

later 2/21/71

Dear Paul,

I've had a phone call from a young friend in New York about other matters. He also mentioned a NY Post story on the taping of a Frost show in which Epstein and Garry appeared, with Frost siding with Epstein. It seems, from this young man's version of the Post story, that again the issue was restricted to the false one of numbers, not to the central questions of whether or not there is repressive action against blacks or dissidents or to whether or not, if there is repression, it is of federal support or inspiration.

If I am not mistaken, Garry is in the middle of a rather trying and months-long jury selection in the Seale case in New Haven, hence I'd suggest he did not and could not prepare for this appearance and by its very nature, had to have been at a tactical disadvantage by being on the defensive.

However, one thing this young friend reported sticks in my mind and bears heavily, my way, on things I had earlier written. Garry asked Epstein if he had interviewed the former San Francisco federal attorney, the black one I mentioned, named Poole. This followed an exchange in which Garry had cited what Poole said on leaving that office (I'm not now certain if Nixon fired him or he quit). Epstein said, as he does in this article, that all such statements flow from Garry's error, which is false.

However, need I make a bigger point of Epstein, doing this enormous research pretended as original, with all those lengthy citations of what happened all over California, and especially under Poole's jurisdiction, and not attempting to interview him? Could anything bear more on Epstein's one-sided purposes? Would you have interviewed all those in California Epstein presents as interviewed in his ~~own~~ own impartial investigation (restructuring himself to the implication, never the statement), without interviewed the local federal attorney who had sounded off on precisely this subject, whichever way he sounded off? Now remember, this is not a case where there had to be a whirlwind trip of a day or two. His California citations are a large part of his piece. So, whether or not he was there, how in terms of honesty of intent could one accept his failure to quote Poole, whether from the records made available or in personal investigation?

The fact that Poole was totally ignored strongly suggests that he was not in what was presented to Epstein, for Epstein doesn't even argue against whatever he said. My recollection of what Poole said is not that it had to do with numbers but that it had to do with federal policy.

I don't know when the Frost show will be aired.

And aside from whether or not Frost was partisan, he has or his show has a not unfamiliar attitude on political assassinations. For example, they aired a number of people on several, saying there was no conspiracy, and refused any opportunity to present the other side. They scheduled Kaiser, who did a rather careful and deeply disturbing book on the RFK assassination (and I will show you what I have obtained since then that I am certain will disturb you about the trial), and then cancelled him. It is something like the paper that is overup and then selects on a political basis. Only, they are never overup. They select and they change their minds about a subject or a person or an approach or what a book says.

Sincerely,

12/10/70

Dear Mr. Ungar,

After our brief conversation a few minutes ago, I decided to lend you the AG's memo because your understanding is important to your reporting and your reporting can be very important on a law I'd like to see used more and better than it has been.

However, as you can realize, I need this in my own preparations.

You can either copy it or use to order or get one at the GPO.

The opening pages are what I referred to.

Justice has already tortured "national security" into "national interest".

Perhaps you may want copies of what I do not have, the House and Senate Committee Reports. Justice prefers to quote House, so I presume they find what is in the Senate Report less congenial. Should you go to the doc rooms for these, I'd appreciate copies.

I also have a few of the decisions under the law and a list of the cases filed to about two months ago. Relevant to the Sierra case, I think, is a very recent one of which they apparently did not know, Wellborn v Hardin (Balt). The judge there said that factual and scientific studies could not be disguised, misnamed and withheld.

Hastily,

Harold Weisberg

11/14/70

Editor, The Evening Star
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir,

Your Reed Irvine's review of Albert Newman's book on the JFK assassination proves how sweet to the receptive nose the stench of garbage can be. The review, the book and the space you give both prove Orwell a true prophet.

In one respect is Irvine right. He says Newman "sifted" the evidence. That he did, with, as Irvine says, "great care", eliminating what he knew of it that was uncongenial to his pre-conception, that Oswald really wanted to kill the reactionary former General Walker.

Most of the 600 pages of this tedium are the propaganda of the rightist Dallas Morning News and of Radio News. On the basis of no evidence at all, Newman says Oswald spent his time reading the first and hearing the second. No single person of the thousand's interviewed reported either, and no accounting of Oswald's presumed finances permits his purchase of any newspapers.

The real tribute to Newman's genius is missing in Irvine's deification of him who substitutes the will of the politically-motivated for the fact of real inquiry, then calls it "non-fiction". The nonsense of the official investigation's explanation of what it calls Oswald's movements after the assassination ~~xxx~~ is all explained by the Newman genius. In Irvine's words, accurate enough, for it is the entire basis of the book, "Oswald set out ~~ix~~ with his pistol to shoot Walker. By sheer chance, officer J.D. Tippit ended up being shot by Oswald instead." Newman really goes farthur, detailing how Oswald planned the Walker assassination for that lunatic's doorstep.

Remarkable, considering that Walker was not deep in the heart of Texas, in Dallas, but in distant Louisiana!

Thus, SuperOswald to Newman and super-writer to Irvine.

For conceptual and literary dishonesty, there is nothing in the abundant literature of sycophancy that compares with Newman. Makes one wonder if Potter Clarkson, whose recent publications include other bombs of contrived support of the official assassination mythology, has official support, like USIA or CIA. Or, maybe Potter just likes to lose money?

Why don't you do some investigating?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

8/23/70

Dear Paul,

While you were away there were several developments. Brief updating.

DJ didn't comply with the order you heard Curren give. We went back to court the day after the week was up and he signed a summary judgement. Apparently this got Justice really up tight, for they added the criminal to the stupid in filing a perjurious affidavit that Friday, 8/14. We didn't learn of it until 8/17, when a copy reached Bud's office. I didn't get a chance to go over it until the early a.m. of 8/20, when I spotted the perjury. I wrote Mitchell. Von Hoffman has a carbon he is to return to me. Aside from the specific ~~intention~~ perjury, the affidavit had perjurious intent. It falsely swears that I had been given a copy of what the judge ordered I be given and as of then and as of later had not been give. We also have letters from Justice saying this stuff hadn't yet been given bearing a later date. Exactly when the copy of the file cover reached Bud's office I do not know. I do not yet have it in my possession. The picture did not reach me until 8/21. I had a hunch they'd send that to me, so instead of waiting for the mail to be delivered I went to the P.O. for it and got them to date the envelope. The frank bears no cancellation. Inside there is another internal routing slip, undated. The point is that Justice was telling the media the picture had been mailed when it hadn't (and another guy in Justice wrote a letter indicating it hadn't yet been printed). Then they arranged that there would be no dating of the mailing.

Paul Carson of WWDC interviewed Justice and me and aired a story. The Frederick and Hagerstown papers carried stories. Carson was phoned by AP DC and AP Md. In both cases the story was killed on the desk. He apparently had later conversation with them, for he told me yesterday that they told him the story was killed because it duplicated yours on Gracie! Somebody cooked up a thin one, but it held.

While Justice was in clear contempt, I propose doing nothing about that. Perjury is another matter, and if I can I will do something about this. We'll see if there is any Justice response to my letter.

Meanwhile, I want you to examine the picture closely. They made the print as unclear as they could, but it still shows things that might be interesting. I've asked them to be good boys and make me a proper print, from the negative, not by making a hastily-dried picture of the print, complete with fingerprints, lint, etc. If they do not, I will not press them on this, needing the time for other things.

Sincerely,