

Jonathon Daniel wasted that wonderful speech he made to the World Press
Institute so far as LOOK and Fletcher Knebel are concerned, and the late President
Kennedy's aside to the New York Times, that the country would have been spared
The Bay of Pigs
the disaster had the press not constituted itself a fourth branch of the government,
~~at the time of the Bay of Pigs, if~~ forgotten before its lesson could be learned.

Ironically, it was in an attack on a book that questions the official account
of the assassination of President Kennedy that ~~this issue can unequivocally clear~~
wise counsel was ignored.
XXXX
Edward Jay Epstein wrote the book, "Inquest". Viking published *it* LOOK and *my* Knebel do
not like it. It is my "competition"; but I think it is important.

Mr
It is important because Epstein interviewed members of the President's Commission
on the assassination and senior members of its staff. In their own words he
documents their misgivings and apprehensions about what they did and errors
they made. A viable and honorable attack upon the book requires proof of misquotation
or misinterpretation. This ~~the eminent~~ *give* Mr. Knebel does not ~~allege~~. Until it is
shown that Epstein misused what he was told, all the literary gnat-straining
serves only to fortify his ~~central~~ central thesis, that the staff of the Commission
knew it was doing wrong ~~and wrong was done~~.
not it did wrong.
even while it was wrong.

The book deals ~~with~~ with one of the major events in our history, the inquiry into the assassination of an American President. If there is any subject that requires a full, open and impartial siring, this certainly is it; yet the assassination of President Kennedy did not get it. The "Whitewash", as my book terms ^{the inquiry} it, was not full, not open, and not impartial, ^{Ma} and ^{Ma} In his own way Epstein documents this, and his documentation survives ^{Ma} Kenebel' assault, which ^{really} ignores it.

Viking is to be commended for its courage, (no matter how ~~late~~ late they found it,) ^{Ma} for printing the book, and Epstein for writing it; for it is clear that there has been nothing that reasonable people can call an investigation of this horrible crime.

Imagine I a President of the United States ^P is foully murdered and questions remain to be asked and answered, and he who asks the questions is berated for it! Can there be a time when ^{such} ~~these~~ questions must not be ~~raised~~ asked? Must the questions still not be answered? Is it somehow evil to seek to resurrect the national honor, to belatedly right a wrong, or to seek assassins if they are free? Is it somehow irresponsible ^{or reprehensible?}

Anything the ^V effects a President affects every American. He is not only the embodiment of the power and majesty of the country, he is the symbol of us all.

Can there be an unsolved Presidential murder with ~~future~~ ^{Succeeding} following Presidents remaining free, with the institution safe, with the country secure?

Or is it that ^{Mr} Kaebel has had too much of the "Night of Camp David"?

Is it wrong for ^{Mr} Epstein to deal with fact about the alleged investigation

of a Presidential murder and right for ^{Mr} Kaebel to get rich on a fiction ~~book~~ across

whose cover is emblazoned the horrifying question "What would HAPPEN IF THE

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES WENT STARK ^V RAVING MAD?"

What happens to a United States whose President is killed and the murder has no satisfactory inquest, Mr. Kaebel? This is Epstein's question, as it is mine and that of thousands of other Americans.

It is a question he asks as non-fiction. It is not answered with fiction.

A LOOK has yet to face it.
A What happens, LOOK?