

So far am I from your "conspiratorialist" label that I refused to change my first book to charge what you attribute to me when this was a condition of publication by a respected major publisher. That is what made me my own publisher. It was on precisely the question you raise out of context, too. Instead of yielding to promises of financial reward, I spent another ten years digging.

Five Freedom of Information lawsuits later, when I make the results of this work public without even getting back the cost of xeroxing, you assail me for making freely available only xeroxes of the document?

This is public indecency, not journalism.

Is the late conservative Senator Richard Russell a "conspiratorialist" to you? He had his own doubts about the Warren Report. He encouraged my efforts to disprove it. One area of his doubt was exactly what these transcripts deal with and you misrepresent. He told me the executive agencies were neither fully informative nor truthful. I have official records in which he also said this, pointedly.

If your interests included truth and accuracy, you would not have written so malicious and dishonest a column without minimum checking. With someone other than yourself, that is. You might even have read these transcripts.

The timing of this prejudicial column that in so many ways departs from traditional journalism and its norms, while it may be no more than coincidence, is a matter on which I desire to make a record between us.

In November 1974 there was much more attention to my publication of the January 27 transcript which I had received earlier (C.A. 2052-73, federal district court, Washington). AP, UPI and the Washington Post syndicated large and accurate stories. Despite much more extensive attention to the January 27 transcript, you did not find that worthy of your attention or comment, although that is the one transcript which goes into detail about that which you took out of fair context from the AP's accurate reporting of the January 22 transcript.

However, the first story broke prior to the disclosure of improper CIA and FBI activity and subsequent investigations.

The story you misuse was printed in the Sunday papers of May 18, after investigations of the FBI and CIA were under way and after an obvious campaign of misdirecting leaks, too.

You ignored wider-spread reporting when there were no charges pending against either agency, reporting based on another verbatim official transcript only. Then you suddenly become a partisan again only after charges against these agencies.

Now only you go into an alleged personal investigation for a book that makes you a partisan. You disguise this in your column. You do not go into any real investigation. If in fact yours was thorough, it had to tell you that neither transcript nor your column includes.

This begins with the certainty that the allegation of Oswald's connections was not fabricated as you say it was. It includes other