

### Kennedy Assassination

Q.: Mr. President, as you know, an aura of mystery has developed around the assassination of President Kennedy. I am thinking of two or three books that were written, and some lawyers and others casting doubts on the works of the Warren Commission.

The case, as I understand it, was based on the alleged mysterious disappearance of photos, X-rays and so forth.

Now the Justice Department discloses that the Kennedy family had these documents and they have now been turned over to the National Archives.

I wonder why that was not disclosed before, and also why this material is

POT 11/5/66  
still not available to competent non-government investigators?

A.: First, I think it has been available to the Warren Commission anytime it wanted to see it. Second, I think it is available to any official body now. Third, I think that every American can understand the reasons why we wouldn't want to have the garments, the records and everything paraded out in every sewing circle in the country to be exploited and used without serving any good or official purpose.

It is my understanding, and all of this took place while I was away, that most of this has been over in the Archives stored all the time. It has always been available to the Warren Commission and the Government, the Justice Department, the FBI. The late, beloved President's brother was Attorney General during the period the Warren Commission was studying this thing, I certainly would think he would have a very thorough interest in seeing that the truth was made evident. I believe he did have. I think that he, the FBI and the entire Government made available everything that the Commission wanted. I think they made a very thorough study. I know of no evidence that would in any way cause any reasonable person to have a doubt about the Warren Commission.

But if there is any evidence and it is brought forth, I am sure that the Commission and the appropriate authorities will take action that may be justified.

*Int 3/10/67*  
**New Orleans Probe**

Q: Mr. President, you appointed the members of the Warren Commission, sir. I believe at a news conference recently you said you saw no reason from stories that had been written to doubt the conclusions of the Commission.

The District Attorney in New Orleans is attracting world-wide attention with statements now. First of all, he challenges the Warren Commission's conclusions and he does not want to cooperate, it appears, with the Federal Government in a case that involves a matter of very severe national importance. How do you feel about this?

A: I do not have any information from New Orleans, other than what I have seen in the newspapers. I would not have any comment to make with the limited information I have seen in the newspapers at this time. I know of no reason to change anything that I have said before.

ejndin  
Bill  
Jury

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
6-2064;TR4-4246

20734

CONFIDENTIAL

November 5, 1968

President Lyndon B. Johnson  
The White House  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President,

In your yesterday's press conference you said, "I know of no evidence that would cause any reasonable person to have a doubt about the Warren Commission". This is not quite the same as saying "a doubt about the Report of the Warren Commission." About this Report, to be kind, there is nothing but doubt. If you do not share this doubt it can be only because of the heavy burdens of your office that prevent your intimate knowledge of details and because you have not read my book, WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT.

Following its publication I sent copies to members of the Commission and its staff as well as several agency heads in the executive branch. In each case I asked that any error in my work be called to my attention. This has not happened in a single instance. It cannot happen because there is nothing in my book that does not come from the evidence of the Commission.

Further, I would encourage you and your advisers to consider that what has thus far appeared in print is far from the last thing that will.

I am continue to research and write in this field and I believe I know what I am speaking of when I suggest that you ask of whoever may be reading the literature for you this simple question, especially about my work, "Suppose it is true?"

Your final comment is one on which I would appreciate amplification: "But if there is any evidence and it is brought forth, I am sure that the Commission and the appropriate authorities will take what action that may be justified." With the Commission out of existence, how can it? This being the case, who are the appropriate authorities and what kind of action can they take? Are there any authorities that are not involved in those things about which action may eventually be required?

The evidence has been brought forth. It is in my book. The source of everything is given. There is no question but that evidence was tampered with and destroyed, and on an official level, I very much fear the public reaction, especially the misdirection of public reaction, when this is generally understood. I also fear the possible consequences and implications, especially as we get closer to 1968. The integrity of our institutions and our society are involved. I strongly urge you to give deeper and more responsive consideration to this matter than your comment reflects. If there is any way in which I can help you in this matter, you have only to ask me. I believe my knowledge of the field is second to none. I believe I have spent more time in it than any member of the Commission or its staff and I know I have seen what the members of the Commission have not seen.

Sincerely yours,  
  
Harold Weisberg