

Harold Weisberg
Hyattstown, Md. 20734
October 1, 1966

The Editor
The Evening Standard
47 Shoe Lane
London EC4
England

Dear Sir,

There is nothing in the shabby way you have treated me and my book that justifies the time this letter will require, yet in your interest and that of a correct public understanding I am writing to suggest that had your writers read an accurate, fairly complete and unbiased account of the Warren Report and its version of the assassination your news would be much more accurate and quite possibly a little more interesting.

At the same time I do not shun telling you that I believe you are at least remarkably unfair in making even the name of my book a taboo in your paper while extolling those that came later, add nothing material to it, and collectively do not approach its content. To behave as you have is your right. It is not to your credit.

As an example of the kind of thing you miss, the treatment of the police car near Oswald's rooming house (Len Deighton, September 22, 1966). Mrs. Roberts did not specify No. 207. She resisted specifying any number because of her extremely poor vision. She thought the number could have been 106 or 107. The number of Tippit's car, the only one assigned to that area according to an exhaustive search of the police radio logs, was 10. There were three different and inconsistent versions of these radio logs in the evidence, not the two Lane says. You will find more on this in WHITEWASH beginning on page 54.

It did not take Oswald 8 or 10 minutes, assuming it was he who killed Tippit, which it could not have been. The Commission's own reconstruction is much longer. The Report allowed Oswald 13 minutes for this walk. The Commission's staff required 17 minutes and 45 seconds. With all the errors made in favor of the Report by the staff that alone made possible a beginning time of 1:03, even then the Commission could not get Oswald to the scene of the murder until 5 minutes after it was on the police radio (WHITEWASH 56).

Only your devotion to press agency could lead you into this gaffe: "These photos (of the President's clothing) were not included in the Warren Report (nor in any of the 26 volumes of evidence)". (It is you who did not close the parenthesis.) If you will look in Volume 17 beginning with page 23 you will find photographic reproduction of the coat, shirt and tie (he wore no undershirt). None of these pictures, including the one Epstein used, make sense without artistic treatment. Hence I did the work and traced all the testimony bearing on this (WHITEWASH 185).

Your enthusiasm for INQUEST might perhaps have been less unrestrained had you known that within three months of its publication it was being "reinsidered" in New York City for a fifth its cost. Your enthusiasm for Lane's work is remarkably inconsistent with part of your commendable concluding sentence: "Personally, I never had much ~~xxxxxx~~ time for books written by committee; fiction by committee it terrible." Lane's was both written and rewritten by committee.

It is, indeed, unfortunate that when influential papers finally devote belated attention to this really important subject they do it with less honesty than could be desired and less accuracy than should be expected. Continue to ignore me if that is your desire, for it is certainly your right, but do have those of your staff who will be writing on the subject read a copy. You will find that it alone of the books comes

from the official evidence only. All important data contain references to the volumes and pages and you can thereby use WHITEWASH as an index to the official information.

Intending not to be presumptuous, may I also suggest that you bear in mind that what you currently write may not be the last word, that as this story unfolds there will be developments not consistent with what is written now that may in the future be embarrassing to you?

I rather enjoy your reference to Popkin's book, as yet unpublished in England. You were also within your rights in ignoring my previous letter about the great professor of selective skepticism whose book bears a title that is a transparency of my chapter "The False Oswald" and whose concept also comes from my work. You might find the comment of Mr. Stephen Barber in The Sunday Telegraph for the 25th. appropriate: "Popkin is by no means the first to come up with the 'two Oswald's' idea. Mr. Harold Weisberg, a former analyst for the Office of Strategic Services (forerunner of the C.I.A.) beat him to it in his book "Whitewash", which picks more holes than any in the Commission's report and its 26 volumes of appendices. So in reality Prof. Popkin has not carried the doubters forward much..." And this was in mid-February 1965, not October 1966, the date of Popkin's work.

I tell you frankly, sir, I had really expected more fair treatment in the British press. While I am at a loss to explain this unfairness, I do hope it will eventually be otherwise.

Should there be questions that may occur to your or your correspondent, who since June has not found the time to answer the letter you then forwarded to him, I will be happy, without obligation on your part, to do what I can for you or him with honesty and impartiality as, from his previous experience, he has reason to suspect would be the case.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Weisberg