

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
12/44/75

Mr. John Crewdson
New York Times
1920 L St., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear John,

During periods when the phlebitis allows me to move around more I try to clean up the accumulation of several months, including filing when I could not bend.

Today I came upon the enclosed. I remind you of its purpose for several reasons.

It is the list of pages in Post Mortem I prepared for you prior to your arrival, the very pages you refused to let me call to your attention, saying you did things your way. My point was and was explicit: that for one without the background and with a book of this size and complexity I owed it to you to simplify and to call to your attention evidence I considered newsworthy. (I'll face any challenge on newsworthiness as of today.)

The view you later expressed is that there is no JFK assassination news short of grabbing the assassins. While I ~~disagree~~ disagree and hope the Times would disagree, I do not content your right to your own opinion. I have my own opinion of the journalistic impartiality and judgement it reflects, but that will not interest you.

There is no need to return this.

I had and have no other need for it.

I can't recall the purpose of the first item. I presume it was to tell you of another and perhaps relevant matter.

I recall the last clearly enough. It was to tell you, whether or not I did, of the purposes I had in mind for my confrontation with Belin. I have the text. His change of heart and position was not spontaneous, although nobody treated it as anything else, including you, who knew in advance and after the fact. To your knowledge I had earlier, if not newsworthy to the Times, charged perjury and its subornation to named witnesses and Commission lawyers. My speech to Belin's face was Belin's record on this. With copies of what he suppressed to this end. (I understand that in Buckley's show aired last night he made no reference to me and I can assure you-prove-that he had one of the first copies of Post Mortem.)

Jim tells me you three were pressing Bud on the extradition treaty, I presume in an effort to support O'Connor's version. If your interest were of another nature you'd have been in touch with me. That was my work, the Hanes/Huie contracts are relevant, and a British reporter, aided by the British Embassy, made an independent study. There is also what I do not think you are anxious to know, the interpretation in the Vesco case. If you would rather avoid me, ask Channel 6 in New York for a tape of Hanes Sr's version when he and I confronted after Foreman fled. There is much available on what you show an interest in if your interest is in uncolored fact. And if you believe anyone knowing anything about him expected there was any chance for Ray to appear before a grand jury or any lawyer would assent without exculpation, you must be a charter member of the Flat World Society.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg