George Lardner, Newsroom
Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20071

6/29/91

Dear George,

I'm at a loss to understand the delay. I've been asked about the Garrison book three times this past week and I no longer have a clear recollection of it. I'd like to have it and at the least the Sciambra memo as soon as possible.

As you know, I have no copy of the book. The one you have is Dave Wrone's that I annotated for him.

I've read Mangold's book through the first Nosenko chapter. I'm also annotating it.

It may interest you to compare what it says in the notes rather than the text about whether or not the KGB suspected Oswald was a sleeper agent with what is said about those identical FBI reports in the first if not still the only previous book to draw upon them. And as I recall other things Mangold does not refer to.

I used up what would have been four blank pages at the end of Post Mortem.

If I did not include a citation to what the Commission had about Oswald's politics and avoided mentioning in its report, you can find it through the index to my first book. It quotes and cites his writings.

As I recall those FBI reports Mangold cites to the HSCA when I got them years earlier at the Archives included a bit of that. Mangold didn't.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Harold

Dear Jim,

7/2/91

Thanks for the filing on Noriega's relations with the CIA. I've read through the opening general statement and just begun the part of him, and it is interesting and worthwhile. His lawyers avoided the trap omniscient Christic dug for itself in going for all the attractive nuttiness. The part I've read is so far as I can tell entirely accurate and not at all overstated.

When Lil retypes it I'll be enclosing a letter to Mangold. To a degree it will speak for itself.

As you may remember when he was getting started he phoned and asked for help. I agreed. You should remember that you copied some things for me to use in helping him. Some time passed, I'd heard nothing, so I wrote him telling him if he'd changed his mind to please let me know because in my circumstances I did not want to waste any time. Again no response. Then I saw some uncorrected page proofs I did not read. The table of contents indicated two Nosenko chapters. So I wrote again and asked if he had any Nosenko information he'd not used in the book I'd appreciate copies. Silence.

Then the book was out and I got a copy and I saw the thanks to Jeff (AIB) Goldberg. I figured that accounted for his impoliteness and his imposition on me. Until I got into the book and started observing what surprised me: he was covering the CIA's institutional ass as much as he could. Which is quite much! And then I got to his lie about what Nosenko told the FBI the KGB believed about Oswald. What he wrote is not an accidental error. It is a deliberate lie. Among a multitude of other relevant things his omission of what the CIA swore in my FOIA suit, which he cited without context twice, leaves no doubt at all in my mind.

Thus far no reviewer or reporter has asked me about the book, I have no reason to expect that anyone will, and I've not enough energy left for taking up the cudgels now and being able to do anything else. But what he has done is scandalous and ought to be exposed.

And the shadows of the disinforming AIB continue to disinform, or be part of it....And it has come to the point where one who opposes wrongdoing is himself suspect for exposing it. As with AIB, HSCA, etc.

Reading of the CIA's mail-interception activities reminded me how much I'd like to have what of mine they intercepted. It includes at least one offer to publish Whitewash abroad that never reached me and related letters. Plus the returned MS, hand-delivered but mailed back. Plus other things of which you know.

Hope all is going as well as it can,

Harold

9/11/91

Dear George, Landau

Herewith Carr's Hollywood Reporter story and my (unanswered) letter to Oliver Stone.

I do hope you get time to do and to do justice to your Golitsyn interview.

I assume you are under some wraps but if you can tell me, was it offered to you or the Post?

As part of what they got from Mangold, all possible institutional exculpation?

I do not suggest they expected this from you.

If he is the man sicced on me, as I suspect, I can't understand how rational, responsible people could trust his judgement or account of anything at all.

I can think of no way other than from Angleton that he could have known of my interest in Nosenko and I'd had no contact with Angleton.

Isn't it frightening to know that decisions of considerable importance were made on his word, his judgement, and by people who credited him? And the likes.

Best,