

Mr. Bill Baker and/or  
Ms. Wendy Govier  
KRTN (Knight-Ridder Tribune News)  
700 National Press Building  
Washington, D.C.

7627 Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, Md. 21701  
12/25/91

Dear Either or Both,

Some time ago I was given a sheet that before folding is headed "The JFK assassination: One gunman?", credited to Baker at the bottom and consisting of a number of sourced graphics. After folding the first page is headed "Graphics reporting Visual evidence in the JFK assassination," by Wendy Govier, the second is headed "Audiovisual sources."

In part because after the advent of serious and limiting illnesses I have devoted what effort I can to perfecting the historical records of this assassination and in part because I believe you had serious purposes, I write you with strong criticism I do not intend as personal insult but in the hope of getting your attention so that you can understand what you have done, how you have failed, the potential of serious harm from it, and on the chance you may at some point redo this and then, to the degree you can, if you are willing, to correct it.

I do not take the time for some specifics but if you ask for them to the degree possible for me I will respond.

First of all, you bit off more than you can chew. In part this is because you can, from the internal evidence, be evaluated as beginning with profound ignorance and great prejudice.

To a degree these overlaps. For example, what I see in this printing is exclusive devotion to the multitude of JFK assassination conspiracy theories with no intent to evaluate them and no ability to and you are almost devoid of fact.

Under publications your less than amateurish listing is limited to conspiracies theories in no single instance proven and in almost all instances ranging from untenable to knowingly false and impossible. Some are even ridiculous. You obviously did not use the Library of Congress, which you did under "Resources for the JFK graphic," to learn what books are available. Thus you have eliminated those that are strictly factual.

With very few exceptions this criticism is true of what you list under resources.

Your text is loaded with factual errors, provides you did not and could not keep, and you are so uninformed or careless that you do not even have the producer of the one absolutely factual and truly superior "video" correct. It is Gerard, not Gerald Selby.

As of the time you printed this, October 1990, there were in excess of a quarter of a million once-withheld official records relating to the JFK assassination investigation because I alone have that many, obtained by a series of FOIA lawsuits. This does not include the perhaps 200 cubic feet of records available in the National Archives and the not inconsiderable number of pages obtained after I was no longer able to litigate by Mark Allen.

Where you try to deal with basic evidence you not only have limited understanding of it, you are blind to what is vital and relevant in a visual source you do cite.

Because I do not assume that you are incompetent + do believe that you are enamored of the multitude of almost all untenable theories presented as solutions, which not one is, without the knowledge required to understand that all are seriously flawed.

What you evolved is a high-school concept of college freshman or sophomore execution. It is a disinformation, not information.

It does seriously mislead and deceive those who use it.

It supports all these theories, most of which are really nutty, and that serves to direct those who may use this from serious, dependable sources.

It also inhibits what with the best of intentions you could evolve.

The major single barrier to any effort to bring more truth about this assassination to light has been and remains these theories of the would-be Perry Masons by both their content and the exclusion of all else in the efforts that, among other disasters, led to the establishment of the House Select Committee on Assassinations.

You do cite their work. Then you have to know that each hearing began with a narration of what was attributed to those who espouse theories and the hearing in each instance was devoted to debunking them, not to investigating the crime itself or the official investigations of it.


In a regrettable number of instances these theories were easily proven to be wrong. The net result was the destruction of credibility of all criticism, most of all of that which is not based on and does not include these theories all of which are in varying degrees faulty.

The compendium of them that you cite is "Crossfire." It is trash, incompetent, inaccurate, sometimes stupid and so obviously by a man (whose name you have wrong, it is "Marrs") who is so ignorant of fact and indifferent to it in his cribbing of Pen Jones' "mysterious death" he lists these as significant when they are not and cannot be <sup>He</sup> <sub>and</sub> indicates as among the more significant <sup>some</sup> ~~are these~~ he does not mention in his text and about which his misinformation ranges from merely mixed up to absolutely impossible and that incorrect.

I'm sorry that you put all this effort into so poor a product for which the best I can hope is that it is widely ignored.

Perhaps you should ask yourselves what really impelled you to do this and whether or not you were competent to even begin it without acquiring the readily available factual information required to do it responsibly.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg