



Have you personally checked out the conclusions of the Report against the evidence cited and that in the record but not cited? This is the format of my first book, WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT. If you have not - and the news story does not quote you as invoking secondary authority - it is honorable and proper to make the charges you have, with immunity, against American citizens whose work you are not in a position to evaluate? Can you assure me and other Americans, for example, that you have personally studied the evidence that the members of the Commission did not see?

You are, of course, entitled to believe what you choose. Your beliefs need not be based upon fact or personal knowledge. You are within your rights in believing the world is ~~round~~ flat - even to join the Flat-World Society. I do not expect that the <sup>as a</sup> Senator of California <sup>you</sup> will so proclaim on the Senate floor, however. Thus, you may well believe that "the conclusions of the Commission...are unassailable" and "indisputable". But when you so announce, on the floor of the Senate and with all the respect and majesty of that body in seeming endorsement, is it not incumbent upon you to know what you are talking about, to be able to say, "I haven't made this study and it shows " whatever you have concluded.?"

In the absence of this - and no one else who takes your position can say it, either - I ask you to consider just who it is who "have fanned the flames of rumor...spread doubt..." I sent a copy of my first book to each member of the Commission and the more important members of the staff and to those in the executive departments most involved. In each case I challenged the recipient (to either show me where I was wrong or, join me in the conclusion

of that book, that there must be a full and public airing. *The answer was silence*

I agree with you that it is a matter of national concern when people lose faith in those who bear the public trust. But are you saying this faith *I trust* *is an automatic rights* that we are back in the days of monarchies? Must

3/

not that faith be warranted and earned? Have we not just seen, disgracefully, how little cause there sometimes is for such faith, in both Houses of Congress? What is there that makes us, ~~xxxx~~ <sup>and trust</sup> regardless of fact and evidence, owe faith to any part of the government when it has demonstrated its error and refused to consider or ~~recif~~ rectify it? Are we supposed to obey and honor liars, crooks, and kind of miscreant because he is employed by government? Or are ~~the~~ <sup>our</sup> citizens ~~is~~ <sup>are</sup> entitled to expect no less of their government than the purity of <sup>on</sup> Caesar's wife?

History, lamentably, is full of the error of government - and of Senators, and of prejudice and less than honorable acts. We have no right to expect perfection of man or that government will not and can not err. But we do have a right to expect of every other part of government that, like the court, ~~it~~ <sup>they</sup> will assume men can err and that ~~it~~ <sup>they</sup> will correct error. *Insistence*

*upon* This is what makes a democratic society viable, not complacency, not the pusillanimous acceptance of error, ~~by concerned citizens.~~ *(am my times)*

You talk about "commercialism". Do I take it that you ~~hear~~ <sup>have</sup> refer to Congressman Ford, who put his name to the first and very commercial book that we, as taxpayers, put him and his assistant in a position to write by paying for the work of the Commission? Or to Congressman Ford whose name appears on a personal Warren Report in LIFE magazine? Or Louis Nizer, who wrote a glowing introduction to a quite commercial version of the Warren Report at a time when the evidence allegedly backstopping it was not available? To Charles Roberts? Merriman Smith? NBC? CBS? AP? To those many ~~on~~ <sup>and in</sup> the staff of the late President whose financially-successful book-publishing ventures were made possible by his murder? To William Manchester, who becomes a million-<sup>and in</sup>aire by his shameful prostitution of reality? I think it would be helpful if you would rise on the floor of the Senate and just as loudly proclaim ~~just~~

who made how much money from this assassination, and who <sup>derived</sup> other ~~profits~~ <sup>and</sup> benefit. Let us have ~~not~~ only the truth, Senator, ~~but~~ <sup>the</sup> whole truth. To this end you may examine my books and bank accounts when you will.

I think it only fair that you send me a copy of the text of your remarks and with it the assurance that you will make as well-publicized an effort to correct any error you may have in your <sup>speech of</sup> ~~speech~~ the 13th.

I think it also only fair that you undertake to prove the charges you made against me, chapter and verse, or apologize for them ~~with~~ <sup>with</sup> as much prominence and oratory <sup>zeal</sup> as when you launched them.

If you are unwilling to do this, there are at least two men who know what kind of man Senator Thomas H. Kuchel is, what motivates him, how well he serves the public trust vested in him.

Sincerely yours,

Should you ever want to face some of the evidence, a possibility <sup>of which</sup> your speech does not inspire ~~one~~ <sup>me</sup> to hope ~~for~~, I am at your service.

And although there is nothing in your public conduct on this subject to earn what I intend as friendly advice, I would suggest that any man who expects to face the electorate and who speaks on this assassination, recognize that it and the government's handling of it address the integrity, sanctity and viability of our society and consider the eventuality that someday soon he may be proven a knave or, worse, an irresponsible liar. Events have a way of correcting the lies men seek to write as history.