

X MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX

X MX MX MX MX MX MX MX MX
473-8186

Route 7
Frederick, Md. 21701

March 27, 1968

Manager, WABC-TV
1330 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10019

Dear Sir:

In your program, "A Conversation with Louis Nizer", aired February 25, 1968, your Bill Beutel led Mr. Nizer into the expression of his opinion about the Warren Report and those of us who have proved it wrong, of whom I am senior and the one who has done and published most of the work.

In his customary manner, Mr. Nizer began his response with mixed defa-
mation and fiction, establishing a standard from which he never departed. Without interference or correction by Mr. Beutel, who cannot be expected to be familiar with the enormous volume of evidence, Mr. Nizer proceeded to use your facilities for the spread of what I think can fairly be termed non-stop slander and falsehood.

His endless irresponsibility never ends. I have debated him on the subject, as a consequence of which he has since scheduled no new de-
bates. His willingness to fabricate is as fascinating to me as it is shocking. I am distressed that on a subject as vital to the national integrity as this that you permit this without some effort to check on the accuracy and appropriateness of what you present.

Because Mr. Nizer's comments are so utterly at variance with reality and because this is, without doubt, one of the "controversial" subjects of our era, I ask for the opportunity for fair response.

And because you have no way of knowing what the truth is, to show you that Mr. Nizer did abuse your trust and your audience as he did fact and the national honor, I make these comments about his appearance:

"I have as a lawyer studied 28 volumes of that report."

Now, the Report consists of but a single volume. The Commission pub-
lished 26 volumes of what, for lack of an appropriate word in the language, is called "evidence", 15 of which are of "testimony" and 11 of documents, etc. In each of his appearances that I have seen and heard and during the four hours he spent taping with me, Mr. Nizer has made it abundantly clear that he has less familiarity with this data than the garlic with the stew over which it is wafted. There are an estimated 10,000,000 words in these volumes. Few people can take the time to study them. If Mr. Nizer did, and all the evidence is that he did not, then he is without doubt the champion misrepresenter of all time. Do you believe a man as busy as he could possibly take the time to master the contents of 26 enormous volumes? Why, he doesn't know how many volumes there are. In each of his appearances he gives a dif-
ferent number, the invention of which is not inconsistent with the rest of his appearances.

"I have studied the objective evidence, the scientific proof of every conclusion."

Not even the Commission claims that its proof is "scientific" or "objective" and in truth it is not. In some cases, the conclusions are diametrically opposed to each and every bit of evidence. More, Mr. Nizer has not "studied" it. Rather, he has invented it. The magnitude and consistency of this simply stagger the mind, particularly because of his exalted reputation.

"I regret that great damage is being done this country's reputation by spreading rumors of possible conspiracies which never existed."

If the Commission proved only one thing, it proved Oswald's innocence and then misrepresented it. If it proved only one additional thing, it is that no single man could have committed the assassination. This means conspiracy. The damage that is being done the country is by eminences who pretend a fairy-tale is reality, who blindly insist that Black is white. Mr. Nizer adds to his glib manufactures the citation of the language of the Report as proof that the Report is right. He never cites the evidence itself. Here again he is consistent, for he wrote a glowing introduction to a commercial version of it at a time when the so-called "evidence" was entirely unavailable.

He is not unwilling to misrepresent his own relationship to that, either, and invariably, as he did on your program, he misrepresents that, too. At no point did he indicate that he had no connection with the official Report. Invariably he says or implies the opposite, as, "I don't want to refer to my analysis of that report printed with the edition of the Warren Commission Report." What Mr. Nizer penned is in no way an "analysis" and it was part of the commercial Doubleday edition, not the "Warren Commission report". I can cite you his record in his own words on a number of occasions, including that on which I corrected him to his face. Without exception he pretends that he wrote part of the official Report.

"Recently Mr. Garrison ... said the President was shot from the front, and not from the rear. Well, this was gone into fully by the Warren Commission report."

It is I who first published the proof that the President was shot from the front. It is unmistakable and overwhelming. Mr. Garrison never, ever, said the President was not shot from the rear, and I know of no single critic of the Report who ever did. And this matter, rather than being "gone into fully" by the Commission, was distorted, misrepresented and suppressed.

Mr. Nizer then cites the fact that there was no bullet hole through the windshield as proof there had been no shot from the front. Here he displays limitless ignorance or deliberately misrepresents. It is obvious, if you will but think of it, that the shot or shots could have gone above or around that windshield. If Mr. Nizer has the remotest idea of that of which he speaks, he must know that the physical circumstances of the assassination preclude the possibility of a shot from the "grassy knoll" even crossing the windshield if it were also to hit the President. The angle of the street is about 135 degrees, and the knoll was farther to the side.

"Scientists even discovered the lead of the bullet which splintered the inside (of the windshield) ... and came to the conclusion even of the trajectory of that damage to the windshield that it came from the rear and behind ..."

No "scientist" discovered anything. It was first a reporter and then federal investigators. The only "Science", that of the spectrographic analysis, has been totally suppressed. The "trajectory" did not exist and the Commission never suggested otherwise. Instead, it conjectured that the fragment of bullet which caused this damage exploded from the President's head. Had anyone wanted to, this could not have been "fully disposed of by the most profound and conclusive scientific evidence". There could be nothing but conjecture, save for this suppressed spectrographic analysis.

"... seventeen people shot from eight different directions ..."

This is quite a disreputable falsehood, a simple manufacture that even your own uninformed reporter should have detected. None of us claim that, nothing like it, nothing remotely warranting anything like it.

"... the shells of his (Oswald's) bullets, which were connected with the bullets that were found in the car ..."

Precisely the opposite is true. Those "shells" were connected with nothing except a history of having been in rifles more than once, astounding as this may seem. The Commission misrepresented this, as does Mr. Nizer, but the suppressed FBI evidence is unchallenged. I published it in my first book on the subject. The sad truth is that not a single bullet was found in the car, let alone the "bullets" Mr. Nizer invents.

"... the bullets (that killed Tippit) were traced directly to the revolver. There wasn't any even controversy of that (sic)."

Again, only the opposite is true. Aside from other problems with the evidence, including the fact that the bullets and shells did not add up, when 100 bullets were fired from that same revolver, the FBI which fired them could not trace them to the revolver by analysis. There was, indeed, nothing but controversy.

The involvement of the brother of the late President in this case is warranted by nothing save the persistent official and unofficial desire to arrange his political assassination by quite falsely making it seem that he was responsible for the work because he was Attorney General. The fact is that he totally disassociated himself from it and says he has not even read the Report.

There is one comment you aired with which I can agree: "... the American people are being belabored with some demagogic views on this subject."

When a station airs a man of Mr. Nizer's reputation, it should be able to assume he will not abuse its trust or its audience. When it goes into this subject, it can become the creature of its guest, for no station can make the studies required to know the vast evidence in this case.

However, in this case, you did air what in every aspect is the opposite of truth. I ask for the opportunity to respond, particularly because the thrust of the entire thing is to damage me and my work.

-4-

If you would care to arrange this as a face-to-face confrontation with Mr. Nizer, I accept. I will be overjoyed if he does and agrees to a limit of two minutes for responses, for in that limited time his endless misrepresentations can be nailed.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg