

Mr. Leonard Downie, Jr., executive editor  
The Washington Post  
1150 15 St., NW  
Washington, DC 20071

Harold Weisberg  
7627 Old Receiver Rd.  
Frederick, MD 21702

6/21/98

Dear Mr. Downie,

I take this time at 85 and in impaired health in the hope that it may lead you to do some thinking and that that may lead the Post to meet its responsibilities better than it has in the past. I ask nothing of you.

You have reported the FBI scandals Frederic Whitehurst exposed and today you have the review of Tainted Evidence, by the reporter who also failed to report such information when he could have. But when I began exposing the dishonesties of the FBI's Lab more than 30 years ago that was not news, and when in 1975 I put myself under oath so that if I lied, I'd be the perjurer, to attest to perjury by the FBI Lab (which meant its subornation by the Department of Justice), that was not news.

When the FBI's "defense" against the charge of perjury was that I could make such charges ad infinitum because I knew more about the JFK assassination and its investigations than anyone employed by the FBI, that farout "defense" which, among other things, is an admission of perjury, official perjury, was not news.

The Post's record is slightly better than that of the Times on this. When I called this perjury to the attention of Rick Smith he wrote me that he had consulted, as I recall, with Burnham, and they decided there was no news in it.

I began exposing the FBI in the first book on the Warren Commission and the assassination investigation. Mac Mathias, then a neighbor and a friend, after reading it, gave it to the Post, which gave it to Harry Stern to read-in in 1965. When I had to ask for it back three months later Stern had read about five percent of it from his marker.

After more than a hundred international rejections, without a single adverse editorial comment, I opened the subject by becoming a publisher myself and I made a success of that first book. The review of which by your then book editor, I think Geoffrey Schmidt, was killed by Ben Bradlee. Bradlee told him he did not know enough about the subject to decide whether what I wrote was correct. (My work comes from the official evidence only and is cited to it.) In the more than 30 years I have not had a call or a letter from any of those of which I was and have been critical complaining that I had been unfair or inaccurate in anything I said about him. This now extends to ten published books, which all legitimate authorities will tell you are the basic works

on the subject - no such complaints. And not one reviewed by the Post. Not even when a former Post reporter, after reading my NEVER AGAIN!, bought a copy and gave it to See, Book World.

The whoring with our history by the Gerald Posners gets considerable attention by f when in my Case Open I referred to him as a man who has trouble telling the truth even by accident and as a plagiarist and a shyster, that gets no mention. Nor did it that he was silent when faced with this, except that he eliminated one of the plagiarisms in the paperback reprint.

The Post has not in the years since then told its readers that the assassination of a President - of any president - is, in our society, ad facta coup d'etat and the Post, with a record better than most papers, still treats the subject like ~~like~~ a shibboleth. Without reflecting any thought about the consequences, from what it has published as well as what it has not.

What it has not is in one of my books that I gave the Post, the fourth of the "hitewash series. In it + proved that Gerald Ford got the appointment as vice president, which means he became president, through perjury. He swore falsely at the hearing on his appointment and I published that proof. It has never been mentioned anywhere.

Compare this with the play on Clinton's alleged false swearing about his sex life. And with the virtually total failure to mention how common such allegations have been in our history. Going back to our very beginnings.

If the media fails to let the people know when and how their government fails, how can the people know? And if they do not know, how can our society work as it was intended to work by those greatest political thinkers in history who risked so much to establish it?

On the Warren Commission and the media failures, I enclose also the opinions of the staffer one member asked to read my first four books. He states in it clearly what the Post knew for several years and did not report, that Russell refused to agree with the basis of that Report. Before George Lardner became our assassinations expert (and he is the best in the country's papers) the Post knew that Cooper also refused to agree with that. Their archives, of which I have copies, reflect that they went to their graves refusing to agree with the basis of that Report about which they have been deceived and misled to get them to sign it.

I've lived longer than you and I still have a clear recollection of what happened in those lands in which the press did not do as it should have done. I do hope you will think about this.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

*Harold Weisberg*