

Who killed Kennedy?

SIR.—The main difficulty with Lord Devlin's apparent review of 'Rush to Judgment' in your last Sunday's issue is the same difficulty which obtained when Lord Devlin wrote in the *New Statesman* a 7,000-word paean of praise to the Warren Report when it came out: namely, he has not read the evidence. Lord Devlin is unfamiliar with the content of the 26 volumes containing the verbatim testimony and the exhibits, of which the Warren Report is a fraudulent summary.

It is all the more disturbing, therefore, that Lord Devlin writes in so offhand and cavalier a manner about Mr Lane's treatment of evidence. He quotes Mr Lane as saying 'there is some evidence to suggest that one or more shots may have been fired from the book depository,' and continues: 'The "some evidence" consists of a tripod, a rifle, three empty cartridge cases, two bullets which came from the rifle, and three witnesses who saw a man with a rifle at a window.' Those who have read the Warren Report will recognise Lord Devlin's words. The problem is that, on examination of the evidence of the witnesses mentioned, and the exhibits to which Lord Devlin refers, one finds that they in no way establish what Lord Devlin wishes—that the fatal shots came from the sixth floor of the Texas Book Depository building. Even less do they link Lee Harvey Oswald with the event.

There are other points in Lord

Devlin's critique which suffer equally from indifference to the facts, but it has to be put on record that defenders of the Warren Report who were total in their praise of it before, and more careful in their praise of it today, are filling pages of the Western Press with words based on prejudice, ignorance and unflinching determination to support the official view, while avoiding the absolute intellectual responsibility of confronting the evidence.

Bertrand Russell and Mark Lane have suffered abuse of an unusually vindictive character because they have been lonely in their insistence that examination of the facts leads to the destruction of the official view. No one has been asked to rely on them, but only on the evidence which is available to all.

SW1.

Ralph Schoenman

★

Sir.—In your Back Page feature, last Sunday, you most unfavourably compared me with another author, Edward Epstein, referring to me as 'an ex-politician,' while stating of Mr Epstein, 'He embarked on the subject two years ago because he wanted to see how a Government department operated in crisis situations where it had no parallel past experience to guide it.'

It is true that I served in the New York State Legislature, having been elected to that body due to the endorsement of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. While that may make me 'an ex-politician,' a term which I fear you

use in a pejorative sense, it seems entirely unrelated to the validity of my work.

You are quite in error in explaining to your readers how and why Mr Epstein became involved in this project. At the request of Professor Andrew Hacker, I spoke at Cornell University in New York during 1964. Professor Hacker said he wished to assist my work and thus he became a member of our Citizens' Committee of Inquiry. When he suggested that he would like to make an additional contribution, I wrote to him asking that he question each member of the Warren Commission and each lawyer on the Commission's staff and present an article to the *New York Times Magazine* (a publication for which he frequently writes, based upon his findings). Professor Hacker undertook this assignment, but later reported to me that the *New York Times* had informed him that it would print no such article, for 'the case is closed.'

Professor Hacker suggested that one of his students, a Mr Edward Epstein, would be willing to undertake the same subject if I asked him to put certain questions to the Commissioners and counsel. I, of course, agreed to do this, and our working relationship continued in this fashion until one day Mr Epstein declined to give me further information, stating that 'I now have a book of my own.' And indeed he has, for in my view his work is an important contribution to illuminating the secret meetings and conferences of the Commission and its staff.

SW3.

Mark Lane