

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

7/28/93

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr. Yardley,

Thank you VERY much for your review of the McGinnis commercialization and exploitation that taints just about all of the "commemoration" of the 30th JFK assassination anniversary.

To the degree my limitations permit I am trying to keep track of them. All I'd known of this one is the ~~exp~~ copyright controversy. I regret that the issue was raised over such slime because I do not believe that any of us has the right to copyright our history if that part of it was an exclusive from officialdom. I wrote Kurtz about this without response because I believe that at least in part his trust was imposed upon by Manchester. The original contract was not at all what Manchester represented.

I have two interests in particular in keeping up with the coming books. One is to perfect the record ^{1/2 ave} for history while I still can. The other is to be able to respond ^{to} requests for information from reporters and reviewers.

All I have, which includes about a third of a million pages of assassination records I got by more than a dozen FOIA lawsuits, will be a free public archive at local Hood College. Until then my practise has been to give free and unsupervised access to all writing in the field all of whom I know will write what I do not agree with. I assert no property right and permit unsupervised copying on out machine.

The commemoration of the 25th anniversary was an atrocity. I expect this one to be as evil but in some instances more cunning. ^{written} Some of course, will believe what they want to believe without having done the work necessary to learn whether it is possible.

Suppose, for example that you are given Gerald Posner's coming book to read. Suppose, as I believe, it is persuasive with what he presents. And it turns out, if one knows the unquestionable official evidence, that from the puffery I've seen it is impossible.

It happens that the Posners spent several days here. They had unsupervised access and made copies and even borrowed pictures I do not recall being returned. I'll have to ask. They left with my books that limited as they are to the official evidence told them that what he now says is impossible. So, he knows better! (It is impossible, as his publisher told Publishers Weekly, for any enhancement of the Zapruder film to prove that Oswald was a lone assasin, or even any assasin.)

It was not until I read that PW story that I understood why when they were here and interviewed me they ask ^{at} nothing consistent with this book. And, of course, I'll be among ^{listed} those he interviewed.

If you can let me have copies of what you receive on this coming flood of money-grabbing I'll appreciate it. I can then ^{add} it to the files for history and be better prepared to respond ^{if} asked for any information. (Lardner knows me pretty well.)

Sorry that at 80 and with many illnesses my tying can't be any better.

Again thanks and best wishes, Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg

See Connally-death

Mr. Stephen Rosenfeld, editorial
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

7/18/93

Dear Mr. Rosenfeld,

Please excuse my haste and the age that has crept into my wife's fingers.

If I had seen the enclosed Belin Times oped piece sooner I'd have responded sooner.

It came in today's mail.

There is more I'd have liked to say but *if* as I hope you consider this there is hardly room for more! If you do consider it, do whatever *you* think necessary, *please*.

Of all the people I've met Belin alone makes me think of him as a Judenrat,

I met and debated him but once, at Vanderbilt in the fall of 1975. He could not ~~face~~ face his own record, ~~he~~ he could not even deny my ~~pre~~ representation of it although just released from a hospital spell for my first thrombosis and allowed to travel too ~~soon~~ ^{soon} I was in such shape that ~~when~~ ^{when} they saw me at the airport on return I was single-loaded. But the day he got back to Des Moines he announced a press conference for the next day at which he joined the old demand for a new investigation.

For him nothing exists except what the Warren Commission had and of that nothing exists to him other than what he wants to ~~exist~~ ^{exist}. And then he often misstates ~~it~~ ^{that}.

It is disappointing that the media accepts him alone when he exploits any controversy or news of any kind to insist that he is right because he says he is right and nothing else matters.

It is not quite as lonely in the middle as I once told the Post's readers, helped enormously by you. The nuts among those who invent solutions based on their unproven theories dislike me more publicly and among those who support what to me is the official mythology a doctor who supported in JAMA's indefensible last year's articles saying the autopsy pathologists did a fine and accurate job is coming tomorrow and a month ago we were visited by the detective handcuffed to Oswald when he was killed. He autographed a picture of it to me.

Perhaps I understate a bit too much above for you to get a laugh out of it.

~~At~~ ^{For} a convention of these self-described researchers last month they solicited a "study" of me as a ^{government} "disinformation agent." And according to its published, quoted in publishers ~~Weekly~~ ^{Weekly} Weekly, his coming commemoration of the 30th JFK assassination anniversary has me as an accessory after the fact. ~~That~~ ^{That} understates what its author wrote me.

That should make me less lonely and it sure moves me out of the center!

Thanks and best wishes,

Harold Weisberg
Harold Weisberg

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

6/25/93

Dear George,

When we talked about your Guinn story yesterday afternoon we never got onto the same wavelength. Let me see if I can clarify this with one quotation from him as you quoted him (copy enclosed):

"The pieces brought out by the Archives did not include any of the specific pieces the FBI analyzed (he testified). Where they are, I have no idea."

There was but a single set of fragments removed from Connally in the official evidence. That is the "set" the FBI supposedly ~~was~~ "analyzed."

Of that one set, the only set in the official evidence, Guinn testified that what he was given to test "did not include" any of them, Connally of other.

Making it further clear that he testified he was given other than the only set of recovered fragments, he said of them, the only official fragments, "Where they are, I have no idea."

The FBI did not dispute this in any way of which I know.

It therefore did not deny that what Guinn was given to test was not fragments recovered from Connally's body.

The only evidence is that what Guinn was given to testify is not the authentic and only fragments recovered from Connally's wrist, at least in the possession of the government.

I do not see how anyone can not believe that he was given something that was not recovered from Connally's wrist. Whatever its origin.

On another matter, I hope that in the near future you can come up again, as you said you'd like to ⁱⁿ do your card of several weeks ago. I would like to discuss with you some serious problems I am having with my new book and what I have that I think causes it. If at some point that does not interest you for a story, perhaps you can suggest where I might get one published.

Best,

Editor (letters to)
Washington Post
4159 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

6/25/93

From the "Fanfare" item (6/25) ^{fight} headed, "Schmeling Reportedly Protected Jews in Berlin," I may owe Max an apology.

On the day after he second ^{fight} fight with Joe Lewis 55 years ago I was in London, Ky., having been borrowed from the Senate Civil Liberties Committee whose editor I was by the Department of Justice to help it in a sensational and significant prosecution of that era, against about three-dozen corporate and deputized gun-thug defendants in what was then known as the "Bloody Harlan" case. It was for murders and other violence to prevent unionization of the mines.

My friend Homer Clay owned the country weekly published in London. He was out of town and his wife, Delores, phoned me the afternoon of press day, the day after that fight, to ask my help in filling some blank space in the issue.

One of the stories I ~~wrote~~ wrote in haste was about the fight. I'd heard it on radio the night before.

The headline I wrote for it created quite a reaction in the good-sized press corps covering the trial. One, George Dixon, was later a Post columnist.

The head read, "Joe still champ; Max still Schmeling."

Harold Weisberg

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md 21702
301/473-8186

