

Editor  
Journal of American History  
1125 East Atwater Ave.,  
Bloomington, Indiana 47401-3701

OV.  
1/2/92

As we have learned that war is too important to leave to the generals, so does your December 1992 teach us again that ~~at~~ our history is too precious to leave to the professional historians, those who at the time of <sup>great</sup>crisis, when a President ~~was~~ assassinated, failed to meet their professional obligations then and since then.

You have three inform your trusting readers about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy whose sole qualifications for writing on the subject are profound<sup>s</sup>, professional ignorance of it. Your belief is, apparently, that if they are professional historians ignorance is no disqualification.

Thomas C. Reeves, who has built a career for himself in the politically acceptable field of bashing John Kennedy by distortions, misrepresentations and outright lies, has the effrontery of assailing Oliver Stone, whose partisan I am not, as "partisan." He lies on your page in getting so carried away with his hatred that he tells your readers that JFK "supported" the CIA's "effort" to "murder Fidel Castro." I have the CIA's records that say the exact opposite.

But for the Reeveses there is no need for consultation with the available record that not a single professional historian lifted a finger to help make available. They have the title of professional historian and that and you regard as a license to say whatever their prejudices require.

William W. Phillips, who has the brass to pretend <sup>N</sup>knowledge of the literature of which he is so ignorant, writes of me as a "conspiracy theorist" when in fact I am the one author of books that advance no theories at all, the one who has debunked those who substitute theories <sup>for</sup> facts <sup>of</sup> which Phillips himself is guilty in his article. He is so ignorant of the established fact that he praises the utter nonsense of Jim Moore because he allegedly "treats the evidence more critically than any other author." Phillips might have illustrated Moore's accomplishments by citing one of his <sup>proofs</sup> in support of the <sup>W</sup>Farren Report, that when he removed the new floor laid on the old hardwood one of the Texas School Book De-

pository Building he found the clear imprint of the cardboard boxes Oswald allegedly <sup>as/</sup> stack/there! On the floor that has been used for decades, of all the boxes that had for so long been stacked there, he found an imprint <sup>n/</sup> on hardwood - and of those boxes alone. To describe Phillips' commentary as stupid is to praise it!

And then you have Robert Brent <sup>Toplin</sup> ~~Phillips~~ pontificate with the initial lie, that all those who do not accept the official assassination mythology are "conspiracy buffs," of whom he says we "have not been able to make striking breakthroughs that allow us to pursue a new line of thought successfully."

This gross ignorance and incredible stupidity unfortunatly <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ a fair characterization of professional historians in general when they were faced with the assassination and lacked the ability, interest and courage to be professional historians.

How in the world <sup>Toplin</sup> does he know? Can he know? What effort has he made to learn?

There is nobody who <sup>my</sup> makes any effort to learn any fact <sup>o/</sup> about this assassination who will not learn that through a dozen Freedom of Information lawsuits, some precedental and one leading to the <sup>1974</sup> ~~amending~~ of the Act to open CIA, FBI and related agency files, I obtained a quarter of a million pages of previously ~~secret~~ secret pages. Of all the professional historians in the land only two have had any interest in these records.

Not Phillips, who sneers about "a coup d'etat" as though the assassination of a President, to professional historians, can have any other effect under our system.

He is typical of all professional historians save these two in his adherence to the official propaganda <sup>which</sup> ~~who~~ he refers to "the massive body of real evidence showing that there were only three shots...."(his emphasis) when in fact the Warren Commission's own records he could not have consulted prove the opposite and prove that the best experts they could muster could not duplicate the shooting attributed to the duffer, Oswald.


Toplin, if he read the newspapers at all, cannot report them straight. He refers to "efforts to make public records of the Warren Commission... that had been scheduled to remain closed for many years." In fact, for many years only about two percent of those records have not been <sup>n/</sup> publicly available.

As I look back over more than a third the life of our country and a long, tiring,

costly and not unsuccessful effort to do for the abdicated professional historians what they failed to do for themselves and recall their dedication to preserving ~~the~~ and protecting the national disgrace of consigning a President to history with the dubious epitaph of a Warren Report that cannot survive critical examination of that Report alone, I have come to believe that morally those who sell their minds are no better than those who sell their bodies.

Only to the ignorant, the uninformed and the prejudiced does your December 1992 issue not prove this all over again.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg