

29 April 1969

Donald C. Goddard
Sunday Department
The New York Times
New York, N.Y. 10036

Dear Mr. Goddard,

Since the Times has been zealous enough to send not one but two letters declining to print my letter on Epstein's article in the New York Times Magazine (20 April 1969), I will permit myself some further comments.

I am delighted that you intend to print Professor Thompson's excellent letter. It is, as you say, very similar to my letter, although it was written after mine was already in the mail. Thettwo letters are almost identical inlength, and in content.

But there is one very serious difference. While both Thompson and I show Epstein to be incorrect in relying on C.B.S. "evidence" of blurred frames of the Zapruder film, my letter reveals that Epstein was already aware that the C.B.S. claims were specious when he consciously and purposefully sought to mislead your readers by presenting the C.B.S. "findings" as valid.

My letter further reveals Epstein's chicanery and willful misrepresentation by showing that his published conclusion ("no substantial evidence...more than one rifleman...") is the exact reverse of his private admission in writing that it is "extremely unlikely, even inconceivable, that a single assassin was responsible."

One understands the Times' unwillingness to acknowledge to its readers that it has given Epstein a platform from which to dâssâminate not mere error but deliberate falsehood. However, I would like to request you to reconsider your decision and to publish at least the second paragraph of my letter of 20 April 1969, in the interests of fair play and of undoing a disservâce to readers that was surely unintended.

Yours sincerely,

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