

Anderson column of 9/7/76

HW 9/7/76

The WxPost column was cut by what was read to me from the NY Post by phone.

I don't recall ever seeing any writing with as many disclaimers.

The most important one was missing: their source, CIA stuff from Bud, was not quoted fully or fairly. This on the Ruby angle.

He is a crazy man and otherwise was evaluated as a worthless source. His name is John Wilson Hudson, as I recall. There are CIA reports from London on this. I did not recall it when Mark Semolensky first questions me about what is inherently an unbelievable story. I called him back to be sure he knew when I was reminded.

Besides this there is Oswald as a sharpshooter and Roselli's unidentified associates. Read Morgan, Wadden, or Mafia?

I can't recall a line in this column that does not exude awareness of what it was doing, of its basic, intended dishonesty.

A reasonably intelligent high-school kid should be able to see through this kind of writing. Or, they are not worried about their editors or something else means more.

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701  
9/7/76

Ben Bradlee  
Washington Post  
1150 15 St., NE  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Mr. Bradlee,

This one I owe you and the Post.

I leave the interpretations to you.

You may recall I sent you a carbon of the letter I wrote Les Whitten about gross inaccuracies and being used. And about the time I'm willing to take ~~to~~ be of help to those who want accuracy in what they take to the country. Do take the time.

About the time Bob Woodward called me about the advance-warning story on the JFK assassination, perhaps the same day, Mark Smolonsky also called me on what is in the Anderson column you ran today.

I knew you did not run the whole column. I had that in today's NIPost read to me this afternoon.

At first I did not recognize the Ruby crap that had been fed Anderson from some declassified CIA files. When I was reminded I phoned him. I think it was a week ago "onday. It had been some time since I read those records. But there are more of them.

The source of the Ruby nonsense, as I remember the name, was a Britisher of bad reputation, a psycho and one with an axe to bury in Castro. After the original reports the CIA did some checking in London. I've paraphrased the results.

Or, a totally undependable source and a single source, regardless of what wishful thinking is added to it. I had already cautioned the column that it was being fed old stuff, what you had printed long ago, little of this as you print. On the Ruby propaganda, which is what it is, Solonsky told me he knew of those other reports. I offered him access to my files.

I also told him that back in 1968 I had three or four long interviews with an American soldier of fortune who had been jailed with Trafficants, that he had made no mention of this and that if it had happened or if he'd thought to make it up he'd have sold it.

While I can't recall as brief a bit of writing with as many disclaimers the omission of that one can't be accidental.

There is no single part of this column that can be believed. It very obviously has invisible auspices. But the auspices does not excuse the departure from normal standards and common honesty.

The disgust I feel is in addition <sup>to</sup> that I feel for this whole wretched campaign to make it appear that JFK got himself killed - and deserved it.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg