

Jeff Herley, Outlook
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702
11/11/96

Dear Jeff,

I was really surprised when I saw the plug you provided for Oswald ^{Talked} when you did that without any checking as for example, with me after what I sent Outlook about their piece in it (that you sent them and about which they were silent with me) and considering the fact that you do not know a damned thing about the assassination. I was surprised about your lack of concern about your reputation when you could write so glowingly about a work that has to be one of the most dishonest and most inaccurate of the many that sought to ^{exploit} ~~exploit~~ and commercialize the JFK assassination.

When you saw, and I presume you read the book ~~without~~ before plugging it, what they wrote about me you did not think of using the phone and asking me if they were truthful? as they knowingly, deliberately, were not, their cheap vengeance for my embarrassing them. or, when you were going to consider the plug, checking the Post's copy of Oswald in New Orleans to satisfy yourself that what they said was the truth. As it was not. I was clearly writing about the investigation, not developing any conspiracy theory, and rather than saying that it was Oswald who went to see Odio that chapter is titled "The False Oswald."

This came to mind months after I read that dreadful, ignorant, arrogant and not infrequently stupid "contribution to the new post-cold war history of the Kennedy assassination [of which there were two, not one]" that is based on overt lies almost without end. And it has little if anything at all to do with the JFK assassination.

It has no "new evidence" at all. What they claim is new, what they got from their Silicon Valley cavalry Adams was not withheld and he did not have to use FOIA to get it. It had been disclosed to me in several FOIA lawsuits and was in the FBI's public reading room before any of them were bitten by the assassination bug. If they showed you the records you'd have known this and that all of that began with me and what I gave the FBI in 1963.

I could go on and on about this and about how ludicrous so much of what they made up is. Like Oswald being the informer on that Cuban "camp" raid on the other side of Lake Pontchartrain. (Which was not in any event any DRE "camp.") There was not and there was no need for any informant. The Cubans themselves caused that raid by their gross carelessness that made neighbors fear that they were going to have the whole area go boom.

You may think I used the word "lie" without cause but I tell you that without lies they had no book. I had highlighted a page earlier for another purpose. When going over it and other pages for still a different purpose I highlighted in red what is on that one page in various ways a lie. If you doubt this, call me and read it to me and I'll explain it. I'll then have to get the book and turn to page 6 but I will.

You did make a major contribution to burying the truth about the JFK assassination that much deeper and to misleading the people on an important national issue. I know you did not intend that. You did it by abandoning the standards of your craft with what you regarded as decent reason for it but in fact you should have questioned every part of.

Where the La Fontaines do not overtly lie they are untruthful in many other ways. There is little in their book that is truthful and much in it that a man with your experience should have had questions about.

You really were very unprofessional in your help to that ^{part} of self-important ignoramuses and in your blurb.

Being reminded of this in checking something else was no fun.

I'm surprised, too, that with your reporting experience you never thought to check the transcript of the Hard Copy show. In it Elrod refused to say what the La Fontaines attribute to him and it represents their culling of more than 16 hours they had on videotape from their own account.

You really surprised me. - hope you learn from this. It could have been very hurtful to you.

Sincerely,

Harold
Harold Weisberg