

NEW ADDRESS: Rt. 7, Frederick, Md. 21701

1/25/68

Dear Mr. Wintour,

When you can say "The argument will go on forever, but the Evening Standard sees no point in pursuing it further at the present time", it is easy to understand how you can believe the author or the drivvel, nonsense, slander and astoundingly inaccurate and immature opinion you publish from Washington can, to you, be one of the outstanding British correspondents there.

"Argument"? In your paper: Nay, sir; merely apology for the erring government. It is precisely because you and Mr. Campbell have become unthinking, uninformed and irresponsible exponents of the side that cannot be defended on the basis of fact, reason or logic that we have this correspondence.

It is fair of you to read "motives of dishonesty and/or inefficiency to others" ~~in~~ into my statements. What else should I call what is worse than that? Is it the function of the press, in your concept, to present the distillation of propoganda as news? Is it your duty to slander in the guise of reporting? How does it weaken my "case" to him who under no circumstances will consider it, leave ~~it~~ alone print it.

These are child's games you play with words, Mr. Wintour.

Your paragraph reading:

"In my view it is only those so dedicated to a rational view of history that they cannot accept the irrationality of life, who still battle on with conspiracies, etc.," entirely escapes me.

However, perhaps I can help you with your understanding of history, rationality and conspiracy. Understandable, you are reluctant to believe that the major power in the world could be so wrong in the explanation of its own suzerainty. Euphisims aside, however, conspiracy is a combination to do wrong. It requires but two-more than one. If the Warren Commission proved but a single thing, it proved no single man in the world could have committed the assassination it described. If it proved a second, beyond peradventure, it is that Oswald, unapetizing as he indubitably was, killed no one that day. The evidence on this, despite the official liberties taken with it, is entirely unassailable.

Your Canute journalism defames you more than it does me. From this dispute it is I who emerged with self-respect, not you. You have failed to answer me on a single point, and you cannot, so you resort to meaningless generalities based firmly on the most profound unawareness of the fact and reality about which you pontificate. It is beyond question that neither you nor any member of your staff has made anything approximating the study of the evidence required for the holding of serious opinion. To consider otherwise would be to consider your dishonesty beyond measure. The evidence is that overwhelming.

If, at the moment, I can do nothing else, I can leave a record. That, please believe me, I will do-and am doing. This is a tragedy of such limitless magnitude that some day there will be an accounting.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

From the Editor

EVENING STANDARD  
47, SHOE LANE, E.C.4.

FLEET ST. 3000  
TELEX 21909

22nd January, 1968

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

I have your letter of January 18.

You clearly feel deeply about the Kennedy assassination, as do many others. But it weakens your case to impute motives of dishonesty and/or inefficiency to others.

In my view it is only those so dedicated to a rational view of history that they cannot accept the irrationality of life, who still battle on with conspiracies, etc.

The argument will go on for ever, but the Evening Standard sees no point in pursuing it further at the present moment.

Yours sincerely,

  
Charles Wintour

Mr. Harold Weisberg,  
Coq d'Or Press,  
Rt. 7,  
Frederick,  
Md. 21701.