

137

AT-1/16/ West-Mag

FEEDBACK from our readers

More Words on the Warren Report

Sir:

As one critic of the Warren Commission's conclusions who has taken the time and trouble to read, study and research carefully the *Warren Report* and every one of the 26 volumes of *Testimony, Hearings and Exhibits*, I am seriously concerned that the truth about the Kennedy assassination has been distorted, concealed and misrepresented.

If, as John Weaver says in *West* (Nov. 27 & Dec. 4), "seeds of doubt and suspicion have caught on like crabgrass," then it is because the evidence supplied by the Commission is crumbling from lack of support and not because those who are knowledgeable about the 26 volumes are "emotionally dispossessed."

I challenge Mr. Weaver's statement that no one "could say for sure" whether the bullets struck the President from the front or rear. The sworn testimonies of seven qualified doctors and one registered nurse with 12 years experience point to a wound of entrance in the President's throat.

Mr. Weaver derisively states that "ex-eminists of the right and left found themselves . . . agreeing that it was a political murder," as if no respectable or responsible individual could suspect a conspiracy. But among the 63% who are now demanding a new investigation are Harrison Salisbury of the *New York Times*, Senator Russell Long of Louisiana, Congressman Theodor Kupferman of New York, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Bishop James Pike, Richard Goodwin, former assistant special counsel to President Kennedy, Max Lerner, Raymondoley and *Life* magazine. Are these ex-eminists of the right or the left, Mr. Weaver?

The Dallas tragedy does not demand a more emotionally satisfying denouement . . . drawn from the evidence that the President had met his death at the hands of an insignificant youth." The

Dallas tragedy demands a concerned citizenry, capable of making an honest examination of the facts and of the presently available evidence. What Mr. Weaver has blithely overlooked, in zeal to "put down" the critics and to dismiss them as "cultists," is the fact that there is no substantial evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, that it was Harvey Oswald who killed President Kennedy or Officer Tippit.

At this point, I am obliged to point out just a few more obvious facts: (1) There is no proof that Oswald fired at General Walker, (2) the Zapruder frames are indisputable evidence that President Kennedy and Governor Connally were struck by separate bullets, (3) there is no substantial proof that Oswald could have or did, in fact, kill Officer Tippit.

These are but minor, isolated instances, to be sure, and can in themselves only raise serious questions. But there is a wealth of persuasive information and evidence that makes Oswald's guilt in both murders so questionable and tenuous as to be unacceptable.

No, Mr. Weaver, the Young Prince was not killed by a stockroom clerk. I challenge you and the Warren Commission to prove that he was. The conclusions of the Warren Commission are not good enough for me or for 63% of the American People.

Marjorie C. Field
Beverly Hills, California

Sir:

Congratulations on the excellent articles in your magazine by John D. Weaver, one in two parts answering objections of the Warren Report, the other a sketch of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of California. It is all too rare for a writer to combine objectivity, painstaking research, and a gift for presenting his material in a fascinating manner that is often spiced with humor.

Mrs. Leslie F. Kimmell

Hollywood