

Dear Richard Cohen,

7/5/85

I was surprised at your reflection of political naivete in this morning's column and found myself wondering whether in it you also were "Throwing in the Towel."

Can it possibly be that you ^{have} not even a suspicion of how "eagan has been able to get away with what he gets away with, how "eagan can survive being Reagan?

Can any mature reporter or columnist or editor not be aware of the degree to which this is directly attributable to failings in reporting and opinion-writing?

Here we have a man who, throughout his political life has trouble telling the truth even by accident and for the most part all of that has been and continues to be ignored. What he says is directly quoted and there, for the most part, all of the media act as if their responsibility ends with accurate quotation.

We live in an age in which there is too much news for any paper to cover it all. This, I suggest, however, places each editor under a greater responsibility, to use the space he has available for providing the most important information.


This also is an age in which the press, but alas, not it alone, has come to accept official dishonesty. It is rarely news and it takes an indignant Senator, of whom we have no surplus, to stir the press to report what it should have reported on its own.

The deliberate dishonesty that characterizes this administration, to which this dishonesty may appear to be essential ideology, is greater than I can recall after living for more than a third as long as the United States. Where this kind of dishonesty is or can be most hurtful to this nation and its basic precepts is a value judgement it is not necessary to make to realize that it is serious and it is hurtful in the Justice Department. Where the Post has steadfastly refused to report it as it happens in open court.

So you can understand what I'm saying and mean and get an idea of what the Post and others have persisted in ignoring I'll enclose a motion I am filing now in one of my FOIA suits. This is based on new evidence but in essence it is included in different form in earlier filings. ~~unfortunately~~ I went to the trouble and expense of sending copies to four on the Post, in the belief that perhaps one might recall the traditional news standards of my reporting days, rather long ago. I was wrong. I heard from only one. He told me only that he sees nothing wrong with the FBI or any other agency preparing dossiers on those not suspected of any crime. If you skim the attachments you'll see part of what this means. I was shocked!

I'm glad you raised the question you raised. People ought be giving it thought. But I'm sorry you were not as informative as you could have been.

Sincerely,


Harold Weisberg