

Rt/ 12 Frederick, Md. 21701  
11/23/76

News Director  
National Public Radio  
2025 M St., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear NPR,

If All Things Considered had presented George McMillan as a caricature last night it would have been appropriate news treatment. But <sup>to</sup> <sup>inc</sup> present him for all the world as though he is real and speaks and writes rationally you abused the country, some of its greater tragedies and James Earl Ray, who has never said he killed Dr. King and to this day, by every means possible continues to deny it.

At the inappropriate moment you chose to flack an irrelevant book without so telling your audience that denial is before the Supreme Court.

It was more inappropriate because the 13th anniversary of the assassination of President Kennedy ought not be something to be commercialized.

Journalistically it was atrocious. Your commentator ever fed inaccurate lines to the well-rehearsed actor called investigator (check against a tape of his WTTG appearance - same inflections, same lines, word-for-word). Such as "Of course Ray now says there was an accomplice." No such thing - now or ever. And poison to a man who is asking the Supreme Court for a trial. He has never been tried.

You were not only sycophants - you were remarkably unquestioning. For example, you presented McMillan as an expert on the JFK assassination. What makes him this? NBC sent him to Dallas at the time of the crime to investigate it. He complained against his producer who wanted fact, asking "why don't you look into the guy's motive." You asked no questions? Send your reporters back to journalism school. And the assignment editor who scheduled this identical irrelevancy about the King assassination.

McMillan never investigated the King assassination. It was his boast the day after the avoidance of a trial in that tragedy. He said fact would not corrupt his work. He then had what the New York Times quoted him as calling "a happy contract," large advance, enough to hire a staff of shrinks, contracts in eight countries and publication in months. The time stretched into years because unless Ray is the assassin who cares about his youth or alleged motive? If Oswald did not kill JFK or Ray did not kill Dr. King, is motive relevant? How many people had motive and did not kill?

These are national trauma. They turned the world around, nullifying an entire system of society. Yet you become partisans of the irrational on subject of controversy. There has been legitimate news you have not reported. Fact has been established not with publishers money and public relations but in court without your informing your news audience. It has happened where you are, in Washington. It has been on the wire-service teletypes you have and not gone on your air. Instead you air a synthetic corpse with a bad book to sell and deceive your audience by describing him as an expert when he is not.

I am, therefore, asking for the same time on the same facilities to respond under the fairness doctrine. I have credentials in both assassinations McMillan does not have. In the King assassination I wrote the only book not in accord with the official mythology, Frame-Up, unknown to your audience, probably because in the words of Publishers Weekly it is "pure dynamite against the FBI" years before others began similar exposures. Once the book was out I became Mr. Ray's investigator. I do not speak for him but I can speak about the crime and McMillan. My investigation led to his being granted an evidentiary hearing McMillan was afraid to attend. Thus he can say, as he did in Washington, that Mr. Ray has never denied the shooting when Mr. Ray did, under oath and subject to cross-examination. If you reported last week's story on the AP wire that the FBI had just released 442 pages of secret records on the King assassination, well, they were not just released, it was not a voluntary act by the FBI and while in my reporting youth the truth would be considered legitimate news it is unknown to your audience, too. I am suing

them in two cases right now and within easy walking distance of your offices, if your reporters still walk. This case is Civil Action 75-1996. These 442 pages were not released. I won them in court. They are the first two volumes and the first two pages of the next volume in an admitted total of 88 volumes of suppressed evidence I'm getting. And it is far from all the kicking and screaming FBI has and has suppressed, with the ~~help~~ help of commercializing scavengers of these terrible crimes like the charlatan you presented as news.

It is a sad day for the country when news on significant events requires public-relations agencies and great wealth for the people to be able to hear it.

I've sued the government nine times under the Freedom of Information Act. ~~That~~ The one case I lost is a great victory. Congress was so incensed by official corruption in it the FOIA was amended, with it cited as the first of four cases requiring the amending. That case, about two years old in all, is now before federal district court in Washington on remand. You also found no news in the unprecedented appeals court decision of this July, that the evidence I seek served the national interest and I must do certain things to obtain it, like taking first-person testimony from FBI agents who retired to avoid being questioned under oath.

Your coverage of the news is spectacular. Last Thursday in another court it was held in a third of my current suits that the CIA is not exempt from the FOIA when it is not the respondent in the litigation. (There will be another hearing on this 12/2.)

Last year the Justice Department assured another court in Washington that I know more about the JFK assassination and the FBI's investigation of it than anyone in the FBI. Naturally this makes McMillan an expert, not me, in this representation of your news concepts and standards.

When I did news it would have been regarded as a good human-interest story that one citizen does this without regular income or subsidy, aided by a young lawyer who was in a law-school audience he addressed ten years earlier, a lawyer so new to the profession he has yet to be before a jury - but has been to the Supreme Court a number of times.

I'm serious in the request for fair time to respond. I want it to be as soon as possible because you did reach an audience that can influence the Supreme Court, which ~~xxxxx~~ now has before it a petition certiorari. I'm also 63 years old and have had a severe thrombosis. <sup>It</sup> does not keep me from being active. (I started this at 5:30 a.m.) However, I do not drive as far as Washington and I go there with friends only when I must. I will be there on the second for this hearing mentioned above. I also ask that you air me then.

If you have any questions of fact my lawyer is Jim Lesar. His office is 223-5587, his home 484-6023.

When I'm there I'll show you my last two books. My purpose will be so you can examine the facsimiles of formerly secret documents and ask yourself if you are meeting your journalistic obligations in totally ignoring them when you learned about them on the AP and UPI wires. You also might ask yourself why you ignored my-not the FBI's-first release of its suppressed King assassination evidence a year ago. Congressman John Conyers arranged a press conference so I could give copies away and explain them. The secrets of the FBI lab prove Dr. King was not killed as alleged. I think you should now air this, after your own examination, in response to your commentator's false statement that "ay killed Dr. King. If you want you can air the prosecutor's description of how the crime was committed. I have it on tape, as does Mr. Lesar.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg