

Mr. Richard Harwood, Newsroom
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

7/13/98

Dear Dick,

The "mistake" is missing from your today's understated and limited "culpa", "How Lies See the Light of Day." One of the limitations is that it does not say "How Lies Do Not See the Light of Day." With which I've had considerable experience, including with you. But please do not take this as intended to be personal for it is not, as I hope you see before the end. Rather do I intend this as a record for history, although it will not be published. It will be part of what I estimate is at least a half-million pages in my archive, about a third of a million of which were once withheld government records I got by more than a dozen FOIA lawsuits some of which were precedential and one of which, according to the legislative history no paper reported but is in the Congressional Record (copy on request) led to the amending of a provision of that Act in 1974 to make FBI, CIA and similar agency records accessible under it.

As the Post has never told its readers, the assassination of any American president is a de facto coup d'etat under our system. (If you question this I'll explain it.) It is, I think, the most deeply subversive crime under our system. Yet when the official investigation of the JFK assassination was entirely star chamber not a paper or TV or radio station or network or syndicate - no element of the free press - made the slightest recorded protest. As was done, for example, in the Simpson trial even when there was pool access.

That changed our history as I doubt any of you bothered to think about.

(Please excuse my typing. It can't be any better. I'm 85 now and I must keep my right leg elevated and my left leg with the foot as high as my heart. The typewriter is between my legs.)

In this, as I'm sure it never considered, the media was like that under Stalin or Hitler, among others.

All the media, including book publishers and magazines.

I wrote the first book on that assassination. It was finished mid-February, 1965. I published a limited edition of it that August when it was apparent that book publishers feared the subject. I lost my agent, who told me that, and after I published the book myself a number of those of the more than a hundred internationally who had rejected the book told me they had feared to publish it. In all those rejections not a single adverse editorial comment.

Q Is there a bigger story in this country than the assassination of a president? Would it ~~not~~ not be expected that book publishers would grasp the ~~first~~ first

book in particular? Would that kind of interest not continue?

When I first ran into this problem, before the middle of 1965, I took a copy of the rough draft to Mac Mathias, then a friend and our Congressman. He was just out of surgery and the first night Ann had to take it away from him and make him sleep. He finished it the next day. When he was up and about again he went to the chairman of the judiciary committee of which he was a member, Manny Celler, asking Celler for a hearing. Celler would not touch the subject.

I remind you that the book came entirely from the cited official evidence.

~~When~~ When Celler turned him down, Mac took the manuscript to Al Friendly, then a managing editor. He gave it to Stern to read. When I heard nothing for two months I asked Larry to return it. I then found that in those two months, from his markings, he had gotten ^{only} page 47 of the triple-spaced manuscript.

Broke and in debt and not knowing how I'd be able to distribute the book, I was able to get it printed on credit and did improvise some distribution. The first hundred copies went to the media. I spent a day delivering copies in Washington, including to the Post, and mailed the rest to major papers and electronic networks to which I had not made personal delivery.

It got not one story, not a single review, not a single inquiry.

Then I got the idea of taking what in my reporting days would have been considered newsworthy, the two sentences only on the assassination itself in the supposedly definitive ^{5 volume} FBI report LBJ ordered the night of the assassination.

In those two sentences the FBI did not account for ^{all} the officially-acknowledged wounds and did not even give the cause of death?

Because Mac had dealt with Friendly I took those pages to him. He took me in to Ben Bradlee and they said they'd look into it. They also assigned the book to Dan Kurzman to read. Then I was asked to give Dan and Larry questions to ask of Howard P. Williams. I sat down at a desk in the newsroom and off the top of the head did a ~~single~~ single page of them. Larry and Dan went to see him and later that day, when I returned by prearrangement, Kurzman told me, "Kid, you are in. He had no satisfactory answer for a single question." Larry went in to see Bradlee.

Then, as you may remember, Kurzman left and you replaced him. (I am not suggesting cause and effect and I have no reason to believe this had anything to do with his leaving.) I stopped in to see you once or twice, you seemed not to want that so I discontinued going in to answer questions if you had any.

There was an understanding that the Post was going to do a story on my book. But when your story ~~appeared~~ appeared, the Post had gotten an advance copy of Epstein's Inquest and your long story was almost entirely about it, with the

barest mention of mine. And at that you ^{mis}ded, at least made no mention of what Epstein did report, without asking any questions of them, that Commission ^{me}bers Russell, Cooper and Boggs refused to agree with the basis of the report, what is not a theory but is a fabrication, that one bullet cause ^d all seven nonfatal wounds on three men. (Nobody ever thinks of Jim Tague, ^{slightly} who was wounded at the opposite end of Dealey Plaza.)

I did what Epstein did not do, followed up on that. When I was able to put in Russell's hands the proof of how his trust had been imposed upon, he encouraged me until his dying day (he knew that was close, from ~~Emphe~~ma) and he broke his long friendship with Lyndon B. Johnson. Never spoke to him again.

Russell and his administrative of legislative assistant had a high opinion of my by then four books. When I published a brief account of this in 1974 it got not a single story I can remember and that book, like all ten of them, ten published, more not published, got not a single review.

I had given the Post's book reviewer a copy of the first book. I stopped off to ~~see~~ see him once to see if he had any questions. He had not finished it, had none, and expressed a flattering opinion of it. When no review appeared, after some time I went back. He and his secretary told me he had written a book review praising it and that Bradley had killed it with the explanation that Schmidt, if I recall his name correctly, did not know enough ~~to~~ about the subject to do a review. As you probably do not remember and certainly did not use for checking, everything in that book is cited to the public and published official evidence.

What you did not mention, and I presume did not check is the Commission's own evidence that the ~~re~~port was a lie. I cite what is currently ~~topical~~ topical, the Zapruder film. In that first book and the sequel, which was published before the end of 1966, I cited the Commission's own and entirely unquestionable proof that the President was first hit when that shot could not have come from ~~the~~ window from which all shots in the official accounting were fired, allegedly by Oswald. (Who, from the official evidence, could not have fired a single shot)

When Lardner phoned me because the film was about to go on sale and I told him it would provide a field day for both sides if either got any attention and he asked me what the critics could use, I cited the visible proof that one of the official pictures of the assassination, oft-published and in the official evidence and ~~fixed~~ taken in reaction to that shot, was, from the Zapruder film, ^{taken} taken when it could not have come from that window, before ~~Frame~~ Frame 202 of that film. There is no question at all about this because the camera, which had for some time been at Phil Willis's eye, can be seen coming down from it.

While Geotge did report this, he also argued against it with ~~an~~ irrelevancy.

He said that Frame 204 is indistinct or fuzzy. If "Frame 204 did not exist it would make no difference. All that counted was prior to then because the camera is seen for some time, relatively, at ^{my}Willis's eye, and then can be seen coming down from it as he walks off, at ~~Frame 202~~ ^{Frame 202}.

I had quote^d a bit of this, including Zapruder's own testimony, that he saw the impact of that first bullet before the time in the official account, Oswald could have fired it, but you did not report that or ask me about it.

I also reported the results of the official testing to see if the shooting attributed to Oswald was even possible. That rifle was over ^{loaded}gauge, shims were put under the sight and there were other improvements on the situation Oswald would have faced. Those used in the test were the best shots in the count^{ry}, all professionals and all rated as "master" by the NRA. And not one of them was able to duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald. "No, if you read that book, the Marines evaluated official^y and that when he had used the weapon - as a "rather poor shot,"

Beginning with that first book, of all of those of whom I have been severely critical, not one has phoned or written to complain that I was unfair to him or inaccurate.

^{my books} All have brought what usually is considered newsworthy to light. In fact, as I got what I thought was more newsworthy I gave it away before I could use it myself. Several times to ^{the} Post.

Those dozen or more FOIA lawsuits were never new^{er} except once that I can recall when I pulled a legitimate man/bites-dog approach and Lardner alone did a story. No other paper was there or touched it later.

Not even when I put myself under oath to swear that the FBI, first its lab and then others, were providing perjury to the courts. The IG recently said that he had no evidence of that but I first alleged in it a 1975 suit. The "defense" that succeeded was to tell that court that I could make such allegations ad infinitum because I knew more about the assassination and surrounding circumstances than anyone working for the FBI. (Copy on request.)

There is more like this for which I do not take your time or mine but I do note that all the books that support the official mythology ^{ever got a read,} got reviews, and when the publishers paid for it, extensive, the most extensive, attention.

Like the Post gave Gerald Posner's ~~Case Closed~~ ^{Case Closed}. I got about 20 percent of what I had written, Case Open, published. A Post reporter bought a copy and gave it to the book review department. They never mentioned its existence. And although I'd referred to Posner as a man who had trouble telling the truth even by accident, as a plagiarist (including from a 7-year-old!) and as a shyster,

I heard not a word from him.

Can there be a bigger lie in our society than a lie about what is a de facto coup d'etat?

Did not all the media fail almost from the time those shots were fired?

Did it not fail in accepting the star chamber "investigation" that, and this is in the records I obtained, began with the preconception it bent all to be able to pretend was fact when it was, to their knowledge, a big lie?

What else but the lie that did not see the light of day was that?

And what was that non-investigation but the biggest of lies that did see the light of day only because the media made that possible?

All of the media.

And if, as I believe, the Post's record is the best of any paper, it is hardly a record to brag about.

The media's record on this subject is not in accord with traditional belief. On this subject it protected and continues to protect the official lie, what the founding fathers gave us the first amendment to make avoidance of this possible and safe. It also resolutely refused to report what would ordinarily be considered news, what disproved the official lie.

That should never have seen the light of day!

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg