Mr. David Streitfeld
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

8/31/93

Dear Mr. Streitfeld,

Your very good piece in this morning's paper also illustrates the difficulty if not the impossibility of the best-intended journalism to begin to be aware of the enormous commercialism and exploitation of the JFK assassination. I think you are underinformed about Simon & Schuster, for example, in saying it bears minimal responsibility for what McGinniss set out to do and did. Your opinion should have been reached only with consideration of what else S & S has published and I think will, I'm not taking the time to check for a reason I come to.

S & S has already published the cheapest kind of potboiling exploitation, the mistitled "Who Killed JFK?" It is a sloppy, careless, ignorant, inaccurate, outdated and even then extraordinarily thin and limited rehash of the nonsensical conspiracy theories that one way or another almost all books are. Except for the few that are no-conspiracy theories presented as fact. like Posner's current and incredibly dishonest "Case Closed." I am documenting that now and rush to return to ~~that~~.

McGinniss should have company on that doormat and not Posner alone.

Vidal is correct. These guys, writers and their knowing publishers, "make it all up." I've been saying that in the assassination field for at least two and half decades but the media does not want to listen or learn and puffs it up, making it all possible

I hope it was my letter to the Post that got it to ask Manchester about his gross misrepresentation of the financial end of his "Death of a President." Epstein's comment is correct, but it understates. Aside from the quality of his writing, Manchester's is a bad, misleading and misinformative work of sycophancy in which he did not question the official mythology in any substantial way while publishing what with any thought should have led him to. He also neither made not intended to make any independent inquiry other than for his Camelot purposes.

I hope that after almost 30 years the media will begin to develop a serious interest in that most subversive of crimes and writing about it and learn to distinguish between dependable and other sources. Those wedded to conspiracy theorizing, when dependable, cannot escape the captivity of their minds by those theories. And almost all the journalists have their own points of view few will abandon when they write.

Sorry my typing cannot be any better.

cc: J. Yardley

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

P.S. For two reasons I asked several at the Post to please let me have copies of what they receive on the coming books. One reason is to make and leave as complete a record for ~~my~~ history as is now possible for me when I am 80 and in ill health.

The other is to be able to inform reporters who might want to ask me about those books.

I do not recall whether I asked this of you or not. To date I've received nothing.

And to date I've had but a single call about any of these books. It was from an excellent reporter of whom I made the same request and who clearly reflected his inability to separate his own beliefs from the content of the book about which he asked me a couple of questions only.

In a sense I am also saying in this that the media makes itself the impotent captive of these writers and their publishers.

And that is the main reason the books published on the subject work out to a major national disgrace for both the book publishers and the media.

CV