Ben Bradlee
Wash. Post
1150 15 St., NW
Wash., D.C. 20005

9/9/76

Dear Mr. Bradlee,

Again I take time I do not have in an effort to help you to assume your responsibilities or at least provided a basis for your looking into propaganda your papers presents as news and opinion. Again I'll send Les Whitten a copy. I refer to this morning's copy of that column as it appeared in the Post, not the full column. Again I remind you that I am asking nothing for myself. I now had added motive, however, because I've heard that you have assigned two experienced reporters to the JFK assassination. Well, I will remind you of our first meeting. It was on this and I put into you hands what ten years ago would justify your today's head, substituting FBI for CIA: "FBI Withheld Data in JFK Probe."

Considering that I have published six books on this that remain without substantial question and entirely without refutation, sure is hot news.

First graf, "evidence suggesting." Both words are false, as is the earlier attribution to Sylgia Duran, repeated after I wrote about this. So is the date of the incident.

There was no "evidence." There was a totally unsubstantiated report by a person who had his own, biased objectives. He did not suggest. He stated explicitly what was soon proven totally false: he saw Oswald given $6,500 to kill JFK. (I've had those files for months.) I had earlier records from other sources. There was no need to mask this in the Schweiker report.)

This whole business is part of an indecent anti-Kennedy campaign that to the best of my knowledge is baseless. My belief it is purposeful, by those with their own objectives. This: "Since Robert Kennedy rode herd on the CIA..." If there is one thing that can't be reasonably questioned after the recent and inadequate Congressional hearings it is that nobody "rode herd" on the CIA and especially not in these areas. And when "there is no documentary evidence of this" what basis is there for "It must be assumed that he [RFK] was kept advised of subsequent [to 5/62] assassination attempts."

"Yet neither Kennedy nor Hoover divulged this important information to the Warren Commission."

This is totally false in all aspects. However, if you did not know, then let me tell you that Katzenbach not Kennedy dealt on that level with the Commission and the first thing LBJ did was to by-pass RFK. Not only did Hoover inform the Commission- the Commission knew independently by several means of which I believe I have informed you. One is in my first book, dating to 2/65 or before Pearson and Anderson were used to launch this disinformation and after they had a copy of it; the other is in that executive session transcript I got under FOIA and your national desk killed when I gave it to Bill Claiborne in 4/75. It is also in facsimile in my Post Mortem, which you have.

There is a reasonable limit to what can be attributed to the various spooks, whose misdeeds are burden enough without them being blamed for what they can t reasonably be blamed for.

Whether or not Dulles sat in silence on whatever this "Cuban angle" may be, the one referred to was no secret and the entire Commission and its staff knew of many of them.

I skip ahead to the date of this leak to the column, 1/67. This neatly coincides with what Jim Garrison was up to, although it was not then public. It wqs known. I, for example knew before the column. If Garrison needed no wrong turns marked for him, this was one of the early and effective ones, one about which I could do nothing.

I do raise a question about the timing. After all those years coincidence? When what Garrison might be able to do was unknown?

If "the Cuban connection" means the Rosselli connection only can it be accurate. I did it in a different way to all Commissioners in May, 1966.

No questions in an editor's mind about the CIA leaking this, through the man who was in actual charge?

Only one who has no knowledge of the facts of the actualk killing can suggest who did it. As in 1967 there today remains no basis for blaming a kickback assassination on RFK, whose admirer I was not.

My opinion is that suggesting this without something more than a headline to make is indecent, wretched journalism and a national disservice - part of a continuing campaign of disinformation that were it official could not better serve official purposes.

It is also my opinion that lobbying in newspapers belongs on the editorial or oped pages and that placing it elsewhere deceives the reader. If the column wants to lobby for the Downing resolution, as Smolenky indicated - even argued in favor of - then it should say at least that to relieve its deliberate lies.

These are deliberate lies in many ways. One is in having and having discussed my Post Mortem with me. Whether or not the column has the other books, which I gave it, this one is more recent and was discussed between us. The column, like the Post, refused to find news in that formerly top-secret executive session in which the Commission's knowledge of these matters is explicit, as is its agreement todestroy the record of deliberation, Dulles' proposal. And yes, Ford was there.

Having been informed of Edward P. Morgan's meticulous past I'd appreciate it if you could inform me whether he was with the FBI during the life of the Warren Commission. If so, perhaps the past is other than the column and, uncritically, you tell so many people.

I know something of that first column and the one after it. Morgan represented himself as serving <u>two</u> clients, not one. Why no mention of the second - ever? And if his lawyer-client privilege ended with Rosselli's death, it had not ended when he leaked what could have gotten his client killed. If in fact it didngt.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg