

Harold Weisberg  
Hyattstown, Md. 20734  
October 10, 1966

Editor, Sunday Telegraph  
London, England

Dear Sir,

The space you devoted to letters on the Report of the Warren Commission in your issue of October 2 is an important contribution to what I believe is now the most important thing, a dialogue. Unfortunately, it is an admirable reflection of what characterizes most of the writing and even more of the criticism on this subject. Scholarship, truly, does not exist; scholars are most deficient in it.

Perhaps you will concede that my writing of the first and still the most definitive work qualifies me as an expert. My book WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT, was completed in mid-February ~~1972~~ 1965, published in a limited edition in August of that year, and in the first of three editions of 5,000 each May 9 of this year. Today it went back to press again. This book, bearing the curse of the first, had to be printed privately, for publishers feared the subject. Its format is offset reproduction of the typescript. With no funds for advertising and the handicap of the unorthodox format, I hope you will agree such sale is not less than phenomenal. In part, perhaps, this is due to its history. More, I believe, it is due to its approach. This approach puts me in a good position to comment on your letters.

WHITEWASH is alone in hunting neither witches ~~xx~~ or heroes. It is alone in restricting itself 100% to the official evidence. I am alone among those published to date in having personally ransacked those 26 appended volumes, without benefit of commissions of scholars and editors to help, or of private citizens, or of corps of editors ( which I regret) ~~xx~~ or of eminent historians.

Because my book is not available in England, it is clear that I can gain no commercial advantage from what follows. It is a plague on all the houses from which your letters spring, for all are wrong.

Young Mr. Epstein, who should have known better ( even more should his mentor), became the creature of a faction of the Commission staff bent upon self-justification.

With proper gratitude but abandonment of impartiality and scholarship ( in a master's thesis!) he did not bite the hand that fed him, that of Wesley J. Liebeler, one of the Commission's <sup>assistant</sup> counsel. Liebeler opened his files to Epstein, who in return never asked himself "why?" This <sup>is</sup> another assistant counsel, Arlen Specter, becomes the villain of the staff in Epstein's book. When my current book, WHITEWASH II: WHO DID IT!, is available, it will be clear that both are equally villainous.

More Epstein's villain and that of Mark Lane and Trevor-Roper is Chief Justice Earl Warren, upon whom all focus. The Chief Justice has his own cross to bear, but not that of all the others who are at least as responsible and in many cases more so, as the ultimate unrevelling will show.

More than anyone else in England, Trevor-Roper should know the history of at least the papers of the autopsy, for his eating of tough crow over his misuse of them was quite public. Dr. Goodhart is overly kind to Epstein in his <sup>not stating</sup> ~~quotation~~ of the date after which Epstein alleges the autopsy was changed. Had Epstein devoted the time to the evidence that he spent with the partisans, he would have known that there was no need to alter the autopsy/after January 13, 1966, for it was actually changed on the morning of November 24, 1963. Fascimiles of some of these alterations appear on page 198 of WHITEWASH. The exact testimony of the doctor who did it is in WHITEWASH beginning on page 178. This also includes the exact changes made, and they include from front to back with reference to the neck wound.

Trevor-Roper's venom and Lane find their first expression on the first page of that book where, with the knowingly wrong basis of a false representation of the number and nature of the Commission's hearings, a foundation is laid for holding Mr. Warren most responsible. When I noted this in galley proofs in May I wrote Molt, Rinehart and Winston urging correction of the factual error and the wrong conclusions exclusively based upon them, without success or response, save for further slipperiness ~~to~~ from Mr. Lane.

The Commission, according to your eminent historian, "held 51 sessions" and although attendance was not good, "the Chairman scarcely ever failed". Mr. Warren

did not have the best attendance record, and the Commission's hearing total about six times 51. The cause of truth might better have been served had the historian pointed out that by far the greatest number of interrogations were in what amount to back rooms in Dallas, with but the Commission's attorney, the witness and a stenographer present.

Consistent with this, Lane edits all the testimony while pretending otherwise. In no case does he indicate the identity of the ~~assistant~~ assistant counsel doing the interrogating. That identification is reserved for the members of the Commission, usually the chairman, and the general counsel, with both of whom Lane had quarrelled. These assistant counsel are thus rendered faceless and the reader is left unable to understand the part each played in the whitewash but with the name of the Chairman very much in his mind.

The alteration of evidence is really more serious than indicated in your columns. I refer Dr. Goodhart to pages 202-3 and 208 of WHITEWASH for some quite comprehensible doctoring. Here he will see that one of the major pieces of photographic evidence was more than half cut away (the original appears with it) and that the evidence does not include the frames of the Zapruder film the Commission itself said are most crucial, 208-11, and that both 207 and 212 have been incompetently spliced. Yet the original film and the copies were intact, and the Report declares it is at Frame 210 that for the first time the President was accessible to a shot from the supposed sixth-floor sniper's nest.

Because he bleeds so for the reputation of the Dallas police, I refer Dr. Goodhart to pages 204-5 of WHITEWASH for four of their official pictures which show, with the appropriate text, that the first order of police business was to move all the evidence and then to replace it, according to the word under oath, in exactly the same condition in which it was found. Here, in four pictures, all equally official, each disproved by all the others, and all quite wrong, is the beginning point of the reconstruction of the shooting.



What is needed is not dubious private James Bondery, blind insistence that government can do no wrong, indulgence of personal spites and fears and false but saleable conjectures. There should be but the search for truth, wherever it leads. To begin with, the abundant record of the Commission, for all its defents, dishonesty, distortions, destructions, misrepresentations and even perjuries, is a fine beginning point and people will more readily understand if the official evidence is cited. This evidence shows the Report is false. With it alone WHITEWASH demolishes the major conclusions of the Report. The Commission's "best evidence", to use the lawyer's phrase, shows Oswald could have killed no one. <sup>Epsteins special variant of scholarship</sup> led him to ignore this question in favor of adopting this particular part of the Commission's conclusions, as though it were impervious to the defect he found in what little he did look at/.

The Commission's "best evidence" is that no one person in all the world could have committed the assassination with that weapon and in the available time. This is by no means a startling new revelation, as <sup>three recently</sup> ~~though~~ subjected to the puffery of the salesman for a transparency called book would have them believe. It is discussed at a number of points in WHITEWASH, for example, page 138, and did not await the sensationalizing and copying of the Johnny-come-lately's questing a fast and easy buck.

You have no means of determining the accuracy, honesty or impartiality of your correspondents on this subject, so if you print what is less accurate than one might hope it is not your fault. But is very much to your credit that you devote so much valuable space to what I hope can become a genuine dialogue. It is also an important public service.

Sincerely yours,

P.S. Should you elect to use this letter and find it long, please edit it as you see fit.

Harold Weisberg