

(B)

Edward Jay Epstein, author of Inquest (reviewed in the July/August 1966 TMO), recently wrote a major study of the Garrison probe which was published in a popular weekly magazine, citing specific instance after instance of chicanery, abuse of authority, and lunatic assaults on fact and logic by the New Orleans District Attorney. (Garrison, with characteristic bravado, brushed aside the opportunity to refute any part of this fatally damaging expose of his methods and morals and proceeded to apply his usual diversionary technique by announcing a new sensation--his supposed contacts with a "foreign intelligence service" which he refused to identify, which he claimed had information in its possession which confirmed his "case.") The value of Epstein's analysis of Garrison's vaudeville was all but nullified, however, by the pervasive softness of his attitude toward the Warren Report and by his backsliding from the already-timid and cautious critique of the Warren Commission he had authored in Inquest.

In a television interview on July 16, 1968, Epstein was asked if anything in his study of events in Dallas or in New Orleans suggested in any way that "there might have been a wider conspiracy than just a lone madman" in the assassination of President Kennedy. Although Epstein in a personal letter dated December 1, 1967 had written that "...by a common sense standard...it is extremely unlikely, even inconceivable, that a single assassin was responsible..." he now replied, on the safely theoretical or philosophical plane: "Well, it's a difficult question to answer, because anything 'might have been'..."

He then added that his critique of the Warren Commission and the way it operated showed that "it's much more difficult to establish the truth than one might think." Certainly, it IS difficult for a Warren Commission to establish the truth when--as Epstein neglected to add--it is busily engaged in tortured "reasoning" (e.g., that a poor marksman had the capability to perform a feat of marksmanship which master rifleman, under vastly easier conditions, were unable to duplicate), misrepresentation (e.g., of the testimony of Parkland Hospital doctors and other witnesses whose expert opinions were incompatible with the single-bullet, lone-assassin hypothesis), invention (e.g., that the ammunition supposed used in the assassination was recently manufactured and is currently produced), reliance on testimony of admittedly perjured or untruthful witnesses (e.g., Howard L. Brennan, Helen Markham, Marina Oswald), impeachment of witnesses whose testimony was unwelcome (e.g., Arnold Rowland, Gertrude Hunter, Dial Ryder, and many others), and suppression of vital evidence and material findings (e.g., the autopsy photographs and x-rays, the results of spectrographic tests, and complete failure to establish Oswald's purchase or possession of the ammunition assertedly used to kill JFK).

~~Those who saw in Epstein's faithful Inquest the "Government
secret" will be more than ever convinced by his retreat to virtual apologetics for the
Warren Report that he is not a free thinker. That is really quite~~

4(c)

Those who interpreted Epstein's faintheartedness in his book Inquest as evidence that he was a "Government agent" will be even more convinced of his sinister role by his retreat into virtual apologia for the Warren Report. To label him a paid tool of the Establishment is merely facile and a typical over-simplification. Epstein, just like the critics of the Warren Report who have become Garrison satellites, is using one set of criteria in evaluating Garrison, and a different set of criteria in evaluating the Warren Report, and his "softness" on the one and "hardness" on the other is also governed by inherent attitudes, sympathies, and political leanings. If his temporization is somehow the more reprehensible, it is because his academic and intellectual capacities are so sorry a contrast with his moral febleness and the sophistry of his value judgments.