

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701  
9/28/74

Dear Nicholas von Hoffman,

We are indeed in The Year of Our Ford and Dick Nixon did not misrule in vain when ~~way~~ you - in the era of Watergating - come up with doublegoodspeakducktalk: your column of 9/27/74.

Specifics:

"The trouble with such propositions [sic] is that while they do punch difficult to explain holes in officials explanations, they are seldom able to give us such of a clue as to who the 'real' killer may be." Followed without interruption by

"It is for this reason that nobody has been able to discredit the Warren Commission report." Still nothing omitted-

"If Lee Harvey Oswald didn't murder Kennedy, then who did?"

All one graf.

The "hypothesis" is not Raznikov's. You have been asleep in the years of raking in the loot and shining on the tube. Nor did the solid evidence - and you so describe it while calling it no more than a "proposition" - await the suit you refer to. That suit was much later. (The people who develop this kind of evidence are ignored by the responsible elements of the media and the columnists, while the undergrounders go for the exploiter huts who embroider, profit and ultimately destroy all credibility, thanks to those who give them attention and ignore solid work.) I haven't seen Raznikov's "hypothesis" nor have I investigated that assassination per se but I do have the LAPD teletype on the destruction of some evidence, a secret transcript of a proceeding in which only the defendant was not represented and a criminalist's proof that there was more metal than the one gun could have held.

Now is it really "the trouble" that this doesn't say "who killed Bobby Kennedy?"

Got nothing to do with the pre-Watergate integrity of public authority? The state of justice? How politicians can take and hold strong views opposed to government policy and not survive them? And what the hell the well-paid reporters on the profit-making press are doing - and not doing?

"Nobody has been able to discredit the Warren Report?" You dream, man. Most people never believed it. But it has been destroyed over and over again, save for the ostriches like you who practise good Orwell. Or is it only since you have become so big a success. My first book, which was the first on the subject, did that. It has never been refuted. Bearing the book. And if you think it can be or the Report hasn't been discredited why don't you have some fun and get such respected types as Albert J. Isaacs, Charles Shaffer and Howard Willens - I mean in a gangup - to debate their work, mine or any combination of their choosing in any forum of yours. First see if they will. If they do - and they won't - we can work out minor details. They are locals who did the work bearing Warren's name.

I'll have another in my series on this subject out soon but a freebie to you will be wasted.

What would you think of a prosecutor's case that consisted of "If ~~Nick~~ von Hoffman didn't rob the bank who did?" Especially if this Nick were "convicted" on a combination of suppressed evidence which proved he could not have and ex parte misrepresentation of the other evidence that consisted of the same plus the rottenest prejudicial crap?

I don't think that you want to think. Except about being cute, which pays and soothes the ego.

But if you want to be cute while not having to do any real thinking, I refer you to the Post's files on my four Freedom of Information law suits to bring some of this suppressed evidence out.

In the first when I held a press conference and produced xeroxes of evidence proving the kind of Nazi liars Kleinman and Nixon's then Attorney General were - over their signatures - the Post's reporter filed a column and the Post was over-up. No word. Nor a word when I got a summary judgement against DJ. (This related to the assassination you didn't mention, King's, in which the decision of the 6th circuit, upheld by the Supreme Court, once would have made a column for the before-greatness von Hoffman.)

Let me switch because you are now too important to waste time learning and the Post found this part of that decision, as it found the entire decision, not news:

"...The entire record reeks with ethical moral and professional irregularities, demanding the fullest judicial inquiry...no alternative to the conclusion that Ray's attorneys were more interested in capitalizing on a notorious case..."

Then there is the federal judge who said I should be forever forfended from investigating the JFK assassination. This decision is in the Post's files but the words of that great man Danaher were not news. How can the judicial forfending of a writer - in perpetuity - be news, or column material?

Would you find it cute enough if an Assistant United States Attorney, when pleading the right to suppress, said it was for law-enforcement purpose, and when asked what law was being enforced, there being none, responded (paraphrase), "Surely when a President is killed there has to be some law, human or natural" and on this was upheld by the sainted Maximus John himself? This and the forever-forfend jazz were upheld by the Burger court and the entire law was with it ~~xx~~ administratively and judicially rewritten into a license to suppress. Without a word ~~to~~ the von Hoffman's or the Post's (and a Post reporter was present at every proceeding) and as his first real act as President Open Jerry pulled some dirty-work in conference and nullified the Congressional effort to return the law to its original intent. Yes, the Post knew. And yes, it was not news.

Get with it, man. You didn't begin writing and thinking this kind of b.s and you do owe your readers - especially the young one - something better.

When you can write the kind of graf I've quoted you should stand back and take a long, long, look.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

# Assassination

*Post 9.27.74*  
A Commentary

By Nicholas von Hoffman

Did Henry Kissinger's orders involving Chile lead directly, or indirectly, to Allende's assassination? Many people around the globe may find the question probes a distinction not worth making. President Ford waves the matter off by saying that whatever kind of dipsycoodle we ran in Santiago, the natives loved it. His Vice President—designate tells us that we can find descriptions of similar activities in "The Art of War," written 2,500 years ago by Gen. Sun Tzu.

Not much of an argument. Nevertheless, history does tell us one thing about political assassination, and that is that it invites retaliation in kind. Philip I of Spain learned that when he tried to have Queen Elizabeth wasted. The next thing he knew she had her gungels waiting in the darkened doorways of Madrid trying to get off a shot at him.

If it should ever be discovered that Lee Harvey Oswald was a Cuban agent, it takes no effort of imagination to think that a Fidel Castro might have dispatched the killer to Dallas to avenge the CIA's attempts on the Cuban boss's own life. When three major political figures are murdered and another is nearly so in the space of a decade it becomes harder and harder to accept the idea they were all gunned down

See COMMENTARY, B6, Col. 1

COMMENTARY, From B1

by lonely nuts acting out the murderous and private fantasies of sickened minds.

Yet if anyone seems to have been the victim of just such an assault it was Robert Kennedy. A room full of horrified people saw Sirhan Bishara Sirhan murder the New York Senator. But did they? Richard Raznikov, writing in the Pacific Sun, a San Francisco area weekly, has come up with evidence that does cast some doubt on the official theory of the case. He tells us that after Sirhan's trial, "a group of citizens sued the Los Angeles police for the right to examine the ballistics evidence. Herbert MacDonnell director of New York's Laboratory of Forensic Science, and William Harper, former head of the Pasadena police crime lab and one-time chief of ballistics for the Office of Naval Intelligence, were finally able to conduct the kinds of tests the police would have conducted had they been seeking the truth. Spectrographic analysis proved that the bullet removed from Kennedy's neck and a bullet taken from the abdomen of a shooting victim who recovered, television producer William Weisel, did not exhibit 'common class characteristics,' and therefore were not fired from the same gun."

Raznikov's hypothesis is that there was another gunman in the room and it was he who killed Bobby Kennedy. The trouble with such propositions is that, while they do punch difficult to explain holes in official explanations, they are seldom able to give us much of a clue as to who the "real" killer may be. It is for that reason that nobody has been able to discredit the Warren Commission report. If Lee Harvey Oswald didn't murder President Kennedy, then who did?

But there has been at least one political murder in which it does appear the wrong man was accused and the wrong man was accused and the public was badly

misled as to what actually took place. On Feb. 15, 1933, a certain Giuseppe Zangara attempted to assassinate president elect Franklin Roosevelt. Zangara's bullets missed FDR, but hit Anton Cermak, the mayor of Chicago, who was also on the speaker's stand. He lingered until March 6th; on the 9th Zangara pleaded guilty; on the 10th, he was sentenced to death and 10 days later the sentence was carried out.

Saul Alinsky, the late radical organizer, who knew many of the men involved in this intrigue, said that an FBI ballistics test showed that Zangara could not have killed the mayor of Chicago. Again, the second, unseen gun theory, but with this murder there was no trouble figuring out who owned the weapon. According to Alinsky Cermak had been stalked by the Mob for weeks and, he said, the Chicago police had pulled two gentlemen named Jack (Machine Gun) McGurn and Murray (The Camel) Humphrey off the same train that took Cermak to Florida.

The motive was also known. After being sworn into office Cermak had called in Frank (The Enforcer) Nitti, Al Capone's successor, and told him, "Look, I was elected as a reform mayor, and as you know reform is very expensive, so I'm doubling the price of everything." Alinsky said that Nitti told Cermak there was no way the mob could pay that kind of protection money and make a profit on its bootleg whiskey. War was declared with Cermak using a group of suburban gangsters and the Chicago Police Department to run the mob out and take over the business. There was at least one attempt on Nitti's life and then there was no more Cermak.

The result of Cermak's death was that order if not law was restored in Chicago, thus proving that assassination can work as well here as in Chile.

Since we're now being told all politicians do it and have been doing it for 2,500 years, why should we make moral objections? Assassination and counter-assassination may be as close as we'll ever come to having the old men who start the wars fight them.

© 1974, The Washington Post/King Features Syndicate