

Harold Weisberg
Hyattstown, Md. 20734
July 29, 1963

Mr. R.B. Silvers, editor
The New York Review of Books
250 West 57th. St.,
New York, N.Y. 10019

Dear Mr. Silvers,

Nothing has happened since I wrote Mrs. Silvers on the 22nd. to alter the high opinion I have of you for the space you devoted to the Warren Report. I believe it is a major public service. I hope it can become the beginning of a dialogue. You will note that I have not publicly assailed either you or the professor, for fragmentation is the last thing those of us anxious to right this monstrous wrong can afford. I have been without comment in many other cases of injudicious comment in the thin disguise of literary criticism and in the face of the most obvious suppression. I wrote Mrs. Silvers because the piece by the professor is of a different character.

And I do regret that your letter, the promptness of which I do ^{appreciate} address, does not in any way address itself to the fact.

It is obvious that people working on the same material will find and use the same things. In the professor's case, all the things I found and used - a year and a half ago, not two weeks ago - are suddenly his and his alone, and his inherent answer to this is a blatant falsehood, that my book was just published, whereas even the copyright reveals otherwise. Had he seen fit to comment on the Preface (which, of course, he need not; yet it is not at all unrelated to the entire subject), he would have had the exact dates. There are ever places where he excoriates me for what he elsewhere uses himself. I repeat, he had nothing of consequence, nor has Epstein, that I did not have in one form or another a year earlier; yet Epstein is praised for it, and to the professor it is his own.

There is no one working in this field who I have met or spoken to since the appearance of the piece who has not volunteered what I have said. It is that obvious. As I said in my letter to Mrs. Silvers, I had until then been able to divert comment on the piece but didn't think I could indefinitely, and I thought and think fairness to you dictated I take the time to write as I did. I have made no complaint to the professor. Yet the very night I wrote I was confronted with this piece, and I am happy to report even my opponent found it so transparent a copy, especially with respect to "The False Oswald", my chapter 11, that he so declared, and on the air, entirely without inspiration or suggestion from anyone. Is it not strange, especially with the title of the piece, regardless of who made the selection or when, that there is no reference to my "False Oswald"? Is it possible that because of his treatment of it, may I suggest for reasons he found politically incompatible, the professor saw fit to edit the character, as I did not?

It is likewise rather strange that the professor saw unworthy of comment the fact that after his own tremendous labors, finally solidified in type in July of 1966, he had nothing of any importance not in WHITEWASH a year and a half earlier and didn't have an awful lot of the most important and significant stuff that was - and that he just ignored, another kind of censorship.

Frankly, I had expected better of your publication. I'd feel much better if I could find even scant justification for your last sentence.

Sincerely,