

Chief Executive Officer
Pelican Publishing Company
1101 Monroe St.,
Gretna, LA 70054

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702
10/24/96

Dear CEO,

I wrote the first book on the Warren Commission and the assassination of President Kennedy and since then another nine books. In them I restricted myself to the office ^{val} evidence. In this I am unique. I also made extensive use of the freedom of Information Act, obtaining about a third of a million pages of previously ^{of} withheld official records that way. As a matter of principle I have ~~given~~ ^{le} given all writing in the field unsupervised access to all those records and to our copier. Serious health problems which restrict my access to my own records have changed the nature of my work. (The problems account for my poor typing and writing, for which I apologize.) So, for more than a decade and a half I have been attempting to perfect the record for history to the degree that is possible for me.

I read your La Fontaine fairy tale when it appeared. Earlier I read and wrote critically of their version of their fiction in the Washington Post. It with my permission sent them what I wrote. I also promised to respond in writing to any comment the La Fontaines made about what I wrote. I never heard from them.

In the course of my work I have not to the best of my recollection even written the publisher of any of the innumerable faulty works claimed to be on the assassination. It has been a long time since I read your contribution to confusing and misleading the people about that most major and tragic crime and I did not write you. However, certain aspects of the La Fontaine frivolity with ^{our} history have been called to my attention recently so I ask you a few questions. Your answers or your failure to answer will contribute to the to me sad history of publishing on and supposedly on the subject of the assassination.

From my knowledge of the subject matter it is apparent that you had no real peer review of this controversial subject, if you had any peer review at all. ^{of} Those reviews were once considered essential for responsible publication of nonfiction, particularly what is controversial. It is not only that the content of the La Fontaine book could not possibly get any authentic peer review. I believe it is unlikely that there could have been any without my having heard of it. (In my C.A. 75-226 against the Department of Justice and the FBI they stated to that court that I knew more about the JFK assassination and its investigations than anyone working for the FBI. If you want a copy I'll send it. That suit was the first file ^d under the FOIA as amended in 1974. The legislative history is quite specific in stating that the amending of the investigatory files exemption of the Act was required by

one of my
(earlier FOIA lawsuits. I do qualify as a subject-matter expert.) So, I would like to know why you published this book without any peer review and, clearly, without any meaningful checking of its content ^Δ,

Particularly its content that defames people. That appears to be to La Fontaine specialty when they do not like someone or cannot refute their criticisms.

Consistent with this the book's title and its subtitle state what is not true.

The title is Oswald Talked. He did not and the book holds no proof that he did.

The subtitle is The New Evidence in the JFK Assassination, There is not a single word in the book that justifies this deceptive, misleading and untrue subtitle.

The book, in fact, is not about the assassination at all. It assume's Oswald's ^{guilt} ~~guilt~~ and never addresses any evidence relating to the killing.

If you disagree with this I ask that you ^{tell} ~~send~~ me what you believe is evidence that does relate to the assassination rather than the La Fontaine ^{fiary} tales. Which is what you ^{proclaimed} ~~proclaimed~~ their book ^{does} ~~does~~ not hold.

You headed your announcement of it, "No More Conspiracy Theories, Just Conspiracy Facts!" The first sentence underneath this establishes that it is supposed to relate to the assassination of the Kennedy you do not identify. (Two were assassinated.) I find nothing in the book that is any better than a "conspiracy theory" and much that is not even a theory ^{and} ~~but~~ has no real basis at all. If you believe I ~~am~~ wrong I ask that you tell me what you see in the book that is ~~other~~ than at best a theory. Similarly, when you refer to "conspiracy facts" ~~about~~ the JFK assassination and I find not a single ^{one} ~~one~~ in so long a book, I ask ~~that~~ that you tell me what you regard as facts rather than inventions relating to the assassination itself.

Similarly, you having claimed the book holds ^{the} "The New Evidence in the JFK Assassination," not a word of which I saw in this book, ^{ask} ~~ask~~ that you tell me what you regard as "new evidence in the JFK Assassination," not what is ~~imagined~~ about what does not relate to the killing.

There is, of course, much a publisher cannot know about such ~~a~~ book. This is one of the reasons ^{responsible} publishers considering what ^{controversial} ~~controversial~~, particularly on a subject so important to the nation, have peer reviews.

It might have interested you to know, whether or not it would have had any influence on your decision to publish so disgracefully bad and dishonest a book by a couple who are authentic subject-matter ignoramuses even after they finish it, that their bragged-off "Silicon Valley cavalry" did not even have a child's ~~ringing~~ rocking horse. They boast extensively about his use of the Freedom of Information

Act to obtain new information, what was previously unknown, ^{He} then gave it to them. Not a word of this is true, either, as all but subject-matter ignoramuses, with or without imaginary horses, would have known.

All that nonsense so important in the La Fontaine "conspiracy theory" relating to Elrod was in the FBI's public reading room ^{and} available to all there or by request with a simple letter for many years before the La Fontaine hero wasted all the effort he did to obtain copies. Those records ^{were} placed in the FBI's public reading room once I compelled the FBI to disclose them to me in several FOIA lawsuits. (The La Fontaines do not claim that their guru went to the cost and trouble of filing a single one.) They are identified in the court records as CAs 75-1996 and 78-0322. In fact, the disclosed records are explicit in stating that I caused the ¹⁹⁶⁸ investigation of the so-called Dealey Plaza tramps about whom the La Fontaines have their own fantasies they enjoy and that the very records they claim for their horseless cavalry were disclosed to me in the litigation cited above- many years before the La Fontaines or their guru got bitten by the assassination bug that leads people to believe there is cheap and easy fame or fortune in it.

The La Fontaines say they had 33 cassettes of interviews before they aired the story on Hard Copy. Their book says that ~~their~~ Elrod said what he did not say. The book does not even quote him personally or directly. Did you check any of their cassettes or did you read the transcript of their Hard Copy show on which Elrod did not ^{and would not} say what in their book they claim he said?

There is much more I'd like to know the answers to but I believe the foregoing will reflect an adequate response. This "more" relates to the honesty or lack of it in criticism of others. For example, if you check what they claim they quote from my one book they cite you'll find that I was saying the exact opposite of what they profess, and had they not been subject-matter ignoramuses, they'd have known that was my third book in which I did that. If you bother to check their claimed source you will find that even the chapter title describes what I was writing about, "The False Oswald." I was writing about the character of the official investigations, not making up any conspiracy theory.

Publishers do read manuscripts before publishing them and to decide whether to publish them. Did you not have any questions about the La Fontaine manuscript? Did you make any effort to learn from those they defame whether or not ~~what~~ the La Fontaines told the truth about them? I assume your lawyers told you all you wanted to know about the likelihood of having suits filed where the La Fontaines claimed they had sources. But how about simple fairness and decency? Did you not have any questions about this when the book was read?

Harold Weisberg
Sincerely, Harold Weisberg