

Mr. Burl Osborne, Editor  
Dallas Morning News  
Dallas, TX 75200

7627 Old Receiver Rd.  
Frederick, Md. 21701  
12/20/88

Dear Mr. Osborne,

When one of your reporters phoned me during your preparations for your special 11/20/88 section, I was disturbed by the apparent interest in appearance rather than substance and by the compartmentalization and its rigidly drawn lines.

I write not seeking attention and I seek none. Instead, I suggest that what I say might be included in your morgue for special sections or editions of the future.

In all this space and from all this great effort and cost, you have given your readers no new information at all and when you dealt with the substance peripherally you gave them misinformation.

You also confuse between existence of a conspiracy, which is a matter of fact, not of theory, and who conspired, which is misleading theory and conjecture far removed from fact. Conspiracy is a combination to do wrong plus an overt step. If this crime was beyond the capability of any one man, as without possibility of doubt from the disclosed and <sup>from</sup> originally withheld official evidence it was, then there was a conspiracy.

Under the Freedom of Information act I've obtained about a third of a million pages of government records originally withheld. The litigation in which I was able to do this is rich in fact tested as we test fact, in the courts, that no Dallas paper has ever expressed any interest in, (I consider that FOIA makes me surrogate for the people and everyone has access and can make copies. Mostly this means people with whom I do not agree.)

You have this entire section of a "news" paper which does not, in all those pages, let its readers and libraries know all this data is available. You do not even indicate its existence and you do latch all your stories to the distant past and strange interpretations of that.

In short - and I do not mean to be in any way insulting- you have kept yourselves as well as your readers ignorant of the fact of what was rightly called "the crime of the century."

(Please excuse my typing. I'm recovering from eye surgery.)

Because you have kept yourselves ignorant, you cannot meet traditional journalistic <sup>responsibilities</sup> if you want to.

Where you pretend to deal with the crime and criticism of the official explanation of it, in "Enduring Questions: Conspiracy theories persist," you are factually incorrect at a number of points and you do limit yourself to the conspiracy-theory literature. You are not even aware that the FBI and Secret Service both have always disagreed with the basic conclusions of the Warren Report, tailored to "solve"

the crime with the untenable single-bullet theory. The FBI and Secret Service, both knowing this to be impossible, merely eliminate the missed shot and have the President struck by the first and third and Governor Connally by the second.

Epstein's and Lane's were not the first books. The first of my four-part Whitewash series dates to 8/65. It alone of the vary first is still available. It is used in college courses still. (I've published six books on the subject and I think it does not exaggerate when I tell you that, other than untenable conspiracy theories, they brought to light just about all that is factual.) You appear not to have known of the only scholarly bibliography on the subject a notice of which I <sup>e/o</sup> ~~entire~~ <sup>entire</sup> ~~entire~~.

There is so much information now available, largely through my FOIA lawsuits, yet the major paper you edit is ignorant of all of it and displayed no interest in it when one of your reporters phoned me. It is now, for example, quite beyond question that the crime itself was never investigated and that from the first moments this was the official determination. I recognize this may be difficult for you to believe but your people are welcome here at any time and I can send you a few copies of FOIA records that leave this without doubt. It was actually spelled out by the acting attorney general as soon as Oswald was killed. He wrote his strong recommendation to LBJ in longhand and I can provide copies of the holograph, the DJ and the FBI file copies and other similar records.

Blackie Sherrod's article reports this preconception in a different way. ~~He~~ <sup>He</sup> says that the night of the assassination, which means before Oswald was even charged, the FBI was in your office seeking "a clue as to Oswald's motive." It had already been decided that Oswald alone was guilty. A FBI Dallas record reporting the urging of a nearby police department that certain persons be considered as suspects was run through the file and annotated, indexed and serialized and <sup>with</sup> filed before Oswald was charged. One of the annotations says it was not necessary to follow this lead "as true subject located." Before he was charged and apparently before his name was known to the FBI.

Your own police department ~~didn't~~ <sup>didn't</sup> even question the officers it assigned to protect and escort the President. Two of them ~~report~~ <sup>said they</sup> observed what destroys the official solutions and perhaps this explains at least the FBI's similar "oversight." It appears that Dallas reporters also failed to question them, and I mean ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> two closest to the limousine on the right side. One has since died but I have the touching memorandum of his day's experiences that he wrote out that night and I have the ~~voice~~ <sup>voice</sup> of the other when interviewed for radio. Neither was ever called by the Warren Commission, either. The FBI managed not to interview any of the police escort.

What I tell you is readily subject to proof, if you are interested and I suggest

that if you are not you have an other-than-american concept of journalistic responsibilities. (I've been an investigative reporter, Senate editor and investigator and wartime intelligence analyst -OSS.)

You need not agree with my view but I regard the assassination of any president as the most subversive of crimes in this country and that, <sup>what</sup> ~~however~~ the purpose, it has the effect of a coup d'etat.

I have never pursued any whodunit and there is no conspiracy theorizing in any of my books. Mine has been a large examination of how the basic institutions of our society functioned in that time of great stress and since the <sup>my</sup> conclusion is that all failed, including the press. I believe <sup>that</sup> this endangers our society.

In your case - and again, please believe me, I intend no insult - you don't even report <sup>state</sup> what your own people knew and did and said and you ignored the Warren Report's inconsistency with what you published.

When your photographer, Tom Dillard, saw the leaks of the "solution," he told Barefoot Sanders, then United State attorney, that they all ignored the missed shot. He had photographed its impact on the curbstone. The word getting to the Commission is what forced the invention of the single-bullet fairy tale, so that there might be ~~the~~ a no-conspiracy "solution," the one ordained by J. Edgar Hoover the evening of the crime and by the acting attorney general as soon as Oswald was killed. That curbstone was literally patched, when Oswald was dead, but knowing this the FBI had it dug up and submitted to so-called testing in Washington and then, after misrepresenting the results, destroyed the test. Comparing your picture, which I put in the record of a FOIA case but you have in your morgue, with that curbstone now in the National Archives makes this apparent. There are innumerable such bits of provocative information in which there has been no journalistic interest. Does not the strange patching of a curbstone provoke any journalistic interest, even in Dallas? Or phonying up a "test?"

It appears to be certain that interest in this assassination and its official investigations will never end, in part because those of us below your mention brought so much to light, at least availability. I hope you will have taken the time to read this letter and then ask yourself whether you ought not at least try to be better prepared to better serve your responsibilities and your people the next time there is occasion to remember this most terrible crime and the offenses that followed it, a crime - believe turned the world around and is largely responsible for the disenchantment I found on so many campuses.

Sincerely,

*Harold Weisberg*  
Harold Weisberg

I have a damaged copy of my last book in which, among other things that I hope may interest you or some of your staff, I have before-and-after pictures of that curbstone. What is in the Archives has been examined by an expert who holds that it was patched. I do not intend to attribute exaggerated significance to this one of so many such provocative matters. That it was patched is undisputed in that FOIA lawsuit. With Oswald dead you may not wonder, as I did, who in the world had any motive for obscuring the technical evidence held by the car where the bullet impacted? What was buried in the concrete of that patch is the minute traces of metal that could have been compared with the other bullet metal by spectrographic and by neutron activation analysis, to see if they had common origin the other existing and ignored evidence says they could not have had.

If you have any interest in any of my records your people, like others, can have unsupervised access and can make copies. I do not think that any paper would want to pay reporters to go through some 60 file cabinets of records but I have some duplicates filed by subject and they can examine them without making their own searches.

You do not owe me anything for the book. I'm not trying to sell you any books or any theories and this is a book I would not sell anyway.

I do hope, however, that I get you to think about this entire matter as you clearly have not and to be better prepared for the next special occasion.