How the Washington Post saved the House Assassinations committee HW 3/30/77

George Lardner phoned me yesterday to check out the report ofnthe House assassinations committee. We were on the phone about 4 hours, two sieges on the phone.

I had not seen the rpport. George read passages of his slection. In each and every case none of it was new. Quite apart from this is whether any of it was real.

With one except from the description of the committee I was able to pinpoint the hidden soάrces, supposedly hidden because of the need for secrecy. The one, an allegation of an Oswald Ruby connection, involved too many possible spurious candidates. I named several but did not specify any one.

The only thingn not present oresented as totally the committee's great and original work is a reference to Lifton and Cohen as inde]endent when they worked together. Their names are not mentioned. The publication is not. Passing and incomprehensible refereone only. One would thmx father that the 1/27/64 transctipt was inknown to now.

The kind of error added to overt thievery is typified by their having XXXXX An FBI agent, Frazier, testifying àt the evidentiary hewaring. He did nàt

The totaloty of destruction of the report and the committee'd ramining credibility seemed to impress George. There are few reoorts in the long and oainful histroy of the House.

IafergtiphonkdouaefhodkyzmaxfhknImaMakhhfiykq

It seems that George's story was a bit long and that the ecohomy and other Editors do not edit.

Larry Stern is back on National. He did not use the story - and of it. He told George it was a very good piece but because it is a bit long they'd not use any.

The appearance of that story today could have turned the vote in favor of the committee completely around.

It was legitimately a news story, legitimate commentary, the legitimate subject of an insight piéce, etc. Therefore, thereis no mention of it or its contentd.

This in turn meant that the Congress was denied information essentail to both the Congress and the press.   Hastly