

New Address: Rt. 9, Frederick, Md. 21701 : 301, 473-8166
October 14, 1967

Mr. Norman Redhartz,
Editor, Commentary
103 East 88 St.,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Redhartz,

When I wrote you after the appearance of the article pretending defense of the Warren Commission by the very eminent and learned Chancellor Kent Professor of Law at Yale and, more briefly, on the occasion of his piece on the CBS videotapes in the New Republic, you probably thought me intemperate. How much I really understated his and your literary, intellectual and historical sin you have yet to learn.

Almost singular devotion to the continuation of my own work as precluded this letter until now. The fourth part of my ^{own} "report on the Warren report", the fourth of the six-part WHITMAN series, is now appearing. You ignored the first two, WHITMAN I: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT and WHITMAN II: THE FBI-DEPT OF SERVICE COVER UP. Had you not, your publication of his original display of learned ignorance would have been impossible. Since then - have written and published PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITMAN: THE EVIDENCE OF AN ASSASSINATION IN TEXAS. You no doubt found this book easier to avoid because the New York Times found it and its revelations worth 40 column inches as news. Save for the breaking of a contract, the book parallel is now to bring out would have been the third. It is entitled OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS: THE NEW ORLEANS BIRDSY WITH THE CIA. If he has until now escaped intellectual bellyaches, your scholarly commentator, when he reads that and recalls his studied New Republic pronouncement, "District Attorney Garrison of New Orleans, who cuts a preposterous figure ...", he should then need Maslow for his conscience. I have completed the text of the fifth book, tentatively entitled WEST WORTHING: SUSPICIONS KNOWN BY NAME ONLY.

It is in your columns that Professor Bickel schematized his special belnding of sycophancy and ignorance into what you presented as thorough scholarship. His material comes from a hasty, incomplete and entirely incompetent scanning of some of the Commission's unredacted data in the 26 volumes of "evidence". (How a law professor could even rub his fingers over them without public nuisance excuses me.) To this he adds the pretense that this is all, for he was not about to do the work required to plumb the enormous suppressions he might have disclosed had his dedication to genuine scholarship led him to the National Archives. But, subtle in his ignorance, Professor Bickel unes homedly displayed it in the New Republic, content as the Emperor in his New clothes.

The CBS "firsthour" was a brilliant achievement which demonstrated how much new light a second, more effective official inquiry could shed." I should like to challenge this great scholar to cite a single piece of "new" information in that or any of the other three CBS shows.

Condemning the CBS plagiarism and indifferent to his own ignorance first displayed with such virtuosity in your October 1966 issue, Professor Bickel then said that "CBS discovered" DePrader's film indicates that the camera jumped slightly." Had he not been so intent on suppressing all credit to the first book on this subject, WHITMAN II, Bickel would have known that CBS took this, without credit, from page 47. CBS read this book in its limited edition in early 1966 and thereafter, when they were preparing their own whitewash and were intouch with me about it and my other work, in

WHITMAN II, after I had access to the Archives, I studied the Zapruder film in various forms and added to this what CBS also took credit for.

Like CBS, Bickel finds it possible to pursue his own special effort to make wrong appear right by ignoring a missed bullet, acknowledged by the Report and attributed to by the blood of James ~~Ague~~, wounded by its fragments or a spray of curbstone concrete it caused. Here we have the apotheosis of scholarship, lick-a-tittle style, and this Bickel can conclude that each of the three shots he, like the Commission he really seeks to defend, feels he can pretend a single man could have fired with that rifle, hit either the President or the Governor and all the shooting is accounted for. There is, of course, evidence of other firing, but here, from Bickel's and CBS's accounting, with the bullet that made them want Ague to have bled in vain, we have four shots and the end of the Report and its apologists.

Only the omniscient can say what "occurred to the Commission and its FBI experts". Bickel is omniscient, for he tells us that the probability of a shot earlier than the Report's CBS not "occur" to them. I tell him it did and they could not write this Report without pretending it didn't. He can describe himself - as a liar, a fool, a sycophant or a deficient scholar. The Commission staff knew that the President had been struck before Frame 310 of the Zapruder film. I shall be publishing this proof in POST MORTEM. Their problem was Ague. Thus they had to have a single bullet inflict all the nonfatal injuries the number of which Bickel halves - they were seven - and through this career like nothing in mythology or science fiction, not only not lose more metal than is missing from the bullet said to have done this, but simultaneously, as Bickel, CBS, and the Commission ignore, to have remained also undeformed.

His "alternative", the every-bullet-hits-a-man theory, is neither his nor CBS's but was the case turned over to the Commission by the Secret Service. If he did not know this when he wrote for you, were his pretensions warranted, he should have before he wrote for the New Republic and I published this in WHITMAN II, complete with the suppressed Secret Service pictures of it! If he ever reads to fore he writes, I encourage the eminence to silence until he reads POST MORTEM, where I enlarge upon this greatly.

He may pray for this nonsense to "hang together" with "a fresh look", but he will do as well to pray that the sides do not rise.

I spare you further commentary on your "amato of scholars, this noted apostle of the law and justice, for it should be unnecessary. I repeat that I told you a year ago, that such "defenses" of his, aired by ignorance, conceived by stupidity and delivred by sycophancy (yours), would make the members of the Commission defenseless. A year ago it might have been able to persuade the people that the members of the Commission might have been only misguided, honestly wrong. Bickel and those others, all of whom abdicated their responsibilities at the time of the assassination and of its official accounting, may, by such writing, have made this belief impossible.

Again I ask you, what is the obligation of the intellectual to and? When is our society to get from them the leadership and direction it should be entitled to expect? When will they desert the fairies and the needles and seek and report the truth? When will they remember that it is by criticism and the rectification of error that a democratic society is viable.

And when will they ask themselves what changes in national policy followed the assassination and if there is a connection?

Sincerely yours,

Harold Steiner