

Mr. Leonard Downie, Jr., Executive Editor  
The Washington Post  
1150 15 St., NW  
Washington, DC 20071

12/11/95

Dear Mr. Downie,

In less than a week the Post has given Donald Goldfarb and his book, Perfect Villains; Imperfect Heroes, considerable attention, the second time after I informed it that with regard to the assassination of President Kennedy Mr. Goldfarb was ignorant and factually incorrect. The second time, in yesterday's Outlook, was after it had published Robert Sherrill's review in which he said that while Goldfarb "says he did not intend to include a theory about the Kennedy assassinations - who did them and why... in fact" his book "seems constructed for the very purpose of supporting an assassination theory, which Goldfarb gives us at the end." Yesterday's Outlook gave Mr. Goldfarb a half page for that theory despite my having written the Post five days earlier, that, with official documents proving it attached, that Goldfarb was a subject matter ignoramus.

Commercializing and exploiting the assassinations has become its own industry.

The Post is well aware of this yet as with this Goldfarb exploitation and with other faulty work of recent years the Post propagandizes it.

This is, at the least, irresponsible of the Post.

If in your busy days you people even give thought to the concept of the free press our founding fathers had annunciated to guarantee freedom, I think it is not unfair to say the Post has abdicated its responsibilities on this subject. This despite the fact that George Gardner's reporting has been far and away the best in the major media. This means that the Post has itself become an agency for disinformation. Whatever may or may not have been in anyone's mind at the Post.

Whatever the intent of an assassin or assassins, the assassination of any American president is a de facto coup d'etat. This means that there are few few subjects that can be of greater importance to the people and to the media.

The assassinations have the same importance for those who ~~not~~ write books about it and they also have responsibilities to meet unless their purposes are not serious and, as appears to be the case with Mr. Goldfarb, he uses the assassinations to exploit the "doubt" he says exists. He goes even farther, saying that those who write factually about the assassination of the President are "encouraging sensationalism and undermining confidence in the political ~~instit~~ institutions" of the country. In our system the exact opposite is the truth and it is the Goldfarbs who are the offenders, aided and abetted as they have been <sup>by</sup> the Post and by most of the major media.

Goldfarb is a lawyer. Like all lawyers he knows that when they face a crime in which they have no eyewitnesses lawyers resort to thinking in terms of motive, means and opportunity. He limits himself to motive, ~~is~~ ignoring both means and opportunity. Is there any real limit to the number who can be believed to have motive for

killing almost any president.

The Post ignored this and was content to give him a half-page plus the review knowing he ignores means and opportunity and has no fact in support of his representation of motive.

Despite the official intent not to investigate the assassination of the President and to pin it exclusively on the convenient patsy Oswald - and this is explicit and documented in the eighth of my published books on the subject that, as with the earlier seven, the Post failed to review - there is an abundance of dependable official evidence that is available to those intending responsible ~~evidence~~ writing on the subject. There is no excuse for writing about the assassination with total ignorance of this readily available official fact about it. Or by misrepresenting that official fact.

That dependable official fact controls who could have had the means and the opportunity. It without reasonable doubt eliminates "the mob" as the assassins.

Whether or not there was a conspiracy to assassinate the President is a matter of fact, not of theory.

Belatedly, not later than George Lardner's excellent expose of Oliver Stone's movie JFK, the Post has admitted that the assassination was the end product of a conspiracy. I suggested that article to Lardner and provided him with the documentation for it. Despite this the Post has since then given considerable attention to the books it knows are not truthful and at the same time suppresses all mention of the books it knows are limited to the truth, to the official proof at that.

Most recently to my current NEVER AGAIN! Before that to my Case Open, which refutes Gerald Posner's exploitation and commercialization to which the Post gave major attention, his Case Closed.

It is thirty years since I wrote the first book on the assassination and its investigations. In those thirty years, and this includes all I have published since then, I have not had a single telephone call or letter from anyone of whom I wrote as critically as I did complaining of either unfair treatment or of inaccuracy in a single word I said about him.

Yet the Post did not review a single one of those books- and they are the only books on the subject that advance no theory and are limited to the official facts of the crime.

Ex I do not write this as a complaint and I have in all those years made no complaint while at the same time making myself and all my work available to the Post and to all others. I write, rather, in the hope that I can get you and the Post to think about this and to abandon the policy it imposes on what it tells the people.

This is so literally true that when a week ago today I wrote the Post I sent

a copy to Jonathan Yardley with a letter in which I was specific in telling him that I was not asking for a review in offering him a copy of NEVER AGAIN! and asked only if he would read it if I sent him a copy. I've had no response.

I know very well that the ~~the~~ Post will not now review a book that appeared seven months ago or the one that appeared a year and a half ago - of which a Post reporter bought and gave a copy to your Sunday book-review editor.

I have and can have no ulterior purpose in this. I take this time when feeble from my 82 years and illnesses I have been fortunate to survive ( which explains my typing for which I apologize) in the hope that you and the Post will give this some thought and recognize what I believe it is not unfair <sup>to say</sup> have been your failures and your obligations if our system is to work as intended to.

You may never have thought in these terms but once the Post did acknowledge that there was a conspiracy to assassinate the President, each time it has given the considerable attention it gives to all those faulty books that support the official assassination mythology, it is adding to the protection given both the government which failed us and itself and the successful assassins by all the media failures and abdications for all these years.

It is also, I believe, an outrageous indecency for the Post to report uncritically all the many efforts to blame the assassinations on the victims of it, the Kennedys.

It is, I think, a sad commentary on our press when it falls to a single man who has neither resources nor influence to try to make up for the deficiencies of the wealthy and powerful media when there is a conspiracy to assassinate a President, which means when there was a coup d'etat. I have done as much as I think anyone could hope to do to make and leave the record that under our system it is the responsibility of the press to make.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg

As Sherrill quotes Goldfarb:

"Jack - of the smart alecks at CIA, with his approval - dalled on the mob to try to 'get' ~~Castro~~ Fidel Castro. It is likely that Bobby, who really hated the Cuban revolutionary, may have had some dealings along those lines, too."

In fact, as the attached CIA record states unequivocally, that plot was of the Eisenhower administration, it began more than two months before Kennedy was even elected, and during its life knowledge was limited to six "senior officials" of the CIA.

"o Kennedy even knew about it.