

Jefferson Morley, Outlook
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd
Frederick, MD 21702

11/25/96

Dear Jeff,

Before you can get this, you with your exalted idea of your ^{you}widow and understanding, ^{had}will probably thought nothing at all about what I sent Outlook and gotten yourself all worked up in outrage.

Where do you get off, if you consider yourself a responsible man and a journalist in what was once our fine tradition, writing what you did and Outlook used, without peer review or question, on your word alone?

What qualifies you to offer the representations of fact you did and for that matter, the opinions?

What have you done to learn the fact of the assassination and of its investigations?

You got this irrational notion that consensus is the answer and that is all you needed, that notion.

Even when you claimed to quote the opinion of those you referred to as east-coast journalists, you did not know what you were blabbing about.

Bill Buckley did not believe the Warren Report! He was going to use money of the Aohlberg (China Lobby) foundation to finance a private investigation and a private report. He used Oswald Collier, then president of Twentieth Century book publishers. Collier asked me to be the chief investigator and told me Sylvia Meagher had agreed to be the information officer. It was when Buckley learned that they could not pin Communism on Oswald that the idea was dropped.

Izzy Stone, who was a friend of mine from his days on the NY Post, refused absolutely to even discuss the Warren Report. To Izzy Earl Warren could not do what he did ^{do.} Once when his brother Mark was doing p.r. for Ramparts and had asked me to join him at the Statler, the one on the SW corner of 16 and K, Izzy also came. Mark tried to talk to him about it and Izzy refused any discussion at all.

These are two of your authorities whose ^{alleged opinions}opinions you sought to substitute for fact.

What basis in fact do you have for saying that the evidence against Oswald was "overwhelming" and that the evidence made him also the lone assassin?

How much do the Commission's counsels believe that?

In 1966 I was responsible for a Metromedia special it syndicated on the JFK assassination. It invited some of those counsel and they all declined. They they asked Metromedia for and were promised their own show. The first was was

2

titled "The Minority Report." When I heard they were having their own show, about six of them, I wrote the producers at WHEW-TV in New York and said that when the courtesies extended the Commission's lawyers were extended to me I would accept appearance on that show, one against six. When those Commission ^Wlawyers learned that I would appear ~~against~~ against them they all declined and gave their show up.

And then all they ~~knew~~ knew of me is what they'd read in my first book.

You checked nothing before you wrote that trash. You needed check nothing, such apparently is your idea of your special genius.

Hell, who needs fact if he has that Morley mind, that special genius?

If you really think you had any basis at all for what you wrote, if you want to contest the rather modest comment on it I did in haste, come up with a tape recorded. I'll want a dub of the tape.

Do what you did on another subject and you could find yourself with real problems.

Your speed on this subject seems to be those literary whores, the LaFontaines.

Mary was on the Oprah Winfrey show the 22d. There she had Oswald not the Dallas police snitch of their book but of the FBI. Minor compared to most of it.

I do not think you will but I do think you should do some real thinking, beginning with asking yourself how you could have anything to do with the LaFontaines and how you could bring yourself to urging what you call as "consensus" as a substitute for the established fact of which you have kept yourself ignorant.

Journalism that isn't.

Sincerely,

Harold
Harold Weisberg