

HAROLD WEISBERG
HYATTSTOWN, MARYLAND 20734
301 WA6-2034, TR4-4246
October 5, 1966

Congressman Ford and other apologists for the government's white-wash of the assassination of President Kennedy set up strawmen and shoot them down as the Dallas police made it possible for Ruby to shoot down Oswald. It is not at all a question of "new evidence", helpful as that might be. It is a question of the abuse by the government of its existing evidence and testimony, which it distorted, misrepresented, manipulated and even destroyed. ~~What~~ ^{What} I did in my book, WHITEWASH: The Report on the Warren Report, is to reconstruct the evidence to the condition it was in before it was corrupted, and with this alone disproved all the major conclusions of the Report.

Further, the government has tried to preclude the gathering of new evidence by warning people not to talk. This was so effective that even the Secret Service was denied information by people warned to silence by the FBI.

So far as Congressman Ford is concerned, on May 11, 1966, I sent him a copy of WHITEWASH. In an accompanying letter I told him I had accepted his challenge to "bury" myself "in the monumental record" and avoid "speculation". I had no speculation, and I challenged him to show me a single case or a single error in WHITEWASH. "If you do not," I asked, "may I hope you will join me in my demand for a full and entirely public airing?", which is the need expressed in my book's conclusions.

I further called to his attention his own statement that if Oswald had been in the custody of federal rather than the Dallas police, "then the killing ... would not have occurred", and asked, as I do on page 101 of WHITEWASH, "why this conviction is not embodied in either the Report or a minority report..."

Under date of May 13, 1966, I received from Congressman Ford this letter: "Just a note to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 11, 1966 enclosing a copy of your book entitled 'Whitewash'. Warmest personal regards," etc. Much as I cherish the warmth and friendliness of the Congressman's letter, I would much more have appreciated an acceptance of my challenge as I accepted his. As ⁱⁿ the Report, the Congressman is replete with erudite non sequiturs. At some point he is going to have to face the reality that, knowingly or not, he was part of a whitewash.

HAROLD WEISBERG
HYATTSTOWN, MARYLAND 20734
301 WA6-2034, TR4-4246
October 5, 1966

Congressman Ford and other apologists for the government's white-wash of the assassination of President Kennedy set up strawmen and shoot them down as the Dallas police made it possible for Ruby to shoot down Oswald. It is not at all a question of "new evidence", helpful as that might be. It is a question of the abuse by the government of its existing evidence and testimony, which it distorted, misrepresented, manipulated and even destroyed. ^{what} ~~that~~ I did in my book, WHITEWASH: The Report on the Warren Report, is to reconstruct the evidence to the condition it was in before it was corrupted, and with this alone disproved all the major conclusions of the Report.

Further, the government has tried to preclude the gathering of new evidence by warning people not to talk. This was so effective that even the Secret Service was denied information by people warned to silence by the FBI.

So far as Congressman Ford is concerned, on May 11, 1966, I sent him a copy of WHITEWASH. In an accompanying letter I told him I had accepted his challenge to "bury" myself "in the monumental record" and avoid "speculation". I had no speculation, and I challenged him to show me a single case or a single error in WHITEWASH. "If you do not," I asked, "may I hope you will join me in my demand for a full and entirely public airing?", which is the need expressed in my book's conclusions.

I further called to his attention his own statement that if Oswald had been in the custody of federal rather than the Dallas police, "then the killing ... would not have occurred", and asked, as I do on page 101 of WHITEWASH, "why this conviction is not embodied in either the Report or a minority report..."

Under date of May 13, 1966, I received from Congressman Ford this letter: "Just a note to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 11, 1966 enclosing a copy of your book entitled 'Whitewash'. Warmest personal regards," etc. Much as I cherish the warmth and friendliness of the Congressman's letter, I would much more have appreciated an acceptance of my challenge as I accepted his. As ⁱⁿ ~~in~~ the Report, the Congressman is replete with erudite non sequiturs. At some point he is going to have to face the reality that, knowingly or not, he was part of a whitewash.

HAROLD WEISBERG
HYATTSTOWN, MARYLAND 20734
301 WA6-2034, TR4-4246
October 5, 1966

Congressman Ford and other apologists for the government's white-wash of the assassination of President Kennedy set up strawmen and shoot them down as the Dallas police made it possible for Ruby to shoot down Oswald. It is not at all a question of "new evidence", helpful as that might be. It is a question of the abuse by the government of its existing evidence and testimony, which it distorted, misrepresented, manipulated and even destroyed. ^{what} ~~that~~ I did in my book, WHITEWASH: The Report on the Warren Report, is to reconstruct the evidence to the condition it was in before it was corrupted, and with this alone disproved all the major conclusions of the Report.

Further, the government has tried to preclude the gathering of new evidence by warning people not to talk. This was so effective that even the Secret Service was denied information by people warned to silence by the FBI.

So far as Congressman Ford is concerned, on May 11, 1966, I sent him a copy of WHITEWASH. In an accompanying letter I told him I had accepted his challenge to "bury" myself "in the monumental record" and avoid "speculation". I had no speculation, and I challenged him to show me a single case or a single error in WHITEWASH. "If you do not," I asked, "may I hope you will join me in my demand for a full and entirely public airing?", which is the need expressed in my book's conclusions.

I further called to his attention his own statement that if Oswald had been in the custody of federal rather than the Dallas police, "then the killing ... would not have occurred", and asked, as I do on page 101 of WHITEWASH, "why this conviction is not embodied in either the Report or a minority report..."

Under date of May 13, 1966, I received from Congressman Ford this letter: "Just a note to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 11, 1966 enclosing a copy of your book entitled 'Whitewash'. Warmest personal regards," etc. Much as I cherish the warmth and friendliness of the Congressman's letter, I would much more have appreciated an acceptance of my challenge as I accepted his. As ^{is} in the Report, the Congressman is replete with erudite non sequiturs. At some point he is going to have to face the reality that, knowingly or not, he was part of a whitewash.

HAROLD WEISBERG
HYATTSTOWN, MARYLAND 20734
301 WA6-2034, TR4-4246
October 5, 1966

Congressman Ford and other apologists for the government's white-wash of the assassination of President Kennedy set up strawmen and shoot them down as the Dallas police made it possible for Ruby to shoot down Oswald. It is not at all a question of "new evidence", helpful as that might be. It is a question of the abuse by the government of its existing evidence and testimony, which it distorted, misrepresented, manipulated and even destroyed. ^{What} ~~that~~ I did in my book, WHITEWASH: The Report on the Warren Report, is to reconstruct the evidence to the condition it was in before it was corrupted, and with this alone disproved all the major conclusions of the Report.

Further, the government has tried to preclude the gathering of new evidence by warning people not to talk. This was so effective that even the Secret Service was denied information by people warned to silence by the FBI.

So far as Congressman Ford is concerned, on May 11, 1966, I sent him a copy of WHITEWASH. In an accompanying letter I told him I had accepted his challenge to "bury" myself "in the monumental record" and avoid "speculation". I had no speculation, and I challenged him to show me a single case or a single error in WHITEWASH. "If you do not," I asked, "may I hope you will join me in my demand for a full and entirely public airing?", which is the need expressed in my book's conclusions.

I further called to his attention his own statement that if Oswald had been in the custody of federal rather than the Dallas police, "then the killing ... would not have occurred", and asked, as I do on page 101 of WHITEWASH, "why this conviction is not embodied in either the Report or a minority report..."

Under date of May 13, 1966, I received from Congressman Ford this letter: "Just a note to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 11, 1966 enclosing a copy of your book entitled 'Whitewash'. Warmest personal regards," etc. Much as I cherish the warmth and friendliness of the Congressman's letter, I would much more have appreciated an acceptance of my challenge as I accepted his. As ⁱⁿ ~~in~~ the Report, the Congressman is replete with erudite non sequiturs. At some point he is going to have to face the reality that, knowingly or not, he was part of a whitewash.