

7551 Byron Place
Saint Louis, Missouri 63105

August 14, 1967

Columbia Broadcasting System Studios
New York, New York

Dear Sirs:

This letter is to note some inconsistencies in your four part series on the Warren Report which started on June 26. It seemed to me that the program should have been entitled Feats of Legerdemain in Which Obvious Weaknesses in the Warren Commission's Case for One Assassin Suddenly Disappear and New Evidence and Changed Testimony are Discovered.

Some examples:

(1) In your script Abraham Zapruder said the shots came from the direction of the Book Depository Building. In his testimony to the Warren Commission, Zapruder said his first impression was that it "came from back of me". He also said "they claim it was proven it could be done by one man. You know there was an indication there were two?" To which the Commission lawyer replied, "Your films were extremely helpful to the work of the Commission, Mr. Zapruder."

(2) In an effort to discredit Mark Lane in your script, Charles Brehm said that he thought that the shots had come from the direction of the Depository Building and, also, that Mark Lane had misquoted him and taken his words out of context. But in the Dallas Times-Herald of November 22, 1963, Reporter George Carter wrote, "Brehm seemed to think the shots came from in front of or beside the President. He explained the President did not slump forward as he would have after being shot from the rear." This appeared before Mr. Lane had even come on the scene.

(3) In your script, Senior Engineer Darrell C. Tomlinson was positive that the bullet he found came from the stretcher of Governor Connally. While in the Bantam Edition of the Warren Report, it clearly says "Tomlinson was not certain whether the bullet came from the Connally stretcher or the adjacent one".

To go further into his testimony in the 26 volumes, the Commission lawyer asks him, "Now, Mr. Tomlinson, are you sure that it was stretcher "A" that you took out of the elevator and not stretcher "B"? To which Tomlinson replies "Well, really, I can't be positive, just to be perfectly honest

August 14, 1967

about it." Later Tomlinson says "I'm going to tell you all I can, and I'm not going to tell you something that I can't lay down and sleep at night with either."

You concluded that Oswald was at the scene of the crime because Charles Givens said he saw him on the sixth floor at 12:05. Mr. Givens told the Warren Commission (Bantam Edition, Page 133) that he last saw Oswald at 11:55, but that is beside the point. The point is that you didn't mention that the Warren Commission places Bonnie Ray Williams on the sixth floor eating his lunch until about 12:20 p. m. when he joined his friends on the fifth floor. (Bantam Edition, Page 78)

As for your new evidence on the length of time in which the shots could have been fired, etc., I won't go into that except to comment that it seemed to me that Eric Sevareid had a hard time keeping a straight face when he reported the startling new evidence on the late news. Also adding insult to injury was the way you kept summing up what we were supposed to think like in the most unctuous commercial.

In reply to the specious rhetoric with which you philosophically summed up the last segment, i. e., that people couldn't believe there was just one man and had a conspiracy complex, I never thought there was a conspiracy until facts brought out by the Warren Commission suggested that Oswald couldn't have done it alone if at all.

All most doubters of the Warren Commission conclusions ask is for some unbiased doctors to look at the autopsy pictures and X-rays and report whether the bullet went through the neck, as the official autopsy says, or 5½ inches down in the shoulder as the bullet holes in the coat and shirt evidence. If the latter were true, it would indicate that the front neck wound was one of entry because it would be higher than the back wound, and, thus, that there were at least two assassins.

To paraphrase President Kennedy when he was urged to attack Cuba in order to improve his image after the Bay of Pigs, power isn't the shadow, it's the substance. You are attempting to retain the shadow of integrity at the expense of the substance.

Sincerely,

Grace P. Vale

(Mrs.) Grace P. Vale

Copies to: Cardinal Cushing
The New York Times