

8 January 1966

The Editor
The New Leader
7 East 15 Street
New York, N Y 10003

Dear Sir,

Leo Sauvage has made it devastatingly clear in his three New Leader articles that the Warren Report is neither competent nor trustworthy. It is therefore dismaying that two of your readers took issue with him, one in tones of almost personal offense, without confronting Sauvage's explicit criticisms. Mr Tompkins raised the philosophical and almost irrelevant objection that the Warren Report must be accepted because Robert Kennedy accepts it. He overlooks the fact that William Manchester has been retained by the Kennedys to write "an authoritative history of the assassination" and that Manchester seems to take a dim view of the Warren Report, judging from his remarks to the New York Times (May 9, 1965, page 43). In any case, the concurrence of the bereaved in the official findings (which Robert Kennedy said he had not read and did not intend to read) can hardly substitute for an independent critical examination of the evidence.

J O Rich has confidence in the members of the Warren Commission and considers Oswald a "hopeless jerk" and a "malicious screwball." Again, such subjective personal loyalties and antipathies cannot substitute for a painstaking study of the testimony and documents nor can such arbitrary interpretations of character and motive refute a single one of Sauvage's points.

Perhaps someday one of these angry uninformed partisans of the Warren Report, or—miracle of miracles—the Commission's stoic and silent lawyers will be good enough to confront specific questions specifically and forego the philosophical and psychological generalizations in which they tend to indulge. Meanwhile, the questions raised by Sauvage and other responsible critics of the Warren Report remain without an answer. Have the authors of the Report taken a vow of silence?

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Sylvia Meagher
302 West 12 Street
New York NY 10014