

June 28, 1966

The Editors
LOOK Magazine
488 Madison Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10022

Dear Sirs,

I was rather amused by a paradox in Fletcher Knebel's article, "A New Wave of Doubt." Knebel was so preoccupied with the attempt to demolish the un-demolishable that he inadvertently and unthinkingly provided an important new piece of data which greatly advances the propositions posed by Edward Jay Epstein in his book Inquest. Epstein had merely presented evidence which suggested that the FBI was in possession of the autopsy report when it wrote its own two Reports contradicting the official description of the back wound. Knebel has now provided a definite date—December 23, 1963—on which the autopsy report was transmitted to the FBI. He has thus corroborated what Epstein merely inferred: that the FBI was in possession of the autopsy findings before writing the Supplemental Report of January 13, 1964 in which it again described the wound in terms utterly incompatible with the autopsy report that later appeared (for the first time) as an appendix to the Warren Report.

The case for a fabricated and falsified autopsy report which Knebel strained so hard to undermine is, therefore, only further buttressed by his self-defeating industriousness.

Knebel launches his attack on Epstein's book Inquest with some 85 lines on Arnold Rowland. The book mentions Rowland on three different pages, for a total of less than 50 lines. Here is a case of shooting at a flea with an elephant gun! Knebel's epithet "devious" fits his own foot better than it fits Epstein's, for Knebel has concentrated on Rowland's apparent liberties with fact on non-evidentiary matters, but omitted those facts which support his material testimony. Knebel did not mention that a deputy sheriff testified that Rowland had reported to him, within perhaps 15 minutes of the shooting, that he had seen two men in the Depository windows; that a Mrs. Eric Walther (who was ignored by the Commission) also reported to the authorities that she had seen two men; and that while Rowland's wife did say, under some pressure, that Rowland was prone to exaggerate at times, she added that "usually his exaggerations are not concerned with anything other than himself. They are usually to boost his ego."

I do not find it hard to believe that the FBI did not make an accurate report of interviews with Rowland. At least 61 other witnesses told the Commission that the FBI had reported their statements inaccurately or incompletely. Nor was Rowland the only witness to be impeached by the Commission. He is in company with Roger Craig, Wilma Tice, W.W. Litchfield, Dial Ryder, Gertrude Hunter, Edith Whitworth, Wanda Helmiak, Albert Guy Bogard, C.A. Hamblen, and others—all of whom have in common the foolhardiness of having given testimony or information incompatible, in one way or another, with the lone-assassin thesis.

Knebel has tried to lure his readers like sheep to uncritical faith in the Warren Report, even in the face of massive and overpowering new evidence of its

corruptness. He should better have demanded of his Commission friends that they place before the public some of the documents which have been suppressed from the published Exhibits and, so far as is known, from the National Archives as well-----(1) the Secret Service report with the control number 767 dealing with allegations that Oswald was on the FBI payroll; (2) the Secret Service survey report intended to accompany its album of reenactment photographs, which may indicate whether or not the Secret Service was trying to determine on December 5, 1963 (with the autopsy report in its hands) how the President was shot in the front from the back, as the press reported at the time; (3) the reports of the FBI agents who were present during the autopsy; (4) the reports of the FBI and Secret Service interviews with the doctors at Parkland Hospital; (5) the transcripts of radio and television tapes of statements by Dr. Malcolm Perry and his colleagues about the President's wounds and the nature of the wound at the Adam's apple in particular; and (6) above all, the photographs taken during the autopsy and never seen, even by the Warren Commission, which may show us whether the bullet wound in the President's back is located where the Commission says it is, or where the burden of evidence suggests.

While those and other important documents remain secret, and the spokesmen for the FBI and the Commission offer no serious refutation of the facts which Epstein has uncovered, Epstein's book should receive the respect due it from responsible sources--not the defamatory and unfounded attack that has issued from Fletcher Knebel.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher
302 West 12th Street
New York, New York 10011