

There is an unintended compliment in one of Mr. Sparrow's criticisms of my writing, which before he composed this article had totalled about a million words. "Mr. Lane and Mr. Weisberg", he declares, " have therefore (in my case, because I do not espouse any kooky theories) adopted a method of controversy that does not expose them to direct refutation. They offer no connected account of what they think happened."

Mr. Sparrow's interpretation may be questioned, and I do question it. In fact, I directly challenge it. But no matter, I do offer an entirely connected account of what I think did not happen, the official fiction embodied in the Warren Report, and that, certainly, as an even better target for I restrict myself to the Commission's evidence and in all important cases I cite it-in the text, so there is no need to thumb to the back for citations. It is a simple matter to prove I misrepresent or misquote; I have made it simple, to attempt, at least. I suggest this is a much more stable target than arguing with me about theories. And I also suggest that the eminent Mr. Sparrow does not do it because ~~either~~ he dare not, either from lack of knowledge of the subject matter, lack of error on my part, or lack of courage on his.

Whatever a reasonable man man or may not say or believe, he can hardly expect sensible men to believe that in a million words coming from cited sources "I am "not exposed to direct refutation". It is only that Mr. Sparrow has neither the evidence nor the kidney.

Describing a series of questions that come from the preceding text of the book in the conclusions only to my first one, Mr. Sparrow selects the word "rhetorical". This is not his only liberty with the dictionary. Of these he also says more than he intends of his own logic and, proofs. ~~ix~~ As though these questions were not all answered before the conclusion, were they serve to focus attention on what was already proven, he expresses the opinion that

"so far as they are valid they can be answered consistently with the Commission's theory". Naturally, the Commission is right simply because it makes the claim. Why bother with the evidence? Why bother with trials? Why concern oneself with fact and evidence when there is "theory"?

Perhaps it would be interesting to repeat a few of these questions so distasteful to Mr. Sparrow and give him the opportunity for either that "direct refutation" he finds so elusive or the citation of the appropriate "theory" of disproof:

" Why did the Report suppress the fact that the 'found' bullet had been cleaned before receipt in the FBI laboratories? Why did the FBI not analyze the organic traces left on the bullet? Why did not the Commission find out who first cleaned the bullet and why the FBI did not analyze the traces remaining? Why, in fact, did the Commission remain mute on receiving this testimony? Why did the Commission not trace and report on the laundering of Governor Connally's ~~wisiting~~ clothes, which destroyed ~~their~~ evidence about his wounds?"

These are a random, uninterrupted selection. I await "refutation by theory".

Mr. Sparrow says that "Marina's circumstantial account of the confession" of her husband's alleged "attempted assassination of General Walker" is "supported" by "physical evidence". This is diametrically opposed to truth and fact. The truth is ~~that~~ not only contrary, but when confronted with the possibility of establishing a "physical" connection between Oswald and the attempt on Walker, as by spectrographic comparison of the bullets with the whole one and the fragments attributed to the assassination, the government did not even attempt it.

This is consistent with the continuing and illegal suppression of the spectrographic analysis of the "assassination" bullet and fragments. Does one believe that if this scientific test in any way confirmed the false claims of the government this evidence would be suppressed? Yet I pinpointed this in my first writing, challenged Mr. Hoover to release the spectrographic analysis before any other book on the Warren Report had been published, repeated this demand on all available levels, and have total silence for an answer.

Another of Mr. Sparrow's regiment of straw men, enough to dry a very large literary barnyard, is this: "Again it was an essential factor that Oswald should obtain a job in the Book Depository".

Why? Could not the site of the assassination have been selected by those who framed him simply because they learned he had this employment?

Still another is the jacket misrepresented as Oswald's that so conveniently turned up near the escape route of the Tippit killer. Without crediting (for he never mentions its existence) the source of the proof that this was not Oswald's jacket, my own WHITEWASH II: THE FBI-SECRET SERVICE COVERUP -and it is I who ransacked this evidence from suppression in the Commissio

rescued this evidence from its burial in the Commission's files -as though
and 10,000,000 words
with about 20,000 pages for evidence, there was no space for it-Mr. Sparrow
grudgingly conceded, "There is difficulty in identifying the jacket". How
much can an honest man understate? He then berates us:

"So obsessed are the critics with the laundry mark and its attendant
difficulties ("difficulties": for whom but the blind apologists?) that they forget
two ~~things~~ simple facts: Oswald was seen buttoning up his jacket when he left
his lodgings at 1 p.m. (which is not the time he left); he had no jacket on
when arrested...."

To save Mr. Sparrow trouble, for he has more than enough, let us assume
that he did have a jacket on when he left his lodgings, for whatever that means
when that jacket was never produced. He need now only explain how "Oswald was
seen buttoning up" a zipper jacket that was not and could not have been his.

More invidious is this fiction of the eminent warden: that the Commissioners
got together and decided on a "coverup" or assembled and conspired. These two
things he attributes to me in defiance of my writing and speaking that is 100%
to the contrary. In one of the books he fails to mention and judges my work without
reference to and in prete pretended ignorance of it (a new concept in literary
and legal criticism), what I actually says it that the members of the Commission
were "spoon fed a pre-digested pabulum". This same book as the subtitle, "The
FBI - Secret Service coverup".

But to say the evidence is lacking that the members of the Commission
were conscious conspirators is not to say they were right or not all possessed of
better judgement than they here displayed. For the monster of the Warren Report
to have issued after a ten-month gestation requires a rape more than a con-
spiracy. That there was.

And in saying, as he does, that "a policy of ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~
cover-up would have required the complicity of the seven Commissioners...

Could the Chief Justice have obtained such agreement? Could he have

"fabricated" documents. The Chief Justice "would have been a brave man to suggest such a step to his colleagues unless he was sure of their unanimous support", Mr. Sparrow demeans the intelligence of a retarded juvenile. This straw man is so feeble the proximity of a quiescent feather is enough to demolish it.

This is arrant nonsense. No ^{recognized} responsible "critic" has ever suggested this in any way. And it is the kind of "defense" the chief Justice and his associates will be fortunate to survive.

The straw-man regiment has endless recruits: "Again, it is hard enough to see how a man could have fired repeatedly from the grassy knoll and got clean away in full view of the public". Here is a fair revelation of genuine ignorance. The grassy knoll is created by a ~~six~~ stockade fence. Only one man among the witnesses was on the side away from the assassination. Does Mr. Sparrow's great wisdom and good common sense dictate that an assassin on the grassy knoll would have had to have been on the public side of this fence, toward the victim and the protectors and the public? On the reverse side of the fence, the side any assassin except the kind Mr. Sparrow requires would have been, there was an abundance of obstruction between him and the man in the signal tower.

However, why the requirement "get clean away?" Again, a demonstration that ignorance is not alleviated by learning and degrees and respectability. If you question this, I will supply unpublished pictures taken for me six months ago of a perfect ambush on the grassy knoll from which an assassin would not have to flee. One does not have to be familiar with Dallas to have and learn this; I have never been there. But one does require an open mind, and that Mr. Sparrow does not have.

Of the same substance is his postulation requiring "that a conspirator ~~(need) rush to~~ (need rush to) the hospital four miles away" then

Of the same solid substance is this one; about the possible planting of the magic bullet with the built-in intelligence, Exhibit 399: "But how much stronger an obstacle to belief is provided by the practical improbability that a conspirator would have succeeded in reaching the hospital four miles away, in gaining access through its maze of wards and passages to the right place, in identifying the stretcherman and 'planting' the bullet in it unobserved."

First, it should be understood that there today is quite a question about which stretcher the bullet traces to. The one thing that cannot be in doubt is that it was the "right" one, for that it wasn't. It may well have been one of several "wrong" ones (my writing refers to other patients admitted at that time).

Then Mr. Sparrow forgets for a moment his favorite bete noir, Mr. Joesten. If Joesten is right and all officialdom was involved in the murder, officialdom did have unrestricted access to that area.

The "maze of wards and passages" is Mr. Sparrow's creation. It would not have confronted his mythical conspirator, as a mind less burdened by learning and degrees might assume, the hospital emergency room is convenient to the emergency entrance.

However, the quite obvious lack of necessity for this torture of reality is that the ideal place for such a conspirator was inside the hospital, with no necessity for this mad rush. He could have been a just-admitted patient-as, for example, one with an epileptic seizure (and there was one, in Dealey Plaza, immediately before the motorcade reached it); or, he could have been an employee of the hospital, whose freedom to roam it is without question (and among the Kennedy-hating Cuban refugees there were a number on the very spot).

No more visible is this pretended logic; attributed to the "critics' unreal, melodramatic world- a world where an object moving slowly away from

the marksman (not across his field of vision) becomes a difficult target at under 100 yards".

Here, in reality, Mr. Sparrow stakes an uncontested claim on the "unreal" and "melodramatic", for in re-enacting the crime, after the rifle allegedly used in it was considerably improved, and in an environment that likewise was more congenial to success, as with half the elevation, no waving trees or brisk winds, no 18-inch wall to shoot through and under a window open less than that much, with no boxes to work around (and they could not possibly have been a rest and for any other purpose were very much in the way), and with an even easier target than a live one "moving slowly away" - with all of this benefit plus all the time in the world for the first shot (cannot you imagine the considerate President halting his car so his assassin could draw a steady bead) and still, inanimate targets solidly planted at distances to which experienced marksmen could readily adjust, mechanically- the next shots the Commission could get, rated as "masters" by the National Rifle Association - could not duplicate the spectacular success attributed to the duffer Oswald.

Particularly because he postulates this was so easy a show, so exceptional a feat, would it be comforting to hear Mr. Sparrow clamor for the release of all the records the National Rifle Association has on this "test" that was so grossly misrepresented by those Mr. Sparrow "defends"?

Oswald was a "disappointed Communist", Mr. Sparrow assures us, no doubt from his trust in the Report, which without fail describes its villain as "dedicated to Marxism and Communism". This is a rather exceptional representation of what one finds if one takes one of the rare good suggestions Mr. Sparrow makes. So pleased is he with his advice that he repeats it. We should read Oswald's "historic diary", he says, as though we didn't. Oswald's privately-expressed beliefs are certainly important. They do, as Mr. Sparrow infers,

give us a true picture of the man. This is his pro-Soviet stance: The Russian leaders are "fat, stinking politicians". And here his love for the American Communist Party: it has "betrayed the working class".

I can only wonder if Mr. Sparrow took his own advice.

His questions are not quite as good. In explaining that the public was ready prey for us "scavengers", he also represents that no one had read the Report or any substantial part of it. "How many of them have opened the Report", he asks, "let alone weighed its arguments against those of the attackers?" His implication is that the Report is unknown.

He will not be comforted by its sale, in the official, Government Printing Office edition, which was a spectacular success, in the commercial, hard-back editions, in the countless thousands in bookclub editions and in the also countless abridgements. Does he forget there was an immediate pocket-book edition? Does he forget that the Report's "Summary and Conclusions" were the official press release, that it was carried, word for word-all of its great length-as the wire-service story? Does he forget the very generous press attention-the complete thing in the New York "Times", for example?

Mr. Sparrow has been playing back his own records or what is equally fatal, listening to his American colleague, Mr. Louis Nizer, the great lawyer who wrote a glowing endorsement of the Warren Report for one of the commercial editions (and, somehow, escaped being called a "scavenger" for it) without having seen the alleged supporting evidence, which was not published for two more months.

Of course, there are other Mr. Sparrow respects, praises and recommends. For example, Mr. William Manchester who, he says, penned an "hour-by-hour chronicle". That he did, without the things that did happen and with all of the things that didn't in a rare upsetting of the law of averages that made him more wrong on detail than if he had consciously invented it.

that of Mr. Joesten but they have not produced one, Why not?"

I doubt that it would impress Mr. Sparrow to repeat that this is not the function of a responsible writer whose explicit purpose is to disprove the official accounting of the assassination.

What may trouble him-and should if it doesn't-is his quotation of Joesten's late-1967 book as compared with mine, which dates to mid-February 1965, or Mr. ~~James~~, whose publication date was toward the end of September 1966, as giving us "three or four years".

But were Mr. Sparrow the type ~~ix~~ easily troubled, he'd be distressed at the clamorous obfuscation he hurls at Mr. Lane (and me, although it is entirely inappropriate as addressed to me) in claiming that the doctors in Dallas did not know their business and could not recognize a wound of entrance in the front of the neck because they didn't look at a wound twice as large in the back and that they said this was a wound of entrance only under the pressure of an unwelcome press conference.

This would come with better grace from Mr. Sparrow if he had cited my evidence of front-entrance for the neck wound. It is in the handwritten draft of the autopsy. Rather, it is in the unburned one. Mr. Sparrow has no invective for the chief of the autopsy who burned the first draft of the autopsy report two days after the murder. Nor has he any explanation of the magic which converted the unchanged description of this wound as a "puncture wound" into "second, much smaller wound" when the autopsy was typed.

Now, unless there is perjury and its subornation, which is not at all unlikely, this information was not given the autopsy chief by the doctor in charge in Dallas until the day after the murder. It is hardly from spontaneous press sources.

"Nowhere, ~~in~~ even by inuendo, does Mr. Sparrow represent the doctrine, purpose, content ~~purpose~~ or thrust of my writing. It is explicit in all my books. All are part of a single study of the assassination and its official investigation. It is and has been my inflexible determination to do what I could to bring about another official investigation of the assassination. This is as explicit as it can possibly be in all of my writing and speaking. I have dwelt on this at great length, impromptu and under considerable pressure without, I am absolutely confident, in any way indicating otherwise than what I now tell you: I believe that the re-investigation must be official because unless it is ^{that} the society which began to fall apart when the accused assassin was first systematically denied all his rights (and with him, all of us) and then murdered only because public authority made it possible must at some point begin to function again; and ~~that~~ unless we all acknowledge our collective responsibility through the government and the government acknowledges its specific responsibility we will not recapture our lost national honor.

For this purpose I dedicated myself to the disproof of the Report to the degree possible. This I have undertaken on a number of levels, with the published "evidence" and by resurrecting what has been suppressed, on a scale that all the others, collectively, do not approximate. I have published three books that come in large part or entirely from the suppressed evidence, ^{almost} and the fifth is written.

For this purpose it is in no way my obligation to pretend to solve the crime. I do not consider myself James Bond. I am a writer and an analyst. I make no pretense of solving the crime.

Having devoted great length and emphasis to Mr. Joesten's "solution", which is obviously foreign to my belief and writing, Mr. Sparrow then says, "No wonder Messrs. Lane and Weisberg have no positive theory to suggest!"

To cite a parallel: if Mr. Sparrow is defending a man accused of murder and

that man is innocent, must Mr. Sparrow replade the police and prosecutors and
bring to book the actual murdered?

If an innocent man can go free only if he finds the guilty one, how many of
us would be free?

It is child's play for Mr. Sparrow to cite ~~the text~~ what he thinks least credible of the writing of any one "critic" and assign it to all. He does this with me, often in direct opposition to what I have written. Not once does he cite my words, against me or the others. Why do we (I) not believe that Oswald murdered Officer Tippit? Because of the "unreliability of some of the witnesses (e.g. Mrs. Markham)".

From this one would never believe that not one of the witnesses who "identified" Oswald did so without benefit of having previously seen him officially identified as the murderer, or that the Commission itself proved he could not have gotten to the scene of that crime until five minutes after it was reported on the police radio.

Or that it failed to call as a witness the off-duty policeman, Officer Bowley, who swore it is he who made that broadcast on the murdered policeman's car radio-and looked at his watch and established a time ten minutes before the earliest that ~~before~~ Oswald could have reached the scene of the crime, even if one accepts all the Commission's errors in tracing and timing Oswald.

To say that we or I "seek to discredit the Commission's conclusions on vital points (e.g., the source of the shots) by calling attention to the differences of opinions among the observers" is a deliberate lie as it is addressed to me and a deliberate misrepresentation of my own published writing Mr. Sparrow pretends to review. The fact is that it is I among the "critics" who began by saying what Mr. Sparrow knows and the Commission ignored, that eye-witnesses are among the least dependable sources of information in such dramatic events.

Again lumping me in with who I cannot begin to imagine, I learn that I have done an evil things and written an undependable work because I "repeatedly fail to distinguish between a good point and a bad ~~point~~ one and refuse to abandon arguments that have been shown to be without foundation". We do have a specific example that is ~~strangely~~ foreign to my writing even when interpreted by such

mind.

minds as Mr. Sparrow's: "Circumstances that seemed suspicious (e.g., the military rehearsal shortly before the assassination, of the ceremonial for a presidential funeral) have been shown to be without foundation".

What this really shows to be "without foundation" is any intent on Mr. Sparrow's part that is in any accord with honesty or purpose or belief.

One of the examples he cites at this point, however, should comfort him little. He denies that it is true, in his words, "that the Dallas police took notes of Oswald's interrogation and then destroyed them".

One might imagine so eminent and learned a gentleman as Mr. Sparrow to wonder about the total absence of a single original note of any kind or character of any of the hours-long interrogations of the man accused of murdering the President. One might expect those of less academic standing and considerably less learning to wonder why Oswald was being interrogated. If there were no notes of what he said, how could what he said be established? For what other purpose was he allegedly being questioned?

In the case of the chief interrogator, Homicide Captain Will Fritz, it is explicit: he did make notes, he prepared a typed (and then altered) statement from them, and then destroyed them (particularly since the Jencks decision are the police apprehensive about having notes that can be demanded and examined by the defense. Destroyed notes, quite obviously, cannot be the subject of embarrassing cross examination.) In the case of the FBI it is not only explicit; it is unvarying. Every questioned FBI agent destroyed all of his notes and each insisted it was the inflexible FBI procedure. Even James Patrick Hosty, the "Oswald" expert, who did not type up his notes until a month after the assassination, well after the beginning of the official investigation, nonetheless destroyed them and the Commission was without complaint of any kind.

Does Mr. Sparrow imagine that had Oswald confessed there would be no tape recording of his words? Or no exact, stenographic transcript? What police,

federal or local, would seek a confession and then not be prepared to receive it. For what purpose is the accused allegedly warned that anything he says can be used against him if there is no preparation to have and use what he says?

Mr. Sparrow likewise departs from any relevance to my writing in, this ~~my~~ writing, which can in no way be justified:

"At the same time, says Mr. Joesten, there was afoor a conspiracy to kill the President, the parties to which included one of th President's ~~xxxxxxx~~ aides, Ken O'Donnell, Chief Werry and Captain Fritz of the Dallas police, members of the F.B.I. (among them, it seems, Mr. Hoover) ^{and-} Mr. Joesten makes much of this- Mrs. Paine...The President was to be killed by simultaneous fire from the famous 'grassy knoll' and from a window in the Book Depository - in essentials, the plot is the same as that postulated by Messrs Lane and Weisberg..."

This, truly, is an outrageous and abominable departure from any reasonable extension, even as Mr. Sparrow has himself stretched it, of what to any reasonable man is fair comment. Aside from my belief that there was shooting from the front, and on this my writing is specific with the sources, this is absolutely opposed to what I believe, think or have ever said. I shudder to think that a responsible publication would dare print such defamatory writing without a cursory check.

If Mr. Joesten has done what I would have thought impossible-libel the Dalles police-how much better is his critic, that upholder of the law and protector of decency, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ John Sparrow?

The rest of this rotten passage likewise, as Mr. Sparrow presents it, is in essence attributed to me and is likewise a total abandonment of any pretense of responsibility or integrity on the author's part as it is an assumption of responsibility for which the publisher should be held to account.

In one of his defenses of the Commission Mr. Sparrow expresses his disapproval of those of us who say and overwhelmingly proved that the Commission was selective in its testimony-taking, exhibit searching and evaluations, omitting (and I say suppressing and destroying) what was inconsistent with its predetermined conclusion of Oswald's solitary guilt.

"What else", is his pious plaint, "should an investigator do".

There are two proper answers.

If, as I have from the first charged, the Commission acted as merely a prosecutor, although the canons of the U.S. bar specify otherwise, it might be argued that as a prosecutor the Commission might have ignored the evidence that would have been adduced by the other side.

If, on the other hand, it took seriously the duty with which it was charged, to get and present all the truth, all the evidence, then it had the responsibility of presenting, side by side with what it espoused, that which was in contradiction. Its failure to do this cannot be taken as a sign of either integrity or ~~definitive persuasion~~ conviction of its own rectitude.

Mr. Sparrow cannot have it both ways. If he insists that the Commission behaved honorably and properly in carefully eliminating that which was inconsistent with its conclusions, he must acknowledge that it acted only as a prosecutor. If he does this, he acknowledges that he is wrong and I am right, for in my initial writing on this subject-and that in the first book and the first published book on it-this is precisely what I said, that the Commission constituted itself a prosecutor rather than a fact-finder.

"Mr. Dwight MacDonald wrote for Esquire a Critique which is the shrewdest, feirest, weightiest, and most entertaining of the strictures on the Report that have been published".

If Mr. Sparrows regards this as a subject on which he is to be entertained, I leave him to his own tastes. Mine are different.

Now nowhere in his lengthynopus does Mr. Sparrow make any reference to his own knowledge, personal or visarious, of what is in the Commission's files that it withheld. I mince no words. I call this suppression. Unlike those who do not and cannot produce documentation, there are 150 pages of facsimile reproduction of documents relating to the unquestionable and deliberate suppression, misrepresentation and destruction of pictures of the assassination, in my third book, to which Mr. Sparrow alludes. Most of these were entirely suppressed by the Commission. I got them from my own extensive, painful and expensive search. Securely founded in his own ignorance, Mr. Sparrow says of Mr. MacDonald, whose article was published in February 1965, "he did not believe that they intended to conceal anything". Thus does Mr. MacDonald's writing and beliefs become attractive to Mr. Sparrow, this he becomes an "expert". Mr. Macdonel's own contentment with his own opinions is more adequately protreyed by his own record: he never wrote the book for which he contracted with Prentice-Hall, and he never withdrew from his contract so they could undertake another work. Seemingly without embarrassment, "r. Sparrow concludes his glorification of Mr. Macdonald with further exposition of his credentials:"...he agreed with their conclusions."

Not that Mr. Sparrow is inconsistent. Professor Alexander Bickel's article is "searching", much to his liking. Why? Not alone because he is a "professor". Mr. Bickel also is in accord with the Commission's conclusions. His depth of scholarship and astuteness of mind made him the author of a mechanism for proving the Commission right by making them wrong. Instead of the first shot

having been fired at or after the 210th frame of the amateur movies taken by Mr. Abraham, which is central in the Commission's concept of a single assassin, Professor Bickel would have it shot, having first been aimed, in less than one-eighteenth of a second, through a tiny aperture in a tree. So little aware of the essential evidence is this learned practitioner and teacher of American law that he is entirely unaware that for the shot to have then been fired, were any man in the world capable of such split-second reaction and mechanical performance, at this point in the sequence of events and from that sixth-floor window from which it allegedly came, the ^{serious} injuries inflicted on the Texas Governor and the insignificant one suffered by a bystander, James C. Tague, are entirely without accounting. But, Mr. Sparrow likes it anyway.

"The academic origin" of Epstein's work also appeals to Mr. Sparrow, as does that slight book and its author. They "did more to damage the Commission... than any other contribution to the debate". This tribute is limited, however, to "enlightened readers".

Mr. Epstein's attractive is identical with Mr. Macdonald's and Professor Bickel's: He is a "scholar", in this case scholarship is defined as a study not based on the existing evidence (Mr. Epstein's knowledge of it is so scant he had to get one of Mr. Sparrow's "demons", Mrs. Sylvia Meagher, to do his notes for him). But Mr. Sparrow makes no secret of the reason for his liking of Mr. Epstein: "...he does not believe in a conspiracy..." and "he accepts the view that Oswald shot the President". "Accepts" is hardly the description of a "study" ^{to} in which the question is stranger. Mr. Epstein at no point examines this evidence. Like the Commission and Mr. Sparrow, he assumes Oswald's guilt, which is the only possible way of establishing it, the Commission's own credible evidence leading to only the opposite conclusion.

Professor Popkin is not quite as attractive to Mr. Sparrow as the other "scholars", but he likes and respects him. "Professor Popkin", he says, is no more a demonologist than is Mr. Epstein". "D

emonology",

"Demonology" is Mr. Sparrow's dividing line. Mr. Popkin is on the right side of it. He is further attractive to Mr. Sparrow because "he puts forward a positive theory". That Mr. Sparrow finds this "theory" entirely incredible merely makes Mr. Popkin more attractive to him. Likewise Mr. Popkin's assumption that Oswald was a conscious part in a conscious conspiracy. Mr. Sparrow's likes and dislikes have nothing to do with fact or evidence. They can be accurately measured by a writer's attitude toward Oswald; the guiltier the more attractive. Thus I can understand why Mr. Sparrow likes me so little. From the first I have insisted that the Commission's own evidence establishes Oswald's innocence.

If the professors do nothing else, they stick together and look out for their own!

The ghost of the late Senator McCarthy has entered the mind of Mr. Sparrow. After an entirely distorted introductory section, intended to establish whatever the Commission might have said as unquestionable truth and those of use who prove otherwise as "demonologists", his kindest profanity, we are told that "the manufacture of conspiracy theories became a small-scale industry in the United States". What may with no less fairness be said of a writer who exploits his position and defames his honorable calling to grind out falsehood and misrepresentation, depending upon his exalted reputation and position for their acceptance and shunning truth and fact in their content? Is Mr. Sparrow less of an "industry"? The difference is that he has done little or no work and contents himself with the certification of the correctness of the report on the extraordinary basis that it says it is and those who wrote it say this also.

This slander is followed in the very next paragraph with McCarthy more subtle: "As time goes on it will become increasingly evident that the real mystery concerns not the doings of the protagonists in Dallas during the fatal week, but the subsequent performance of the mystery-makers themselves and the success of their campaign".

Next, "There is a certain evidence of association between those who have criticized the Report."

Now I declare that between me and those other writers Mr. Sparrow cites the only "evidence of association" is one-sided and unauthorized; my material was used, without credit or permission. There is no other "evidence of association".

However, he is specific, and for a rare once correct, in reporting that I "supplied material to Jim Garrison" (later in his article he forgets this). But Mr. Sparrow's obvious and dishonest intention is to associate me with Mr. Joesten and the others, and with this association, to try and brush off on

to try and pretend that what he quotes at some length from their writings and his "answers" to them are fairly applicable to me and my writing. Thus he can say of me-for he does not except me, what is as totally false as it is libellous,"If the critics turned their scrutiny upon themselves they might well detect in their own activities evidence of a sinister combination". And thus I become a "crack-pot", a "rabble-rousing publicist" or a few other things. He prudently does not specify., Perhaps he really means all of them.

Again hiding behind the words of another and a deliberate vagueness, as his training in the law perhaps counsels, I now find that for an American to seek to preserve his society, to want and fight for justice and integrity of government, is, in the words attributed to Dwight MacDoneld (whose expertise is established by his basic accord with the Commission's conclusions), is to have "a large, left-handed political axe to grind".

This is not the only political sneakery in Mr. Sparrow's writing and disturbed mind. All that is lacking is the once-polular "Moscow gold".

In this approach, aside from the revelation of character ^{blemishes} ~~deficiencies~~ and intellectual deficiencies, what does Mr. Sparrow reveal of himself? How does he conceive the end product of a re-investigation of the Kennedy Assassination?

What he carefully hides from his readers, certainly greater in number, to use his own figure, than those who read my works, is the basic conclusion I make specific in my very first writing: that the expect job has not been done and must be, entirely in public and preferably by Congress.

Now just how "left" must one be to ask for a Congressional investigation that might be headed by Senator James Eastland of Mississippi? Just how subversive is it to demand that instead of the star-chamber secrecy and prosecution back-room ~~xxx~~ procedures of the Warren Commission, the new investigation be entirely in public?

And what, indeed, does he think would follow government acknowledgement

that the investigation did not do the job, that the awful crime has not been solved, that the Report is undependable? Does he expect the Red Army in Washington, perhaps ~~also~~ in the White House? Does he expect this to inspire a revolution, any kind of a popular uprising?

Has it never occurred to him that the Anglo-Saxon concept ~~is that~~ of law is that man err, that the most eminent, the judges, are bound to make mistakes, and that a decent society provides for the rectification of this error that is as certain as man's mortality? Does the law or respect for it crumble from the reversal of wrong decisions on appeal?

Rather, I say, the rectification of error by government inspires respect for and trust in that government. When our government does what I have from the first and without deviation demanded, re-investigates the assassination, entirely in public and in conformity with traditional Anglo-Saxon concepts of evidence and decent procedures and subjects its evidence to honest examination, the effect will be exactly opposite to the sinister implications of this man who has so little confidence in the law, so little faith in justice and public procedures, so little trust in people.

The government will not be subverted or in any way endangered. It will, instead, enjoy a trust and respect the right to which it has forfeited. Only ~~a man~~ ^{and senseless hate} ~~is~~ so sick with fear/he cannot think straight can conceive otherwise.

There is one man in England who writes of the Warren Report without possession of or direct reference to the 26 volumes of so-called "evidence". That Mr. Sparrow can use this word to describe the collection of untested citations of the Commission is no tribute to his concept of the law or respect for its traditions and standards. Having read his newest apology for what no man who is honest and informed could apologize, I am now satisfied that Mr. Sparrow either doesn't have them or doesn't use them. For example, he ~~says that~~ ~~of the 26 volumes~~ writes, "The evidence taken by the Commission was published in 26 volumes, half of them consisting of photographs and other exhibits."

The best that can be said for this is that it is ignorance.

The Commission did publish 26 volumes. The first fifteen are of "testimony", the remaining 11 are of "exhibits", including some pictures. In neither number nor bulk are "half of them...photographs and other exhibits."

Consistent with this is Mr. Sparrow's comment on Professor Popkin. It is always easier to address the copy, as Mr. Sparrow did. The Popkin work is a rather thin transparency of some of mine, to which he has added irresponsible conjecture and inaccurate while remaining faithful to my footnote error and impressed ^{so} by my contraction of testimony that he uses the same words-no more and no less. And Mr. Sparrow has a clear preference for "professors" and "scholars".

In comment on the incident at the Irving, Texas, gunshop, as reported by Popkin, Mr. Sparrow says:

"In fact the clerk was a woman and all she said about seeing Oswald was that she could not remember his ever being in the shop".

I would recommend that Mr. Sparrow henceforth shun the Dallas, Texas area, for the young men there consider themselves very manly. That "woman" clerk is Diel Duwayne Ryder, whose testimony appears in Volume 11 of the Hearings, beginning on page 224.

Mr. Sparrow tells us, "The owner was away during the relevant period".

And, "the key witness was the manager, who contradicted himself to the police...." There was no such person-no "manager", this "key witness".

Next Mr. Sparrow favors us with a direct quotation from this "key witness", this non-existent "manager", ~~the young man who was the repair work~~. He prefaces it with the denunciation that he "contradicted himself to the police", the same police who had not a single interrogation report in their files of the their investigation of a President's murder, then says that:

"...when pressed about the contradiction on oath before the Commission and asked whether he could say definitely whether he had seen him 'outside of the shop any place', replied (and his answer, seen in context, seems to cover the shop also): 'No, sir, I dont believe I have. I mean, I couldn't say specific, because back again to the common features, so on and so forth'."

Because this is a fair paraphrase of the question asked by Commission Counsel Wesley J. Liebeler and the words inside quotation marks are some of this ~~xx~~ in the testimony of Diel Ryder (11H231), we now know that this "key witness" who was the "manager" was the youthful repairman.

Charles W. Greener, owner of the Irving Sports Shop, also is not a woman. Presumably neither he nor his wife would any more relish reference to him as a woman than Ryder or his wife.

And despite the considerable amount of time I have spent pouring over the Commission's documents, public and private, I must confess ignorance of Mr. Sparrow's woman clerk. Had he been specific, with names and citations of testimony (unafraid to "bore" the reader, as he so coyly put it), we might locate her and her testimony - if she and it exist.

Or is it that Mr. Sparrow despite the lustiness of his exparte and behind the back assault upon all of those who do not agree with him, really fears devils loving scripture?

Mr. Sparrow is trouble by my use of language. He prefers what he calls "dispassionate" writing. I do, indeed, write on this subject with passion. I am not an intellectual eunuch. I may no effort to hide my feelings - and I am not one bit ashamed of them. I think they are as appropriate as they are honest, My President was ^{in broad daylight} gunned down on a street of a major city in my country. He was then consigned to history with the dubious epitaph of a fake "investigation", by the government that came into power by that murder. I think when this happens the basic institutions of our society are in jeopardy, including the presidency, and that when it is uncorrected no president is ever safe or free. I regret that eminent lawyers, who argue only that wrong is right because wrong says it is right, do not see it this way and have no dedication to the tradition of their profession.

I claim a dedication to my responsibilities as a writer. To those intellectual leaders whose abdication was somtotal when the President was murdered, when his accused murderer was in turn murdered while he was in the hands of public authority and only because that public authority made it possible, I say that if it is a literary sin to write on such a subject with passion, then I am a proud sinner! I do feel the pounding blood. And I do not use ice-water for ink.

And I am entirely without apology, to Mr. Sparrow or anyone else.

At only one point does he include direct quotation from my writing. It comes out this way bracketed, in that strange integrity of Mr. Sparrow's, with Mr. Joesten, for purposes that are unsubtle to the discriminating and informed reader:

"The staff of the Commission did not shun lying to the Commission itself, 'he writes,' and neither was deterred by perjury or its subornation'; as for the FBI, its report inculcating Oswald 'is a tissue so thin and a polemic so undisguised that it would demean the labors of a hick police force investigating the purloining of a dessicated flounder'."

What is lacking here in Mr. Sparrow's "critique" is a statement that the staff lawyers did not lie to the Commission; that either was embarrassed by perjury and its subornation; that the FBI report was in any way a fair, reasonable and honest document. Unlike Mr. Sparrow, my work is specific. I make no charges without proving them. There was perjury and its subornation, and it was known; the staff did lie, and I provided direct quotations, with citations, in quotation marks; and what I said of the FBI report is less than the direct quotations of it warrant. If Mr. Sparrow is not troubled by an FBI report, supposed to be definitive and made in pursuance of strict Presidential instruction pretends to account for the assassination with no reference whatsoever to who shot that had been fired and pretends to account for what happened, I must plead guilty. I am, indeed, troubled by this!

In all 20,000 words of his alleged study, Mr. Sparrow finds ample space for an assortment of slanders and libels against me, but not a single error does he even claim that I made. This, surely, is a new concept of criticism, the equal of his new concept of law and justice: the Warren Report is right because it says it is.

This is the man who concludes his article with a complaint about ~~how~~ "the recklessness" of those who say and prove the Warren Commission was wrong are guilty of heaping "almost unlimited Calumny" on them "under a law that allows almost unlimited calumny of public officials, at whatever cost to the reputations of the innocent."

His scholarship is amply reflected in his article: he has not a single quotation of the evidence but ample reference to works of sycophancy. Those works of which he approves are those in agreement with his preconception. This leads him to what he may yet be less than proud of, as we shall see.

He "evaluates" me on the basis of one book that he read in manuscript in 1965. It is to him more than anyone else that I owe its failure to achieve English publication. He saw to that. He does list ~~it~~ WHOTEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT, in his bibliography.

But how "scholarly" is he when in his text he says, "Mr. Weisberg has published three" books and he does not claim to have read two of them (though he does allude to evidence in one of these that he does not credit to it -and doesn't dispute it, either!)? How "scholarly" and complete is he-and in this great verbal outburst, the one thing he had was space- when he doesn't even identify them?

Indeed, how accurate is he when I published four books well ahead of the fourth publication of his article, the last a month before the two he mentions in his postscript?

The fact is there is no scholarship at all in his writing. It is a self-demeaning lickspittle predicated upon fear and hate and firmly based upon

ignorance. It has the probity of the lawyer who demands ~~innocence~~ acquittal for his client without trial because, after all, his client says he is innocent. Is anything else necessary?

In the absence of specification of error - which he cannot make first, because there is no major error in my work and second because he is too uninformed to be able to do so he resorts to an unoriginal device. He says, "Mr. Lane and Mr. Weisberg say" and then proceeds to forget about what "Mr. Weisberg says" - in every, single case! In not one does he quote me! Instead he lumps me in with some of the wildest things he has dredged up, knowing full well they are neither what I say or think.

It is not as though Mr. Sparrow is unaware of his nakedness. He seeks to cover it, like the Emperor. To hide his total separation from the evidence, to mask his failure to invoke it to support his claims, which he cannot do, he stoops to this cheap device to pretend otherwise:

"A moment's reflection," he writes, "shows that to answer their charges individually would take up volumes at least as long as the books that contain them. And misrepresentation ~~is~~ is too often like the hydra: cut off one of its heads and a score of others take its place; the task is never-ending."

The misrepresentations are Mr. Sparrow's, as I shall show from his own writing, not as completely as possible but enough to establish who is truthful and fair, who has honest intent -and who hasn't.

