

Dear Sam,

11/21/88

You ask me to comment on the New York Times 11/18/88 article, "Who Killed John Kennedy..." Beginning with the headline, it is lousy, dishonest, uninformed, misleading and prejudiced. It is bad journalism, bad history, bad commentary. Bad.

It does not reflect any consultation with the Times' own records and printings.

As with most reporting, from the beginning, it is angled to support the official mythology. It assumes in every angle it pretends to assess, the basic correctness of the official mythology, that Oswald was the killer. Thus the headline itself is dishonest, part of the cheap exploitation, identical in language with some of the TV specials that ripped off the national mind. Neither questions the official line on who killed JFK.

Whether or not there was a conspiracy, as I think you'll see, is a question of fact, not of theory. But every reference in this crappy piece is to conspiracy theories and theorists. Once it is decided whether or not there was a conspiracy and only then can there be reasonable inquiry into who conspired. But in this story and all else of which I knew there is no consideration of fact and all is limited to idle and always untenable theorizing.

The dumdums on the Times did not consider, in the Castro-did-it nonsense, the political realities of that moment, as the solution to the missile crisis of a year earlier JFK guaranteed the territorial integrity of Cuba. That is something the USSR could not do. So, on this basis alone, there is absolutely no possibility that Castro wanted anything to happen to JFK.

In getting this far, day before the anniversary, I've been interrupted four times and I've lost my thoughts.

There is a difference between reality and perceptions. The fictions of the Warren Commission are perceived as the reality when they are not. It is hard to try to get anyone who has not studied the materials - their own materials, in fact - to begin to believe how utterly dishonest the whole thing was. This extends to all elements of the so-called case against Oswald. None of it sticks. The entire official theory, and the official solution is only lousy, untenable theory, crumbles before the evidence on which it is allegedly based and when what I've gotten in the Freedom of Information actions is added, it is a ghastly business. But to make it simple for you, nobody, including the best shots that could be located, was ever able to duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald. And all efforts were under much improved conditions that obtained at the time of the assassination. On this basis alone, I think you can get a glimmer of what I'm saying. Now if that could not be done, is it reasonable to even suggest that a lousy shot, the "marine Corps" evaluation of Oswald, could do what the best shots anywhere could not do? Later again. Had to take cordless phone to bathroom and did get a call there! (Comments on my appearance on a student's documentary aired by the A & E channel by a reporter I've not heard of in years.)

I've forgotten what else I intended ^{NY} saying after reading that article. In general, please believe me, the crime itself was never investigated and I've got the records reflecting that they never intended investigating the crime. The press has been solidly behind the inherently incredible official story and has been trying to put all criticism down for years. This also was the intent of the House investigation and I'm the one critic they never once mentioned. They would not tangle with me but I exposed them throughout, sometimes credited, sometimes not in the papers.... There is no basis at all for the allegations of a mafia connection and what has been claimed to support it is from history false: JFK was killed, Bobby remained as AG as long as he wanted to and there was no reduction in mafia prosecutions.... Before the phone can ring again, a few more points: it was never possible to prove the alleged penetrating power of the bullet which allegedly cause seven nonfatal injuries to both JFK and Connally and nobody was able to aim and fire three shots within the 5.3 seconds Oswald had, with that rifle,

Best, *Harold*