

✓ DALLAS TIMES
HERALD 11/1/66
Search for Truth

One of the many good people of Dallas has sent me a copy of A. C. Greene's review of the so-called "review" in the Saturday Review by Judge Fein.

Is it possible that Dallas and your paper are so intellectually destitute that you have to depend upon others for the formulation of your opinions for you? Cannot you and your staff reach your own independent judgments, make up your minds for you, tell you what is true or false, good or bad, worthy of the consideration of your readers or not worthy of it?

With respect to my book "Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report," I personally delivered to your office in the National Press Building in Washington one of the first copies. This was the week of May 9, 1966. If you have made any comment on it no one has informed me of it. I also offered to present to your correspondents the evidence behind every word of the book. This offer was not accepted. It is possible for me to make this offer for there is no evidence in my book that is not the official evidence. This is one of the things that distinguishes "Whitewash."

You err seriously if you think every word on this subject has been either written or printed. There is but one answer to this terrible and shameful situation, for the nation, for Dallas and for your paper. That is the untainted and uninhibited truth. Slanders and evasions will not prevent its ultimate triumph. They will but further dishonor those who seek to delay and frustrate it.

HAROLD WEISBERG
Hyattstown, Md.

● *Our independent judgment was that Mr. Weisberg's book was not worth reviewing but that Judge Fein's study of six books was of interest.—Ed.*

Harold Weisberg
Hyattstown, Md. 20734
October 29, 1966

Editor
The Dallas ~~Times~~-Herald
Dallas, Texas

Dear Sir,

One of the many good people of Dallas has sent me a copy of A.C. Greene's review of the so-called "review" in the Saturday Review but Judge Fein.

Is it possible that Dallas and your paper are so intellectually destitute that you have to depend upon others for the formulation of your opinions for you? Cannot you and your staff reach your own independent judgements, make up your minds for you, tell you what is true or false, good or bad, worthy of the consideration of your readers or not worthy of it?

With respect to my book, WHITE ASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT, I personally delivered to your office in the National Press Building in Washington one of the first copies. This was the week of May 9, 1966. If you have made any comment on it no one has informed me of it. I also offered to present to your correspondents the evidence behind every word of the book. This offer was not accepted. It is possible for me to make this offer for there is no evidence in my book that is not the official evidence. This is one of the things that distinguishes WHITEWASH.

With respect to the literary assassin hiding behind the judicial robes he has befouled, I have challenged him to debate his so-called review, my book, the Commission's Report and/or evidence or any combination, in the pages of the Saturday Review or elsewhere, without or with the help of Norman Cousins. He is silent and he will be, for he cannot face reality and truth.

I would like to hope that at this too-late date you might. You err seriously if you think every word on this subject has been either written or printed. There is but one answer to this terrible and shameful situation, for the nation, for Dallas and for your paper. That is the untainted and uninhibited truth. Slanders and evasions will not prevent its ultimate triumph. They will but further dishonor those who seek to delay and frustrate it.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Weisberg

JUDGE FINDS FLAWS

Criticizing Critics Of Warren Inquiry

By A. C. GREENE

David T-H
10/26/66

✓
"AS THE WAR against the Warren Commission escalates, it is time to take stock," says New York City Judge Arnold L. Fein, writing in the Oct. 22 issue of Saturday Review.

He inspects the seams of six of the most highly critical new books on the commission's report and investigation, and he leaves some rather tattered garments. Edward Epstein's "Inquest" he finds "patently tendentious," Harold Weisberg's "Whitewash" is "consistent only in finding malevolence everywhere" and he accuses Richard Popkin's "The Second Oswald" of containing "far fetched and unsupported conjectures as could be imagined."



GREENE

Some Pertinent Points

While Mark Lane's "Rush to Judgment" "makes some telling points, vigorously and effectively" it is, Judge Fein says, "marred . . . by name-calling imputations of motive which remain undemonstrated, and by inconsistencies and contradictions in the attack."

At best, he finds that all the writers "mix their criticism of the way the Report was written with a criticism of the investigation." The Warren Commission is open to certain general criticisms, he says, giving five: the Commission should have employed full-time, independent, nongovernmental investigators and lawyers, should have devoted more time to its task and heard more testimony in full-dress formal hearings, the entire investigation should have been further extended in time and scope, a technique should have been evolved for admitting adversary counsel, with the right of cross-examination, and a more complete investigation of and report on the inconsistencies in the evidence heard and the official reports submitted to the Commission should have been required.

But none of the books stop here or anywhere near here.

"Perhaps the critics are not obliged to conform to the same standards (as the Warren Commission)," he comments, "but at a minimum should they not be required to state the facts as they are, to report the truth, to avoid the dissemination of unsupported rumors, and to refrain from character assassination and unfounded imputations of improper motives?" His most damning quote, in this respect, is from "The Second Oswald" where Popkins suggests: "The Western European critics can

only see Kennedy's assassination as part of a subtle conspiracy, involving perhaps some of the Dallas police, the FBI, the right-wing lunatic fringe in Dallas, or perhaps even (in rumors I have often heard) Kennedy's successor."

Book's Own Critique

Judge Fein scathingly remarks, "This paragraph is perhaps the best critique on Professor Popkin's theories and his book. What further commentary is necessary about an inquiry which will repeat without further explanation, clarification or comment — critical or otherwise — that complicity in the assassination might be attributable to 'perhaps even (in rumors I have often heard) Kennedy's successor'?"

One by one Judge Fein takes various speculations and arguments of the books and attempts to break them down either by facts overlooked by the authors or by applying logic both ways in the arguments — and he finds the critics guilty over and over again of the same discrepancies of which they have accused the commission.

The most annoying problems remaining involve the actual shooting, such as (1) how many bullets were fired, (2) from what directions might they have come, (3) the time and nature of the wounds of President Kennedy and Governor Connally and (4) Oswald's capability as a gunman. But all the conclusions drawn up by the critics in opposition to the commission's conclusions face this obstacle: they produce no satisfactory alternatives.

Finally, says Judge Fein, "The common theme of the books is conspiracy, and, in effect making it part of the conspiracy, improper motivation on the part of the Commission."

"Conspiracies have an objective. What objective was served by the assassination of President Kennedy? And what steps have been taken to carry it out? Nowhere in these books is there a suggestion of an answer . . . and no one has yet been able to produce a scintilla of proof or a minute reason why the Commission would want to exculpate the real assassin or assassins, if Oswald was even indeed innocent or not alone."