

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
WA6-2034

20734

September 10, 1966

Mr. Ed Harvey
WCAU radio
Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Mr. Harvey,

A note from Dave Salsburg tells me you are looking for some one to appear against me. That would be fine. Dave says you are trying Specter. I have four times agreed to confrontations with him, each time recommending against it. This is like rejecting a license to print money, but I believe fairness and the clean washing of the whole mess demands it. Specter was wrong, terribly wrong. But he was not alone. It would be a gross inequity to single him out, as Epstein has done, little realizing how or why for he became the creature of another. This sort of approach leads to a witch hunt, which really solves nothing.

This is the reason I have avoided teeing off on him in Philadelphia, where it would make good copy. His severest, inside-the-commission critic Liebelser has at least as much to answer for, perhaps more. Why repeat the Epstein mistake of deifying Liebelser and horning Specter just for good copy of a few extra bucks. If the national interest worth it?

However, I'll meet whoever you may have. I would also suggest it can be quite exciting without opposition, and I can give you references, including your own station. It depends on the approach. If you are responsible, as I believe I always have been, under considerable provocation, the facts are such there is no problem with listener interest. And because I have restricted myself to the official record (which I alone did, despite the puffs you read), there is no question of my sources.

The subject is so vast it can always be fresh. There are several aspects of it that have never been discussed in Philadelphia. Lane doesn't include them in his book. One is what happened to the accused once he was in the hands of public authority. I have never discussed this anywhere, yet it is a part of my book, the second. There is one aspect of this, the missing interrogations. Or the witnesses, which I alone go into exhaustively, not to use their testimony as part of a case, because eyewitness testimony is always dubious. I used this to show how ignoring the simple legal maxim got the Commission into so much trouble. Or the Oswalds' government relations, which no one else touches. Or the number of shots, which no one else goes into with great care, because it is easier to skim and generalize. There is vast material. I have virtually completed a sequel, without duplication, and all from the record (I'm not announcing this yet).

I'll be in Philadelphia the 20th. to speak, if it is of any interest to you.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg