

9/21/76

Mr. Howard Bray  
Fund for Investigative Journalism  
1346 Connecticut Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Howard,

Enclosed is a carbon of my letter to Mother Jones. There must have been a half-dozen major interruptions while I drafted it yesterday. Some were from a number of young people who have my concerns about what the House assassinations investigation can mean.

To one who has not lived through what I have with these people - and with Lane alone it is 10 years - what I fear may seem strange. When I am the first to conclude there is need for a Congressional investigation, the conclusions of 2/15/65 in my first book, it may appear to be even more strange.

But it is very real. It is now probable. And when I can't keep up with what I'm into, when I've not been able to complete a book laid aside six months ago, I must find the ~~same~~ means and time.

I have a notion that a publication with more weight than Mother Jones just might go for a piece on this now. There are reasons other than topicality. One is that these farouts require that I, their severest critic on the basis of fact, become the defenders of the agencies. This criticism is without basis, as Schweiker's was unfactual and irrelevant.

Nobody appears to want Truth as a client.

The thievery is annoying. However, I would not take time to contend with it now. I have been living with it for a decade, beginning with Lane in his first books and then with Garrison, as George Lardner noted in a story in facsimile on the back cover of my third book, the one with the brown cover. The difference now is in the potential.

Since I wrote you I have received more information in the form of a tape-recording of one broadcast and a dependable account of another the dub of which has not reached me and a by-lined article. There is no doubt about my being correct prior to receiving this evidence. It constitutes proof on all counts.

I will be using means other than a story. I have begun, when asked for comment to be broadcast. Some of these students who, from personal experience know what to expect, will be doing their thing. However, a story that could receive attention could make a harder impact could be much more important.

Were it not for their uncomfortable pasts my first choices would be the Post's Outlook section and the New Yorker. I don't think Bradlee would even take the time to talk to me. I do think that if he or Geyelin did they could be satisfied. So would their lawyers be on libel. (Actually, Lane can't be libelled, he has that kind of record and is that utterly unconscionable.) Moreover, there would not be any libel action, not even in desperation.

You saw part of my files. You saw only about 40 files drawers. There is more. One of the larger files is on Lane, from an earlier similar effort that I feared would cause a mistrial in the Shaw case. My Lane files are far from complete, but they do include even CIA transcripts of his statements that the CIA did not give me.

Do not misunderstand this. My objective is not to "get" Lane. I have refused many opportunities to do this over the years. In and of itself this would serve no constructive purpose. In fact after I knew he had stolen my work and in what I hoped might be a common interest I abandoned my second book to defend all of us when he had foolishly said he would sue a former Warren Commission lawyer for calling him a liar. Nothing is safer and Lane dared not sue. At the request of a friend of his, Maggie Field, whose husband Joe was a partner in Hutton & Co. I took after that lawyer, Wesley Liebeler, and silenced him for 10 years.

My objective is to prevent a subverting from the non-government side. Now it means an effort to prevent the suborning of the Congress.

Let me tell you a little more about the addition to the book I'm about to reprint. It is at once an expose of the Rockefeller Commission and of the CIA. I have CIA evidence of the most probative nature that it developed before there was a Warren Commission and never gave it. I have what it gave to the Rockefeller Commission, which then suppressed it. It has this meaning: if the Warren Commission had had it they could not possibly have written their Report. Period. That definitive.

While at this point it merely confirms what I have proven by other means it is ~~the~~ dramatic and it is also official.

I will be using it in facsimile.

I'd like to believe that with the House having voted an investigation something with more influence than Mother Jones could be interested. Also something that R pays what justifies the time.

If you would like to talk about any of this and we can't in any other way I'll be in Washington the 30th and the 1st on two FOIA cases. Both are in the morning and should not go into the afternoon. I do have a check-up on the phlebitis at 3:30 the 1st.

Again thanks,

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg