

Mr. Jonathan Yardley, book reviewer
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

1/17/94

Dear Mr. Yardley,

If I remember correctly, some time ago I wrote you that all writing about the JFK assassination is not of theorized conspiracies. Just about all the media say this and probably believe it. The very first book on the Warren Commission was entirely factual, with not a single theory in it of any kind, and it came entirely from the official evidence. That first book was my Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report. It was completed in mid-February, 1965. After more than a hundred rejections internationally, I published it. I do not recall a single adverse editorial comment from any of those submissions.

Thereafter I published six more books, one on the King assassination. They also are entirely factual, with no theories of any kind in any one of them.

Richard Gallen/ Carroll & Graf have just published selections from the four books of the Whitewash series and from Post Mortem.

I send you herewith a copy so you can see for yourself that not all the books on the JFK assassination and its investigations are of conspiracy theories.


In Post Mortem I included information I got from mostly one of as I recall 13 FOIA lawsuits as a result of which I have about a third of a million pages of once-withheld records. They will all be a permanent, public archive at local Wood College when I am no longer able to use them. I now make them available to all writing in the field, most of whom I do not agree with.

In general, ~~write~~ neither the media nor most writing in the field ~~is~~ distinguish between whether or not there was a conspiracy and if so, who conspired. Whether or not there was a conspiracy is a matter of fact, not of theory. Establishing that as a matter of fact, and in my writing it ^{is} a matter of official fact, does not identify who the conspirators were. Because the crime itself was never investigated officially means that there are no leads for private persons to follow. The factual, documented basis for my saying there was never intended to be any official investigation ^{of the crime itself} appears in my NEVER AGAIN!. It is to be published in September.

My position is not popular with others who have written what they believe are JFK assassination books that are really theories - on both sides.

Again, apologies for my typing. It cannot be any better.

Sincerely,


Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

Mr. Jonathan Yardley, book reviewer
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

1/17/94

Dear Mr. Yardley,

If I remember correctly, some time ago I wrote you that all writing about the JFK assassination is not of theorized conspiracies. Just about all the media say this and probably believe it. The very first book on the Warren Commission was entirely factual, with not a single theory in it of any kind, and it came entirely from the official evidence. That first book was my Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report. It was completed in mid-February, 1965. After more than a hundred rejections internationally, I published it. I do not recall a single adverse editorial comment from any of those submissions.

Thereafter I published six more books, one on the King assassination. They also are entirely factual, with no theories of any kind in any one of them.

Richard Gallen/ Carroll & Graf have just published selections from the four books of the Whitewash series and from Post Mortem.

I send you herewith a copy so you can see for yourself that not all the books on the JFK assassination and its investigations are of conspiracy theories.


In Post Mortem I included information I got from mostly one of as I recall 13 FOIA lawsuits as a result of which I have about a third of a million pages of once-withheld records. They will all be a permanent, public archive at local Wood College when I am no longer able to use them. I now make them available to all writing in the field, most of whom I do not agree with.

In general, ~~none~~ neither the media nor most writing in the field ~~is~~ distinguish between whether or not there was a conspiracy and if so, who conspired. Whether or not there was a conspiracy is a matter of fact, not of theory. Establishing that as a matter of fact, and in my writing it ~~is~~ is a matter of official fact, does not identify who the conspirators were. Because the crime itself was never investigated officially means that there are no leads for private persons to follow. The factual, documented basis for my saying there was never intended to be any official investigation ^{of the crime itself} appears in my NEVER AGAIN!. It is to be published in September.

My position is not popular with others who have written what they believe are JFK assassination books that are really theories - on both sides.

Again, apologies for my typing. It cannot be any better.

Sincerely,


Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

12/23/93

Dear Dad,

I suggest
you read News
Week 08/11/93.
It compares
Colorado the
point that
there was no
immigration at
the W.R. 08/11/93.
Historic and
the media have
caught up with
you since 1911 and
before that to entire
some years ago!
Best
Linda

Wishing you peace
and happiness
during this Holiday Season
and throughout
the coming New Year.



Image Craft

Imprimé au Canada

© Image Craft Inc.
Cambridge, Ontario

125 BN4008
Printed in Canada