

6/11/71

Mr. Karl Hess  
Institute For Police Studies  
1520 New Hampshire Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Karl,

Most intellectuals and political thinkers formed instant opinions about the political assassinations, have at best only the most rudimentary idea of what is with them involved, none of their consequences or whether or not these serve any special purposes or have had any significant influence on the course of national and international events and, in general, are turned off on the subject or consider it (which also means above all the official investigations) a field for nuts or marginal paranoids.

I can't begin in the one page for which you asked to answer these misconceptions. Nor can I give you instant insight into what I have already published, two sets of which, not including FRAME-UP, of which I enclose the non-official reviews, are in the IPS library, a gift from me. But I can offer the belief that doing something can serve constructive purposes worth the effort and regardless of the perspective with one condition: that whoever might make an effort wants a decent society.

My study of these assassinations is, I think, the most definitive exposure of the FBI, especially as it frames those it wants put away or blamed for anything. It shows how they manufacture evidence, memory-hole what is uncongenial to its fascist purposes, defame those who feel less than adoration for Hoover, even lie to commissions and courts. Had I the legal assistance, there are several cases of undoubted perjury I might have pushed. Next week (not again the FBI or DJ), I will be endeavoring to push such a charge in federal district court (Gesell's, 2 p.m., 6/15), where two other motions are to be considered. While the odds are against me because I am, perforce, my own "lawyer", I am pressing this case under 5 U.S.C. 552, the mis-named "Freedom of Information" Act. I have others in preparation (and meanwhile research, write, correspond and temporarily nursemaid an injured wife). Of the many possible side benefits of these actions can be the casting of the most serious doubt about any sworn statement by any federal agent or lawyer in or out of court, before grand juries, etc.

There has always been the most powerful pressure against any airing of the fact of the assassinations and their official investigations. For a short while we made a breakthrough, ended with Garrison's irresponsible intrusion, which pre-empted attention and resulted in the loss of credibility by those doing serious and original-and meaningful-work. From my own experience, I'd say the pressures against FRAME-UP are by far the greatest. The attacks by the New York Times, for example, are far more than they ever did before.

All of the major, syndicated talk shows have aired the other side, some repetitiously, with Percy Foreman, Ramsey Clark and possible Huie and Hanes. All have refused to permit me to present the other side, under the "fairness" doctrine. I think a worthwhile purpose could be served by my making formal demands under this doctrine and then following repeated rejection by going to the FCC. If again rejected, I think there exist real possibilities of airing the suppressed evidence and the official records- and the sycophancy of the major Media - in court and with possibly productive ends, victory alone not being the only one.

I am without income or funds. My debts are about \$35,000, and meeting the regular interest is an unending problem. So, I cannot pay a lawyer. It is in this connection that you said you might know one or might who might undertake this representation.

The shows I know are involved are Cavett (where I presume it is the production staff that made the decision without consulting him), Frost, where the producer told me to approach the individual stations, and Griffin, who seems to be a special friend of Foreman's and actually aired him when appeal was pending.

(Simultaneously, and I think improperly, the prosecution is covering Tennessee with speakers ranging from an investigator to the District Attorney General himself, audiences ranging from the most inconsequential "civic" group like the Rotarians to the State Bar, which was addressed at all its regional meetings and at the annual convention. I have a tape of the Lord High Executioner himself presenting withheld evidence, using official property and public employees to help, as in projecting slides of what mere mortals or writers are denied - and what violates the privacy rights of the King family, like the autopsy pictures. All my requests for opportunity to respond to only that which was alleged by the prosecution have been unanswered.)

On the regulations, I think there is no doubt I am entitled to equal opportunity to respond on the major shows. They deny it because they have the raw power. Meanwhile, there is a move afoot to eliminate or alter this doctrine, and I think what I propose may be a major deterrent to that if pushed with vigor and should it get any media attention.

I hope you can interest young lawyers in helping. I am reluctant to start pushing the shows unless I can follow up before the FCC. If there is no alternative, perhaps I will be forced to do that, the alternative being the death of this book and the enormous effort and time that went into it. The publisher has arranged no single promotion and refuses to, so again, if it is to be done, I must do it. I regret you have not read this book, so you cannot understand what is really involved and its current relevance to so many cases.

Thanks for anything you can do.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg