

NEW ADDRESS: St. 7, Frederick, Md. 21701 301/473-8186

11/23/67

Mr. Harold Lidden
News Director
WVUE-TV
New Orleans, La.

Dear Harold,

While I was in California I backgrounded Art Kevin, KFI radio, on the false Oswald bit and Sylvia Odio. I also gave him copies of my files on this. I had hoped to encounter a competent newsmen who I could trust and I had the files with me. There are several to-him local angles. He will be following them up.

If you called Sylvia Odio and she was able to confirm the "war names" Lorenzo and Alonzo (rather than Leopoldo and Angelo), it would be good for him to know it (me, too). There is further confirmation of this in a new San Francisco witness who phoned me on an all-night talk show. Friends are seeking him out. He gave me his name and address off the air. I'll keep you posted.

Art's office phone is 213/ 462-2133. Home, 656-5153. It also occurs to me that as this thing develops, perhaps you can feed each other.

As you know, the Louisiana News Co., after ordering OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS, refused to sell it without an advance guarantee of a \$50,000 indemnification against non-existing suits. They projected a 15,000 sale. The publisher offered them the total cost of their order as a guarantee, but they declined this. My personal belief is that this is a device they cooked up to avoid selling the book. The one possibility suggested to me is that Shaw might sue -over my correct quotation of the Washington Post, the New York Times, and the Attorney General!

While I was in New Orleans I was able to arrange for a young man just starting in some kind of distribution business to handle the book. He is limited by having no capital, etc. Koufa promised to help a bit by delivering the books to him, then refused to do it. His name is Jack Frazier, phone 944-5445. When Frazier picked them up, he was additionally threatened against putting these books in racks in drug stores and supermarkets, where Koufa has a practical monopoly on rack space. I phoned his lawyer last night to ask him to inquire into this and offered my opinion in practise this amounts to an exercise of monopoly in restraint of trade. Whether or not it is the law, it is the fact. Thus, although Frazier has been able to get the books into some stores, he and we are denied access to the mass market. When this is with a book on the New Orleans end of the assassination and the only one available and when it has a foreword by the New Orleans District Attorney, I think it also amounts to a denial of the rights guaranteed by the first amendment. Whether or not this is legally true, it is in practise.

UPI asked me to write a piece on "the other side" to commemorate the anniversary. I did and they moved it. The New Orleans papers, which managed to avoid mention of my book, also managed to avoid printing that, although they had little trouble with their consciences printing slanders and libels when offered, without retraction. In fact,

if a single paper or radio or TV station used this piece, + have neither seen nor heard nor been informed of it. Here, too, is another sample of the meaningfulness of the first amendment guarantees.

The boycott is so thorough, even when my work provides what the "establishment" urgently needs and wants, that, too, is suppressed.

If there is any way in which you can help, I'd appreciate it. One mechanism that occurs to me is in providing you with legitimate news. For example, on the Pyne show (he stopped eating people long enough to tape me and then to ask that I stay over to do his radio show) I presented a series of documents that disprove the Warren Report conclusion that Oswald ordered his FPCC literature under the name of Osborne. The evidence is that there was no FPCC in New Orleans, that the locally-printed handbill was ordered by a man named Osborne but that the only people who knew of this at the Jones Printing Co. said it was not Oswald or that they could not say it was Oswald. I imagine that the FBI reports mask what really happened, that the people out-and-out said it wasn't Oswald. I can supply documents such as these to you and they can be shown on the air. Here we have not only a clear misrepresentation of the Commission, but one that actually hides a probable conspirator. This is in the book and the use of it, with credits, would help to that degree. I would hope it would be considered news in New Orleans.

The abandonment of traditional concepts of freedom of the press on this, certainly a touchstone issue, is one that I hope can and will be resisted so that we can have a meaningful freedom. If you knew the history of my third book, I think you'd agree that there now is more than a self-imposed censorship. I do hope there are men in the press who will take this seriously and try and do something.

Jim made an exceptional speech in LA Tuesday a week ago. +t was a powerful, eloquent speech that was amazingly well received by the tough, skeptical audience, the annual convention of the Southern California electronic press. It was totally suppressed in the papers, save for a single underground sheet. Radio and TV- locally only-played it straight and fairly. UPI killed the story on the desk in New York after asking for it. Jim (properly, in my view) charged Johnson with responsibility for the continued suppressions and challenged him, as the obvious beneficiary of the assassination, to end the suppressions, in the national interest and his own. Art Davis can also supply you with a tape of it. When I left LA late this past Tuesday morning, the Natromedia radio station was broadcasting it.

You can see how I am spending the "holiday". I hope you can find some way to help. I hope also to be down there again soon and that we can meet again.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg