

It is also supported by the Commission's ~~and~~ own evidence that it deliberately misrepresented. This is amply recorded throughout my published work. There is more detail on it in ~~NEVER AGAIN!~~ NEVER AGAIN! (Carroll & Graf, 1995) New proof from what the Commission and the House assassins committee had and suppressed is included in NEVER AGAIN!)

83 ¹ fols

In ⁱⁿ fact, ~~the~~ tests made for the Commission, ^{under} ~~was~~ vastly improved conditions, with that rifle overhauled, the ^{new} ~~best~~ ^{shots} in the country could not ~~addddd~~ duplicate the shooting attributed to the ~~de~~ duffer, Oswald. The Commission did not let Connally or anyone else know ^{this}. I brought ^{it} ~~this~~ to light in Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report.

Because the FBI knew the shooting attributed to Oswald ^{is} as impossible, particularly ~~at~~ the ~~Connally~~ Connally testimony proves, and because it was determined to state that there had not been any conspiracy, it made on that no shot missed. That in its account diminished the great labor the Commission attributed to the first admitted shot

13
Feb 82A

In an unsuccessful effort to prove that the crime was the work of a single shooter the Commission decided on the impossible and got away with it thanks to the Media's unquestioning support of its conclusions. The official "solution" by the Commission is one with which the FBI did NOT agree. It is that the first shot struck the President at the back of his neck, went through it without striking bone, (which was struck) exited through his shirt collar and necktie, then entered Governor Connally's body under his right armpit, smashed five inches of his fourth rib, exiting under below his right nipple whence it smashed his right wrist and entered his left thigh where it lingered until just the right time to sneak out and be detected at Parkland Hospital.

From this history, like nothing in science or mythology, that magic bullet emerged without a visible ~~scar~~ ^{scratch} despite all the ~~to~~ bone it demolished in Connally's chest and wrist. (Again, see NEVER AGAIN! and my earlier books at quotes.)

The second ~~shot~~ ^{shot}, in the official mythology, missed entirely.

(The FBI, even though it knew very well that a shot had missed, does not acknowledge that in its "solution" which it reached and put on ~~papers~~ ^{papers} before the Commission was started on its work. The Secret Service agreed with the FBI on this.)

The third ~~again~~ officially acknowledged shot is the fatal shot to the President's head.

Thus, with three empty shell casings found on the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository Building, where Oswald worked, the Commission decided that all the shots came from there, from Oswald's rifle, ^{Three casings, three bullets and no more. 84A} and that matched those three spent-shell casing.

At The FBI's "solution" is that the first shot hit the ~~President~~ ^{President}; the second shot caused ~~all~~ ^{his} of Governor Connally's ~~wounds~~ ^{wounds} and the third shot was the cause of death.

What about that missed shot, which also had a victim with a minor wound; which was seen impacting, with that impact photographed; with those photographs on TV and in the newspapers; with the victim bleeding, albeit only slightly; with his wounding on the police radio the recordings of which ^{or was it} the FBI transcribed for the Commission; with that victim interviewed by the papers and by the FBI ~~before~~ ^{before} the Commission deposed him?

Don't ask—unless you, too, want to be known as a "scavenger" with that fabled "rush for dollars" of which the Connally all were very careful not to write up said all were and all were getting.

Connally's testimony is something else. It is solid and it is probative and he went to his grave without ever deviating from it.

He testified that he heard the first shot and turned to his right toward where it came from. Seeing nothing he was turned back to the front to turn ^{to his left} around when the second shot hit him. (This is what the FBI agrees with.)

Not only was his wife Nellie looking and not only did she confirm everything her husband testified to, the famous motion pictures taken by Abraham Zapruder confirm Connally in the finest detail.

And this is how "scavengers" were both invented and defined.

I knew nothing about this newest contribution to our history in New York until a friend who then produced a syndicated radio program on books sent me a copy she marked up ^{about} pretty extensively with ^{indignation and with} exhortation for me to file ^a libel suits over passages she marked in her indignation.

Schiller's hired hand began his piece reporting the success of Lane's book and of his promotions of it. ~~This is Schiller's property.~~

What Schiller was doing to promote his record was right and proper but when Lane did that to promote his book that was to be criticized and condemned as "a relentless hard-sell campaign ^{exc. H.L.} missing since the heyday of Hadacol."

Somehow consistency, a fault Lane was to correct soon enough, was also grounds for Schiller/Lewis criticism:

"His charges were the same, whether ~~by~~ he was speaking in Cleveland or Copenhagen." *A Must they not have been?*

By the time Lane's book appeared I had ^p almost completed my second book. For it drew largely on what I had found at the Archives where I had been ^w working for about about a half year. But as Schiller/Lewis put it,

"Lane was not the first frog croaking at the encyclopaedic evidence amassed by

painstaking investigation
 the most ~~and~~ ~~notable~~ murder in history. His suspicions had helped generate a
 keening pack of speculators to storm the "ational Archives....Among the most
 vigorous critics were:

will not surprise anyone
 "Harold Weisberg, a Maryland waterfowl breeder and dethroned National barbe-
 cue Cooking Champion. ..."

Thus it is that Schiller/Lewis began to make Mailer's argument of 50 years later
 that history and novels are the same, both being fiction, and that ^{like novels,} history lies.

I had worked more in the Archives before Lane's book was published than Lane, Schiller/
 Lewis and all others who worked on The Assassination, for real or otherwise. put together.

Earlier I had
 I had turned to farming, with waterfowl a hobby, after being a reporter, an
 investigative reporter, a United States Senate investigator and editor, and an intelli-
 gence analyst during and for a short period of time after World War II. Thus to these
 rank amateurs who saw quick bucks my only qualifications were as a waterfowl breeder
 and a "dethroned" National Barbecue King. *just it*

"Dethroning" sounds so much more suitable for their purposes so Schiller/Lewis
 made it up. Before they were finished they were quite adept and experienced at it. *It comes naturally to Schiller.*

In ~~these~~ *those annual* contests the winner was thereafter ^{automatically} disqualified under the rules of the
 poultry industry which sponsored them.

With only a Schiller to satisfy a writer like Lewis, who also gets paid for it,
 can have much fun, ^{functing} ~~testing~~, ~~distorting~~ and yes, just a making it up. *Thus he, as in*
 saying that I had an animal who was a goose who I fed from my mouth. *you'll*

Schiller had asked me what I had done before I farmed. He and Lewis make no mention
 of what I said above ~~it~~ but when I told him that on returning to writing I was working on
 two books for children, to tell them the story of life through ~~these~~ true farm stories,
 that was ideal for their corruption.

I go into this not because it has any important ^{cc} to me but because it is part of
 Schiller's unique qualifications to become the "associate" of a Pulitzer-prize winning
 author. ~~sp~~

" "

We had four families of wild Canadiana geese, hbnkers. I had earned their confidence to where they came when I called and trusted me to where they would take break from my mouth without biting me. Although wild they became that trusting. People, especially children, found that attractive and from time to time I did it. The last person to photograph it was the right-wing thinker who was the writing in support of the official mythology, Richard Whalen. But, as anyone who knows anything about ^{what wild eat} ~~how~~ fowl ^{and how} eat ^{they} ~~and what wild fowl relish~~ knows, it is impossible to feed them ^{from the} only by mouth.

But, having not a single error they could find in my work and having to somehow make little of it, this was one of their ~~histrionic~~ devices. Well, with Schiller having a higher opinion and description of himself, that was his "journalist's" way of reporting on the assassination, ~~a crime~~ ^{to him} a crime with ^{insignificant} effect of a coup d'etat.

Where I wrote about the official evidence and that only, it comes out in their rednering as "cumbersome trivia."
^{whether or not it was}
 (to them it may have been "cumbersome," ~~it~~ ^{the actual evidence} certainly was strange to them.

They could not and they did not alleged ~~the~~ a single error to it and it remains after 30 years that first boat they could not touch other than by making fools of themselves, which they did gladly for money, ~~remains~~ the basic work on the crime.

At the ~~per~~ end of their fun-and-games with a Presidential assassination and that for money they return to me again. This time it is say that there is nothing wrong with and no evidence missing in the four frames of Zapruder's film ^{missing from the original} that discovered were missing. There is no way for anyone but an expert to understand what they are talking about and to ^{be} ~~be~~inwith they do not. That is no handicap ⁱⁿ for Schillerian "journalism" or for the ready acceptability of ^{them} ~~nonfiction~~ supposedly nonfiction that had no peer review:

" Weisberg assumes they show something contradictory to the official finding. ~~it~~ suggests that members of the Commission were misled into ^{see} vizing the edited version in a merely cursory manner. Yet the missing frames, which ^{add} nothing to the body of evidence...." ^{if with them "missing" how could Schiller and Jones know whether or not they had any "evidence"?}

Those four frame were removed from the original of Zapruder's 8mm motion picture. When that motion-picture film is exposed more than 20 percent of what the camera sees

and records is not seen on projection. The film is activated by square holes cut into it into which a gear that moves the film fits to move it. That part of the film is masked out when it is projected *and when it is copied.*

Schiller/~~in~~ Lewis read, supposedly, and made fun of my second book from which they contort what I quote above. Their high standards of "journalism" impel them not to report that those missing frames have no official accounting or explanation; they coincide exactly with when the Commission says the first shot was fired; the FBI, in printing that film into still pictures and numbering the frames, did not tell the Commission anything was missing and in fact they skipped numbers and in their numbering to account for what was missing and then gave a single film number to a ~~set~~ patched frame that has the most magical tree and people in it - trees that grow in the air with no roots and people whose lower and upper bodies are not connected.

What I was able to do, and ~~was~~ after 30 years ^{it is} entirely unrefuted is prove by the part of the Ha-ruder film that exists but is not seen on projection that the first shot was fired before the Commission said it was and when the Commission said Oswald could not have fired it. This ^{is} ~~also~~ ^{alone} destroys the official "solution" and proves there was a conspiracy.

To the Schillerian joubournalism this is "cumbersome trivia."

Unless he treated it as that he could not have had his record, ^{his hired-hand} ~~this~~ apology for written book and his credentials as a journalist. journalism and his book.

- Was ^{this} adeptness in vaporizing evidence and a lack of any inhibition or restraint ~~at~~ all in doing it an asset for Mailer? If so then ~~is~~ all three parts of Schiller's project there are many instances of his adeptness.

But then the question arises, which Mailer?

Schiller/~~in~~ Lewis devote much time to ridicule of Lane and Jones. Remarkably in so lengthy an article, experts that they are on the assassination, at least in their own account, they are not able to show any factual error by any of those they mention other than by quotation ~~of one~~ of the Commission's former counsel, Wesley Liebeler. ^{Who} could hardly be expected to say that he and the Commission were wrong. But when they ^{quote} ~~cite~~ Liebeler it is not with his citation of the actual Commission evidence, ^{It} is to

treat his arguments as fact when the actuality is that they are refuted-disproven-
 by the Commission's own evidence. In the course of this, their mustering of alleged
 evidence, they have a few, very few, words from a couple of former Commission counsels.
 When they run out of former Commission counsels who can hardly be expect to ~~condemn~~
 condemn themselves and their own work, Schiller/Lewis turn to "TV host David S^yskind,
 Suskind, who was later to be Schiller's adversary in his ~~first~~ first major ~~Wheeler-~~
~~dealer~~ ^{again} operation and the man who became Schiller's "associate" in that, Norman Mailer.
 Both thus became quotable authorities with the same qualification Schiller has for
 presenting himself as an authority- ignorance.

Of Suskind they say he "accuses Lane of spreading a 'diabolical smoke screen.'"

They quote Mailer as having written, without saying where or when, that Lane's
 book "will live as a classic for every serious amateur detective in America."
^{ect}

Schillerized this is ridicule. As Mailer wrote it, in a major review for the syndi-
 cated Sunday book review weekly of that era, Book Week, it was praise.

~~but as~~ The Schiller scrounging around for deals in 1966 was not the wealthy and
 successful ghoul he had become by the time he became Mailer's associate" ^{for the third time} all over again
 in Tales, so also had Mailer ^{had} become a different cat from the man who condemned the CIA
 as the nation's enemy of democracy ^{He converted it into our} into its great democratic asset ^{only} - save that it did
 not do enough ^{at} "wet jobs" ^{addressing} to suit the ^{changed} changing Mailer.
^{his writing for Schiller Lewis}

In the course of ~~all of this~~ they invent authorities as ~~they~~ ramble, They quote
 "Alcolm Kilduff, who had been an assistant press secretary in the Kennedy administration,
 as the "spokesman for the Kennedy Establishment" ^{more than four years after his last}
 connection of any kind with any Kennedy.

Most of the ~~ten~~ others ^{Schiller's and Lewis} who are ~~these~~ "scavengers" are little known and never, with
 one exception, ~~make~~ ^{make} much difference or ~~a~~ attracted much attention.

Like George Thomson, of Glendale, California, an engineer with some rather imagina-
 tive notions and no connection with anyone else.

Barbara Garson ^{MacBride} wrote a brilliant spoof of Johnson a la Hamlet, ~~MacBride~~, and
 because there is murder in Hamlet Garson becomes a "scavenger."

Vincent ~~Salandr~~^a Salandria, ~~the~~ Philadelphia lawyer who had written a couple of articles for minor magazines, is criticized in one of their rare pretenses of knowledge of fact of the assassination and as always when they run this risk they flaunt their ignorance. Referring to what happened as soon as the President was hit by the fatal shot in the Commission's own account only six seconds after the first shot Salandria "suggests that the president's head lurch(ed)(sic) backward and to the left."

Neither Salandria nor any other critic "suggested" this. It is dramatically visible in the Zapruder film, which Schiller/Lewis have just said that Salandria had "haunted the National Archives to study."

Invoking their pretended expertise on the evidence they then state of this backward "lurch" of the President's head, "Such a conclusion would clearly indicate a second assassin." They do not say how. ^{it is because} the source of that shot would have been from the front, with Oswald in the back. ^{with} nothing omitted in quotation they next say, "But ~~Salandr~~ Salandria, like most skeptics, overlooks the forward rush of the motorcade following the impact of the fatal bullet - a movement which clearly destroys his supposition."

The only "supposition" here is ⁱⁿ the Schillerization of the unquestionable evidence.

First of all that limousine was physically incapable of any "forward rush," a defect eliminated in later Presidential limousines. The Secret Service, long troubled by it, has referred to it as handling like an overloaded truck. With all the protective metal added to ~~an~~ an ordinary automobile not powered for all that added weight, to which ^{the} weight of six passengers is added, the limousine had to build speed up more slowly than everyday cheaper models of what Detroit produced.

Having undertaken to spoof Salandria for ^{his} detailed study of the Zapruder film they ignore the fact ~~that~~ that the car had in fact slowed down, ^{as} seen clearly in that film. At the moment of impact of ~~the~~ the fatal shot the driver, the late William Greer, was in fact looking backward, at the President, rather than trying to gun ^{the} ~~the~~ vehicle forward.

That film also shows clearly, and relatively quite some time after that fatal shot,

when it was only the slowness of the vehicles that made Hill's instinctive and heroic reaction possible and prevented still another tragedy.

that the limousine was still going so slowly that Secret Service agent Clint Hill, ^{mount it. Hill was,} assigned to protect Mrs. Kennedy and on the Secret Service follow-up car, was able to jump ^{ed} from his position on the left ~~side of its~~ running board and catch up with the Presidential limousine, jump onto it and push Mrs. Kennedy back into it from the ^{trunk} ~~hood~~ ^{lid} onto which she had climbed trying to retrieve a piece of the President's skull.

"Forward rush"? for that follow-up car?

Besides the ¹ ~~driver~~ Secret Service driver and a and a second agent to his right, there were five passengers in the back ^{had} ~~seat~~, which ^{group men} ~~had~~ jump seats, and four agents on the running boards. ~~With~~ Carrying eleven passengers that lumbering vehicle was going to ~~get~~ ~~the gas~~ and make that "forward rush"?

Only the Schillerization of ^y ~~journalism~~ ^{corrupt} "journalism" makes that possible and only a Schiller who is ~~both~~ ignorant, ^{daring} arrogant and ~~so-brave~~ would make it up and hope to get away with it.

The stills made from the Zapruder film showing Mrs. Kennedy about to slip off the ^{and killed by the follow-up car show} lid of the trunk of the Presidential limousine, ~~and of Hill, who also did any~~ ^{was} "rushing" having caught up with the limo and pushed her back to safety ^{were} ~~having been~~ widely published. The ~~only~~ ^a wonder is that that ^{any} paper would publish so obviously false a rewriting of the ~~set~~ ^{fact} of that ~~great~~ ^{tragedy.} 90A

Ray ^{and} Marcus then gets ~~Schiller~~ ^{Lewis} attention, to be deprecated as a distributor of signs people buy, like "Beware of ~~the~~ Dog." Ray was then the part-owner of a Newton, Massachusetts business ^{although he lived in Los} ~~angle~~ ^{Los} Angeles. They ridicule Ray for his analysis of photographs "to prove that the first bullet hit the president substantially before the moment indicated ^(sic) ~~in the~~ by the Warren Commission."

"Indicated" hell! The entire ~~report~~ ^{report} is based on no shot having hit the President before Frame 210 of the Zapruder film, as the FBI itself numbered those frames.

Before all of this I had "indicated" that Zapruder himself told the Commission ^{that} the first shot was earlier than it imagined ^I ~~and~~ had published it in Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report, two years before this scribbling. Marcus and I ~~were~~ confirmed on this by the later House Select Committee ^{on} Assassination.

Next they get to "David Lifton, candidate for a ^{of 1984} master's degree in engineering at U.C.L.A., ^{which is also true}" which for Schiller is unusual in being correct, and no less unusual, they follow this by saying, "He is the ^{of 1984} co-author of a magazine article entitled, 'The Case for Three Assassins.' The magazine was Ramparts."

Next they have "Harold Feldman, Salandria's brother-in-law, a professor of psychology and languages at a Philadelphia college." Why he is included other than because he was ~~Sam~~ Salandria's brother-in-law is not clear. ~~He is~~ ~~not~~ ~~one~~ of millions of Americans who did not believe the Warren Report.

"arguerite Oswald is included because she made speeches proclaiming her son's innocence, and thus they inflated their "scavengers" by number ^{with her} anyway."

After another of their belaborings of Lane Schiller Schiller/Lewis use ~~Liebel~~ Wesley Liebeler and Arlen Specter, two of the Commission's former counsel's, as authority on the fact of the assassination to refute what they have attributed to Lane, their ~~was~~ major target. They quote Liebeler as saying that of Oswald that "the rifle has his palmprints on it and the bullets that were found ⁱⁿ the limousine were fired from that rifle."

There were no "palmprints found on" that rifle. There ^{allegedly} was part of a single ^{my} palmprint ~~allegedly~~ found under the barrel of the rifle, where unless it was disassembled the barrel could not be touched ^a that the Dallas police ^{may} claim ^{ed} to have ~~lifted~~ ^{that print} lifted with tape ^{so it} that does not exist. The FBI lab ^{could} not find that alleged part of a single palm print to which the authority Liebeler refers in the plural and as complete.

"Bullets" were "found in the limousine?" Not a single one. Five fragments were recovered. The FBI lab could not identify them as having come from a single bullet and unless ^{they} that had, without any question, on that basis alone the Report ^{again} is proven wrong.

They also ~~quote~~ ^{of 1985} their ~~expert~~ ^{pretended} impartial expert Liebeler as ~~also~~ saying of ~~an~~ Oswald that "he ^e had the opportunity ~~to~~ to be on the sixth floor, ^{" So} ~~as~~ did many others. But this ¹ means nothing unless he can be placed there when the shots were fired. Not only ^y could Liebeler and the rest of the Commission and its staff not do that-

their own evidence proves Oswald was not there at the time those shots were fired.

As I also published, from their cited evidence, in 1965, in the first of my Whitewash series.

Their next impartial expert is a Commission ^{member} ~~member~~, Gerald Ford, then the "Republican leader in the House of Representatives. He is quoted as saying "We had no pre-conceived idea as to whether one or more individuals ~~were~~ were involved."

The Commission's own outline of its work gives the lie to Ford. I published one of its early outlines in the first chapter of my 1975 book, Post Mortem. That chapter is correctly titled, "Conclusions First." Not only did the Commission begin with the intention of finding Oswald the lone assassin-it also began with the belief there had been a conspiracy!

The Commission held executive sessions in such secrecy its staff was barred from them, other than their general counsel, J. Lee Rankin. In an emergency executive session after the end of the working day on January 22, 1964, they let their hair down, expecting perpetual secrecy. In fact, although they had no authority to classify anything, they classified that and other transcripts "Top Secret."

It took me ~~20~~ years of effort under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) to get that transcript, which the Commission actually had decided to destroy. But they overlooked the court reporter's stenographic tape. That in the end the government had typed for me. I published it in Post Mortem beginning on page # 475 ^{end 126}

One of the unintended admissions that the Commission began determined to find there had not been any conspiracy came during those Top Secret deliberations of a report they had just gotten that could make people believe there had been a conspiracy. After some discussion this is how Rankin summed it up for them:

"But when the Chief Justice and I were just briefly reflecting on this we said if that was true and it ever came out and could be established, then you would have people think that there was a conspiracy to accomplish the assassination that nothing the Commission did or anybody could dissipate." (page 486)

indent
single
space

must also have ~~been~~ regarded as "cumbersome trivia" because he does not mention it and does not include the one member of the Commission to commercialise his role in his "scavengers."

Ford had put his former campaign manager and later, after Ford became our only unelected President during the Watergate scandals, his White House counsel John R. Stiles on the public payroll to ghost his writings on the Commission. The first of them was an article that amounts to a ~~quite~~ private Warren report for Life magazine. Then Stiles ghosted Ford's Book, Portrait of the Assassin (Simon and Schuster, 196) all for money, thus they are not "scavengers." A la Schiller and Lewis, that divided it.

and if this does not qualify Ford as impartial and totally dependable in anything he says about the Commission, his work or it or on the assassination, then he and Stiles File- I and I need ~~mean~~ mean this literally - the Top Secret transcript of the first executive session after the one quoted above, of January 27, and published it while it was also classified TOP SECRET.

and if that this is not enough, they made substantive changes in that official transcript to protect the ~~Commission~~ Commission from criticisms of the FBI and other "ponderous trivia" like that. I published a word-for-word comparison of their changes presented as verbatim quotations with the actual transcript in Whitewash IV, pages 124 ff.

When this matter came up when ~~Ford~~ Ford was testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee whose approval was required for Richard Nixon's appointing him vice president to replace resigned-in-disgrace Spiro Agnew Ford swore falsely to state that he had done no such thing. This is his testimony by which he became ^{our} first ~~the~~ unelected vice president and then our first unelected President:

"...we wrote the book, but we did not use in that book any material other than the material that was in the 26 volumes of testimony and exhibits that were subsequently made public and sold to the public generally." (Whitewash IV, page 12)

single aspect incident

Thus, with Ford having only stolen a TOP SECRET transcript for profit and then having lied about it under oath, for mere mortals the felony of Perjury, can there be any doubt that ~~he~~ does not qualify as a "scavenger" or that Schiller could

ALM

have had a more impartial and dependable source for his criticisms of those he describes as "scavengers"?

If there linger ^{any} ~~s~~ ^{is} a doubt ~~if~~, then I add for them what Schiller could not have known when ~~he wrote the book~~ and "Lewis ~~combined on their books~~ ^{did not have} because it was kept secret until early 1978, ~~that~~ Ford was the FBI's stool ^{bird} pigeon inside the Warren Commission.

That transcript, by the way, was classified when Ford stole it. It remained classified until the Archives finally gave it to me when ^{in 1974} I sued for it under the Freedom of Information Act. ^{page 129}

But in reporting what was in the papers when the FBI disclosed its records identifying Ford as its informer inside the Commission, I do not want to suggest that Ford ~~fill~~ ^{did} that role for money. No, indeed! He did that as a matter of principle. No, not for money.

~~But~~ ^{not} without the FBI's appreciation.

As a gesture it gave Ford an FBI agent's leather attache case with a combination lock on the assumption he had secret ~~papers~~ ^{to carry and} papers ~~to~~ protect.

~~The FBI~~ ^{The FBI} also certified, when there had been leaking, that Ford did not do any leaking.

That, of course, "cleared" Ford.

The FBI was in a position to know.

After all, Ford was leaking to it!

~~So~~ ^{The FBI} it was well equipped to certify that ~~he~~ ^{Ford} had not done any leaking!

In fairness to Schiller and his dislike of "ponderous ~~trivia~~ ^{trivia} like I found at the Archives ~~and~~ ^{published}, it can be appreciate that in the time he spent there to become the subject-matter expert he was - which is the ^{time} of those three weeks he was not flying those 10,000 miles or interviewing all those he interviewed, he did not see and did not know of most of what I report above.

However, he did know of Ford's private Warren Report for LIFE magazine, which had in on its cover and printed and advertised millions of copies of that.

So, in Schiller's expert opinion and nature judgment the money Ford got for that article, more than most books then got as an advance, was not "scavenging."

Thousands of dollars for Ford for work he did not do, having put the man who did it on the public payroll, was ~~it~~ "not scavenging." But for me to go into debt to do what I did and that when I had ^{400,000} no income made me a "scavenger."

As Schiller and Lewis, obviously were not.

Those who agree with and support the official mythology obviously could not be considered "scavengers" regardless of their ^{financial and other} rewards for doing that.

Schiller used the assistant counsel who is now the Republican Senator from Pennsylvania, Arlen Specter as his ballistics expert. ^{How} expert Specter was is indicated by a new and unheard of ^{inflicted on} damage ~~to~~ ^{to} bullet, a "wobble" ^{Specter} ~~he~~ was holding forth on his personal ^{is} sire bastard, as Ray Marcus called it, that ~~single~~ ^{single} bullet theory that made a "magic bullet" part of our history ^{we} have seen its imagined career, the imagining originally by Specter. Specter told Schiller that in a test firing on live but anaesthetized goats for part of the test and "through a substance ^{my} similar to the president's neck" for the first part, "it would be in perfect condition with perhaps a slight wobble."

Specter did not volunteer how that ^{is} "wobble" ^{affected on an} deformed or marked the bullet and Schiller did not care anyway so he did not ask.

After a little trivia that is trivial trivia rather than ^{ponderous} Schiller gets to his most successful invention. He called it "The Housewives Underground."

Schiller ~~seem~~ scavenged this idea from Park Lane. Lane had ~~referred~~ referred to a "network" of editors, students, "housewives" and ~~as~~ others who were not satisfied with the official "solution" to the ~~assassination~~ assassination and exchanged information, particularly newspaper clippings, with ~~each~~ each other.

Although what Schiller made up made more interesting ^{copy} and loqued ~~it~~ itself to ridicule, there was nothing at all in any way "underground, that being Schiller's invention, ^{and} that he disapproved in his account of it ^{and} it was hardly of "housewives." ^{and 131}

There was one, a single one who was a housewife. As the mother of children she had to care for Shirley ² Martin was nonetheless the most active.

Sylvia ¹ Magher, for years a childless widow, was in fact an editor at the United Nations. Marguerite Os ald, whose picture graces that page ^{posed} as she does not look at the

copy of the Warren Report she is holding, was not a part of anything.

Schiller refers to Maggie Field as "the wife of a stockbroker." Her husband Joe in fact was a partner in the firm of Hatton & Co. Where Schiller says she "employed a thinly-disguised pseudonym (Marjorie Deschamps) to conceal her activities" he not only lies, he can't even lie straight. She ^{had been} was an actress and she made no effort at all to "conceal" what she did and said in disagreement with the official mythology. She could not have been more open. And the way ^I heard ^{the name is} ^{was} "Beauchamps."

Schiller tries to ridicule her over the allegation that the picture of Oswald holding that rifle as it appeared on a LIFE cover had been altered. The evidence of the Warren Commission is ^{that} four different media components altered that one picture four different ways to make it appear to be consistent with whatever version of the official mythology ^{was} then being ^{reported} involved.

As Schiller proved, there is nothing too corrupt, too dishonest, too factually incorrect, too unreasonable, even silly, not to be accepted if it seems to support the official mythology of the ^{the} assassination.

Of which Schiller is an outstanding illustration.

All of this the media just loved.

Without doing any checking, ever. ^{end 132}

There seems to be a single standard: did it support the official official assassination mythology or ridicule any criticism of it. If either were true it was publishable.

With his hired hand to do the writing, Schiller soon had his book out. It is amplification of the record and this Sunday paper magazine-section article. With Schiller's instinctive dishonesty and his flair for corruption and these and other character flaws so commercial, especially when he blended them into his bile of human inhumanity, in less than four months Lewis' magnification of their trashing of our history for Schiller's fame and fortune - he did this for money, not of principle - was in the stores as a Delacorte Press hardback and as a Dell paperback. With the same pretense to avoid

the possibility of a libel suit for referring to all as "Scavengers" he did that with the title ^{That} ~~that~~ while accomplishing his purposes ^{for} ^{with} left him the out that anyone of those who sued

he would pay for it
 is not one to whom he referred as a "scavenger." The title is, The Scavengers and Critics of the Warren Report.

Dell, with which owned Delacorte, took a full-page ad in Publishers Weekly to announce the book to the trade and to tell all it was "rushed to publication." As it was, without any checking at all, without concern for anything but money.

That ad has a box headed, "THE TRUTH ABOUT:" with a dozen and a half items about none of which Schiller either was truthful or intended being. I am third from the last on this list.

It happens that the rushed appearance of Schiller's personal - an commercial - corrupting of our history coincided with the appearance of Dell's fourth reprinting of my Whitewash. So it was condemning me as a "scavenger" while it was selling my book.

Wherein does lie a story.

Delacorte had rejected Whitewash once and Dell had rejected it two times before I published it myself and made a success of it. Then Dell came to me to reprint it.

Not having the remotest notion of how publishers thrived on crooked books of account, what most of us would never expect, and not wanting for my wife and me to be packaging and shipping books to wholesalers and dealers or to be wrapping and mailing individual copies, I agreed when Dell added provisions I wanted to its standard contract. It added them to the contract and then enforced them. As I was to learn, suing a publisher in New York is almost certainly self-defeating because of the interminable delays and the great costs they can and do add. Not abiding by the terms of their contract was the least of what Dell did to me. And did not do.

It placed no ~~such~~ ad in Publishers Weekly to let the trade know-it placed no ad of which I know at all. Meanwhile, in its standing ad it then used each month, of its best sellers, for six months Whitewash was its only best-selling work of nonfiction from its own ad.

The agreed-to advance was \$310,000 and the agreed-to first printing was of 250,000 copies. The "advance", which is again ^{at} the royalties the book earns, is all I ever got, except trouble from ~~Dell~~. Dell.

When it provided accountings, as it did pursuant to the contract, they made no sense at all and even then they were crooked.

These ⁹accountings were for two additional printings while of that first print of 250,000 copies it claimed it had sold only half. So it had to ~~be~~ believed that with 125,000 copies on hand Dell reprinted not once but two more times.

And from its accounting, despite these admitted reprintings, it never did sell that alleged 125,000 copies it had not sold.

None of this did I learn until that September, ten months after the first ^{Dell} printing appeared. *found 134*

Early that summer, in May or June, the Ohio Associated Press Editors had their annual convention in Columbus. I was asked to be the main speaker. I asked Dell to ship me a box of books for me to give away there. It did.

And when I opened ~~that~~ that box it did not hold any of that first printing. Or of the second or of the third.

It was a box of a fourth Dell reprinting that it never did account for or admit having made.

So, while plugging the dishonest Scavengers and taking full-pages ads in the major publication for book publishing, it was spending not a cent on Whitewash and gypping the hell out of me at the same time.

Whitewash was ignore by the media. But when this Schiller scavenging appeared it received considerable attention of the kind that ^{helps} sell the books.

Once again, not a single reporter or reviewer undertook to learn whether the book was honest or dishonest, ^{line} ~~factually~~ correct or incorrect. It heeded the official ~~line~~ ^{line} on the assassination and ^{by} that is what the major media began ^{it} doing and never stopped doing.

So, of course, it had ^{the} media acceptability ~~to~~ from that alone and that alone was enough to draw it to the attention of the trusting public. The newspapers joined Dell and Schiller in deceiving ^{the people} about that great tragedy in our history and the official dishonesties with it.

My contract with Dell gave it the right to my next book. It rejected Whitewash II

after I submitted it in ~~1966~~ September 1966 so it went ahead and published it ~~myself~~.
 As I recall it the publication date was December 2, 1966. But ~~lo~~: Whitewash did so
 sensationally well Dell changed its mind and ^aasked for it. So after I published "White-
 wash II I agreed for Dell, to reprint it because it could reach so ^{end/130} many book- readers
 and I, without a ^acent penny for advertising or promotions and no organized distribu-
 tion ^{could reach} so few. That deal gave Dell the right of first consideration of Oswald in "New
Orleans. Which it turned down after Schillerization.

It goes without saying that all Dell ever paid me for Whitewash II was ^{The} advance

And as with my first book, I have ~~no~~ way of knowing how many they really sold.

Learning that would require knowing which computer accounting to be able to check. A
 former employee who was in a position to know told me they had six sets then, each for
 producing different figures for different ~~purpose~~ purposes.

So, Dell did nothing with the first serious work on the JFK assassination and its
 investigations, letting it sell itself, which it did rather ~~well~~ well, and then when
 it got what from its title could be ^{self}-descriptive if read correctly, it pulled the
 stops and made a big thing of it.

The reality is that Schiller and Lewis were the real scavengers. If the title is read
 with that in mind they are separated as scavengers from the ~~critics~~ critics, in the sense
 of versus, the title is the ~~Scavengers~~ Scavengers, Schiller and Lewis, and ~~the~~ Critics of the
 Warren Report, those the scavengers opposed.

With their scavenging, and it is really worse, ^{ghoul} ~~ghoul~~ that Schiller is, so acceptable
 to the ever-unquestioning media ~~it~~ got attention that a ~~solid~~, factual book on the
 assassination, like the Whitewash ^{series} books, never got.

With ^{the passing of} ~~the passing of~~ ^{so many years} I now do not know ^{whether} ~~whether~~ it was this trifling
^{Sunday} ~~Sunday~~ ^{magazine} ~~magazine~~ article ~~known~~ that was serialized to propagandize where ~~the~~
 that paper ^{did} ~~does~~ not ^{ask} ~~ask~~ whether Lewis did a special rewrite of it into a series
 but from a copy of the letter George Foster, of Riverview, Florida wrote a newspaper on
 March 1, 1967, that did help on, as ^{Foster} ~~mentioned~~ to the paper whose name is the ¹³⁶ ~~Times~~,
 "The series of five articles called the ["] "The Scavengers" by one Richard

*indent
single
space*

*midwest
single
space*

Warren Lewis is a new low in journalism, and I'm surprised at your poor taste in printing such an inept journalistic effort. He deals only in attempted character assassination and sarcastic invectives against everyone who has criticized the Warren Commission report without even trying to answer or refute their charges."

Columnists also fell all over themselves in plugging the Schiller/Lewis support of the official mythology. Walter Winchell with this line, "the debunker of the year: 'The Scavengers and Critics of the Warren Report. A demolisher by R.W. Lewis and L. Schiller. (Delacorte Press)."

The authentic scorching Bob Considine, intent upon preserving the ~~highest~~ journalistic standards for which Hearst was then famous and careful not to tell his readers of his own involvement in it from having written the introduction, added to their fabrications that we were getting rich from our work. He described that as "peddling suspicion of the Warren Report."

There is no point in taking such time on that book. It merely magnifies what these gentlemen of such ^{moral and ethical} standards and principles did that I report enough on above. I do add a few things from a contemporaneous memo I wrote after reading the book. After referring to the deliberate violations of our agreements by Schiller and his gross misrepresentations of his commercialization with which he deceived us and noting that I had agreed to talk to him about others only in confidence and for his information only for his project for "college use" I have this paragraph:

*midwest
single
space*

"Before anything appeared, record, article or book, they ^{cheat} ~~break~~ their contract. (i/e. in still another way.) I was on the Louis Lomax Show in Hollywood in mid-December 1965 and he had a transcript he said was of my statements to them. I phoned Capitol Records, which is located in Hollywood, and Schiller invited me to lunch the next day, a Monday. William O'Connell, my host, an actor, was with me and can confirm that Schiller claimed the transcript had been stolen by an engineer and that no further unauthorized uses would be made of it. He still maintained the pretense of being on our side (in being critical of the Warren Report). And he told me what I later learned were lies, like he had a sound tape of the actual assassi-

*copy
137*

misprint
single
space

nation, with four shots audible although the official account is of three."

That commentary is more than 8,000 words. It has repeated citations of "extensive editing of the tapes to make them say and mean other than I did."

What ~~was~~ Schiller at his Schillerian best ^{did was use} ~~was his using~~ the tape of what I'd told him in confidence about Professor Richard Kopkin and, with no asterisks, dots or any other indication of any omissions or changes of any kind, arranged for it ~~to~~ to come out as what I'd said about Sylvia Cagher. It made me appear to be downgrading her knowledge of the Commission's 26 volumes of appendix, which she knew better than anyone else because she had indexed them, and even that in her book she had cribbed from me.

The latter was not only not possible then because her book had not been published and I'd never seen the manuscript but also it was the opposite of our relations. In 1965 I gave her a copy of the limited edition of Whitecash with permission to use any of it she might want. *She did not ask it - I offered it.*

^{her} ~~her~~ book did not appear, in fact, until later the year after Schiller ^{'s took by months,} interviewed me

That what Schiller said was not only not true and without any basis at all, in this as in other instances an impossibility, is merely the mark of the man and his way of reflecting the ~~high~~ principles and standards which are the hallmark of his professional life.

So instead of ^{making a list of} devoting that space to what is essentially repetition ^{of and enlargement on what were} ~~of the same high~~ principles and moral and ethical standards that have made Schiller rich and famous ^{more so} since then, that space is better spent on a few other of these manifestations of Schiller as the soul of probity and dependability in his professional life.

end
139