

Mr. Harold Weisberg
January 31, 1995
Page 9

Now let me take a moment to discuss a major point of divergence between the Warren Commission findings and the majority of the HSCA members who concluded that there was a fourth shot fired from the grassy knoll that missed everything, including the Presidential limousine. The minority dissented. The minority subsequently was vindicated by the Committee on Ballistic Acoustics Report in 1982. Not once in your letter did you refer to the Committee on Ballistic Acoustics.

I am enclosing with this letter and incorporating by reference herein my formal statement made on July 22, 1992 before the House of Representatives Committee on Government Operations and the Supplementary Statement Concerning Acoustical Evidence. This summarizes my views.

There are several other allegations that involve personal attacks on me to which I will respond in this letter. On page ten you write: "Are you sure you did not apply for the job? Or that some political figure recommended you for it?" The very fact that you ask such questions speaks volumes about the nature of your bias and lack of objectivity. I did not apply for the job. And I did not get the job because "some political figure recommended" me. I received an inquiry from the Warren Commission in December 1963. I was asked to send a resume and a list of references. Fortuitously, as a student at the University of Michigan, I had what has been described as "an outstanding academic and extracurricular record", including election to Phi Beta Kappa, selection as the 1950 Honors Orator, being elected president of the Association of Independent Men, and having been a member of the University of Michigan debate team. I also was fortunate enough to do very well academically at the Michigan Law School and was elected to the Order of the Coif and received the Henry M. Bates Memorial Award made "to each of the two most outstanding seniors in the Law School, account being taken of scholarship in both undergraduate and legal studies, personality, character, extracurricular activities and promise of a distinguished career." In addition to these academic credentials, I also had a great deal of trial experience as a young lawyer. The references I submitted were people who were familiar with my academic qualifications and my experience and reputation as a lawyer. Even if I had applied for the job, I do not think that there would have been anything wrong with that, but the fact is, that I did not make any application, and when I sent my resume and list of references, I did not ask any political figure to call or write anyone to try and encourage the Warren Commission to appoint me as assistant counsel.

Now let me turn to another one of your false allegations: the statement on page one of your letter where you write, "...I restrict myself almost entirely to the official evidence, including a not inconsiderable volume of what you contrived." Mr. Weisberg, that is a patently false and outrageous comment. There is no evidence that I "contrived" and if you ever had any doubt about this, it should have been dispelled by the circumstances of the polygraph examination of Jack Ruby, which occurred because I secretly went behind the Warren Commission's decision not to have any polygraph examination of Jack Ruby. As I write in my book, *November 22, 1963: You Are the Jury*, I was able to persuade Rabbi Hillel Silverman, Jack Ruby's rabbi, to persuade Jack Ruby to demand a lie detector test. You can then reconcile this with your assertions that in some way I sought to "contrive" or "suppress" evidence. What I have tried to do is to highlight evidence which assassination sensationalists generally overlook--evidence such as the testimony of Postal Inspector Holmes who, if he had gone on to church on Sunday morning, November 24, 1963, as he