

3 February 1967

Mr. Robert W. Thomas
Producer, Radio-TV
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Dear Mr. Thomas,

Your letter of January 30, 1967, makes the unfounded suggestion that I have challenged Mr. Jenner's statements on the basis of information derived from published works by critics of the Warren Report. That is not true. If you will be good enough to look again at my analysis of Mr. Jenner's assertions, you will find that I have relied exclusively upon:

- (1) the text of the Warren Report (using the symbol "WR");
- (2) the fifteen volumes of Hearings (transcripts of testimony) published by the Warren Commission (using symbols to designate the volume and page numbers, i.e., "3H 259" indicates Volume III page 259);
- (3) the official Warren Commission Exhibits (using the symbol "CE" as an abbreviation of "Commission Exhibit"); and
- (4) statements by former counsel to the Warren Commission (Mr. Jenner's colleagues) reported without correction, denial, or retraction by the counsel concerned, in such periodicals as U.S. News & World Report and The Saturday Evening Post.

Nothing—absolutely nothing—in my analysis of Mr. Jenner's remarks introduces the claims or conclusions of any critics of the Warren Report. On the contrary, I have demonstrated that Mr. Jenner's assertions are in conflict with the assertions in the Warren Report, which he purported to describe, interpret, and justify. You, sir, have misstated the issue by arguing in terms of a contest between the factual accuracy of "books like Mark Lane's" on the one hand, and the factual accuracy of the Warren Report, on the other hand. Specifically, you say in your letter that "much of the populace is willing to believe the Warren report is just as factual."

My point, which you have persistently deformed, is that Mr. Jenner's assertions were in conflict with the Warren Report and the accompanying volumes of Hearings & Exhibits. In other words, the contest is between Mr. Jenner's account of the facts and the divergent account which appears on the pages of the Warren Report in the specific instances which I documented. I hope that you do not suggest that it is permissible, much less desirable, for the Warren Report to be defended on the basis of a false or inaccurate version of its actual contents.

No question of "viewpoint" is at issue but only the question of the accuracy or inaccuracy of Mr. Jenner's presentation of "facts" which are verifiable from the official record published by the Warren Commission. If he challenges the facts in the official record by giving contradictory

versions of those facts, he is repudiating rather than defending the Warren Report. But if he is really defending the Warren Report, he has a responsibility to rely upon its contents and not a specious version of its contents.

Your letter of January 30, 1967 introduces a number of irrelevant considerations. The bias you attribute to Jerry Williams (of whom I have never heard before) has nothing to do with the factual accuracy or inaccuracy of Mr. Jenner's assertions. The amount of air time consumed by the critics as opposed to the apologists for the Warren Report has nothing to do with it (although it should be said that to my personal knowledge the latter have often refused urgent appeals from the media to appear and speak in defense of the Report—for example, Metromedia's Channel 5 in New York invited every single member of the Warren Commission and every single legal counsel to the Commission to appear on its "Minority Report," a three-hour discussion broadcast on Channel 5 in November 1966, but not one of the 22 invited were willing to participate).

Also extraneous are your references to Mark Lane. I do not consent to transfer the real issue of Mr. Jenner's fidelity to the facts printed in the Warren Report to the specious and diversionary issue of what anyone else, correctly or incorrectly, "advertises as fact." I may say that I compiled the Subject Index to the Warren Report and Hearings & Exhibits published in March 1966 by Scarecrow Press (New York and London), and that I rely on the official record and not on any other source. Certainly I do not appreciate the insinuation that I neither research nor think for myself.

You say of Mr. Jenner's appearance on YOUR RIGHT TO SAY IT that you "merely wanted to let the Warren commission view be heard." But I never suggested and never implied that it should not be heard. I said, and I say now, that the Commission's "view" must be defended on the basis of the Commission's published official records and not on the basis of misrepresentations of the contents or outright inventions. Do you disagree with that?

Freedom of speech is not freedom to falsify. If we can agree on that much, then you may wish to check the published records to see whether Mr. Jenner was correct or whether the quotations and citations in my analysis are correct. If you find that Mr. Jenner inadvertently and unintentionally misstated the facts and misled your audience, and I assume that he did not do so deliberately, perhaps you would agree that it was unfortunate that the listeners were done such a disservice and that the errors should be rectified if possible.

Yours sincerely,

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