

George Lardner, newsroom
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

9/15/95

Dear George,

I was quite surprised to read today's Post and to observe that Cartha DeLoach is writing for it under the name Pierre Thomas. Or is it Tom Bishop?

Not that I do not know there is a real Pierre Thomas. I spoke to him yesterday, after first speaking to Mills. Both said they were interested, Thomas that he'd call back. He did not. Instead he and the Post, whether or not his idea or desire, flacked for the FBI when it was again lying its head off. Like the day before it quoted the obvious FBI lie as beyond question by not finding another quotable ^{source} ~~source~~.

The FBI Lab as a ^{public} record of perjury in court. In my CA 75-226, as I told both yesterday, reading it to one as I recall, when I made myself subject to the penalties of perjury if I lied, instead of depending on lawyers' briefings, and charged Lab SA John Kitley with perjury, the FBI's response what that I could make such allegations ad infinitum because I knew more about the JFK assassination than anyone then working for it. This not only confirmed that perjury, it went farther and said I could do the same thing ad infinitum. Tacit admission of endless perjury and the record in my cases after that confirms it. In the last case I was physically able to contend I charged SA John Phillips with perjury at least six times, under oath and without any allegations made about me. But like all others who obstructed compliance in FOIA cases of whom I know, he was promoted. John Harting is one. In that same case, 75-1995 a clerk named Ralph, I'm getting bad on names but I may recall it, was actually made a special agent. Ralph Harp.

I published FBI pictures of the FBI fabricating of evidence in the JFK case, including in my more or less current NEVER AGAIN! I published a ^{scientific} ~~scientific~~ test result in Case Open proving more of that. I published in facsimile FBI Lab tests that were lied about, the lie proven by the results. I could go on like this indefinitely and include the King case. Dozens and perhaps many dozens of illustrations from the FBI's own records and pictures. Now if it could, and it did do this when President was assassinated and when a man like King was, is there any case in which it is not capable of it?

And should the Post cover ass for it when there is a brave and a principled SA who risks his future in an effort to make it honest and responsible? The kind of FBI we need? I remind you that you once exclaimed to me, "Why you are defending the FBI!" As I have from unfair criticism but that does not mean I or anyone else should defend it from its own abuses of us all. And that I regret is what the Post has just done.

I thought of phoning you at home, before you left, but I did not because I knew you were on the Ruby Rudge story.

But I did tell Mills and Thomas enough of the official ^{FBI} proofs I have, the FBI's own records and pictures, for them to have at least a good idea of what I can provide.

What the Post did it did not do without knowing the truth.

I think it shamed itself and failed in its obligations to itself and to its twisting readers.

What all the FBI had on what it has said and done about the Post they must have really enjoyed that story yesterday and today. Anne Eisele took some of it back with her when I ^{called} ~~said~~ what was readily available to her attention.

I have no reason to believe that he'll use it, if he even sees it, but I did FedEx some of this to Johnnie Cochran yesterday morning before the report that the defense would not call Whitehurst.

Your reference in your today's story was straight and fair.

You and others on the Post would do well to see what Ungar wrote about the Lab and its testimony in his FBI-assisted book.

My, George, the FBI overtly fabricates evidence in the assassination of a President and the Post knows about it, has it offered to it, and it publishes the kind of story it did! It even fabricated pictures of that evidence and destroyed the actual evidence to do that. You should remember some of that from Post Mortem. I presume you have or did not want NEVER AGAIN! because you did not respond to the message I left asking you if you wanted one of the very few copies I then had. I've not been able to get any to use. Those pictures in it are not all but they are I think more than enough. It also refused the offer of copies of the autopsy report and of the autopsy film and then ^{wrote} ~~file~~ a five-volume report on the assassination that does not even give the cause of death or account for the known wounds! (I gave that to Bradlee in 1966)

It went with and still adheres to Hoover's instant-vision solution the afternoon of the assassination, a record I also called to Eisele's attention and I presume she copied.

As I told Jeff Morley when you were on sabbatical, I have the documents I use and the publisher did not want to duplicate relating to the agreement not to investigate the crime itself with which NEVER AGAIN! begins. In interest.

And the Post covers ass for it!

It is disgusting!

Herold