

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
2/27/75

Mr. Steve Crowley
WTTG
Washington, D.C.

Dear Steve Crowley,

There now is nothing you can do about what all of you did to me today. I write because perhaps with more than one person involved it was accidental and because I do not think you would want to repeat it with someone else.

The one stipulation I made is that my address be given. You agreed to this. When I got there you told me there had been a switch and it would not be given on the air but would be given to those who phoned in. This is bad enough but when I asked the operator to take it as I left - people who phone generally do it promptly - she told me they never do that and they do refer calls to "Panorama, which does.

Well, it refused to with the lie that it does not know my address. I learned this from someone who knew only that I live near Frederick and got my number from information when told you do not have my address.

When you air an author whose book is published commercially you do not hide his book or the identification of the publisher or even the title of the book. This is the norm. You get authors free in return. Their payoff is the sale of their work. For this reason publishers generally pay all the author's expenses. Not that shows also do not. They do.

Panorama and the station succeeded in wasting a day for me and putting me to cost that with no income I can't bear and should not have to. You went out of your way to deny me what you give all others. Even lying to do it.

I regard this as abusive and as deliberately discriminatory. The abuse may not have been intentional but you are all pros and the least thought would have made it obvious. Moreover, I specified it in advance. Working for a decade without any income is enough of a futility without this one added. It wasn't at all necessary. I have been aired by more than 100 radio stations since November and there is not one that didn't do this. Most even volunteered to give the cost of the book to save their audience needless letter writing. In no case did any of these radio shows cost me a penny. All were by phone.

Intent is immaterial. If it was the best, and there is no evidence to indicate it, the result was censorship. The station made it impossible for its audience to get my current book.

Three weeks ago I was there to tape an AM Canada show. The commercial TV net in Canada found it not at all unusual to tell its audience how to write me. And when listeners and viewers did not get it as aired, the net phoned me so its operators could give it.

When I taped that show some of your production people asked me to return and speak to the Panorama staff because what they saw persuaded them as good material. I did and I gave a copy of the book. (By any normal standard as topical as one can be today as well as entirely unique in the unprecedented documentation it reprints.) I was then told they'd not touch it unless they could get someone to oppose me. This, too, is a formula for justifying suppression. In the field in which I work I know of no case where this has been applied to the side that apologized for errant officialdom. You manage not to get anyone to oppose me - and on that content gag you? - or to be finks all refuse and that content is effectively suppressed.

I could have had a copy of the book on camera. You didn't see one. There would have been nothing wrong if I had done this. It is always done. But you had given me your and the station's word and you had asked that we stick strictly to the subject. I behaved honorably. But Fovich let Willens ramble into other things and was without protest when I made reference to it when Willens persisted in this. No, he took Willens' side, defending the man who was part - an essential part - of that great and unnecessary national trauma.

I'm sorry Fovich misunderstood me at the end. His flashing the book meant nothing to me and could have done me no good. That was not my purpose.

Here I was between Jones Harris, who was born rich and follows his own narrow political interests by a great national deception and misrepresentation to the New York Times and Willens, who lied without end. Now I could not have called Willens a liar, although he was that. Instead I used the one device I could think of: that one of his bosses, a Commissioner, had said that lying and false swearing are right and proper and the ultimate dedication.

That proof is what was suppressed. What the show was about never was.

Well, you are the latest to join in the suppression.

When that book appeared there was a major Post story (it syndicated \$t, too). There was a New York Times story. AP and UPI had major stories on their A wires. You provided facilities for a Canadian TV net to tape a show on it. And as you saw, I am not a stranger at your station. Elsewhere the page-one play ran up to 44 square inches.

You didn't call me then.

Impartiality? Objectivity?

Only when there was a chance to make a despot out to be a saint did you return to this subject.

You and the station made a commitment you did not keep. I do find this an imposition. Keeping your word would have been to do no more than what is normal elsewhere.

Under the circumstances I think the least you owe me is what AFTRA calls for.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

bcc:JL- Don't rip a gut. It won't hurt and I'm not going to be imposed on like this by them again. You, remember, are the one who told that staff they were engaging in censorship. They began this with the notion they were going to make a big play to the Hoover/Nixon remnant. Whether or not my ending that figures in this - and I do not consider it impossible - they deceived me in every way. And whether or not they think about what I say, I could not care less about being on their station without a purpose being served by it and I could not care less about what they think of me.

I might even go to AFTRA if they don't make this good.

They used me as an entertainer. When they broke their word there was no other role in this for me.

On another aspect, what close-ups do not show, the two women with me said that Willens and Harris appeared nervous. At all times after the beginning.

This same Crowley told me after the show that it had taken Willens ten years to come out of his shell and now he is back in it forever.

If doing this can be considered a good day's work (it has lasted eight years with Liebeler) that still is not the promised compensation.

Ben Franklin returned my call tonight. I told him I'd written him and that I had called him to let him know that while I did not intend to criticize him or the Times and on the air hadn't, they'd been deceived and had printed an inaccurate story.

He said he had not called me back last night because he was out.

By an odd coincidence Harris told me either that he'd had supper with Franklin last night or had been with him. Explanation for Consey's nervousness?

Wanna know how much research he did? He asked me for copies of the documents I used!

There were subtleties you missed. His reaction when I remembered, without apparent need, how we had met: when he'd asked me to do some work for him in the Archives. If you listen to the tape carefully you'll see he admitted that on this, too, the Times lied, meaning, perhaps, that he'd lied to them about where and how he'd worked. He admits he does no work but asks others for help.

He told me that this effort had not been in vain because Sylvia had told him Sunday night for the first time that he had done something good. (We know she's been sick. His account is atahsma so bad she was weeks in an oxygen tent and is now allowed to work only half-days.)

There was not enough time to go into the Dallas/Odio imposter. But as he left I told Willens that with Liebeler in town he ought ask Liebeler how that was investigated. He said, "I know." This means that he knows the non-investigation and the very farout resolution of Oswald in two places, at the same time.

Before the show Willens told me that his WG client was "corporate." I don't remember for whom he appeared. But at that stage, early, "corporate" can be interesting.

There is a simplistic view of this I would suggest you consider.

There is no chance that this show made converts for the Commission and the official mythology. There is a very good chance that an appreciable number of people for the first time have reason to doubt the myth.

And there is no chance that Willens will be praised by his peers or as I really think, that he will not have a considerable embarrassment from fellow lawyers because he had no answer for that Bolton Ford bit.

Did you note that Sam Stern is his partner?