

August 8, 1967

Mr. Clayton Fritchey
The New York Post
New York, New York

Dear Mr. Fritchey:

Having wasted my time in visiting and writing you, I know that, except for leaving a record, there is nothing this letter will accomplish. You are incapable of shame. Your personal record on the subject of the Kennedy assassination, like that of most of the press, makes government ownership and control seem like a blessing, for then people know you and your uninformed, not-wanting-to-be-informed dishonest colleagues for what you are: government apologists.

I am now referring to your column, "Can Garrison Be Stopped". The press, which first made it impossible for Oswald to have been tried had he not been murdered, then became the Commission's whore by allowing itself to be corrupted with the pay of planted and unattributed leaks, now is determined that Jim Garrison also cannot take a case to court. You are determined that American justice cannot function, that a President can be murdered and kissed off with the dubious epitaph of a fake inquest, and that we are all to be satisfied, that nothing may go to a jury.

From that special fink's Olympus of yours, you have dispensed with judge and jury - it is enough that all-seeing, all-knowing Fritchey has ordained it; why bother with such things as judges and juries - and you have found NBC and Walter Sheridan (respected, as can be said for Senator Dodd) innocent of the charge of attempted bribery. When a witness says the attempt was made to intimidate him and bribe him, naturally, whomever he charges with it must be innocent if he enjoys the supreme qualification of having decided, on the basis of his own bias and prejudice, that the government can do no wrong on this subject.

Well, I can't say if Sheridan threatened or tried to bribe Perry Russo, but I know what he did with Gordon Novel, who may be singing right now, having been off NBC's teat for a while, and having gotten no benefit from the corrupt so-called lie-detector test NBC arranged for. It was propaganda. I cannot say "pure". I can tell you what NBC tried to do to Garrison through me. They tried to plant the worst kind of bad, really evil, information on him. When I asked Richard Townley why he did not take this information to Garrison, he said Garrison would not see him. Townley took me to his information, then drove me to Garrison's home with it, then returned with me the following night for the "witness" to make a tape recording. I still have it, with Townley's voice on it. Had Garrison or I used that "information", we would have been ruined. It took a hell of a lot of time that I presume NBC thinks it is cute for me and others to have wasted checking it out. This is hardly the face you put on the "respected", to use your phrase, "reporter". That is no manner of conduct for reporters or respectable people of any kind.

Mr. Fritchey - 2

I know something about the "information" NBC presented. The stuff was being retailed openly around New Orleans by opposing counsel in late April when I was there. NBC has its own concept of respectability, so it would use what the witnesses would not swear to. The only reason the New Orleans papers did not use the John the Baptist stuff is that he would not swear to it. NBC used the leavings of the provincial press. And he would not swear before a judge that he told the truth, for which he was convicted.

Poor Sandra Moffett? Everyone knows her sad case. It remained for NBC to make public that she had a scandalous past, to "protect" her. From what? Garrison's effort to "corrupt" her by meeting her objections to going to New Orleans to testify? She is poor, had no clothes and no place to stay. Instead of instituting proceedings to get her, this big bad man offered to feed, house and clothe her. That, to you and NBC, is evil. Of course, it is not evil if NBC rigs fake lie-detector tests (Novel has since publicly confessed his involvement in what he was charged with) and pays Novel cash for his "services". That, because it is NBC and presumably your friends, makes it honest.

Need I mention the "real" Clay Bertrand that Andrews produced for NBC and the great responsibility of NBC in proclaiming it throughout the land? Or what this new "Bertrand" did, got his lawyer, insisted on swearing to an affidavit denying it and then insisted on testifying before the grand jury?

Garrison is also evil because sex deviates figure in this case. Only the great and omniscient like you and your kind know that this must be a sign of genuine evil intent. Why bother with the slight detail that David Ferrie did threaten the President's life? Or that the FBI has suppressed most of the reports of its (you'll pardon the expression) "investigation" - but not one of those mentioning this. I have it. If you are impatient, you can have it before the appearance of my own book on the subject, completed before I set foot in New Orleans and from the official files.

It must be wonderful to be like you, to know a book has no content by rubbing your hand over its cover, and that a man is infallible because you consider him "respected" (like so many who populate so many jails).

You bleed so about false lawsuits. Have you conducted anything a child could consider a personal investigation? Are you worried about intimidation of the press? Then why are you - and the ACLU - silent on suits filed in that same New Orleans with that identical result?

Forgetting for a moment how "admirable" is what NBC did, and of course you did searchingly look for the truth, so you know from your own penetrating investigation and relentless questioning of witnesses and concentration on thousands of pages of evidence, let us come back to your own lingo, "He has concocted so many different plots to explain the President's murder that it is impossible to recall all of them." What a stroke of literary genius this is! Having said you cannot recall all of them, you cannot be called a liar, can you? I know of only one, and he did not "concoct" it nor was he the first to report it. It is in your possession, but why should a "respected" journalist like you bother to read when he can invent what is more to his liking?

Mr. Fritchey - 3

But try and remember, please, and tell me what "concoction" you know came from Garrison save that the refugee-Cuban groups were in on it and Oswald was their patsy? On my own, I add connected with them.

Let me add Speiser to the coterie of the omniscient. But I think when you quote your fellows on your own personal Olympus, you should at least say that of your own knowledge their crystal balls are in working condition. What does Speiser know of it, save what he may have been told by Sheridan and others equally unbiased, like the New Orleans director of the ACLU, who involved himself, made public statements that are lies, then would neither face what he did nor follow the honorable course of retracting or the manly course of confronting.

You have to live with yourself and your words. Accustomed as you are to it, boy, I'd never change with you!

For shame! How you degrade an honorable calling! A worn-out whore is more respectable and has no less principle!

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg