

Jeffrey Frank, Outlook
The Washington Post
1150 15th St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

8/11/94

Dear Jeffrey,

When I read and corrected what I had written about that Sunday stinker by those novelists the La Fontaines it was much too dirty to send you, as I said I would. Lil has begin to retype it but that will take a little time because she is having trouble from a fall. She has physical therapy on it three times a week but it still causes her pain that sometimes precludes her doing any work. And those trips for the therapy, which never takes less than an hour, sometimes as much as two, are in addition to mine, also three. It is what happens when you accumulate all the years we have and while it is a price to pay, it is worth it.

But when it is retyped I'll send a copy, if only as a courtesy. I do not expect the Post to devote another page^{to} saying that it was bad.

Which it really wasn't in any event.

The Post has fact checkers. My experience with one is that she is the best, very conscientious, careful and an able and effecient worker.

Someone could have called me, as L^darner would have and many papers have.

In addition, that piece does not even makes sense if anyone read it with any care and thought at all.

I could say more but you'll see for yourself.

It also puzzles me because of the steadfast policy the Post has had under all its editors for 30 years. I am only too familiar with it. Can you image that the book-review editor was told not to review the first book on such an important thing in our life and history as the Warren Report? He had read it and planned a favorable review. The validity of which history has since confirmed. And now no mention of Case Open after the space given to that fraud Case Closed. I've heard not a peep from Posner still, by the way, but I've heard that he has a lengthy personal attack on me in his ^{coming} Anchor paperback reprint.

Not one of my eight published books has the Post reviewed although one at least did get a long news story.

Can it be that papers do not like being beaten on news by books, which all of mine did do?

Frankly, I'm curious about how that piece got to the Post and how the Post decided to use it. Or if it had someone's endorsement that led the Post ^{not} to exercise any critical judgement. It really was a surprise to see such an awful thing in the Post, particularly in Outlook.

Best,

Harold Weisberg