

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701

9/28/74

Dear Nicholas von Hoffman,

When we are indeed in The Year of Our Lord and Dick Nixon did not misrule in vain ~~by you~~ - in the era of Watergating - come up with doublegoodspenducktalk: your column of 9/21/74.

Specifics:

"The trouble with such propositions [sic] is that while they do punch difficult to explain holes in officials explanations, they are seldom able to give us much of a clue as to who the 'real' killer may be." Followed without interruption by

"It is for this reason that nobody has been able to discredit the Warren Commission report." Still nothing omitted-

"If Lee Harvey Oswald didn't murder Kennedy, then who did?"

All one crap.

The "hypothesis" is not Kaganov's. You have been asleep in the years of raking in the loot and skimming on the tube. Not did the solid evidence - and you so describe it while calling it no more than a "proposition" - await the suit you refer to. That suit was much later. (The people who develop this kind of evidence are ignored by the responsible elements of the media and the columnists, while the undergrounders go for the exploiter hats who esbruder, profit and ultimate^{ly} destroy all credibility, thanks to those who give them attention and ignore solid work.) I haven't seen Kaganov's "hypothesis" nor have I investigated that assassination per se but I do have the LAFD teletype on the destruction of some evidence, a secret transcript of a proceeding in which only the defendant was not represented and a criminalistic proof that there was more metal than the one gun could have held.

How is it really "the trouble" that this doesn't say "who killed Bobby Kennedy?"

Got nothing to do with the pre-Watergate integrity of public authority? The state of justice? How politicians can take and hold strong views opposed to government policy and not survive them and what the hell the well-paid reporters on the profit-making press are doing - and not doing?

"Nobody has been able to discredit the Warren Report?" You dream, man. Most people never believed it. But it has been destroyed over and over again, save for the ostriches like you who practice good Orwell. Or is it only since you have become so big a success. My first book, which was the first on the subject, did that. It has never been refuted. Bearing the book. And if you think it can be or the Report hasn't been discredited why don't you have some fun and get such respected types as Albert Jenner, Charles Shaffer and Howard Willens - I mean in a gangup - to debate their work, mine or any combination of their choosing in any forum of yours. First see if they will. If they do - and they won't - we can work out minor details. They are locals who did the work bearing Warren's name.

I'll have another in my series on this subject out soon but a freebie to you will be wanted.

What would you think of a prosecutor's case that consisted of "If ~~Nixon~~ von Hoffman didn't rob the bank who did?" Especially if this nick were "convicted" on a combination of suppressed evidence which proved he could not have and ex parte misrepresentation of the other evidence that consisted of the same plus the sotteest prejudicial crap?

I don't think that you want to think. Except about being oute, which pays and soothes the ego.

but if you want to be oute while not having to do any real thinking, I refer you to the Post's files on my four Freedom of Information law suits to bring some of this suppressed evidence out.

In the first when I held a press conference and produced xeroxes of evidence proving the kind of Nazi like Klondikeist and Nixon's then Attorney General were - over their signatures - the Post's reporter filed a column and the Post was over-up. No word. Nor a word when I got a summary judgement against DJ. (This related to the assassination you didn't mention, King's, in which the decision of the 6th circuit, upheld by the Supreme Court, also would have made a column for the before-greatness von Hoffman.)

Let me switch because you are now too important to waste time learning and the Post found this part of that decision, as it found the entire decision, not news:

"...The entire record reeks with ethical moral and professional irregularities, demanding the fullest judicial inquiry...no alternative to the conclusion that Ray's attorneys were more interested in capitalizing on a notorious case..."

Then there is the federal judge who said I should be forever forbidden from investigating the JFK assassination. This decision is in the Post's files but the words of that great man Danaher were not news. How can the judicial forbidding of a writer - in perpetuity - be news, or column material?

Would you find it cute enough if an Assistant United States Attorney, when pleading the right to suppress, said it was for law-enforcement purpose, and when asked what law was being enforced, there being none, responded (paraphrase), "Surely when a President is killed there has to be some law, human or natural" and on this was upheld by the sainted Marlin John himself? Then and the forever-forbid jazz were upheld by the Burger court and the entire law was with it ~~xx~~ administratively and judicially rewritten into a license to suppress. Without a word ~~for~~ the von Hoffman's or the Post's (and a Post reporter was present at every proceeding) and as his first real act as President Open Jerry pulled some dirty-work in conference and nullified the Congressional effort to return the law to its original intent. Yes, the Post knew. And yes, it was not news.

Get with it, man. You didn't begin writing and thinking this kind of b.s and you do owe your readers - especially the young one - something better.

When you can write the kind of graf I've quoted you should stand back and take a long, long look.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg