

Never A Whitewash By Author Weisberg

EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW

by Hal Verb

Q. President Johnson held a news conference on Nov. 5 in which reporter questioned him about an aura of mystery that has been raised concerning the assassination. Johnson replied that he knew "of no evidence that would in any way cause any reasonable person to have a doubt about the Warren Commission." What is your opinion of this remark by Johnson?

A. What is wrong with the existing evidence that was ignored, abused, withheld, misrepresented and destroyed? It is like the forgotten wife.

In saying he knew of "no evidence" the president set the current style of establishing an "authenticity" that has been blindly accepted by the press. In effect, what he said is, "I do not know what I am talking about but..."

Press Assistant Secretary Malcolm Kilduff and the assorted official unofficial, semi-official self-appointed and even entirely amateur spokesmen for the Commission, all of whom specified that they had read none of the criticisms of the Commission and its report, intended to read none of the criticism, couldn't stand to read any of it, evaluated the criticism on the basis of misidentified "reviews" or, in rare cases, indicated they had as much association with books like mine as the garlic wafted over the soup.

The question is not one of "new evidence, nor is it what the President or anyone else was aware of. The official evidence in existence before the Commission was out of business, from which my books (Whitewash I & II) entirely derived, so totally killed the Report and the official investigation that we are now holding autopsies--fortunately without benefit of federal doctors.

Q. An AP story the other day quotes Jack Ruby as denying he was involved in any conspiracy when he shot Oswald in the Dallas police basement. He said there was "nothing to hide." Doesn't this conflict with Ruby's statement to Earl Warren that he wanted to go to Washington and tell what he knew. Why the change of heart on Ruby's part?

A. Ruby himself once said there

was a conspiracy, if you examine his testimony. Examination of related evidence provided grounds for believing the murder of Oswald was, in fact, premeditated.

Q. Recent news headlines indicate that the Kennedy family is trying to block publication of William Manchester's book on the assassination. Do you have any information on this? Is the Kennedy family trying to cover up something?

A. There are many really unfortunate aspects of the situation that have developed and are apparently part of Manchester's book and are receiving current public attention. To me, the one never mentioned is the important thing that Manchester may have written the unofficial whitewash. By their legal action the Kennedys--at least to a major degree--have dissociated themselves from Manchester's opinions and conclusions. I believe this is required by the national interest. Further, it is a courageous and painful act.

by Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy who reopens all the partly healed wounds most painful to her and subjects her to the emotional laceration of reliving the tragedy in public and possibly in open court. This is not an act of suppression and I think I have had as much experience with actual suppression. Manchester is entitled to make all the mistakes he wants in his own name, but he accepted the situation in which he traded the names of others and has already derived great profit from it. He bears a responsibility he must honor.

Q. One newspaper report claims that Manchester in his new book will say that Oswald alone assassinated the President but that only two shots were fired. The article states that "Manchester explains the third shot, the source said, by saying that Oswald already had a spent shell in his rifle before he fired at the President."

A. This newspaper story is exactly what I have been hearing from people who have read the Manchester book. Manchester, thus, adds a previously inconceivable magical power to a bullet with an already incredible history. By his accounting that bullet is already overtaxed as no missile in history and already required to have possessed an intelligence of its own, to have been a missile precisely controlled and entirely

self-controlled -- than anything launched at Cape Kennedy.

In a recent issue of "Underground" you stated that you believed that the Cuban refugees were involved in the assassination.

Would you care to expand on this?

A. In my first book, "Whitewash", I reveal what was then known of a "false Oswald," a person or persons counterfeiting the then least important of men, immediately before the assassination. He was connected both obviously and officially with Cuban refugees. In "White Wash" in the chapter the "Hoover Disavowal" -- or the False "False Oswald" with hitherto secret FBI documents, I show that all of the central figures in this real-life James Bondery were engaged in preparations for an invasion of Cuba immediately before the assassination, including gun-running and the actual training of men in Florida.

Does this suggest three famous initials?