

November 30, 1983

Editor, News-Post

The American News Service commentary you published November 30 is a typical example of what happens when political preconceptions - on the subject of the assassination of President Kennedy, really political yearnings - render fact irrelevant. People state as unquestioned fact what they want to believe and have others believe, what is exactly opposite unquestioned, established fact.

Basic in this anti-Marxist effort to make it appear that Marxists assassinated JFK are two statements that simply are not true. I really question whether the author of this commentary has any knowledge of the fact at all or is merely repeating like-minded and similarly uninformed writers of the past.

"Based on the available evidence, the conclusion that Oswald shot the President has stood up" and "efforts to explain away the ballistics and other data are not persuasive," ANS says. Neither statement is true, although it is true that they reflect the conclusions of the Warren Commission - with which, I add, neither the J. Edgar Hoover FBI nor the Secret Service agreed.

Making full factual response would require the length of several large books, there is that much information now available. In my own archive about a half-million pages of records I obtained by lengthy and extensive Freedom of Information action to which ANS, like anyone else, has the access it has not asked for. Without examination of this extensive material and the also extensive litigation involving the two ANS statements I quote verbatim above, it is not possible to make a responsible statement and represent it as unquestionable fact.

There are two simple tests ANS can have made on its own if it is unwilling to credit the tests made for the Commission by the National Rifle Association and Army experts at Aberdeen Proving Grounds. Let ANS get its own Mannlicher-Carcano, a very poor rifle known as Mussolini's contribution to humanitarian warfare, put a telescopic sight on it, and get the best experts available to try to duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald. It simply is not possible and every effort to duplicate it has failed. ANS can find the results of the work by the Army and the NRS shooters, all "masters," in the Commission's published exhibits. It will find that even the world's best shots, under less than comparable, really much improved, conditions and circumstances, could not duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald, who was both unpracticed and at best a lousy shot.

After I spoke at Hood the night of the 14th, a retired police sergeant told me (unsolicitedly) that he had been part of one such effort, made by the White Laboratories near Baltimore for CBS-TV, and he was outraged by both the dishonesty of preparation and conditions, which included almost remaking the rifle used, and the results, which leave it without doubt that it is simply impossible for anybody to shoot as the official account has Oswald shooting.

What the ballistics data really establish is the absolute impossibility of what is basic to the official conclusion, that the Mannlicher-Carcano 6.5mm bullet enjoyed a spectacular, bone-smashing career, unequalled in either science

or mythology, and emerged in almost perfect condition, without a visible scratch on it. For the official account to be true, this bullet has to have been unscathed after going through the President near the base of the neck, striking bone there; then to have smashed four inches of Governor Connally's fifth rib; then to have gone through his wrist and smashed all those heavy bones; then to have gone two inches into his thigh and left a fragment at the bone. Even when the Army tried to duplicate this career one wound at a time - it never did try to have the one bullet inflict all seven wounds because it was known that the bullet did not have that penetrating power - there was always extensive deformity and mutilation. I'm certain the hunters in your readership will be aware that mutilation and deformity are inevitable.

The same is true of ANS's representation of Oswald as a "dedicated" and a "fanatical Marxist." This is the official line, based on his self-description as a Marxist for his own purposes - and there remain substantial questions about why he engaged in some of his political activities. In his own writings Oswald condemned both the American and Russian Communists. He denounced the Americans as betrayers of the working class and lackeys of the Russians and the Russians as "fat, stinking politicians."

The late conservative Senator Richard B. Russell told me that the executive agencies "have not told us all they know about Oswald." Russell was both a member of the Commission and head of the Senate intelligence oversight committee. To his dying day he encouraged my work. After he died I did learn more about Oswald's past that the agencies withheld from the Commission and the country.

Although his Marines personnel record was arranged to hide it, Oswald had the highest security clearances. In his daily work he had knowledge of the most significant secrets and codes. He had no Marines assignment that was not connected with the CIA. Yet never once, so far as is known, did he ever mention any of this to anyone or indicate it in his writings.

He required and had "confidential" clearance to take basic radar training. Thereafter he was sent to an advanced school and emerged trained for what one of his associates described as "black box stuff." He was one of five men in each of only three units of 100 who had this special training and highest clearance, "Crypto," which in turn required Top Secret clearance. His first assignment was to Atsugi, Japan, which was a major U-2 base. His records then show only maneuvers on the high seas but in fact, from the sworn - and ignored - testimony of his associates, they spent a six-month period at another major CIA base, Cubi Point, Philippines. Before and after Cubi, Oswald and his companions were part of the CIA's effort to overthrow the leftist Indonesian government headed by Sukarno.

Instead of sounding off unfactually to advance its own preconceptions and political beliefs, ANS and those who hold similar views might well conduct their own inquiries to determine why the government withheld such significant information about the official candidate for assassin, why the FBI, Secret Service, two Presidential commissions, the Navy, the Marines and the Air Force, all of which had responsibilities in the investigations, never once reported

this significant information. They withheld what they knew and were party to misleading and misinforming the world.

The proof confirming the testimony I refer to is in the Navy's files, from which, under FOIA, I obtained it.

By coincidence, when I aired some of this the night of the 20th anniversary, a Marine phoned in to state of his own knowledge that both then and now the kind of job Oswald had in the Marines required both "Crypto" and "Top Secret" clearances.

In even the most minor details ANS misleads. For example, in referring to Oswald's wife's uncle, it states that he was "a KGB official." Few Americans will understand this to mean other than he was an official of the Russian spy outfit. In fact, the KGB is also the equivalent of our Interior Department, and her uncle was in that kind of work, not spying.

It is a fabrication and a libel of such staunch anti-Communists as Senator Russell and his fellow Commissioners to present a fabrication as fact, that the Commission received and obeyed "instructions from above to 'avoid the Communist angle.'" I regret that ANS has seen fit to fabricate and make the other errors and present them to trusting editors and readers.

The assassination of any president is the most subversive of crimes. It and its consequences ought not ever be addressed - by officials, serious writers or political commentators - with other than complete devotion to fact and truth. It certainly ought not be a matter about which the people are misled in any way or misused as political propaganda.

I have no address for ANS, so I hope you will forward the enclosed copy to it.



Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD 21701

The Frederick Post

Established 1910

George B. Delaplaine Jr.
Editor

• Tom Mills •
Executive Editor

Fred J. Archibald
Managing Editor

B-2

Wednesday, November 30, 1983

Frederick, Md.

JFK—Who? and Why?

While many may ask, "Why pursue it?" — it is obvious to others that too many questions surrounding the assassination of President John F. Kennedy 20 years ago in Dallas have gone unanswered — if not covered up by what one Frederick researcher claims is the "biggest whitewash" in U.S. history.

Harold Weisberg, Frederick's resident expert — if not the nation's foremost researcher and exposé of "classified" information on the JFK assassination — has been a man in demand in recent weeks as the country observed the 20th anniversary of the heinous crime.

Weisberg has been on radio and TV, interviewed by the press, and has been speaking to civic clubs and other organizations. Monday he spoke to the Frederick Evening Serotoma Club, presenting a fascinating talk — brief and to the point.

The "point," according to Weisberg, who has authored a shelf of books on what he describes as the government's whitewashing of the investigation, is that the assassina-

tion has "never been investigated."

The contention he supports with mounds of documents squeezed out of FBI files through court and Congressional action is that the FBI and the Warren Commission had already made up their minds that it was Lee Harvey Oswald alone who gunned down President Kennedy. The agencies dug no deeper, he argues, ignoring evidence heavily indicating there was a conspiracy.

Weisberg, however, has not stopped digging.

"Thank God for the Freedom of Information Law," he exclaimed, a law through which he has brought to public light more information about the assassination and "whitewashing" than anyone — despite what he labels total opposition and unceasing harassment from the FBI.

Yet Weisberg still sees hope in "our democracy," noting that Congress, sensing the obstruction to his efforts to obtain documents under the Freedom of Information Act, passed legislation requiring compliance. This has helped, he said, but not too much.

Marxist conspiracy?

some of the data that have come to light concerning the Nov. 22, 1963, assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and the startling conclusions that are suggested by them.

The assassination of President John F. Kennedy 20 years ago touched off an anguished era of tragic violence in America.

It also launched an endless round of speculation concerning who had killed the youthful chief executive, and why. At the time, certain conclusions were arrived at on a hurry-up basis. Today we have information with which to assess the tragedy more clearly — and to derive important lessons for the future.

In the aftermath of the assassination, an official commission headed by Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren concluded that Kennedy had been killed by ex-Marine Lee Harvey Oswald, that Oswald had acted alone, and that the killing had no wider implications. In the perspective of two decades, the situation in many respects looks sharply different.

Based on the available evidence, the conclusion that Oswald shot the President has stood up. Efforts to explain away the ballistic and other data are not persuasive. That he acted alone, however, has been called into question, by the House Committee on Assassinations among others. And the possible motives for the killing are quite different from what we were led to believe back in the '60s.

The key ingredient in the equation, known at the time but largely glossed over, is the fact that Oswald was a dedicated Marxist revolutionary. He had been converted to Marxism at an early age, had defected to the Soviet Union, married the niece of a KGB official, was a fanatic follower of Fidel Castro, a member of the Castro-financed Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and a subscriber to Communist and Trotskyite publications.

Efforts have been made to link Oswald to anti-Castro Cubans, but the data on his political outlook point in just the opposite direction. To the extent that he had contact

hostile. The evidence is overwhelming that Oswald was a devout, fanatical Marxist.

Shortly before the assassination, Oswald journeyed to Mexico where he visited the Soviet and Cuban consulates, and was quoted as saying he would kill the President (the Cubans deny this). The day after the assassination, a mysterious pro-Castro Cuban tracked by U.S. authorities crossed the border into Mexico from Texas, then flew to Havana as the sole passenger on a Cubana airlines flight.

In addition, we now know that the Kennedy administration had been engaged in an effort to topple or assassinate Castro, and that Castro himself was probably aware of this. It was this background which prompted former President Lyndon Johnson to tell Howard K. Smith of ABC: "Kennedy was trying to get to Castro, but Castro got to him first."

Such leads were not followed by the Warren Commission or other investigators because of instructions from above to avoid "the Communist angle." The fear was that tracing Oswald's Communist connections would lead to a confrontation with the Soviets, which our leaders wanted to avoid. It was also considered unlikely the Communists would do anything so provocative and dangerous as planning or encouraging the assassination of a U.S. President.

We have learned in recent days, however, that Communist higher-ups are not averse to murdering free world leaders or bringing the world to the brink of war through acts of seemingly senseless violence. In the past two years we have witnessed charges by the Italian government that the Bulgarian secret police — which ultimately means the Soviet KGB — were involved in the attempt to kill the Pope. And we also have the evidence of the recent brutal shoot-down of the Korean jetliner.

Put it all together, and the likelihood that President Kennedy was a victim of Marxist fanaticism — possibly even a foreign-directed Marxist murder plot — seems far greater today than it did in 1963

2/23/72

Editor, News-Post, ...

If, in understandable anguish and frustration, those touched by tragedy in which they were unable to do nothing, tend to think and say others were negligent or could have avoided it, in the absence of proof I suggest the accusations against the State Police in the death of Jeff Hayes are at the very least premature and unfair. When criticism of this kind comes from the beveled it is even more comprehensible, but that does not validate it.

My own experience is that those public ~~employees~~ employees of whose work I know greatly exceeded what we can reasonably expect of them. One illustration is our Route 8 mail carrier, who persisted in the postal tradition, at risk to himself and his property, until he was hopelessly entrapped by the storm.

If this was a death that need not have occurred, how did it occur? By disregard of every advisory and plea by everyone, from the police to adlibbing radio announcers in the entire area of the storm. Going out in such weather when there was no need jeopardized the lives of those who did it and needlessly burdened everyone ^{bearing} with public responsibilities. There are always more people to be rescued than there are rescuers. Rescuers themselves risk their lives. When such equipment as helicopters are used past the safety point or under adverse weather conditions, those flying and those on the ground are jeopardized by the increased probability of accident.

^{the fatal trip?}
In this case for what purpose? The indulgence of a yen for pointless slaughter. Not hunting for food but the killing of crows. Who eats crows? Is there any need to kill them? And in such weather, when ^{for two days} ~~from the night before~~ all forecasts were of great hazard? When at the time of the foolish venture ^{drifted snow} ~~a gale was blowing and long before then drifting~~ was so deep a necessary walk of but a thousand feet winded me? Need one be equipped with learned degrees to recognize this as both foolhardiness and anti-social behavior? Negligence lay in the expedition, which was neither necessary nor justifiable if one feels as I do, that all living things have the right to live and should not be killed except for need or socially-useful purposes, as with poisonous snakes.

As a younger man I had familiarity with emergency situations, as a radio amateur, a reporter and a volunteer fireman. In my experience, most accidents and tragedies of which I know ~~must~~ ^{should} not have happened and were not the fault of rescuers who are never rewarded and often in danger. I have had experience in tornados, hurricanes and floods, and I know how it feels to work under danger and long past exhaustion. Whether or not in the case exomplained of it is the fact, exhaustion alone ~~numbs~~ ^{dulls} the senses and impairs judgement. This is a natural, human factor. It can't be avoided. What can be avoided is adding to the burden of those who undertake humanitarian missions, wearing them out and numbing their bodies and their senses with extra and unnecessary duties, most of all in remote and inaccessible places. Crow-hunting on a snow-blocked mountain is such needless thing. In this case it was compounded by the victim, who left his companions and transportation for no reason at all.

My own experience with the local State Police barracks has been entirely different than what is ~~reflected~~ ^{alleged} in this complaint. I have never found any there slow in responding to a call of any kind. I have yet to find them unreasonable. And when I think back over the years of all the nights not fit for man or beast when so many brave men, including those never thanked, like telephone and electric linemen, who ~~have~~ ^{have} regularly risked their lives and suffered great discomfort for the benefit of the rest of us, I do regret that criticism was made without investigation. This cannot but make each man wonder, the next time he is confronted by danger or any kind, is it worth it?

Criticism of public officials is not wrong. It is necessary in a representative society if society and representative government are to function. I have done my own share of it. But I think it should be warranted before it is made to newspapers, which do have the obligation to print it. Whatever turns out to be the truth in this case, two things are, I think, already clear: the victim was the chief cause of his own tragedy, and for what at best was an immature ego-indulgence; and many brave men, to whom we are all indebted and whose record in this emergency seems to have been a very good one, have been blemished without cause. Both are to be regretted.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg R + P