

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
11/26/75

Mr. John Crewdson
The New York Times
1920 L St., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear John,

Although I can't keep up with what I must do in my present conditions, you in effect called me a liar and that I will address.

At the same time I freely grant you the unlimited right to believe the world is flat if you find facing the alternative too much.

I told you CBS did not ask me to appear on any part of their specials other than the Ray case. You said Mo said otherwise. I enclose the carbon of my refusal to be on that part alone, which is as specific as it can be. CBS has not responded in writing or I'd enclose a copy of that.

The man who was here, as Mo may recall, was Ernie Leiser and he was alone. He declined to tape and took no notes and Mo agreed his purposes did not seem to be those represented. Nonetheless for reasons that are also recorded should they interest you, I did then agree to be interviewed on ~~Ernie~~ the King assassination alone.

My analysis of what CBS was up to in the case referred to was precisely correct. I have all the court papers, all the decisions, all CBS' representations, and all support 100% what I told Rather. Actually, I understated. Every judge who has ruled to date said precisely what I did.

Not only did CBS never ask me to be on the JFK part, the net has never aired me on it. Not even when my book was the first on the Warren Commission. Shortly after they announced their series Birnbaum phoned and said he wanted to talk to me. The one thing he specified was help on filing suits. I invited him here. I have not heard from him since. Moreover, when I first heard that CBS was going to do these specials I offer them subsidiary rights to my work.

We all make mistakes. I am not immune, although I'll stack my writing on a very technical and controversial story and an amount of work if not without precedent close to it against any writing you select and I'll certainly compare my partiality/impartiality on the subject against that of the Times, which has yet to find irresponsible and irrational garbage on the other side unfit to print. In this case I did not make a mistake and I interpret what you said as calling me a liar. I'd appreciate it, because standing is still uncomfortable for me, if you'd forward my letter to Rather to ^{me} on the off chance his recollection is as you represent. Sorry about not copying. He or you can have copies but I'd appreciate the return of my carbon.

You are a good reporter. But you also do not apply the same standards on both sides on this question. At some time when I'm better, if you'll pardon the avuncular, I'll go over either the tape of the transcript of last night's show that impressed you so and let you decide for yourself whether you - without the knowledge you could have obtained from my book - were either as sharp or as critical as you think you are. I believe that you wanted to be persuaded. But I'll go farther: I'll show you copies of what CBS represented falsely of its own work with copies of its own work and I'll give you the proof of deliberate lies. If you'd really read or paid attention to Post Mortem and had not begun with prejudices you'd have seen enough of this for yourself.

As it is not a reporter's obligation to solve a crime he reports, so also is it not that of any other writer. I deal with fact and I give you these challenges: show me one serious factual error in Post Mortem or any other book you have ever seen which

prints in facsimile as much or as high a proportion of the evidence on which it is based and recounts in such detail how all was obtained. So, the question I regarded as reflecting an initial prejudice you asked me from San Francisco combined with your not phoning me when you returned as you said you would we an unintended favor: I got the reading I needed to hold a press conference and in that press conference, knowing damned well that none of you of the impartiality were going to print a word of the substance of the book, took a different approach on which I am prepared to stand if my illness reduces it to a figure of speech. And if you doubt this for a minute, get any one or any combination of those against whom I made the charges you are supposed to have read to get under oath with me before any properly constituted Congressional committee, they and I both subject to perjury charges.

If you prefer an alternative with CBS, you arrange for any or all of those who really did do last night's show- and include the "expert" Weston - in a gangup debate against me in the National Press Club. Now I do not regard you as impartial so I recommend Mo as the moderator. I ask only two things: a fair division of the time and tape recordings for all with all having no limit on the right to use them.

This is not the first time I've made this offer. If any one accepts it, that will be a first.

Believe me, if I have to be there on a stretcher, or can't wear shoes as when I tackled Belin (text available), I'll be there.

Again I am being avuncular, not personal. If you accept none of these offers then try an exercise on your own. Be your own devil's advocate on the text of last night's show. If you can't do it, I'll take the time to help. It was smooth and clever, very persuasive, but full of the biggest holes.

It was intended fraud, too.

I did not lie, John. Why not ask CBS if they asked me to be on the JFK part or if I refused to be on the King part for any other than the enclosed reason.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

P.S. 4:40 p.m. Horrock didn't call. I'm prepared to produce the proof. My appeal, the last step before filing (King-FBI suppression) is dated May 5, 1975. They have time to act and then we were tied up in the Ray appeal and until tonight in that on C.A. 226-75.

You challenge-I'll produce.