

Jim Kostman
AIB
1322 18 St., NW, #21
Washington, D.C. 20036

11/14/78

Dear Jim,

On October 23, which is three weeks ago, I wrote you about your Ray piece in the AIB newsletter. Without rereading what I wrote I am confident it was severely critical and indicated the belief that your piece was seriously flawed. It made no difference to me that you have not responded. We made a date for you to come here thereafter and go over some of my files. When you neither kept that date nor informed me that you would not that also did not discourage me from setting a new time for you to come and go over those files. I believe that this establishes the fact that I can ignore opinions other than mine and that I can excuse and forget what I believe is not unfairly described as social deficiencies or less than proper personal behavior.

Today Seven Days came. It has your article that appears to be identical with that really terrible newsletter piece. ~~It is~~ a really terrible article. It is dishonest, now I believe it is fair to say deliberately dishonest. It is poorly reasoned, with there being no excuse for its publication three weeks after you had at least reason to have some question about it. I called the original committee puffery. It is much worse than this, although it is this. It masks the fact of corrupt committee behavior, its leaking of irrelevant and biased misinformation. You mask this by pretending that on its own the Times dug it up. Perhaps worst of all you have become part of a Cointelpro operation against the truth about a political assassination. I do mean a deliberate FBI Cointelpro operation. There is more I could say but except for noting your covering of Lane's ass by blaming his fabrication on his client I see no point in taking the time.

Your arrogance in this is hard to describe and impossible to accept. I did write you three weeks ago. You have asked me not a question about that. Instead you publish to a wider audience what I had, to put it mildly, cautioned you against. Your writing is incredibly irresponsible. You clearly know nothing factual about the subject and are entirely without concern over this. It ~~and~~ ^{is} cautious appear to be your sole qualifications because I have no reason to believe that you work for the errant executive agency for which you have become a running dog. Of course in this you also become a committee flack.

Despite my strong disagreements with the AIB I have offered to help it in a project of common interest only to have them take the idea and fuck it up, coast-to-coast yet, and not to have profited from that experience. I took time to sit and talk with three of you, as I later did the same with you. I took a little time to write you about the newsletter version of the Seven Days piece. If my time and my belief, which is based on knowledge, not AIB crapping around, mean so little to it and to you I think that any time I spend with any of you is a total waste. I do not have enough time left to waste and I will not do this again.

On a personal level this is an acute disappointment to me. I had hoped that all the really terrible things the AIB has done in the past, like ripping off the minds of a college generation, along with the Lane, and the utter insanity of contriving with him for the creation of a Congressional investigation based on non-fact, were of the past. And I had expected better of you, not know-nothingism and a further corruption of all the minds you might reach..While there is no reason to believe that you will want to discuss this, the proper time for discussion having been prior to publication, if you should want to there is only one way I will - with a tape recording for deposit so that in the future others may know just exactly what the AIB has done and continues to do. Then, if you'd like, I'll take your entire piece apart.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg