

Dear Lasse,

2/19/92

That I begin to respond to your 2/12 at 4 a.m., after answering another of yesterday's 20+ letters and after going over the Washington Post will, I think, indicate the greatly increased interest in the JFK assassination, which began before Stone, and what it demands of me. I probably won't be able to finish this letter before I leave on my daily walking therapy and my thrice-weekly blood tests followed by physical therapy.

You are quite correct in believing that your own comprehension will be greater if you begin with the 1/27 transcript and I suggest even more so that of 1/22, in Post Mortem at page 475 if I remember correctly. I'll enclose an FBI damage-control tickler that will answer some of your questions relating the Commission members' fears and the nature of the investigation. I added the paperclips in making the copy to attract attention to those items.

One of the many Oliver Stone evils is his lying about the allegedly withheld records. Of the Commission's only about 2% remain withheld and probably most of them must be to protect personal privacy and for other legitimate reasons. With regard to the other records, as you will see from another enclosure, there never was any real investigation, none was ever intended, so there is no smoking gun to be disclosed with records. This is but one of the many evils, deceiving and misleading the people for commercialization and exploitation of the great tragedy.

With regard to the House committee's records, all they can be expected to show is that it also never really investigated the crime and that it was dishonest and incompetent.

In connection with your understanding I suggest that you read the Eisenberg memo in ~~EXHIBIT~~ Whitewash IV, page 24. LBJ actually convinced Warren of this nonsense!

Hudkins could have refused to disclose his source. But the Commission never called him because it did not want what he could have said on the record. He became a friend. He left the Houston paper for one in <sup>(45 miles from here)</sup> Baltimore, whence he went to Buffalo, New York, where he now is. We speak from time to time but less often now that I have no time.

The exact language of the First amendment is: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of <sup>on of the press,</sup> speech, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The documents I intend to copy later and enclose prove the intent not to investigate on any level, from the FBI in Dallas to the Government. Katzenbach was the Justice Department No 2 man as Deputy Attorney General but then he was also Acting Attorney General. Moyers was his channel to President Johnson. Imagine the FBI declining a free copy of a picture showing the President being killed because it does not show Oswald with a smoking gun! If in any event could have been used for "identification purpose," of witnesses and relating to the positions of the people in the limousine at an indetifiable moment. This record was never sent to Washington until 1978, when it was to be processed under FOIA for disclosure to me. The 8mm movies actually had 87 frames of the very window in which Oswald allegedly

was just moments before the shooting and nobody is in it. Not sending this information and those films to Washington avoided embarrassing the FBI HQ and it also denied knowledge of their existence to both FBIHQ and the Commission.

If later in selecting a few of these records for copying it seems necessary to add more I'll do that. Please excuse the rush of this response.

Hosty was the Oswald case agent in Dallas. He got and later destroyed a threatening note from Oswald left for him about two weeks before the assassination and destroyed <sup>it</sup>/as soon as Oswald was killed. He lied in his Commission testimony, was praised for that by FBIHQ and then was disciplined, along with other agents, on spurious charges. "Handled" really means ordered to be destroyed by FBIHQ.

The two Thermofax pages (this paper) enclosed are the only two references to the shooting in all five volumes of the report LBJ ordered of the FBI, in the Commission's files Commission Document or CD1. Note that there is no real account of the shooting in all five volumes, all shots not mentioned, cause of death not given, etc.

In Dallas, before any investigation was possible, it was decided that Oswald was a lone assassin. This record was searched, processed and filed before he was charged. No name given.

The Dallas report synopsis records that there had been a mark left by the bullet on the curbstone but it was no longer there! They dug that curbstone up, flew it to Washington and "tested" the patch by spectrographic analysis!

Rosen was Alex, assistant director in charge of General Investigative Division.

William Sullivan was assistant director, Domestic Intelligence Division.

You may have some questions about this tickler outline. I hope it is clear enough to you. Byzantine!

These are copies of records I keep on my desk so it is no problem for me to consult them if you have any questions.

Imagine the FBI preparing dossiers on such prominent men! and twice on the staff!

What a way to investigate an assassination!

Sincerely,

Harold Wisberg





Publisher Harold Weisberg  
7627 Old Receiver Road  
R.d.Frederick  
M.D.21701  
U.S.A.

Dear Harold

Dragør 12/2-92

First of all I would like to thank you for your last letter, and tell you that I am glad that you like my pictures. After all the publicity Oliver Stone and his movie have received the last couple of weeks, I must admit I got curious and went to see it the other day here in Copenhagen. But I must also tell you that I got very disappointed, and I can understand why you and many other serious people, who have spend many years studying the assassination of President Kennedy, think that Oliver Stone and Jim Garrison have, as you wrote me, misled the people by their all-inclusive theory presented as facts. That is exactly what this movie shows.

The only good thing Oliver Stone maybe have accomplished with his movie is, if there will be a public demand for releasing the archives from the Warren Commission.

Do you think that it will reveal more new evidence, you have not been aware of before, if this file would be released, or have they already destroy the most damaging evidence, I think so. As I have told you before I read Time Magazine, and in their last two issues, they have published some articles in connection with the Oliver Stone movie, and as always is their opinion of President Kennedy not very high.

One of this articles by Ron Rosenbaum, I don't know him, have in my opinion some very offensive remarks for many people:

"While no new evidence have emerged, the film has focused attention on the band of mostly self-appointed experts who zealously pursue theories of a wider plot."

At the same time, I was surprised to read a very favorable and I think fair article in Life Magazine from december-91, in which you were quoted in connection with the many conspiracy theories. That's enough of Oliver Stone.

I would rather comment on your books. I notice that you suggest that I begin my translation with Whitewash 1, that is also my intention, but the reason for beginning with Whitewash 4, was because it gives me a better understanding of the background for your writing from the beginning, and the attitude from the authorities, FBI, CIA and the Warren Commission in the investigation of the assassination, which I think started your long and tireless efforts to get to the truth.

Let me try to explain my intentions, which is very difficult.

In my opinion, is it very important to know the background for the Warren Commission, why it was assembled, who were the men Lyndon Johnson selected to serve in the Commission, what was the intentions among these respectable men, where they interested in finding the truth, why were they so afraid of the evidence they find, why were they so afraid of Mr. Hoover, and finally, can we believe them and their final report. (which I doubt)

Therefore, I think it is important for any person to know the background for this Commission when one reads Whitewash 1. I think that when you read the book, together with the knowledge from among other things the transcript from the session of the Warren Commission the 27th of January 1964, you know how the mentality was among the members, and therefore your evidence in Whitewash 1, will have a more stronger effect, understanding and credibility.

Perhaps I am wrong in this analysis, but I would like to hear your opinion to this.

In Whitewash 4, you examine the book of Gerald Ford "Portrait of the Assassin" and his faking of the 27th January transcript. I have read the first chapter of this book in David Wroner's "Freedom of Information" which he so kindly forwarded to me, and I have intended to use this material along with your proof of the faking of this transcript, but I am not sure whether there would be any problem with the copyright of the book of Gerald Ford.

The transcript, the original, is very fascinating to read, and at the same time shocking, and I would like to ask you some few questions regarding this.

The members of the Commission discuss at great length, whether the reporter Mr. Hudkins can claim privilege for not disclosing his sources. According to the "Bill of Rights" which the members on the Commission should be well familiar with, especially the Chief Justice Earl Warren.

In this amendment to the American Constitution, which I am sure I don't have to tell you about, is it stated:

"Government shall not infringe on publisher's right not to disclose sources of published thoughts government can not punish reporters for refusing to reveal the names of informants."

How can the Commission then be in doubt, whether Mr.Hudkins can be forced to reveal his sources.

What happen to Mr.Hudkins afterwards, was there any retribution against him in his job or otherwise?

Why was this distinguish men, selected by the President of the United States, so afraid of the government agencies, and specially Mr.Hoover.They have been giving authority by their president to investigate everything and everybody, and when they stumbled over the thruth, they were to afraid to confront it.

Going back to your letter, you told me you could send me some documents I could use in my translation. It is very difficult for me to select from your I believe enormous archives, but I am interested in some of the FBI-reports in Whitewash 4, but I would rather leave it op to you, if it is not to much to ask for, if you could select some documents you think is important.

I do not hope I have been asking to much of you, but I have so many questions I would like to ask, so even I try to make a short letter, I always ending up making a long one.

Sincerely Lasse. 

Lasse Larsen  
Engvej 76  
2791 Dragør  
Denmark.  
Lasse



1st

# Freedom of the Press - Right to Read

*Government has no power  
to restrain, license or censor press,  
nor prohibit an individual or group  
from reading what has been published,  
because of the right to association.*

*Government shall not censor thought or publications,  
the censorial power is in the people –  
over the government.*

*Government has no power to define or punish  
any form of slander or libel against it.*

*Government shall not infringe a publisher's right  
not to disclose sources of published thoughts;  
government can not punish reporters  
for refusing to reveal the names of informants.*

*Freedom of the press applies to all media  
used to publish and disseminate thought;  
including newspapers, magazines, books,  
audio-video recordings, films and motion pictures;  
all forms and expressions of creative art and drama,  
and scientific inventions and discoveries;  
also, radio and television broadcasting  
(Subject to Government allocation of broadcasting frequencies,  
which constitute a limited natural resource).*