

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

8/6/91

Dear George,

As you now know, our letters crossed in the mail. Believing that you take your vacation in August I sent it to your home. With your byline in today's paper, I sent this there.

As you do not know, for several weeks, in our better moments, we have been the Cane family. Most of the time Lil has required a wheelchair, sometimes a walker.

So, I've not done and now am not doing any checking. Besides, I did not have a list of what you got and don't even know what other files you were interested in.

Those records that do not seem familiar I return herewith.

After you did not return the records I requested, and that now seems like more than a month ago, but said you would, I reminded you several times, without any response. Believing that you vacation in August I wrote you more pointedly so you could keep your word before going on vacation. I knew you'd gotten records from Jim- I'm the one who told you to see him because Dub kept Garrison's xerox machine as busy as anyone else I saw at it, perhaps busier. Was it not reasonable to believe you'd have more trouble remembering after vacation? And did I not also tell you that if you sent me any you got from Jim I'd return them? When you did not respond in any way to a number of letters, what did you expect of me? If you had made any response none of what followed would have followed. It is not my fault that you did not respond.

You refer to my letter as "bilious." That is not how I felt. Aside from what I said I felt abused and imposed upon and I resented it very much because you knew that we both were not well when you were here, could not avoid noticing that I get around only with difficulty and can't even make more than a cursory check of my own files. And that not all the time. You know also that at my age and in the state of my health everything I do is at the cost of something I won't be able to do. At least before next to the last time I wrote you I was diagnosed as having spinal stenosis and then I sprained my more severely impaired foot. But without knowing of these additional medical problems and limitations, you knew how limited I am or then was and yet for whatever reason - you were not that busy all that time - you decided to ignore my letters. For a man almost 80 to complain about your not keeping your word and not responding is not really "bilious."

Quite a few weeks ago I did hear from someone at CNN in L.A. but not along the line of Stone being "entitled to his definition of 'truth'." We talked quite some time, he said they had much to learn before they could responsibly air anything, I suggested that he did not have to master all that was public but could compare what Stone had said with the readily available fact, - offered him access to my FOIA records, he said he'd get back to me after several weeks and I've not heard from him. I didn't even note his names to the best

of my present recollection although I might have. If he asked me to send him anything I did. The only recollection I have of recent weeks of sending anything to any TV show is a few pages on one of Garrison's would-be self-promoters who tried the same con in the King case that those who produced a show for BBC fell for. I also declined to be on that show, "Inside Edition." One experience was too much. (*Jules Riccio Kimble.*)

TV people still seem surprised to learn that there really are some of us who do not care enough for their attention to compromise with principle to be on the tube.

That woman would not have believed it if I'd told her that I refused to be on a Dan Rather TV special for the same reason, principle. I know from someone then with CBS News that they were quite surprised.

Anyway, it has been so long I do not expect to hear from CNN. They may have decided that it would take too much time to be adequately informed.

I did hear from Moo today. The Stone show closed its New Orleans stand with a couple of parties one featuring a stripper who "took it all off." Supposedly they moved to Washington to film there. Stone was quoted on that.

You ask if you sent me less than you got. I have no way of knowing. But thanks for what came today.

Sincerely,

Harold
Harold Weisberg

The Washington Post

1150 15TH STREET, N. W.

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20071

(202) 334-6000

WRITER'S DIRECT TELEPHONE NUMBER
202-334-7434

August 3, 1991

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21701

Dear Harold:

Enclosed are xerox copies of documents about Boxley and the Garrison investigation, the originals of which I returned to you months ago. I may have included more than you gave me since I got additional documents from Jim Lesar. If I have sent less, let me know which ones are missing. In any case, I think you owe me an apology for your bilious note. I trust you will find the originals someday. They were, as I told you over the phone, in a plastic grocery bag that I left at your door.

and unjustified

By the way, did CNN ever contact you about a five-minute special their entertainment division was going to do on the Stone movie controversy? Somebody called me from L. A. about it weeks ago, explaining at length how Stone was entitled to his definition of "truth." I told him I didn't think I wanted to play that game, but that they could call me to double check when they got to town for filming. They never called again.

Sincerely,



George Lardner