

CHAPTER 50

The Hoax of "The Hoax of the Century"

After the thoroughgoing disgust of reading his so appropriately self-descriptive Killing the Truth, the required contempt for such irresponsible writing and its most disgracefully libelous allegations all based, where based on anything at all, on the most undependable and prejudiced of sources I decided against wasting more time reading Harry Livingstone's Killing Kennedy. Instead I got a xerox of his chapter supposedly on Zapruder's entirely imagined role in the alleged but non-existing faking of his film.

His Chapter is titled, "The Hoax of the Century: Faking the Zapruder Film."

If it seemed at all possible that anyone in his right mind would pay any attention to this chapter it, too, is appropriately titled because it is all a monstrous hoax and sixty four pages of it at that (page 115-179).

Blissfully ignorant of the established fact of the assassination and fired by his zealotry that only determined ignorance made possible, he has this italicized line under the chapter title:

Time has been deleted from the film. With time removed, the film is useless, a clock on the assassination.

He attributes this, with no further identifications to "Newcomb and Adams."

It can be presumed that he has in mind they wrote this in the book they never got published. Whether or not they ever do, Livingstone never gets around to making the impossible case that "time has been deleted" from the film.

Perhaps they and he meant "timing" rather than "time" but with him, who knows or can know what he means. He means so often what is entirely impossible and less often says it. What is attributed

tot he film is the timing of the shots. To the degree any motion picture taken from where Zapruder stood could capture what can indicate the timing of shots, his does do that.

In fact it is the reality that "time" could not be removed from it that gave the Commission and the FBI their most serious problem in foisting off on the trusting nation the fiction that all the shooting was by one man, Lee Harvey Oswald.

This is because there is no reasonable interpretation of what is captured on that film that does not disprove the essence of the official assassination mythology, that Lee Harvey Oswald alone fired from that old Manlicher Carcano rifle all the allegedly three only shots that inflicted all the injuries that were inflicted. That was proven to be a physical impossibility in official tests by the country's best shots under greatly improved conditions and with the rifle overhauled. I first brought this to light in Whitewash in 1965 and in more detail in NEVER AGAIN! that was published in 1995.

Beginning with the myths of his titling, Livingstone stays lost in his own mythologies and those he adapts from others who, when he gives any source at all, are all at best only theorizers of "solutions." All but a few are so remote from serious inquiry that even their names are unknown to me.

When he has nobody whose inventions he can quote Livingstone is never at a loss. He can always make up what he wants. He does that in his second paragraph of this sick manifestation of his irrationality, of his ignorance and his irresponsibility:

The real film of the assassination was taken by someone else, and is quite different. It was taken right alongside the car and showed all that is not in the Zapruder film, which was taken from much farther away. The first film was used by the FBI to reconstruct the crime, and it's still secret.

Who took that film?

From which side of the street?

With what kind of camera and film?

What does it show "that is not in the Zapruder film?"

Who is keeping it "still secret?"

Don't look for these and other answers because they are not there.

Thus he cites no source, there being no source.

He says it, that is enough for him, for those who go for his assassination insanities and for him to be publishable.

Only a world-class subject-matter ignoramus could bring himself to say that the FBI "reconstructed" the crime. It never did, never intended to and if Livingstone were not so utterly lost in his belief in his unique genius as he conceives it he would have recognized that if not earlier he read the irrefutable proofs of this in my NEVER AGAIN! It was out before he published this his fourth High Trash of his series of High Trashes. Assigning himself an importance that exists only in his sick mind and those of the clique of subject-matter ignoramuses addicted to him he wrote and sent me anonymously a lengthy diatribe in which he alleged that I wrote NEVER AGAIN! merely to refute his Killing the Truth and his other equally ignorant literary and historical trash. In fact I had completed that book almost two years before his appeared. But needing no information other than what oozes from the murk of his mind as he pretends that he alone knows and writes the truth and all others do the government's dirty-work by assailing him and his work, he knew immediately that I had spent all the time and effort required by NEVER AGAIN! merely to refute him.

He needs no refutation because to anyone informed about the fact or even merely reading what he writes he refutes himself.

For centuries it has not been necessary to refute that the world is flat.

When I read that diatribe he sent me it was apparent that he intended it for one of the small publications devoted largely to assassination mythologies that are on occasion presented as theories when they are not even that.

Sure enough, Jerry Rose published it in his The Fourth Decade. My October 12, 1995 letter to Rose chiding him for his irresponsibility and his ignorance, for his departures from personal and professional responsibility in publishing such libel and ***** without even the most perfunctory checking, is without response.

But by the time Livingstone submitted that diatribe to Rose he had learned that I had completed NEVER AGAIN! long before his newest Killing Kennedy in our history appeared. So he has to eliminate that part of his ravings that Rose published but cannot and does not defend.

However, Livingstone's sick self-concept and his belief in his own importance that does not exist in any way, as it awlawy has, led him to ignore what he has to ignore to be able to write anything at all, the proof **** there was no need "reconstruction" in NEVER AGAIN! At its very beginning it states and proves that there was a de facto government conspiracy not to investigate the crime and that the FBI's director, J. Edgar Hoover, was part of that immediate conspiracy. It was reached as soon as Oswald was killed and it was known there would be no trial.

From that moment on - and that moment was two days after the assassination if not even earlier - the last thing the FBI wanted or intended was "to reconstruct the crime."

I cite the day Oswald was killed because that was when it was formally agreed to, as NEVER AGAIN! proves with the cited and once-suppressed official evidence. However, so far as Hoover and the FBI are concerned, it can with reasonable certainty be stated that the decision not to investigate the crime dates to two days earlier, to the afternoon of the assassination. Hoover himself is my source on

this.

In fact, Hoover boasted of it as his instant vision of Oswald as the lone assassin when he was interviewed by William Manchester for his book. He not only gave Manchester to understand that he knew immediately that Oswald was a lone nut assassin - he also boasted that "the FBI immediately entered the case despite non-jurisdiction." Which is to say illegally and with the intent of controlling the investigation. (62-109060 NR 6/4/64).

The case is what from the first the FBI did.

It could not do that with any reconstruction of the crime itself and it never made one. Any reconstruction would have killed the fake case it made up.

That there is no source for this creation of Livingstone's imagined need is because he has not yet gotten to where he feels he can say, "I say it is so therefore it is and has to be so."

But that is what his writing says when he can, protected to the degree his determined ignorance of the established fact can protect him in his own mind, he begins this chapter this way, saying that there was an FBI reconstruction of the crime when there was none and that the nonexistent reconstruction was based on "the real film of the assassination" he never identified and cannot, because it does not exist. He gets around that, for those who edit his stuff, if that is ever done, and for those who are suckered into buying it and worse, believing it, saying of that non-existing film "and it's still secret."

In this instance, on the opening page of this chapter, he does not give his alleged source because it does not exist. It is only in the sense that it does not exist that it is "still secret."

He has other reasons for not giving his source when he has a legitimate one - a rarity for him, particularly in this chapter. Only six pages later (page 121) we get to his failure to cite his source that does raise several questions of honesty. If there can be a question of honesty with the irrational.

In what will be quoted from his page 122 he is still talking about those very earliest hours after the assassination and his made-up history of the Zapruder film.

On December 4 J. Edgar Hoover informed Lee Rankin of the Warren Commission that he was told beforehand that the FBI had "a copy" of the film. The film being referred to was taken by Abraham Zapruder, who, after making a copy available to the FBI, sold the film to Life magazine... [Livingstone's elisions]. The Central Intelligence Agency has inquired if the film copy in the possession of this Bureau can be loaned to that Agency solely for training purposes.. *This is, of course, one copy too many. Richard Stolley of Life wrote his boss C.D. Jackson on November 25 in [sic] his contract with Zapruder, that three copies were made, one copy going to Life with the original, and two copies going to the Secret Service, one of those copies sent to Washington. The Secret Service gave a copy to the FBI, but the evidence I've gathered shows that more copies were made, and the film began to proliferate from the start.

Here again, no source indicated.

The only source of which I know for the Hoover letter *quotes is my Photographic Whitewash (page 143). That book, published in 1967, Livingstone has. I published that letter in facsimile.

Whoever drafted that letter for Hoover to sign did make mistakes, known mistakes because not only did it not happen the way this letter says, it could not have happened that "after making a copy available to the FBI," Zapruder "sold the film to `Life magazine.'" The record is absolutely clear, too, on the fact that the FBI's copy is one given it by the CIA, which did get two copies.

So, it is only by Livingstone pretending that the FBI's copy was still another not accounted for or this is made easy for him by the profundity of his ignorance of the established fact, because it was quite some time after the Life deal that the FBI got its copy from the Secret Service. He phonies up his non-existing case for "one copy too many" while acknowledging in what is quoted above that "the Secret Service gave a copy to the FBI."

All the records make it without question that the FBI had only the copy of the film it got from

the Secret Service.

Anxious to hide the fact that there are errors in this letter Hoover did sign, Livingstone altered it within quotation marks to hide the most obvious of those errors. The Hoover letter refers to "Adrian" Zapruder. Livingstone changed that to "Abraham" Zapruder.

For several of his own Reasons Livingstone was not about to admit that his source of this letter was my book - was me.

He also found it expedient to omit the question I raised in the footnote on page referring to the CIA's telling the FBI it wanted the film "solely for training purposes." I asked, "To train assassins?*" Or to teach them how not to get caught."

Note also how Livingstone begins this deliberately dishonest phony case his is making up of the alleged "proliferation" of copies of the film "right from the start." His writing at this point is about the very earliest days of the investigation. In this context he gives the date of the letter only as "On December 4," making it say and mean December 4, 1963. In this sense he says that copies of "the film began to proliferate right from the start."

But in fact that letter is dated bullly, December 4, 1964. It was written a year after Livingstone says it was written as part of his fabrication of his nonexistent case he devotes so many pages of unrelieved trash to.

In short, he lied and he knew he was lying.

He lied on the date and he was dishonest on his source.

As what I published on that ***** in 1967 says all of this happened "More than a year after the assassination, after the Report had been issued and the 26 volumes printed" and "This letter was roited* to seven different Commission files after it ceased to exist." I quote this on the off chance that those

addicted to his rabidity about the assassination and about his pre-eminent role in investigating it may be inclined to attribute his omitting the year the letter was written to simple error.

It is all spelled out.

He had another for him very good reason for pretending not to know about Photographic Whitewash. It begins with the accurate official account of the number of copies made and who got what. The very night of the assassination there was the first of these official accounts in the handwritten note with which the first of the Secret Service copies was sent by plane to Washington that night. It was by Agent Max *G. Phillips (page 15). I published his note in facsimile on page 138.

Where I begin the account of the history of this film in the earliest days, all from the official records, I also go into the Life explanation of when and where it was damaged and more. I here quote more than is necessary to make the immediate point to reflect what Livingstone has made himself part of. In reading this, remember he had and made uncredited use of this book, as reflected above. This is to say that he knew what follows and more like it:

[SEE PAGES 7-8]

In rereading this after almost 30 years I remember that of the copies of that manuscript that were out the one that was mailed back to me by Harrison L. Salisbury of The New York Times never reached me.

This may perhaps indicate how Hoover and the FBI knew what that book would say before the book was published.

As this account did not include, in announcing that the original Zapruder film had been damaged

in its lab Life also said that was the weekend of the assassination, when in Chicago copies were being made from the original for use in the issue then being prepared.

This is the accurate and early account of the history of the original film when in Life's possession.

Despite its promise Life never made those missing frames of the film available. It did not even respond to my request for copies. Besides, as I made clear earlier in Whitewash II, of those frames destroyed in Life's lab more than twenty percent of what was recorded on them in the original film no longer existed to be disclosed.

This is because the film was moved through both the camera and on viewing on projection by toothed gears that engaged sprocket holes in the film to move it. When movie film was then copied automatically, the exposed film between those sprocket holes is masked out, as it is on projection.

With this partial history of Life's control of that film and its failure to keep its word by disclosing copies of those four frames, without the exposed film between the sprocket holes it is worth recalling that Livingstone begins this mess of misinformation and disinformation declaring, again giving no source, that "The Zapruder film is for public consumption" (page 115). For consumption by the public denied access to it? With commercial uses controlled by Life which permitted only certain frames to be used and then at exorbitant prices?

To make what Livingstone was driven to do is this particular massacre of his massacring of our history comprehensible it is necessary to go back to after he had finished promoting his High Trash 2, his second book. He then phoned me telling me that at long last, after publishing two books supposedly on the assassination, he was going to go to the National Archives to study the Zapruder film. He told me he was working on a documentary with someone he did not name in New York. He asked me what he should look for. I demurred, telling him he would not like what he would see. That was

because he had written that in the assassination shooting the back of the President's head had been blown out. But in the nine frames of the film that Shaneyfelt and the FBI had not copied from color into black and white for printing that I had forced the Archives to make available to me at the beginning of those nine frames it is clear that the back of the President's head is intact. And that, of course, is the opposite of what his High Trashing says. But when he insisted I told him.

Bout three weeks later he phone me to thank me for telling him the truth, because, he said, he wants to know the truth and because he wants to write the truth.

But apparently the more he thought about it, knowing full well that he knows all there is to know and never making any mistakes, he decided that the film had to have been faked not to show the back of the head blown out.

In his High Trash 2, published before then, he refers to me, according to its index, on thirteen pages. All his references are complimentary. This first is "Harold Weisberg has always tried to teach us to look for the simple answer" (page 92).

That is close enough to the William of Occam (also spelled Ockham philosophy, he being the ancient and first British philosopher. It was not and it did not becomes his practice.

In the bibliography of his first High Trash he says of my Post Mortem, which centers on the medical evidence, that it is "a very crucial book on the medical evidence."

That is what he said in his first book. It also is what he ignored thereafter because the official evidence in it refutes what he set about making up.

Over the years he was her innumerable times, alone and with the Baltimore policeman who was moonlighting as his investigator, Richard Waybright. Each had the run of the place, with free and unsupervised access to all the records I have. Mostly Livingstone wanted to hold forth his great

discoveries and the like. He left the searching and copying up to Wabright who, it turned out, not only stole extensively when he could have xeroxed them but he also did that for Livingstone's then blood enemy, David Lifton. Livingstone's need of Waybright's services impelled him to accept the fact that he was being two-timed. It got to the point where from copies I have Waybright was two-timing Lifton by writing out for Livingstone what Lifton was asking him to get.

But the more Livingstone thought about my directing him to prove that he was, based on the actual evidence, wrong in having written that the back of the President's head had been blown out the more he convinced himself that rather than being helpful I was some kind of devious government agent intent upon wrecking him and his work. In the course of telling himself that he is never wrong he concluded that because he isn't the Zapruder film had been faked.

Hiding from me what he was saying about me in his tired book in which he certainly does kill the truth, he kept in touch with me when he wanted information. When that travesty appeared he had me a co-conspirator in the assassination in several ways having to do with the connection I never had with Texas oil magnate of the far reaches of the right political extreme, H.L. Hunt. He also had me given special training for all he managed that I never got from the OSS in World War II for a special function it did not have, all made up to describe me as an assassination deinofof***** agent, a "*****."

During the last of his phone calls, which was before that third of his books trashing the truth appeared, when he was arguing that the Zapruder film was faked, I told him that was impossible for many reasons one of which is that all the copies had to have been faked and that before that could even be thought of the government did not have the original because Life had gotten it when it bought the exclusive world rights to it from Zapruder.

It is because this is the fact, that the faking had to have been on the original to be on all copy

otherwise the faking would be exposed, that he decided that the original, too was faked and that Zapruder was part of that alleged faking.

Thus the need for his chapter "The Hoax of the Century." If he could not pull his own fake off he admitted that all his earlier books are what I call them, trash, and his alleged evidence in them is faked, the word he likes. So ***** other than to himself.

The simple truths I told him that he could not abide he does not and cannot address. One is that any faking of the original must be on each and every copy made from it just as an alleged faking on any copy must be on the original. Another is that when the original film is but little more than a quarter of an inch in its larger dimension, its width, what can be invisible on it can be simply enormous on projection. Those suppressed slides I examined in the Archives began as little more than a quarter of an inch in width but were about five feet wide when projected onto the screen.

He says this is easy, simple (page 117) but the opposite is true, obviously.

There is much that is astounding in this mishmash of the made-up and of the mythologies but what is perhaps most astounding of all is that after all his alleged work on the assassination and of this film in particular he has written this added self-indictment without understanding what movie film is. He writes about it as one would write about snapshots. Snapshots and other still photographs reproduced on paper or the like are negative films and the prints are the positives.

Any film that is projected, whether it be movies or slides, is positives and is film, not paper prints. Yet at several points he writes about the original and what we are supposed to believe are duplicate originals as "negative" film.

Aside from using only the most dubious of sources, when he has a source, he even contradicts himself. Along with this contemporaneous official records created before the autopsy was performed

on the corpse, and with faking of any kind the results of that autopsy was knowledge that was absolutely required, are not only not within his ken, expert that he says he is, they cannot compare with what in his writing is obviously false, absolutely impossible.

We have seen and he very well knew from my Photographic Whitewash that Secret Service Special Agent Max O. Phillips was in so great a rush to get a single one of the two Secret Service copies of the original film to Washington the night of the assassination he wrote his covering memo in longhand to be able to make the plane. That was, regardless of all the inventions and convolutions of Livingstone and his like-minded associates, the night of the assassination, as we have seen. Knowing this he nonetheless writes:

ZAPRUDER TELLS US that a copy of the film was flown to Washington that day, but it is completely unreasonable that a *copy* of a film of one of the most major crimes of the century would have been sent for study there, and not the *original*. The Dallas Secret Service and the Dallas FBI would have been working closely together and helping each other. Since Zapruder has said elsewhere that he retained a copy which was shown to the FBI, the Secret Service, and others in his offices, as he says above, there is an obvious contradiction in how many copies existed. (page 117)

In saying that "Zapruder tells us that a copy of the film was flown to Washington that day (and it was that night, not that day), he ignores the fact that is beyond question, as the Phillips memo confirms, that is what happened. The simple truth destroying the faking of his case he ignores. Instead he argue that "it is completely unreasonable that a copy of the film of one of the most major crimes of the century would have been sent for [what he assumes was the purpose] for study there, and not the original. (Both emphasis his).

Solving the crime was not the responsibility of the Secret Service. It had the responsibility of protecting the President, no more. Where the original should have gone is to the Dallas police because that assassination was, as Livingstone does not say, a crime under Texas law only then.

Moreover, the Secret Service had no facilities for doing what Livingstone here tells the reader it should have done, studying the film. Its photographic resources were so limited it could not do what the average photographic amateur can do in his own home, develop and print photographic negatives. The White House Secret Service agent who handled its photographic work, James Fox, could not even process color film. He took the autopsy photographs, as I set forth in Post Mortem, to the Navy's lab in the Washington area. There he developed and printed the black-and-whites but he had to get the Navy to process the color photographs.

Whatever Livingstone argues, knowing the truth as he does, that Zapruder knew the value of his original almost as soon as he exposed film, and that neither the Secret Service nor the FBI asked him for it, he wants it believed that only "the original," his emphasis, was or should have been sent to Washington whose agents did not ask for it.

What did happen and he knew did happen is not relevant. Only what he wants to have happened and did not happen is to him relevant.

This also is true of what he next says, that "the Dallas Secret Service and the Dallas FBI would [my emphasis] have been working closely together and helping each other."

While this argument is conjectural and invalid it is also an unintended disclosure of his world-class subject-matter ignorance. Cooperation is one-way only with the way FBI. Not only is this a general truth so abundantly clear in all those disclosed records of which Livingstone was so determined to keep himself entirely ignorant, in this particular case the FBI was really uptight because it knew of Oswald's "defection" to the Soviet Union and did not tell either the Secret Service or the Dallas police about it. Even more, it knew and suppressed from all other agencies, including the Commission, that shortly before the assassination Oswald left a note threatening to bomb the police, the local FBI

office or both. Accounts in the official FBI investigation of more than a decade after the fact differ. Knowing that, knowing of Oswald's threat to violence, the FBI still did not tell either the police or the Secret Service about him that made the FBI even more vulnerable.

So, while when it suits his fabrication for Livingstone to conjecture, to say that "the Dallas FBI would have been working closely with" the Secret Service, the unquestionable official fact is that the exact opposite was the reality.

Still faking a case of more copies having been made than were accounted for he then says that what he elsewhere says was the Life copy that for a short period Zapruder retained to show others "is an obvious contradiction in how many copies existed." It was, in fact, the second Secret Service copy (7H575)

Next Livingstone writes on the same page, nothing omitted in quotation, that

There are a couple of bombshells in all of this. Erwin Schwartz, Zapruder's partner, insists that *Life* never got the film until at least Tuesday, November 27. Schwartz accompanied Zapruder to the film labs and stayed with him the whole time the film was being developed and copied on November 22, and was with him also when *Life's* Richard Stolley collected the film at the Adolphus Hotel on Tuesday, he says. The copy given to *Life* was to be used to make stills. This would have given the conspirators plenty of time to alter the film before *Life* got it. However, *Life's* November 29 edition was printed on Tuesday, November 26th, which gives damn little time that day to get plates made for the printing presses from the frames in the film. The only answer to this is that *Life* must have got the film before Tuesday, clandestinely - perhaps on Saturday, November 23. I believe that additional, officially unaccounted-for copies of the film were distributed as soon as it was developed on the day of the assassination. Initial alterations were simple and easy.

The only real bombshell here blows Livingstone up but his reader has no way of knowing that.

Maybe Zapruder had a partner, which is not mentioned in any of the hundreds of thousands of official pages I have and of which there was no indication in Zapruder's testimony or in his office when I was there with Zapruder. Livingstone's claimed source on this is a man I've never heard of or seen

mentioned in all those records and testimony, one Richard Bartholomew. They are, according to Livingstone, related by marriage. The Dallas phone book for that year (page 891) includes no Erwin Schwartz. It does include an "E. Schwartz, who may or may not have been Erwin. Conspicuously, Livingstone avoids checking out what he wants to believe. In fact he is notorious for this, particularly in his Killing the Truth. And what is conspicuous in this and in all the impossible that follows is that not a single thing attributed to Schwartz is even possible, leave all what is without question impossible.

Beginning with the impossibility that according to this Schwartz "Life never got the film until Tuesday, November 27."

That Life issue, which included stills from the Zapruder film, had by then been printed - and the Zapruder film was in it.

Besides this the record is without question, the original was in Life's possession that weekend when it was damaged as copies were made from it.

What he says has to be believed, particularly where he cites no source. He has no source for saying that "the conspirators" had "plenty of time to alter the film before Life got it." He does not even bother to say that there was in Dallas and available to his conspirators those who had the capability of making alterations on so tiny a piece of film that was only a little more than a quarter of an inch wide and have the alteration invisible when projected to the width at which I examined it, five feet. In any checking, projection to much great size is possible.

What he omits in this is that the alterations he imagines would not have been on any of the copies because they were already away from the control of his alleged conspirators.

He does not say what alterations were made or how they would be made invisible.

He says it was "easy and simple," that being the requirement of his mythology, therefore and for

no other reason it was easy and simple."

He says there was plenty of time that also being the requirement of his impossible mythology, therefore and again for no other reason there was plenty of time.

Whatever the myth requires the maker of the myth makes up. That Livingstone here merely makes it up is clear because he cites no source or authority, not even on of the regiment of assassination nuts he regards as authorities and experts.

His myth requiring that the original that was without question in Life's possession on Saturday, November 23 not be what Life had he merely makes up an "unaccounted for" copy and conjectures that Life had it "clandestinely."

These oversights would not be acceptable in a cheap novel but they are the essence of Livingstone's supposed nonfiction.

Going into all the conjectures and fabrications he has following conjectures and fabrications, and addressing all of them is impossible because he has nothing else, but next is one in which he does have what he regards as an authority. He begins this one by substituting for the original film that Life without any question at all got from Zapruder another of those imagined endless copies of the original. His imaginative "expert" Bartholomew has as his source, real or imagined, only that always-wrong Schwartz.

This, too, is on that same page:

Since Schwartz himself delivered the film to Stolley, he does not believe Stolley's claim to have been looking at the film before then. "If Zapruder gave Stolley a copy to take with him, Schwartz doesn't know anything about it," Richard Bartholomew says. it makes no sense to me that Zapruder would have given *Life* the original film that Saturday without a check, and we have no knowledge of money passing until the more formal contract made on Monday, November 25. At that point, *Life* would cut a check and send it overnight to Zapruder and collect the film. On the other hand, the film Schwartz describes talking to Stolley was for making stills, and so would be a copy, not the original. Furthermore, Schwartz, whose memory could conceivably be dimmed by

the intervening thirty-one years, does not think that Stolley even saw it that Saturday morning, and was gone from Zapruder's offices by ten or ten-thirty in the morning.

It would seem that *Life* did not officially have the film until Monday, November 25, the date of their contract with Zapruder. That would theoretically give them one day to prepare the photographs.

Whatever our clown prince of pretenses may believe of Bartholomew - and he does not even pretend to have spoken to Schwartz - he knows that whether or not Schwartz said it to Bartholomew he knows it is a lie that Life did not have the film and the original of the film and that Schwartz was not sent by Zapruder with any film to Stolley for Life. It is without question in the published evidence that Life had, damaged and used the original and only the original and that it was flown to the Life Chicago photo lab the weekend of the assassination.

It was who discovered this damage that had been kept secret by Life, by the Commission and by the FBI at the very least. It should have been known to others, including the major media, because the Commission published the proof positive in its Volume 18 on page 19. it is part of Exhibit 885. There, in the supposed seriatim numbering of the frames by FBI Lab agent Lyndal Shaneyfelt, which means he knew and with his knowing that the FBI knew, a frame numbered 207 is on the top half of that page and instead of Frame 08 on the bottom half is one Shaneyfelt numbered 212.

With the frames between missing, how did Shaneyfelt know to number the one to which he gave that number 212? By comparison with the Secret Service copy the FBI had. But as I point out in what Livingstone had, Whitewash, that frame is not 212. The bottom half of that frame is the bottom half of 212. But the top half is the top half of Frame 208. I published that page in facsimile on Whitewash, on page 206. Livingstone has Whitewash. Whether he had the Commission's 26 volumes remains a question. When he says, "What Zapruder tells us" above he quotes Zapruder's testimony but he does not source it to that testimony. This leads to the suspicion if not the belief that he actually quotes a

source that used Zapruder's testimony and not the testimony as the Commission published it in its Volume 7.

Be that as it may, the fact also is that on page 45 of Whitewash, which I repeat, Livingstone has whether or not he has those 26 volumes, I published what explanation was then possible. When I published those two frames there is a note referring back to page 45.

That is what forced Life to confess so belatedly that it damaged the original.

In this, as neither Life nor any government agency nor the major media told the people, the very weekend of the assassination Life destroyed the original film at the point wher in the official account the President was hit for the first time.

If Life could not know that when it first published frames from the film it did know this when the Report was issued. And then, too, it preserved silence.

If by any remote chance this clown prince who presents himself as an expert could have had any real, any legitimate, any doubt about what he made up, the proof positive is visible on that page as the commission published it and as I published that Commission page in facsimile. The proof that Life had and used the original is on that page as on all the pages of Exhibit 885. Each and every frame has on its left part exposed sprocket-hole area of the film that exists in the original only because those copies were made with automatic copying equipment that automatically eliminated the sprocket-hole area when the copies were made.

Thus it is entirely without question that if Schwartz said what Livingstone quotes Bartholomew as saying that Schwartz said - what a standard this is for serious nonfiction writing, single-source and third-hand - Livingstone knew that what Schwartz said was a lie and therefore he bases his phony claim to the hoaxing of Zapruder's film on a lie.

And if this is not enough of a self-condemnation, what follows adds to it. What follows is Bartholomew's own quoted conjecture in which he casts doubts on what he says Schwartz says by saying, and Livingstone has this within quotation marks, "If Zapruder gave Stolley a copy to take with him, Schwartz doesn't know anything about it."

"If?"

A serious, self-respecting, honest, honorable writer can base what he calls "The Hoax of the Century" on an "if"?

The known, un-Schwartzed, un-Bartholomewed fact is that for Life Stolley had to original, the only way that Life's Chicago photo lab could have damaged it the weekend of the assassination.

With himself the expert of experts who has to have known the facts, the unquestionable truth when he wrote it, Livingstone then pontificates, that being another of his substitutions of fact and truth, "It makes no sense to me that Zapruder would have given Life the original film that Saturday without a check, and we have no knowledge of money passing until the more formal contract made on Monday, November 25. At that point Life would cut a check and send it overnight to Zapruder and collect the film.

Although it is one of the things about which he boasts least often, Livingstone has on occasion boasted of having a law degree. Not of having taken and passed any bar examination but of having taken and completed a lawyer's formal education. His reflection of his knowledge of the law is such that were he to defend anyone on a traffic charge that person would be lucky not to wind up charged with murder. As a lawyer he never, ever learned how to spell what he spells as "libel." He has gone around saying, and the quotation is direct from what he has written, "I am the law." In his writing, published and private, he reflects ignorance of the law, not knowledge of it.

And here the lawyer in him has him say that it makes no sense to me that Zapruder would have given Life the original film [which without question he did] that Saturday without a check..."

His law education clearly did not include "libel" because he regularly libels those he regards as his enemies, those who became enemies to him by not agreeing with him or merely for now bowing down before him. So, maybe in the course of getting his degree in law he managed not to learn about agreements and whether or not they are binding and enforceable. But regardless of his ignorance of the law he has another problem, her and through his writing and in this and in his other books:

He knew that before Zapruder gave Life anything they in fact did have an agreement, the agreement later incorporated in a contract that has all the t's crossed and the i's dotted and all the details that could not, on the spur of the moment, be put on paper. Not only did he know about this agreement he includes it in this chapter only five pages later!

Writing of Life's Stolley and Zapruder and of the day after the assassination Livingstone first quotes Zapruder of saying "he was going to sell it [the film] to the magazine" [Life]. His next sentence of page 122 is: "An agreement was drawn up and signed."

And thus it is that five pages earlier the law-graduate Livingstone wrote that "it makes no sense to me that Zapruder would have given Life the original film that Saturday without a check."

Thus, we see that fact or truth or reality or knowledge of them make no difference to him if there is something he wants believed, in this case a something he regards as essential to not having all his work laughed at. he had to know that in fact Life did then get and did that very weekend damage the original film, despite all he writes to the contrary; and he knew very well that before Zapruder gave Life anything at all he had from Life a "signed" agreement.

This alone is a more powerful self-indictment than anyone else can make of him and of his

writing. Yet it is the basis of his personal "hoax of the century" in his false, knowingly dishonest claim that the Zapruder film was altered.

This alone is more than enough to raise the most substantial questions about anything he says or writes. His reason for making this lie up is ample reason to not trust a word of his: he made it up to try to keep all his work from being laughed at and discarded and to hold onto the loyalty of that band of assassination nuts who are so important to him and to his self-respect, those like-minded nuts who like him are lost in what they do not and cannot understand and who like him are both ignorant and contemptuous of the established fact.