

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
11/20/76

Mrs. Kathryn Graham, Publisher
Washington Post
1150 15th St., NW
Wash., D.C. 20005

Dear Mr. Graham,

Several times recently I have written you about what amounts to the Post being used for official propaganda and permitting itself to be so used.

The Goshke 11/13/76 story headed "Oswald Reportedly Told Cubans of Plan to Kill JFK" does not identify the record on which it is allegedly based. One who has spoken to Goshke tells me it is the enclosed Warren Commission record identified as CD1359.

To anyone who has made a reasonably careful study of the subject the extensive amount of information that is available establishes that your story is of an impossibility, as common sense also should have indicated.

With CD1359 I am also enclosing CR984, which was published by the Warren Commission as its Exhibit 2952. In this form it is in your library. I suggest that the part I have marked on the last page is J. Edgar Hoover's definitive statement on the impossibility of what you reported and syndicated. Please note that it is dated after any of the sources that were so carefully fed to your reporter.

He was led to believe that he was being given other confidential information when in fact the records cited merely duplicate what the Warren Commission published. The reference to Sylvia Duran is a convenient example. Another is Oswald's visit to the Cuban consulate in Mexico City. While there remain many questions about this visit, which has been the subject of enormous disinformational activities, all the Post used was gone into and published by the Commission. I believe it is at the least unfair to credit this, in 1976, to "Documents released recently by the CIA under the Freedom of Information Act" when in fact it was all published in 1964 in official documents. In 1967 I published CD984/Exhibit2952 in context, with examination of the other relevant and available information. This was not news to the Post then or now although it is in the Post's library and I was available to your reporter.

His story is based on a serious omission. He did not check, from the story, with the one most obvious official source, the Archives, to see if the alleged "Hoover memo" was in the Warren Commission files. If he had, if he had learned that the Commission did have that memo, then there would have been no story because it would mean that the Commission had satisfied itself that the memo was not factual. The Post knows that the Archives has the Commission's files. If it did not have the knowledge earlier it did beginning in 1966 when I introduced two who are now among your editors to these files. It therefore is difficult to attribute this omission in your story to mere oversight. I think you should be aware of this.

With what honest exposure can mean to the executive agencies it is certain that through the life of the new House committee there will be other such disinformational activities. They are possible now only because of what papers like the Post have refused to print in the past. An example of this is my book Post Merten, which contains official records suppressed by the Commission and avoided by it. This is a large book, so if you have an interest in forming your own opinion about the journalistic judgments represented by the Post's refusal to use any of these records I'll be glad to provide a guide to you.

When you depend on sources rather than old-fashioned journalistic inquiry it becomes difficult to expose how your sources abuse you and through you the country. We thus face the prospect of the perpetuation of the agency that is the direct result of journalistic failures at the time of the Warren Commission. Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg