

15 July 1967

Representative Theodore R. Kupferman
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ted,

Thank you for sending me a copy of your letter to Russell D. Niles on Professor Goodhart's latest pronouncements. I have written to request a copy of his article, about which I had not been aware before. Professor Goodhart is one of the most prestigious apologists for the Warren Report but one of the most irresponsible and uninformed of its spokesmen. He had a highly partisan commentary on the RR in the May 1965 NYU Law Review. I wrote to him at that time, respectfully taking issue with some of the more glaring defects in his review, only to receive a frustrating and smug rejoinder which did not address the relevant points. He has since published further commentaries in the British press and elsewhere, which manifest a stubborn bias toward the Report and a refusal to acknowledge or confront any of the serious criticisms which has caused even Lord Devlin and such friends of the Report as Harrison Salisbury, Max Lerner, and Alistair Cooke to change their earlier position. I am very glad that you have taken issue with Goodhart's unfounded allegations.

Thank you also for your letter of the 12th to me and the copy of your letter of the same date to Bob Ockens. I am sorry that CBS did not send you the complete transcripts of the four broadcasts. I have already sent you a copy of my letter to Richard Salant (Harold Weisberg wrote him after the broadcasts saying that he now had a better understanding of the term "salaried news"), as an enclosure with my letter of yesterday dealing with Congressman Ford.

I very nearly said in that letter that I felt very unhappy because I inferred from your comments on the galleys that the book has not affected your view of the Warren Commission or its findings. I had felt that your reaction to the material in the book would serve as a barometer of its impact on the public--that if it caused a change in your private opinion of the Commission's performance, that would augur well. If it did not change your personal view, it would suggest that the book had failed in its fundamental purpose. Now I read, with gratitude and hopefulness, your statement to Bob Ockens that "the book is overwhelming." Perhaps this leaves my first inference intact; but I am still grateful for your generous and encouraging comment, and I do want you to know how much I value and appreciate those words, as well as all the moral support you have given my work all along.

Most sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher