

Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
3/10/75

Mr. Les Whitten
c/o Jack Anderson
1612 K St., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Les,

In haste and in outrage I write to protest the warehouse journalism in the today's column you co-bylined, particularly those words someone at the WxPost had the decency and journalistic ethics to eliminate:

"Some sources believe this is why Robert Kennedy, tormented by grief, went into semi-seclusion after his brother's assassination. After the Bay of Pigs fiasco, President Kennedy had put Robert in charge of the CIA with instructions to shake it up. It is unlikely that the final (sic) attempts upon Castro could have been without Robert's knowledge.

"Could he have been plagued by the terrible thought that the CIA plot (sic), which he must at least have condoned, put into motion forces that brought about his own brother's murder...."

There is other thoroughly unprofessional content in this column but for my immediate purposes I ignore it to focus on this and on what I've underscored, not all of which needs explanation even to an apprentice cub. It is the most reprehensible kind of abuse of a journalistic power and the most obscene and irresponsible kind of writing.

When I consider that a mutual friend has told me of your previous CIA employment, there is also, whether or not justified, the obvious suggest of conflict of interest because some of this quoted writing would profane an over-used and under-cleaned barnyard.

"Some sources?" What a reportorial gadget! Who, Fiorini, of whom the column has not seen fit to recall some of its writing I remember rather well? Or that anonymous Washington lawyer you or Jack told Jim Lesar was the original source? (This crap also is repetition of earlier columns, although not so identified.) Les Whitten telling Jack Anderson? Anderson telling Whitten?

Bobby went into semi-seclusion? With all that TV exposure?

Having his brother gunned down was not enough for genuine grief?

"After the Bay of Pigs...." This refers to almost all JFK's administration. He had been President less than three months before that crisis created for him by your former associates. But he was killed more than two and a half years later! Delayed passion? Delayed vengeance by those whose hate never subsided?

Can experienced men like you and Jack really believe this?

"...put Robert in charge of the CIA...." No President could do this.

Now assassinations are not unknown in any spookery. In ours it is my understanding that there is a regular channel. It does not end with any one man, not an Attorney General or any other. Assuming there had to be formal approval. Surely you knew enough self-starters to know it did not have this requirement. If not, read Allen Dulles in my Whitewash IV (pg 61), the book whose contents were, like all the earlier ones, not worth the consideration of your readers.

You give no source for "It is unlikely that the final attempts

upon Castro could ~~zks~~ have been without "Robert's knowledge."

(You suggest prior knowledge but with the imprecision that typifies this idecent propoganda do not say.)

No source. For bullshit there is but one source.

Not true, either. The least likely thing is that he'd have been involved. Or taking you slant, allowed himself to be.

Assume for a moment that Bobby had some awareness of or even involvement in any or all (and you fail to report all) attempts known to have been made against Castro. What possible basis is there for telling the people that it is reaction to the Bay of Pigs - to the exclusions of all else - that caused the JFK assassination?

(To say nothing of what is known of Castro's attitude of that time toward JFK, which in itself makes even cheaper and more sickening propoganda of your column.)

But can anyone past a kindergarten believe that ifx all this fabrication were true or even possible that Castro would have used a man utterly inexperienced in shooting, a man who had to be nudged into minimum qualification in the Marines, a man official described by the Commandant of the Marine Corps as a "rather poor shot," a man of whom there is no record of the shooting of a rifle for years, as his assassin with the whole world of professionals from whom to chose?

You say, "...Kennedy was gunned down by...Oswald, a fanatic who had been active in the pro-Castro movement...."

I challenge you to porve any and every part of this statement. Other than the spelling of Oswald's name.

Hell, Les, even the Warren Commission didn't say this! Or Hoover.

So, I have to ask myself, at a time when the CIA is under attack and on political assassinations, why you have to have a column of undiluted bullshit, that so departs from journalistic norms, and is so inherently incredible.

Bobby killed his own brother, did he?

This is what you say.

How I'd like you to question my use of "obscene."

This is a shameful business.

You have done a completely wretched thing.

Who is in your debt for it? Who benefits?

Those who did kill JFK and with that turned the country around.

And these authoritarian-minded in the CIA who have raped the Constitution and any rational concept of freedom and of laws and the observance of law.

I can better understand and more easily tolerate all the corruption I have found in officialdom for the past decade than I can this deparavity, this total abdication of the responsibilities and indeed duties in any society that calls itself free.

Shame, man, shame!

Harold Weisberg