Lil- ee below

Dear Jerry,

By the time Lil can get you to please come and get this and E-mail it to Briggs I will be in Baltimore, at Johns Hopkins, with my second consultation after lunch and certain to get me home quite tired. Especially since this despicable business by Kraft had me up most of the night. I think it is urgent to get to Kansas reason not to believe the Kurtz hatchet job and will appreciate it much if you E-mail this to Briggs as soon as you can. If I did not believe this is urgent I'd not ask it of you. I will, of course, repay you any expenses. Katie cannot send the exhibits or attachments with what connections she has.

Thanks,

Ii

If there is any observation you would like to add, please feel free and do not wait for me to see it. I believe that speed is now essential.

Please read this to Jerry, 473-5639, as soon as you can. If he is not there, please tell Barb to let him know as soon as she can that I have a few pages to E-mail to Kansas University Press and that I think it and speed are urgent not only for Wrone's book but to cut the ice for any that follows it.

Copy of what Jerry picks up and will E-mail to Dave

Mr. Michael Briggs, editor-in-chief
University Press of Kansas
2501 W. 15St.,
Lawrence, KS 66049-3905 FAX 785-864-4154

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr. Briggs,

On Saturday, the eight, I received from Dave Wrone a copy of your letter to him of the third and copies of the Kurtz and the anonymous reviews of his book. He sought my advice on his response. I read what he sent me later that day and prepared a rough draft, which with me means a very rough draft, on Sunday, the ninth. It is more than twenty pages. On Monday, as I do on Wednesday and Friday, the first six hours of the day was taken by kidney dialysis. It weakens me and all I could do after that was write a much shorter comment on the anonymous review, which is of an entirely different nature. I have not yet had time to read and correct it and forward both to Wrone. I go into time restrictions on me because you seem to have a deadline only ten days away and aside from being enfeebled by my age, I am almost 87, I also have a much more feeble wife to care for as best I can-she is much more limited in her capabilities-and we live in the country. Today, at 7:45 a.m., I will be driven to the Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, where I am a hemotology patient, for two consultations. The trip alone tires me excessively so I cannot expect to get more done after I return. But I feel the urgent need to write you at greater length than is usual because of the unusual position in which you are and of the deplorable situation in which Wrone is.

First, because you may regard it as a reason to believe that I may be prejudiced in what I say, I tell you that Wrone is and for years has been one of my dearest and closest frieds. But I do assure you that what I say is not motivated by friendship or by prejudice.

I hope that my wife may be able to arrange for this to be sent you by E mail while I am gone so I also apologize for my typing and my writing. Neither can be any better, I regret. I also have to type with my legs elevated for medical reasons.

I asked Wrone if he would mind if I were to write you about the uniqueness of the special problem you did not know you faced and he agreed. I asked him to write you and ask that you ask Kurtz to provide you with the proofs of his most common criticism of the Wrone book, my allegeded influence on him and my alleged numerous errors in what I have written and published, as Kurtx did not say, nine books and as any authentic subject-matter authority will tell you, they are the basic books on the fact of the JFK assassination and on its official investigations. In thinking this over I decided, without consultation with Wrone to write you

about Krafts' criticisms of me and of my work first of all because if you ask Kraft to do what he should have done and did not do in his supposed review, provide specifics rather than giving his uninformed opinions as unquestionable fact, you will get from that your own evaluation of the dependence or the lack of dependence you can place on what Kraft wrote you. By this I am asking you to ask him to provide either a copy of each alleged error in my work or a clear and an accurate citation to it along with the proof, not any opinion, of the error he claims to find in it.

If he does this, as I doubt he will, you will get little or nothing other than an independent reading of Kraft on this subject and of his lack of real subject-matter knowledge, despite his having written a book supposedly on it.

Because of Kraft's slurs on me and on my work I provide what is fair and informed comment on his book and what addresses whether or not Kraft's slurs are anything at all like the reality, the reality that is in part represented by the copies of the official records that will be attached to this or mailed you separately if that cannot be arranged.

The first is the Journal of American History review of Kraft's book. It reports that as far back as then Kraft was engaged in disparaging the work of other Warren Commission critics. It states that there is virtually nothing of any consequence that is new and that the book's valid points come from the very critics Kurtz disparaged. Uncredited, that can be plagiarism. Aside from citation of a few of Kraft's many factual errors in his book the reviewer also noted that for there to be any possibility of the theory Kraft advanced after proclaiming that he never did that, "requires a feat of levitation that is neither recorded on any film of the assassination nor testified to by any eyewitnesses."

Also enclosed is a copy of a page of Kurtz's testimony before the Assassination Records Review Board by which Kraft asked to be heard. In it he goes big for one of the innumerable fictions of the JFK assassination, an alleged connection between the supposed Communist Oswald with the far-right extremist former FBI agent Guy Banister. Kraft states that he saw them together in New Orleans, when he was in college there. But what Kraft did not trouble to examine, the disclosed FBI New Orleans office assassination record which I rescued from oblivion by means of FOIA litigation, There is no FBI record of this self-proclaimed patriot, Kraft, ever reporting that to the FBI. Some patriotism, some caring about the President that is!

With regard to myself and my work, I established or helped establish several new precedents and based on one of my dozen or so FOIA lawsuits to make public what was withheld, the Congress amended the Act in 1974, its investigatory files

exemption, citing what I proved in one of my early lawsuits as requiring it. That amending of the Act is what made FBI, CIA and similar files accessible under FOIA.

Years before anyone else did it, when I was faced with FBI perjury in those lawsuits, I did not confront that hiding behind any lawyer's filing. I put myself under oath so that if I erred or lied I would be subject to charges of perjury and under oath attributed perjury to the FBI. The Department of Justice and the FBI "defense" against this specific charge of perjury is that I "could make such claims ad infinitim since he is perhaps more familiar with events surrounding the investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy than anyone now employed by the FBI."

According to the FBI and the Department of Justice I knew more than anyone working for the FBI but according to Kurtz my work is overloaded with errors- not a single one of which he cited.

It will also give you an understanding of what you got yourself into in what would ordinarily be a safe assumption, that a published college professor can be trusted to be accurate and honest, when you asked Kurtz for a peer review, if you ask him to rather than give his opinion of libel in what Wrone wrote he provide you with the proof that Wrone did libel, as he did not. However, Kraft might not like what Wrone wrote, truth is not libel and in each of those cases, Wrone wrote the factual truth.

Kraft's inference that as scholarship or in writing there is an improper influence I assert on Wrone is an infamous lie. All he asked of me was that I read the book as he wrote it to be certain there is no error in it, a normal practuse in non-fiction, normal, that is, other than among the Kurtz's. Wrone was not the first to ask that of me. One of those whose books Kurtz criticizes Wrone for not citing, the Reader's Digest's Henry Hurt, for one examplw, also did that. But what those who ask for a peer review have no way of knowing, there is not a word, not a single word, in the Hurt book, which was an entirely different book, that was sutitable for use by Wrone. Kurtz cannot get it through his head that a few, a very few os us, adhere to and use the officially established fact rather than what we imagine in our writing.

Kurtz does not even address the entirely different book that Wrone wrote and instead is critical of the book he would have preferred that Wrone write.

If you have any questions or want any proofs, please ask. I do not have and cannot use a computer but another dear friend, Dr. Gerald McKnight, head of the Hood College history department, lives nearby and does. His phone number is 301-473- 5639. I do not know his computer number. He lives on Shookstown Road, Frederick. I am certain he will not object and time now is very precious.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg Harold Weisberg