

NEW ADDRESS: Rt. 7, Frederick, Md. 21701:::301/473-8186

November 30, 1967

Mr. Fred Vinson, Jr.
Assistant Attorney General
The Department of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Vinson,

Someone who wrote the President to express his disquiet at the suppression of evidence pertinent to the assassination of President Kennedy has given me a copy of your form letter reply. Because I presume you are in the same position as the President and the Attorney General when they made erroneous public statements on this, the position of the members of the Commission- you know only what you have been told by those you have reason to believe - I take the trouble to write you.

It is false to say as you do, "The authors who have criticized the conclusions of the Warren Commission do not claim to have any significant new evidence, so far as we are aware". I am aware of the excessive number of qualifications in this sentence and I still tell you it is false. However, may I ask what is wrong with the "old" evidence that was ignored, misrepresented, even destroyed? It is not merely a question of new or old in evidence, nor is it a question of what conclusions were drawn. Even were this the case, need I tell you the number of cases that are properly reversed when superior courts examine the evidence on appeal.

It likewise is false to say that all the withheld evidence is denied because "if disclosed (it might compromise confidential sources or techniques (this latter being a new excuse not included in the guidelines), or in some cases jeopardize the lives of individuals abroad." There is suppression by the exercise of the raw power to suppress.

If you challenge these statements, I would welcome the opportunity to prove them to you. This offer extends to the proof of violation of the order of the Attorney General of October 31, 1966, including by the Department of Justice.

Your paragraph dealing with the "New Orleans matter" is both evasive and condemnatory of the Attorney General himself. If Mr. Garrison "has not discussed his proceedings with Federal authorities", have Federal authorities followed what would in most other cases be the norm, and discussed with Mr. Garrison what evidence they have that might be appropriate in his case - or asked him for what he has? And if it "would not be proper for us to comment on the evidence in a case pending before a state court", was it proper for the Attorney General, on more than one occasion.

Those who respond to the inquiries of citizens to their President owe it to both the citizens and the President to speak directly, not evasively, and to state fact, not official positions. If you are unaware of the fact, whether or not you have read my four published books on this subject, I invite you to challenge my statements and to afford the opportunity to present the evidence you claim does not exist to you. Unless you accept my offer, you cannot, in good conscience, continue to mail out the kind of form letter I have. To do so would be dishonest. Our government has been dishonored more than too much by the handling of this entire affair. It is not too late to begin to deal honestly with the people who have every right - indeed, the obligation - to be disturbed over it.

Sincerely yours,
Harold Weisberg