Dr. R. Goldberg
40 Rue de Chateau
45230 La Bussiere
FRANCE

8/ 21/92

Please do not ask me to continue correspondence like this.

Dear Dr. Goldberg,

Please try to understand that at 79, in seriously impaired health, enfeebled and limited in what I am able to do, I just can't take the time others would like me to take to respond to all questions, particularly not when I have answered them in my books or when on their face they are not reasonable or when they come from the awful junk that presents conspiracy theories, never proven, as fact. I'd never have a minute for anything else and I am trying to get on paper what nobody else can.

I am sure AARC did not move and you had the correct address. I suggest that you write the man who now runs it, Jim Lesar, 918 F St., NW #509, the next office but his private law office, and enclose what was returned to you so he can see it.

I did not look at the TV show you refer to. I did see its earlier version and what it presents as fact about who did it has no credibility at all. You'll waste you time if you devote it so uncritically to all that stuff. I don't know how you can get it, though.

The proof that there was a conspiracy is quite simple: the official evidence is that the crime was beyond the capability of any one man.

Your misunderstanding of the actualities is such that I hope you will not consider me impolite and try to understand the position I am in when I say that you ask questions you would not think of asking if instead of seeking all the junk in the field you read what is factual and does not theorise, like my books. Example: contrary to your question, Warren could not produce any case against Oswald better than his staff did for him because it does not exist. He therefore could not have made the Report "more foolproof."

I'm sorry but I won't waste a minute on the Stone atrocity. It is all fiction. This is an example of what I mean by your going for all that has no credibility and ignoring what can inform you, what can be the basis for research.

There is not likely to be any leak because the crime itself was never investigated officially and wasn't intended to be. No Smoking gun.

You say that my advice to you seems to be that you stop probing. No such thing. And, no offense intended by bluntness, what you are doing is not probing. You are spinning wheels in the commercializing and exploiting slime. You cannot solve the crime but you can learn much about the assassination and how our basic institutions worked in that time of great stress and since and much, very much, about the investigation and what its purposes were. My belief is that the only limit on research is solving the crime.

There is no real limit on those who could have had or gotten the capability to do the job. You err, I believe, in treating as one the assassination and the coverup. I know of no reason to believe that. The coverup is the way the bureaucracy works when it has problems to wipe out.

In reading all the drek you reflect familiarity with you have seriously misled yourself and perhaps you first problem in research is getting it all out of your head. Best wishes,

Harold

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

1. Your reply has struck home, especially "we can eliminate in our thinking but we cannot incriminate."

2. Or giving me Jack Anderson's address you did not include a zip code.

3. Three weeks ago I wrote to the A.R.C., 918 F Street, N.W., Suite 510, Ward, D.C. 20004 and received their official literature. I immediately identified a number of documents for repeats and, today, had my letter returned with "moved, not forwardable." Does A.R.C. still exist? If so, can I have their complete current address? If not do you have available from the C.I.A. files on Oswald C.D. 1 # 321, 347, 631, 674, 692, 931, 1054, 1216) and from Jesse Curry's J.F.K. Assassination File - pages 92, 112-113. I will gladly re-imburse all costs (shipping, xeroxing

4. Europeans swear by a 1988 documentary made by British television titled "The Men Who Killed Kennedy." Have you seen it? Is there anything valuable in it? How do I get to see it? or obtain a transcript?

5. The puzzles I am wrestling with are your statements "I believe with that with my first book I proved that beyond question there had been a conspiracy" ... "Knowing that there had been a conspiracy does not identify any conspirators. How many prove there was a conspiracy? What constitutes proof? Against what standard of proof did you succeed? and others fail?

Let you not think I doubt your contributions

I only seek to dispell my own misgivings. Mainly, why, with all the resources at his disposal, and being a former prosecutor and Attorney General, did Earl Warren not produce a more air-tight case against Oswald such that the controversies raging now would never have had a chance of occurring? With seasoned experts in the art of deception and duplicity (Dulles, McCloy) to help him, would dat Warren, while under time pressures, still have been able to make the Commission's Report more foolproof? or de-bugged? I see parallels to how the government handled the Rosenbergs! Do you?

6. I was struck by the major role given by Stone to Edward P. Landale. With reference to my point #5, in the Rosenbergs' case a Colonel John Landale testified for the prosecution. Are the two of them related?

7. I crave how much you care about the truth emerging! Is there no hope of a real leak by one of the conspirators? Why not, when either dying or for 'fun' when bored with life?, or with old age and a loosening of mental faculties?

8. If I add up all your advice it seems sensible to stop probing!! Is that truly your bottom line? (like admitting how clever the assassins were?)

9. My last question is who could have been so clever as to masterminded an assassination and mis-direct the public (emphasis on mind, not power)

Please know my respect for you has grown

With hope for your good health,

Dr. R. Goldberg
40 Rue Du Chateau
45230 La Brosse
France