

9/10/68

Dear Mrs Parks,

In your Columbia article you refer to several CIA agents in attendance on the Clay Shaw trial. I'd appreciate any further detail you can give me, including their identifications. You should recall my interest.

If I can sympathize with the apparent motive for the piece, the seeming end of objective journalism - and I, as a victim of its end, do sympathize - I believe the end product is not what you intended. You were grossly unfair to Art Kevin and excessively kind of Aynesworth and Phelen.

I have come to know Art well. He is a diligent reporter, an honest man, and if there is bias in his reporting of any aspect of the assassination story, in long association with him I have not detected it. If you had looked into his copy, the only fair basis of judgement, I believe you'd have learned this. For example, in his handling of Bradley, who symbolizes that which Art detests, extremism. Bradley has now filed suits against almost everyone under the sun, but not Art and his station (or me!). Using your reasoning you could "prove" my close and sympathetic association with some of the most notorious anti-Semites...You were also unfair to Art's station.

Aynesworth and Phelen are alike, yet different. I can understand how Phelen got turned off, but not his or Aynesworth's conduct. It is my information both went much further than you say, acting as intimidating investigators for the defense. As you know, much of Garrison's material was stolen, a considerable inhibition, if his own knowledge of it did not sponsor what I think it should have. I have been told the witnesses were interviewed in advance by this pair and others, in advance of the trial, and in a way that could not but intimidate. Their activity during the trial was reported to me by several people. It is hardly that of the reporter. Aynesworth has been a partisan since Dallas. His reporting there was anything but dispassionate. He was the beneficiary of financially valuable leaks of what could not be leaked without the greatest impropriety, without corrupting the public and media mind. I cannot vouch for the accuracy, but I have more than once been told he had the use of Marins for a month as part of his "reward". The reporting of both is unlike that of Kevin, who is a both-sides man.

And what of your paper and Time? Both are partisans. Your own paper has not once reported what I have done as news, has killed stories reporters considered news. I have had, at their requests, several meetings with the staffs of both papers, lengthy backgroundings. Sun reporters on more than one occasion have gotten me out of bed at 2 a.m. for this, and I have helped them. They have, in a fit, used my material in their stories. Features, a couple, news, none. My books have been news. I did the only book on the New Orleans case, but readers of the Sun do not know it. The "review" of my first book was long delayed so a deliberately-selected partisan, unconcerned by fact, could slander it while "reviewing" it with much later work. Time could not be less dispassionate. Above all, it has and is still suppressing the Zapruder film, which it owns and has never permitted to be used in any meaningful way. Read this part of my PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH. So, let me recall the bible: "let him who has clean hands...." and "Let him who is without sin..." I agree, it is time for the casting of stones. But hit the right guys.

Sincerely, Harold Wisberg