

Letters to the editor
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

10/4/95

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

The Post's lead editorial on "The Simpson Case" concludes saying that "The protections^s afforded defendants in American courts are ...designed to protect the citizen from a capricious and vengeful sovereign. They ... exist to guarantee a fair trial to rich celebrities and common folks alike."

Does the Post^{really} believe that us common folks could spend the millions required for the Simpson defense?

Or that without it there could have been any meaningful defense?

Is it to "guarantee a fair trial" to "common folks" that the Republican Congress plans to reduce even more the funds^{available} for the poor who can afford no lawyer?

The editorial is correct in urging that these protections not be touched. But they guarantee the right^{to} not the reality of a fair trial. As many thousands can attest.

Harold Weisberg

