August 8, 1967

Mr. Jemes A. Hudgens Vice President, WTOP Buradcest <sup>H</sup>ouse Washington, D.C.

Foar Mr. Hudgens,

1

1

In both his writing and his speaking, Charles Hoberts referes to me when he speaks generally, as he did on your station. In addition, he made specific reference to me that was deliberately inaccurate, as I have already shown you. There were two interviews on successive days, not the one you ellude to, representing Mr. Eddie Galleher's personal interest in presenting that side of the case slone and emphasizing his endorsement of Hoberts and his beliefs.

Whether or not, those who have written critically of the Report and other work of the President's Commission on the essessination did so honestly certainly is controversial, at least from the point of you and the only point of view WTOP presented. However, you presented but that single point of view and you are denying me the opportinity to present the other. Because I am the only local person emong those mentioned I think it is additionally ap propriate that I be the one provided with the opportunity of Answering Roberts' fileschoods and defemations. I think there is little doubt this does entitle me to an opportunity to raphy under the FUC's fairness doctring. I would have preferred that it be under WTOP's own concept of fairness, for there now can be little doubt in your mind that what you aired is both wrong and not accidently so.

Aside from this, I dispute your inference that if the wrongful reference is but a single one, with my name correctly given, that is neither unfair nor damaging. Ferhaps my recollection is incorrect, but I think there were two specific references to me. If I had a transcript of these shows - and here I emphasize that they were entire shows - I could point this out with accuracy. If it is no burden to you, I would appreciate transcripts. May I also point out to you that my immediate and detailed letter want unanswered, even after we discussed the matter at that time?

Although I do not think it essential to invocation of the fairness doctrine, I do point out that by your course of conduct you have made the station a partisen in this matter? Galliker's endorsement of Roberts was, i believe, inherent in the shows and his attitude and words. Your own repeated refusal to provide me an opportunity to respond to established factual error and misrepresentation is similar in character and is appropriate only in what is labelled editorial matter.

Iou also seek to diverse the support of Roberts and his book and contents from your presentation and endorsement of it, which I think is wrong and also not consistent with the fairness doctrine. The impirt of these shows was to tell the viewer to run out and but the book that proves how wrong all these terrible people who say the government did less than it shoulds and could really are, how they lie and distort, and above all not to buy the other books. Galliher reflected his own attitude by his silence when I delivered a copy of my first book to him May 9, 1965.

I'd prefer that you redonsider your decision. Otherwise, I will not drop the matter here. And I deeply regret that WTOP has not been independent of the partisanship of its owner, the Washington Post on this subject. Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

## POST-NEWSWEEK STATIONS

Broadcast House, Washington, D. C. 20016

JAMES A.HUDGENS Vice President

August 7, 1967

Mr. Harold Weisberg Hyattstown Maryland 20734

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

This letter is in response to your visit of July 31, 1967 to my office to discuss the brief references to you and your writing in an interview by Eddie Gallaher of Mr. Charles Roberts broadcast on WTOP-TV on March 13, 1967.

Although we carefully considered your request for broadcast time when you first raised the matter last May, we again have given careful consideration to the matter and have concluded that our actions have been fully consonant with the FCC's fairness doctrine.

Very truly yours,

ames A. Hudgens James A. Hudgens

## A DIVISION OF THE WASHINGTON POST COMPANY