

11/3/69

Mr. Martin Agronsky  
WTOP-TV News  
Broadcast House  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Agronsky,

Once upon a decent time it was the custom of honorable reporters and decent papers never to say a man was guilty of a crime until convicted in court by a jury of his peers. With so many of the fine traditions of American journalism, this is no longer true.

Tonight you said Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone assassin of President Kennedy, shooting him with a mail-order rifle from the Texas School Book Depository. Break this down as fine as you will, each element is false to such an extent that I believe today even a biased mind will acknowledge more than a reasonable doubt.

The unapetizing Oswald is one of the victims, as are the members of the Commission which steadfastly refused to conduct an investigation of the murder it was charged with investigating, while its publicists were loudly pretending that in star-chambers it was. The liberal journalistic friends of Earl Warren and the conservative devotees of Richard Russell have this in common: by their silence and their advications they guarantee the man they respect, like the national honor and integrity, will not soon recover from what they have uncritically accepted or worse, with no personal knowledge, proclaimed.

The purpose of this letter is to request equal time to respond to your inaccurate broadcast. I propose to offer you for airing some of the suppressed evidence showing that Oswald was known to the government not to have been in a position to have committed the crime, that there is no proof that rifle was used (and the evidence that is alleged to prove it to this day is still suppressed); and what until now has not been aired, proof tested for the first time in court that there was no investigation to see how the crime was committed or by whom.

Had you responded to my several earlier efforts to reach you by phone when you were airing the official stories on the assassination, all now ordained pointless, committed only by nuts while they serve comprehensible political ends, you might have had an inkling of the truth. However, were our positions (and knowledge of the facts) switched, were I to receive such a letter as this, I'd have the deepest doubts. Therefore, I offer to answer you in advance more than enough to satisfy a reasonable man that the foregoing is not exaggerated. More, I will show you in confidence what I will not now permit to be aired. I think it will shake you a bit.

Sincerely,

Harold Eisberg