

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
11/20/76

President
National Press Club
14 and F Sts., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir,

In the enclosed carbon of my letter to National Public Radio I repeat my earlier request for fairness-doctrine time to respond to its broadcast of your this week's speaker, Dr. Lattimer. I hope you will see fit to be fair and present a view other than that of Dr. Lattimer, who speaks for the official position on one part of the JFK assassination. I do make this request of you, for an equal opportunity and under the same circumstances and conditions.

In my letter to NPR I set forth what I believe are unique credentials in this field. I believe they qualify me as no others are qualified to respond by broadcast and to inform your members and their guests.

As a reporter you may be interest in knowing that one of my many suits under FOIA for the kind of evidence Dr. Lattimer does not present was cited by the Congress as the first of four suits and decisions requiring the 1974 amendments to FOIA. For reporters I believe this litigation is a fair representation of what is unique in my work. To obtain this withheld official evidence and in this one case I have been before two district courts, the second one new for the second time on remand; I have been to the appeals court three times, the last winning a sweeping reversal; and to the Supreme Court. The appeals court has ruled that I "must" take first-person testimony and that this serves the national interest. It has ruled that I must do this with former FBI agents who retired at ages less than mine, coinciding with my litigation and in unhidden effort to avoid giving testimony. My lawyer believes that taking testimony in a civil action from retired FBI agents claimed by the government not to be subject to the compelling of testimony is also without precedent.

I hope you can agree that when what I have sought since 1966 in these efforts is no more than the results of tests of non-secret nature there is no reason to believe they support the official story. If they did I'm sure they'd have been released long ago, with every effort made to attract maximum attention to them. However, there has been a benefit from this official suppression. It forced me to make other investigations that produced other official evidence that had been suppressed and I believe is irrefutable. I have enough of this on slides. I can provide copies for those of your members who would like the actual documents. Among those I consider relevant to what Dr. Lattimer said and did not say are the formerly suppressed FBI lab reports, the death certificate which the Warren Commission did not have, and the report of a secretly-convened panel of experts who interpreted the autopsy material other than Dr. Lattimer does.

My files, which are quite extensive, are to become a university archive. They contain much I believe is of current news interest and for the most part are available to reporters. For its archival value I would appreciate knowing who arranged for Dr. Lattimer's appearance to coincide with the first meetings of the new House committee and why no other view was presented with it.

If you would care to inquire into my credentials I will be glad to cooperate. You have members who knew me and my work.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Rt. 12, Fredrick, Md. 21701
11/29/76

National Public Radio, attn:
Program Librarian, Audio Archive
2025 N St., NW
Wash., D.C. 20036

Dear Librarian,

While you clearly are not the one to address, the response to my telephone request for a tape of Dr. Lattimer's Press Club broadcast and for fairness-doctrine time for response gives me only your name and a schedule of prices. I would appreciate your prompt referral to the proper person because I want to respond promptly.

I phoned WETA-FM after the broadcast, was referred to Mr. John Halford and was told that Deborah Baker Hall would send me the forms for making this request officially. It is my understanding that under the fairness doctrine the request must be made of a station. I have met this prerequisite.

The entirely different form I was sent stipulates a delay of six weeks. This is clearly inappropriate with a fairness-doctrine request. I would like this as fast as possible. I will be making a similar request of the National Press Club in the hope that it also will be fair. I therefore heed what Dr. Lattimer said to the club and on your nationwide broadcast. I am well aware of what Dr. Lattimer says in general. I addressed it and him in my most recent (of seven) books on the assassinations, Post Mortem.

I believe I am uniquely qualified to respond to Dr. Lattimer under the doctrine because I alone of those who do not agree with the Warren Report have made an extensive personal investigation of the evidence Dr. Lattimer misrepresents, bringing to light by personal investigation and a series of Freedom of Information suits what he and the Commission suppressed and misrepresent. In these suits the Department of Justice has certified to a federal court that I know more about the JFK assassination and the FBI's investigation than anyone in the FBI. I have devoted 13 of the most intensive years to this inquiry. I have slides also. This include the suppressed official evidence and some of the fruit of the ongoing litigation. There are three current suits in federal district court in Washington. I believe I have further and unique credentials on precisely Dr. Lattimer's topic in the federal appeals court July decision in favor of me, No. 75-2021. It held that what I seek serves not only my interest but that of the nation. If you'd like a copy I'll be glad to provide it. This decision is without precedent.

Unlike others who receive attention in this field my work is based on official records. I have published more pages of them in facsimile than any author has published in text. I am a former investigative reporter, Senate investigator and intelligence analyst. I believe these also are unique credentials in this field, credentials no other person who might be granted fairness-doctrine time has.

I would appreciate it if you would supply the tape in cassette form. I will pay your charge if there is one. It is my understanding that under the doctrine there is none.

I think you and the Press Club should both be aware of the timing of the presentation of a partisan on a controverial subject in which in the best possible interpretation his work has been extremely limited. It coincides with the opening of the new House inquiry. It therefore amounts to a coloring of the minds of most reporters and all those who heard the presentation. This, I believe, is quite prejudicial. The Press Club may not have been aware of this or had the intent. It is, however, the fact.

Sincerely

Harold Weisberg