

ML

R W Hayes

8/25/67

Dear Mr. Press,

Your letter of July 21, addressed c/o Dell, has just reached me. I answer, if too briefly from the press of other obligations, because yours is a thoughtful letter and I can understand that you are, deeply and sincerely, troubled. That is the intent of those who mixed and spread the whitewash of the whitewash.

Of my own work, I give you my word that there is nothing taken out of context, nothing twisted, nothing with a source improperly cited, and, in fact, you can check it all in your own L.A. library. If you recall the Lomax show, remember, Liebeler was supposed to be there and wasn't. He will not face me. He will never mention my name. Ditto Ball and all the others. No matter how Schiller twists and distorts - and the designed dishonesty of their work is beyond the grasp of ordinary, decent people, there was a 30% error in the reconstruction. Sheneyfelt testified exactly as I quote him, and in no other context. The Zap camera was used in his reconstruction. Schiller did not do all that work. He used what Liebeler, afraid to face me, fed him. My New Orleans book, which will soon be out in an "original reprint", will have much more about Liebeler. Schiller asked Penn Jones to go out and get him a bottle of whiskey early in the morning and then made the crack you will recall.

I have not checked Lane's work out, nor Epstein's. I disagree with some of their doctrine and say what I think in WWII. But of my own work, let me tell you that as of today, there is no single person who has alleged error to my face or who has alleged it and will face me - not a single one! I've challenged them all.

If I were a wealthy man I could make this clearer. But in my third book (flyer enclosed) I print 150 pages of once-secret documents. There has been not a single denial of what it says. The New York Times gave it 40 inches as news.

On the accuracy of the basic things Mark Lane says, I assure you that as I recall his book, it is accurate. Where he gets into error, for the most part, is on minor things. Epstein's error on the autopsy is great, but it is in the opposite direction, on the side of just not knowing what he was talking about.

I am hoping that it will be possible for me to come out there soon. Again, if I can, for I am really without means, I'll challenge these same people. There is nothing I can do if the papers do not print it. They will not, however, meet me.

The video and AP specials were deliberately dishonest, quote out of context, leave things out. They were designed to confuse people, to halt the sale of books critical of the government. They suppress me more because I have said from the very beginning that Oswald was innocent, had intelligence connections, and that the FBI and the Secret Service were covering up the CIA.

Wish I could answer you at greater length, but I cannot take the time from work. There is one answer: for the people to demand the truth and, to the best of their ability, to inform themselves. This is a vital issue. Thanks for the time you took.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Page 1

July 21, 1967

Ronald Press  
3163 Colby Ave  
Los Angeles, Calif 90066

Mr. Weisberg:

I've just finished reading Whitewash II. I had previously read Whitewash I, and before that Inquest and Rush to Judgment. I have also read the paperback Warren Report for 95¢ and the paperback book, The Witnesses: Their Testimony, which just about covers the believable book circles not to mention NBC's branding of Jim Garrison and CBS's four part series on the Report. You no doubt have seen these. I wrote to you as a layman, looking up at the battle between pro-Report v. Anti-Report. But am I confused? Simply: yes. I don't know who or what to believe. Not being an expert in researching as you are (as you must be by reading your books or you are a good faker), I don't know what to look at, where, <sup>how</sup> or to follow your references to the Report, or for that matter, Lane's or Epstein's. I can only believe if I wish what you said in your conclusions in W.W. # 2, that nothing is taken out of context, in fact is fair as you put it. (Pg 378, # 3) I might come to the point right away. Lane (especially Lane) and Epstein have been accused of quoting out of context by news media, members Liebler, Ball, McCloy etc not to mention others. I believed they were doing the right job, truthful etc but they were not. A new book out by Schuler and Lewis called "The Scavengers and Critics of the Warren Report. They bring forth misquoted, out of



Context examples of Lane's book and lectures. They even accuse you of taking out of context + from one part of the Report and putting it next to another sentence in another part of the report. This had to do with the FBI reconstruction. I am not sure of the exact example they gave for it was long ago. And then the confusion comes on. Believe you or them? You criticized Lane and Epstein in your book. So that leaves you. It seems you don't ~~get~~ get as much publicity as they (especially Lane). But I feel you are more sincere, or truthful. I saw your appearances on local channels KATJ where you were interviewed by Ted Meyers and KTTV where you were interviewed and hit off abruptly at the end by Louis Lomax. Also on the n.y. produced special; The Warren Report: a minority opinion. I am pretty well acquainted with your views. I believed you. But then Life (Nov 25, 1966) mag. review of the Zapruder film came out with this. They went through a brief summary of some of the books. Examples: The Oswald Affair, ~~The~~ "Savage" - for fetched theories, Savage is shrill, facts are questionable. "The Second Oswald, Richard Porter, "strictly for detective story fans", Rush to Judgment: (quote from Alexander Bichel), "grab-bag of virtually all conceivable theories that offer an ~~alternative~~ alternative to Commission findings. The books are wildly speculative... peripheral and indiscriminate." Inquest: (in short they found it the most objective book of all but ~~however~~ Epstein's speculations are open to question). Whitewash: "by Harold Weisberg, a writer who printed his book at his own expense, is a

broadsheet against almost every statement the Report makes. It has solid nuggets of criticism, but they're lost in a sea of irrelevancies."

The Jan. 14, 1967 edition of Post mag. is generally favorable to all critics and calls for an investigation by Congress. Well, by February I was pretty well set. By that I mean, I still doubted the Report. Then Garrison's debacle on NBC followed by CBS's complete agreement with the Report. CBS examined the Report, glossing over the paper bag Oswald used (or didn't?). They had a reporter wrap a Mannlicher-Carcano in a bag, then walk in front of the camera (suppose to be Frasier) and see if you could see the 8" stick up above his shoulder. Walter Cronkite asked, "You yourself can judge if Buell Wesley Frasier mistook the sight of Oswald tucking the package under his arm, making it almost invisible..." which is like saying "you don't really see a rifle there, do you? Of course not. But I did. But what got me back to the Report side was when they said jerking motions could be seen in the Zapruder film which were determined to be Zapruder reacting to rifle shots. There was a jerk at frame 190, 220 (approx.) and 318 which would (because of an instant delayed reaction) mean shots at frames 186, 216 (approx) and 313. Frame 186 would be a shot between the branches of the oak tree, meaning a shot earlier than thought, along with the evidence the camera could have been working faster or slower, increasing the time span from 4 sec to about 8 sec., sufficient time? yes. Then I read

Page 4

Whitehurst II and there was the confusion again.  
are you right? Is CBS? who is? If Jane  
being a critic is criticized for misquotes, are you  
~~like her?~~ Can I expect an answer because I  
(I cross out better than Humes)

have brought up instances of misquotes or out of  
context instances people have (Schiller and Lewis, I believe)  
accused you of committing. If you are the type I hope you  
are, I hope you'll tell me the correct and truthful  
answers because as I write this, I'm  
still in the middle looking out and I hope the major  
purpose of the writings, the assassination, will not  
be overshadowed by accusation v. accusation.

Sincerely,

Ronald Press