

4/30/75

Mr. Larry W. Loeb, General Attorney  
American Broadcasting Co.  
1330 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, N.Y. 10019

Dear Mr. Loeb,

I really do not regard your letter of the 14th as responsive. And instead of quoting the language of the Fairness Doctrine you offer a distorted interpretation. I did use the exact language. You evade it.

Please take this as a renewal of my request.

At the moment I have pneumonia and pleurisy and can do nothing further.

But I want you to know that quite aside from the Fairness Doctrine I have strong feelings about your and other stations using something of the significance of the JFK assassination as a cheap substitute for a skin flick.

Had the major media met their obligations at the time of that tragedy it would not be an issue today, the country would not be in the shape it is in, we'd not have had Watergate and your stock might be in better shape.

Since then the nets have been pretending that they did a first-rate reporting/investigating job and have religiously refused to air anything that indicates the truth, which is entirely the opposite.

One of the commercializers you presented as an expert with 11 years of the most diligent and productive work invested (totally false) has been making public misuse of the letter I wrote ABC. He used a sentence entirely out of context and in a deliberate misrepresentation of what I wrote ABC this past weekend at a symposium at the NYU law school. That is, when he knew I was ill and would not be able to attend.

Before I have occasion to speak publicly about this I would welcome any light you can shed on this and any information you can obtain, including the names of any and all to whom anyone at ABC may have given copies.

I would like to believe that you and ABC share my indignation over this further abuse.

Although I was running a high fever last Friday I did have the press conference I'd promised, at the Roosevelt. I believe your local radio station covered it. I don't know how completely it taped, but as part of what I meant by an entirely different view than any you aired ("all responsible views") I refer you to it and to any coverage of the speech I was too ill to deliver that night. The speech helps explain my opposition to what you do not address but was made explicit to me in your representative's call, that you had abdicated your responsibilities to Dick Gregory. I address him and this phoney the touch of his wand and your misuse of the airways converted into an instant extert. If you'd care to read about 7,500 words I'll be glad to lend you a carbon of the unedited draft, all my illness permitted.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

4/30/75

Mr. Larry W. Loeb, General Attorney  
American Broadcasting Co.  
1330 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, N.Y. 10019

Dear Mr. Loeb,

I really do not regard your letter of the 14th as responsive. And instead of quoting the language of the Fairness Doctrine you offer a distorted interpretation. I did use the exact language. You evade it.

Please take this as a renewal of my request.

At the moment I have pneumonia and pleurisy and can do nothing further.

But I want you to know that quite aside from the Fairness Doctrine I have strong feelings about your and other stations using something of the significance of the JFK assassination as a cheap substitute for a skin flick.

Had the major media met their obligations at the time of that tragedy it would not be an issue today, the country would not be in the shape it is in, we'd not have had Watergate and your stock might be in better shape.

Since then the nets have been pretending that they did a first-rate reporting/investigating job and have religiously refused to air anything that indicates the truth, which is entirely the opposite.

One of the commercializers you presented as an expert with 11 years of the most diligent and productive work invested (totally false) has been making public misuse of the letter I wrote ABC. He used a sentence entirely out of context and in a deliberate misrepresentation of what I wrote ABC this past weekend at a symposium at the NYU law school. That is, when he knew I was ill and would not be able to attend.

Before I have occasion to speak publicly about this I would welcome any light you can shed on this and any information you can obtain, including the names of any and all to whom anyone at ABC may have given copies.

I would like to believe that you and ABC share my indignation over this further abuse.

Although I was running a high fever last Friday I did have the press conference I'd promised, at the Roosevelt. I believe your local radio station covered it. I don't know how completely it taped, but as part of what I meant by an entirely different view than any you aired ("all responsible views") I refer you to it and to any coverage of the speech I was too ill to deliver that night. The speech helps explain my opposition to what you do not address but was made explicit to me in your representative's call, that you had abdicated your responsibilities to Dick Gregory. I address him and this phoney the touch of his wand and your misuse of the airways converted into an instant extert. If you'd care to read about 7,500 words I'll be glad to lend you a carbon of the unedited draft, all my illness permitted.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

April 14, 1975

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated March 14, 1975, in which you request that ABC broadcast your views concerning the John F. Kennedy assassination. Your request is apparently based on the position that, under the Fairness Doctrine the Federal Communications Commission requires that the viewpoints of all spokesmen be aired whenever controversial issues are involved.

For your information, the Fairness Doctrine requires a broadcaster, in presenting a discussion of one side of a controversial issue of public importance, to present representative and contrasting viewpoints in its overall programming. The Fairness Doctrine does not afford a right of reply to any individual or group, but instead places the choice of spokesmen in the reasonable discretion of the broadcaster. The broadcaster is not expected to present all views, but only to use its good faith effort to identify the major viewpoints and shades of opinion being debated.

We feel that we have fulfilled our obligations as broadcasters in the treatment in our broadcasts of the assassination of John F. Kennedy. For example, last March 6th on "Geraldo Rivera : Goodnight America", Dick Gregory and Ralph Schoenman explained their conspiracy theory of the assassination; Robert Groden, by analyzing certain film, explained his views of why the Warren Commission was in error. Also, on March 27th on "Geraldo Rivera : Goodnight America", Malcolm Kilduff and Jim Bishop defended the work of the Warren Commission; Drs. Josiah Thompson and Cyril Wecht cited forensic evidence to support their opinions of the incorrectness of the Warren Commission; and Mark Lane explained his reasons for disbelieving the Warren Commission.

For the reasons outlined above, we respectfully decline your request for time, but thank you for writing us to express your opinions.

Very truly yours,



Larry M. Loeb, General Attorney

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
Coq d'Or Press  
Route 8  
Frederick, Maryland 21701