16 June 1967

Mr. Walter Kronkite
CBS Television
518 West 57 Street
New York City 10019

Dear Mr. Kronkite,

Like my fellow-critics of the Warren Report and members of the public in general, I am looking forward with the greatest interest to the three-part CBS Report which will begin in about ten days. The CBS program on Sunday, September 29, 1964, upon the release of the Warren Report, greatly influenced public opinion in favor of the Warren Commission's findings. On that date, the Hearings and Exhibits, which raise very grave questions about the validity of the Warren Report, were not available. That the news media nevertheless unreservedly promoted acceptance of the Warren Report was unfortunate and perhaps irresponsible. I hope that CBS, in its forthcoming review of this controversial and cardinal question, will give the fullest possible exposition of the arguments against the Warren Report which have become apparent since the 1964 program.

There has been a certain amount of public debate during the last year on issues of evidence, but there has been no real confrontation with the really basic issue—the deliberate, purposeful misrepresentation and falsification of fact in the Warren Report. It has become axiomatic for both apologists for the Report and many of its critics to explain its factual errors and defects as the product of haste and carelessness. That is facile. It is also invalid. It is demonstrable that many of the misstatements in the Report can only be calculated, purposeful, and disingenuous (and this is demonstrated beyond quibble in a book to be published later this year).

Let me cite some specific examples. The Report states, on page 89, that Dr. Charles S. Carrico "noted a small wound approximately one-fourth of an inch in diameter" etc. But on page 519 of the Report, a photocopy of Dr. Carrico's actual report states that there was a "small penetrating wound of (anterior) neck," etc. The word "penetrating" was deliberately excised in the first passage on page 89 so that it would not compromise the Commission's attempt to revise history by claiming that the characteristics of the neck wound were thought by Dr. Carrico and his colleagues at the time of their attempts to save the President's life to be "consistent with being either a point of entry or exit" (page 91).

On this very same point, I note in the current issue of Variety that CBS was unable to obtain from any source the video/audio tape of Dr. Perry's press conference after the President was pronounced dead. All copies have been misplaced, lost, or taken away by federal agents. The National Archives copy is listed as "lost." Surely this total disappearance is no coincidence? (The Variety story mentions that CBS does have a video tape of the Perry interview but no audio; perhaps it can be submitted to lip-reading?)

Additonal examples of the studied misrepresentation and mutilation of fact in the Warren Report are cited in the enclosed article, "Truth Was Their Only Client," which is merely a sampler and by no means exhaustive.

If there is incontrovertible proof (as indeed there is) that the Warren Commission manipulated, suppressed, and falsified the facts, and did so in each instance with the effect and presumably the purpose of strengthening the evidence against Oswald, then that dishonesty of purpose and performance is the fundamental and overriding issue. To present arguments about the number of shots fired, the validity of the paraffin test, and other problematical questions of evidence, however well-intended and balanced the presentation of opposing arguments, still evades the first and foremost question—the probity and integrity of the Warren Commission and its Report. Much of the "hard evidence" has already been undermined or invalidated by new information which has emerged during the last year or so; there is every possibility that the remaining "hard evidence" will suffer a similar fate as more information continues to surface——in forthcoming books, in documents being declassified in the National Archives, and in scientific quantifications and analyses of films and photographs which are being and will be undertaken.

For any responsible medium of information to "reassure" a public only too ready to be complacent on the most important contemporary issues,into renewed confidence in the fraudulent Warren Report,would be a grave disservice. For this shameful miscarriage of justice merely to be exploited rather than explored, to score in "ratings," would be a default on the high sense of responsibility with which the television networks performed during the four days in November 1963 which so tragically changed the nation's history, and the world's.

I hope very much that CBS's study of the Warren Report controversy will, on the contrary, make a genuine and courageous contribution to public understanding of the events in Dallas and thereafter.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher
302 West 12 Street
New York, N.Y. 10014

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Jack Gould, The New York Times
Mr. Bob Williams, The New York Post