

Herold Weisberg Hyattstown, Md. 20734
October 13, 1966

The Editor
The Sunday Times Magazine
London, England,

Dear Sir ,

It has become a modern literary sin to write with passion and to document with thoroughness. It is in bad taste with non-fiction, especially when it deals with the national honor and integrity. About this one needs ice for ink; disinterest and detachment. One is not to feel the pounding blood when his president is killed and consigned to history with the dubious epitaph of a fake inquest. Thus you fault my book WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT as "hot tempered" and by this device avoid all mention of its contents and what it has accomplished. This is your indubitable right, but I suggest a review of British writings on similar topics will reveal that you, to your credit, also have feelings and have not shamed in expressing them.

Your October 9 article is significant and important, despite the unfortunate inaccuracy that ~~you~~ characterizes it and most of what is written about the assassination and its investigation. Had you read WHITEWASH instead of condemning it out of hand because its author dare not to be an intellectual enough you could have avoided them. They are of varying magnitudes and are not all of opinion. Should you so desire I will enumerate them and cite you the official evidence in proof. My book alone is entirely restricted to this official evidence.

Some of the error is understandable at a time when you are luxuriating in the benefits of press-agentry. I prefer as an American, however, with or without hot temper, that the facts be as accurate as it is within the capacity of man to state them.

To set the historical record straight, the first books were those by Leo Sauvage and me. Mine was completed in mid-February 1965, published in a limited edition in August of that year, and in the first of the to date four privately-printed editions the smallest of which was of 5,000 on May 9 of this year. With no advertising, improvised distribution and seriously handicapped by its format, it is still the work that

laid the basis of credibility and acceptability for those that followed and added nothing of fundamental import to its revelations and collectively do not approximate its content.

It is by no means correct to state as you do that if that single magical bullet could have or did inflict all seven non-fatal injuries on both the President and the Governor, "the official verdict of the crime can stand". It is but one of only too many flaws on which it cannot stand. It is likewise without foundation in the Commission's own "best evidence", as you infer on the same page, that Oswald had to be one of the assassins if there were more than one, as this same "best evidence" proves abundantly and deductively.

Nor is it a fair representation to say only that the Commission merely "regarded as the most credible (that) the first shot was fired" at a certain point and drop it there. The Report actually states, "Although it is not essential to any findings of the Commission to determine just which shot hit Governor Connally...(page 19) unless it could conclude with finality that he was struck by this first one only it could not conclude that there was a single assassin, for at least two shots struck the President, one missed the motorcade entirely, and the so-called fatal shot could not possibly have struck the Governor. You will find this amplified at length in my chapter "The Number of Shots", the only exhaustive analysis of this subject.

Frame 207 is not, according to the Report and the evidence, "the earliest moment Kennedy could have been by an aimed shot from the Depository..." Frame 210 is. Should you desire, I'll amplify this for you. In this connection I should like to refer you to the revelation in WHITEWASH in both text (page 45) and appendix (page 206) that this and the adjacent Frames have been physically removed from the reproduction purportedly seriatim of the Zapruder film in Exhibit 865, the only frames so destroyed. The alterations in Frames 207 and 212 are obvious. The film was poorly spliced.

The medical evidence is contrary to the presumption that a delayed reaction was "perfectly possible" with the Governor.

It is only technically true that the photographs of the President's garments you use "were not included in the Warren Report". Other similar ones were, despite the successful press agency. Look in the first volume of exhibits. You'll find five similar ones. It is likewise wrong to say that "the medical drawing - again not shown in the Warren Report," etc., for it is Exhibit 385 from Volume 16 and I reproduce it on page 196. It is possible to be unfair to the Commission, but it is not necessary to invalidate the Report.

Despite his certification, which I reproduce in facsimile on page 187, the autopsy doctor did not destroy his "notes". I would have thought your paper would have been the last to repeat this error, even though other writers did not benefit from your experience. What Dr. Humes swore he burned is the first handwritten draft of the autopsy (my pages 183ff.). The nature of the substantive changes between the final version and the existing handwritten version, some of which I reproduce in facsimile on page 198, is the difference between front and back, high and low, day and night.

Another persistent error is that Dr. Humes executed the schematic diagram that shows the President's rear non-fatal wound was in the back (as does much other evidence I assemble on page 185). Although the other books so state, it is untrue. The only one man in the world established by the evidence not to have "filled up" this chart is Dr. Humes, who swore one of his associates did.

Your quotation from the FBI report is consistent with the emphasis of other writing, but it omits a most significant fact, that this FBI Report also says different² bullets struck the President and the Governor and that it accounts for all three bullets the Commission acknowledges were fired without accounting for the one known to have missed entirely. It also ignores the front neck wound. To me, these things are quite shocking.

There is no evidence that the whole bullet was "found on a stretcher". I treat this in great detail (pages 161-2, 171), the man who discovered it specifically refused to say that and instead declared under oath " I am going to tell you all I

can, and I'm not going to tell you something I can't lay down and sleep at night with either."

Your account of the picture of Oswald with the rifle is unfortunately incomplete. I alone have the rest of the story (pages 80-2). There were two similar pictures, the negatives to both of which were seized by the police and inventoried. One "disappeared" and was sold to the press. This, as you might imagine, is not in the Report. I am not aware that the members of the Commission knew it, either.

Two other things you say about the "single-bullet" theory are not factual. "Its most powerful advocate among the Commission's staff lawyers" was not Norman Redlich but Arlen Specter. And it is not true that "Oswald's guilt must stand or fall" with it. Only too many other things disprove his guilt, if the Commission's "best evidence" is to be credited.

In closing, despite the unfortunate and unnecessary error in your lengthy article, I do want to commend you, if the commendation of a "hot-tempered" ^{on} means anything, for the attention you have given the subject and the generous investment of space. What is very much in order now is a free and open dialogue, unsullied by second-hand epithets and based solidly upon evidence, not vested ~~commercial~~ commercial interests.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

P.S. I delivered one of the first 100 copies of my book to your Washington correspondent on May 9. If he has not sent it to you, one is available from my English agent, Mr. Gordon Harbord, 53 St. Martin's Lane, London W.C.2