

To: Sylvia Meagher

From: Verne Moberg

I found your book fascinating, even after ~~examining it~~ having examined it for some length of time.

You raise more questions than you answer and that is good here; as you say, it is the Commission's responsibility to answer these--not that of the independent researcher. But one ~~important~~ general question kept rising in my mind in your book and other critics' books and in the TV debates on Feb. 11-12.

Like many of your potential readers, I'm sure, I am very interested in the Warren Report and Kennedy's death but I don't happen to know very much at all about legal procedures and have never been especially interested in murder trials etc. Reading criticisms of the Warren Report I am much more impressed by the evidence than by the "distinguished" supporters' endorsements of it, and the arguments have persuaded me to mistrust the Commission ~~and~~ and seriously doubt their findings. Yet, the supporters are at least correct in stating that an army of America's foremost ~~experts~~ "experts" and "names" participated in this case. Earl Warren may have erred astronomically, but I mistrust him less than I mistrust the judges in perhaps most of the states in this ~~country~~ country. If Warren and his army of so-called prime Establishment talent could not solve the Kennedy murder -- with every conceivable resource at their fingertips -- then is there any justice at all in this country?

I lack the legal perspective to judge how bad Oswald's "trial" was compared to other trials. How much are we entitled to expect of the Warren Commission -- or any other investigatory body? If the Commission had pursued all those neglected witnesses, how much would it have cost, how many volumes would it mount to? Is it worth devoting that much effort to Kennedy's killers instead of the Poverty Program?

While I'm wondering I sense these notions are off-the-point. Yet they affect one's attitude toward the arguments generally and sometimes in quite particular ways. For instance, when you complain that the Dallas policeman took the ~~finger~~^{palm} print record from the rifle without witnesses, I wonder if every policeman has to call another cop to watch while he performs any menial detail of investigation. (In Finland cops are said to do things in pairs because it takes one to read and the other to write but maybe in America we need one cop to do and the other to watch?)

I think many readers may have similar questions and a few general sentences or a paragraph at the beginning or the end of the book might provide the necessary solace (or reprimand or explanation).

vm

Sylvia -
For you to decide.

VM