media and most professional historians shun it!

What has happened to us that was not in the thinking of those greatest of political thinkers, our Founding Fathers?

If you decide to use what I enclose, please feel free to edit it. Or to ask any questions you may have. Or to see what I refer to and do not enclose. There is, alas, a limit to what I am able to do.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

I enclose:

The CIA's 2/14/89 letter to me, with attachments that say the Kennedy could not have known a thing about the CIA's plots ^{Asil's charge} against Castro, which were of the Eisenhower administration and as of the August before the election;

The FBI's letter notifying the attorney general after that plot was exposed (I have a fat FBI file on this if you know anyone who could be interested in it);

The report to Senator Russell from his legislative ssistant, C.E.Campbell, on my first four books the Senator had given him to read and report on. I've highlighted ^{reference} to Russell's refusal to agree to the single-bullet fiction and to the memory-holed executive session. The Garrison reference written on this by Russell refers to the fact that my published asked Garrison to write a foreword;

A page from an oral history by Senator Cooper on their joint refusal to agree with that single-bullet fiction;

The transcript of the phone conversation between LBJ and Cooper in which Russell says his objections were incorporated, as they were not, and he and Johnson agree that the single-bullet myth is impossible;

A page from my 1965 book that has the Marine's evaluation of Oswald as a lousy shot in facsimile.

OAH Newsletter
112 North Bryan St.
Bloomington, IN 47403

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

Kermit Hall's ^{apparent} ~~supperant~~ reason for using the JFK assassination to attract attention to himself can be his desire to replace the president at OSU, who had resigned to go to Brown, but James W. Hilty's reason for arguing that the government is right because it says it is right is not apparent. That he refers only to what can be misrepresented to seem to support the official assassination explanation is obvious, as is his total ignorance of both the official evidence that disproves the Warren Report's conclusions and the disproofs that have been published and have not been refuted since that report was issued.

It is not only in the OAH Newsletter that Hall sought this attention. If he is to be believed he also wrote more than 20,000 words for the first issue of this year for the Maryland Law Review. In both he misrepresented that line he lifted from H.L. Mencken, "the virulence of the national ^{appetite} for bogus revelation" that, as Mencken ^{wrote} it, related to race, *not assassinations*.

It is not easy to believe that as Dean of the College of Humanities, the Executive Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Professor of History and the Law at OSU, in addition to being a member of the board of the Assassination Records Review Board, Hall still had time to research and write more than 20,000 words for the law review, in addition to what he wrote for the OAH Newsletter.

In his long article Hall misrepresented my work along with much else. Because ^{of} after his untruthfulness in the Newsletter in attributing the CIA's mafia plot against Castro to the Kennedys I wrote Hall before you published Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.'s refutation ^{to} of that. ^{Hall} He did not respond. So after reading what to one who is not a subject-matter ignoramus is assassination propaganda in the law review I decided to make a full record for history (historians seeming to eschew that) and with Hall having given source notes a bad name I attached to that examination of more than 250 pages some 65 exhibits that all are or came from the official evidence. It has been quit some time since I sent that to the board. I have yet

to receive not only any refutation or denial - I've not even gotten acknowledgement of receipt. However, that record will exist for history because that board is required by the law that created it to make all its records of any kind publicly accessible when it finishes its work.

As is true of Hall, it is true of Hilty that he says what is not true. For example, he says that "physical evidence and witnesses, moreover, place Oswald (and no one else) in the position from which the fatal shot was fired." In plain English this is a multiple lie. There is no physical evidence that could or did place Oswald there at the time of the crime and there is no witness who placed him or anyone else there at the time of the crime.

I wrote the first book on the Commission and the assassination, Whitewash: the Report on the Warren Report, completed in mid-February, 1965, and since then I published eight more. (In Hall's scholarship I published ^{only} two, the last in 1966). In more than 30 years I have yet to get a letter or a call from any of those on the Commission staff of whom I wrote critically. *claiming I was unfair or un-accurate*

Also lost in Hall's scholarship in which he pretends that I theorize conspiracies only is the fact that I filed a dozen FOIA lawsuits to bring withheld assassination information to light, making about a third of a million pages publicly available; that one of those lawsuits was cited by the Congress as requiring amending of FOIA in 1974; and that when the FBI used perjury to withhold assassination information, rather than using lawyers' pleadings I placed myself under oath and swore to the FBI's perjury. Its reply (in CA 75-226) is that I "could make such claims ad infinitum since he (I) is perhaps more familiar with the events surrounding the investigation of President Kennedy's assassination than anyone now employed by the F.B.I."

To Hall this is theorizing conspiracies when in fact I am the only one writing about the assassination who has restricted his writing entirely to the official evidence.

Which that report and its defenders like Hilty misrepresent.

3

Three Members of the Warren Commission did not agree with what is basic in its Report, the so-called single-bullet theory, which is a complete fabrication, not a theory. Two of those Members went to their graves refusing to agree with that. They had forced an executive session for Senator Russell's beliefs to be made a record for our history and for the Commission's consideration. That record was memory-holed. When I published the official proof of this in 1974 not a single one of those responsible for this (I hope) unprecedented dishonesty in our history complained. Said a word, in fact, encouraged Russell encouraged my work until his dying day, regretting that his failed health and other obligations prevented his being more active in it.

And even Lyndon Johnson did not believe that single-bullet fabrication, as the transcript of his conversation with Russell soon after Russell had, he thought, made his records in that executive session ~~clear~~ *in history* clear.

But Hilty says that "the ESCA confirmed the basic conclusions of the Warren Commission, including that single bullet theory," when in fact that committee concluded that four shots were fired and despite Hilty's misrepresentations, the best shots in the country, provided by the NRA and all rated as masters, and under vastly improved conditions by the Army at its Edgewood Arsenal, were not able, in tests conducted for the Commission and published by it, could not duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald.

Hilty complains that David Wrono referred to Oswald as a "duffer" in shooting. Hilty can do this by misrepresenting, as he does, the official evaluation by the Marine Corps commander, which I published in 1965, in facsimile, that Oswald was "a rather poor 'shot'."

(The ESCA also suppressed the fact that the executive session that was required to be taken down by the court reporter and preserved did not exist.)

It is ludicrous for Hilty to say that what he enlarges into "Oswald's hours of dry practise" made a veritable William Tell of him. Marina testified that

in total darkness Oswald played with that ~~rust~~ rifle in New Orleans. How in the world could he practise sighting and shooting in total darkness- and with a rifle ~~was~~ notorious for hanging fire. *when he fired nothing.*

Hilty does not know what he is talking about when he says that neutron activation analysis is "a technique not available to the Warren Commission." All it had to do is what it did not do - ask. The Atomic Energy Commission in fact urged that. I have ^{its} ~~the~~ records and used them in CA 75-226. The FBI did have NAA's done, I sued to get the results, and ⁺ published some of them in Post Mortem in 1975. They include the proof that Oswald could not have fired a rifle that day.

Once there was serious criticism of the Commission's conclusions all sorts of efforts were made to make the ~~usual~~ ^{unreal} appear to be real, the impossible to be possible, and ~~Hilty~~ ^{Hilty} refers to a couple. But the facts are contrary to ~~Hilty's~~ ^{Hilty's} representation of them.

What is clear from reading Hall's lengthier article is that despite his service on the Assassination Records Review Board he is what he ~~began~~ ^{is} being, a subject-matter ignoramus.

And not he alone, it seems.

Under our ~~ess~~ system the assassination of any president is a de facto coup d'etat. That is the deepest of subversions. it should not be approached as a game to be played by those who have their own political objectives to serve and all that the successor government does should be scrutinized carefully, not excused by those who have not bothered to learn what the established official evidence is and means - as distinguished from wholesale misrepresentations of it.

The failure of most professional historians to meet this obligations is another national tragedy.

Witness Hall, Hilty and so many others.