

Mrs. Earlene Roberts, the housekeeper, reported two interesting facts: one, that while Oswald was in his room (around 1 P.M.), a police car pulled up in front of the house and honked, waited a bit, and then drove off; the other that when Oswald left, he stood by the bus stop in front of the house (the bus that stopped there went back to downtown Dallas) for "several minutes" (XXII:160 and XXVI:165). In an affidavit dated December 5, 1963, Mrs. Roberts said that she looked out a moment after Oswald left, and that she does not know how long he stood there. When she testified before the Commission, she seemed to be confused on various matters. She was not, however, asked anything about this particular item.

Oswald claimed he went to his room to change clothes and to get his revolver. (One of the many oddities of that amazing day is that when Oswald was arrested he had on him a payroll stub from the American Bakery Co. dated August 1960, a period when Oswald was in Russia. The stub turned out to have nothing to do with Oswald, but to belong to someone else who lived at the same address where Oswald once had lived. Maybe Oswald was collecting misleading data in case he was arrested [XXII:178 and XXVI:542]. He then apparently walked to the place where the encounter with policeman Tippit occurred. The physical evidence about the times involved indicates it just might barely be possible for Oswald to have made this odyssey.

The Tippit affair is puzzling. It seems out of keeping with Oswald's calm, unflappable character

As to the two Oswalds, we know that one, probably Lee Harvey, was seen on the second floor at about a minute-and-a-half after the shooting, by Policeman Baker and Mr. Truly. One, described with different clothes, was seen by an employee, Mrs. Reid, a few moments later holding a coke and moving in the direction of the front exit. Oswald Two left by the rear (observed by Worrell), hid until his ride arrived, raced down to the freeway (observed by Deputy Sheriff Craig), was picked up, and disappeared. The real Oswald went on a strange journey, leaving a wide trail, taking a bus from several blocks away (and taking a transfer he didn't need), exiting from the bus a few minutes later, walking to the railroad station, and taking a cab. If he had really wanted to vanish rather than be followed, he had ample opportunity to disappear into the mob in downtown Dallas, to take a train, to go to the movies, or anything. At the railroad station, he was in no great hurry. He even offered a lady his cab. According to the cab driver, Mr. Walley, an elderly lady came up just as he was about to drive off with Oswald, and she wanted a cab. Oswald "opened the door a little like he was going to get out and he said, 'I will let you have this one,' and she said, 'No, the driver can call me one'" (II:256). Oswald insisted on riding in front with the driver (so he could be seen, perhaps), got off a few blocks from his rooming house, and walked there—another indication of his lack of haste. He rushed into the house, went into his room, and emerged a few minutes later.

Establishment in reverse >

5/27/67

Dear Oil Magnet,

Your note on the copy of the letter to Long John Nebel reminds me that I have been meaning to write you but stayed so busy I didn't. Before going to New Orleans the end of April ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ I finished CIA WHITEWASH: OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS. I had a deal with Dell, the editor liked the book, and they backed out. Since returning I have just about finished the writing of PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH: SUPPRESSED KENNEDY ASSASSINATION PICTURES. I have no publisher for either and am going ahead with the photo book as though I were going to do another private printing. I hope not, but if that is what I have to do, that I will do.

It is in connection with this that I intended to write. I included a carefully-disguised version of the ^{AP} unavailable missing frames to which I added my own experience directly with LIFE. I also have been in the AP picture dept. Then it occurred to me that you said to do nothing that could in any way reveal how I learned about that AP memo. There is nothing at all in what I have written but I thought, in view of your injunction, I'd better write you. I think it is a pretty stiff book. I think CIA WHITEWASH is exceptional, perhaps the reason for the publisher retreat.

Nebel is a junior, self-appointed monster. Some of the time I sounded most angry toward the end I was actually laughing in his face. He makes a fool of himself, apparently finds it profitable, and has no other concern.

To answer your note: Both of the unpublished books comes from WHITEWASH III and actually are it, although I have not so titled them. The next thing I'll do, and I hope soon, is what I still call by that name. The N.O. book is 150,000 words. The photo will run several hundred pages. There remains too much for a single book still. So, if I do the photo books as a private printing, I'll be sending it with a coupon to those who ordered III and with a money-back guarantee.

Why the comment about Price, who has a Price Foundation (as does the CIA). Are they one and the same?

Is a silver mine as good as oil? There is a big advantage in not being considered a "tunt", of course.

It depends on how many unexpected interruptions I have and whether I have to or decide to do Photo as a private printing. But I now feel, if I can keep going as I have been, that a month's work will have ~~it~~ as a general book rather than the specific-subject two, Gene. How I'll get what remains all in one binding I do not know.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Harold!
 Where's my will?
 And I don't mean World
 War II. Arthur Price is
 either a Turk, CIA man, or
 a very dedicated President of P.G.P.
 Pennsylvania Pub. Corp. (cont.)
 Anyway, I've just brought in a Scherzinger
 The Summit Group, and I think
 I'll get up a foundation.
 Carl

Copy

CARL SCHREIBER
 ATTORNEY-AT-LAW
 40 WEST 72 ST.
 NEW YORK CITY 23
 EN 2-6100

May 21, 1967

Re: Radio program May 20;
 Harold Weisberg, Assassination
 of President Kennedy

Long John Nebel
 ABC Radio
 New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Nebel:

I know that discussion of the murder of President Kennedy is a bore and anathema; but I agree with Harold Weisberg. I don't think Oswald could have been the killer and certainly he could not have done it alone.

As a moron, I read the Warren Report through the newspapers and I concluded with the media that Oswald was the lone assassin, including Louis Nizer's newspaper article the day after the Warren Report was published by the United States Government.

Needless to say that as time went on it seemed to me that nobody could read the Warren Report in one day; therefore I decided to read the Report myself.

The warren Report is totally unacceptable after reading, even to a moron. I have read it, and after reading it I feel like a moron.

When I heard Weisberg and Nizer discuss the Assassination on WOR some months ago, for hours, I decided to check a few local facts myself. And, it turned out that Weisberg happens to be a genius. But nobody will listen to him. Including you, Mr. Nebel.

Weisberg discovered the following; and I personally checked it out.

On January 30th, last, LIFE Magazine published photographs called Zapruder Frames #207 through 212; LIFE released same for one-time publication only.

One-third of each frame released by LIFE was cut and altered. The exact position of Phillip Willis photographing President Kennedy "as he was hit by the first shot" is eliminated from Zapruder's film.

The reason LIFE and the FBI cut and altered the Zapruder Frames is because President Kennedy was hit long before Frame #210. This means Oswald could not have fired the first shot; the Warren Report says that Oswald could not have fired before Frame #210 Zapruder Film.

Wittingly or unwittingly, there is a cabal, Mr. Nebel, and I sense that you are honest enough to know that a bullet travels faster than the speed of sound. Phillip Willis snapped his picture at the sound of the "first shot"; LIFE magazine and the Warren Report ignore it.

Sincerely, *Carl Schreiber*

Carl Schreiber
Attorney at Law
40 West 72 Street
New York, N.Y. 10023
February 3, 1967

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Hyattstown, Md. 20734

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Enclosed please find \$10. for 2 copies of your WHITEWASH III, when published; I am now reading your WHITEWASH II, and I have to congratulate you on an excellent and definitive job, and of course, I have read No. I.

The thing that got me to read your WHITEWASH I, was the usual abject and not so complimentary reference I often found in the media about your first book, and when I read Popkin and his characterization of you stridently-overstating, etc., I figured that I should really get your book. Particularly because I was right on top, so to speak, of the Report and tried to labor through the following 26 Volumes at the New York Public Library, and I couldn't respect Popkin's book when he wrote: "The real Oswald went on a strange journey, leaving a wide trail, taking a bus from several blocks away (and taking a transfer he didn't need), exiting from the bus a few minutes later, walking to the railroad station, and taking a cab." (Avon, Division of The Hearst Corporation, Paperback, "THE SECOND OSWALD", page 105). Maybe the railroad station is at the bus depot, and it's not important to me except that I know it is not, but Popkin repeats this error. And, in this fashion, Popkin loses respect as an accurate writer and researcher. On the other hand, you have been accurate and acute in your research and I have found no error nor distortion in your books, so far. And, if I do, I certainly will let you know about it.

Then, I caught your Barry Gray talk, and following it, the Nizer thing, and its repeat broadcast, on WOR couple of weeks ago. Of course, that's how come I knew of and bought WHITEWASH II etc. Let me tell you something, Mr. Weisberg: You are great. I mean Great; apparently, you are not a lawyer, yet I know that you have outclassed Nizer on the facts. Your insistence upon "the record" of evidence as not being the Report warmed the cockles of my heart, to coin a phrase. Anybody knows that Nizer is some kind of rank aspirant to political office possessing no conscience nor care for truth. Certainly, it is not for me to say that you should assiduously take care to not make even one error, for, a singular error can destroy you as an historian. And, you are a historian, Mr. Weisberg. There was a certain anguish on my part when Chet Huntley of the NBC Huntley Brinkley Report described you as a "chicken-farmer" because I had, at that time been reading your WHITEWASH I at different bookstores at different pages and found no chickens there.

So, I have certain critiques which I offer to you, in addition to my wholehearted support. The first criticism is that you are absolutely right and correct about the defects in the Report and at this stage, through the efforts of Mark Lane here in America, I think that Americans want to know, in a reasonable way, just what

the damning facts are. For you, on the WOR radio program to say that you cannot recollect your thoughts, or that because of the unfair schedule you cannot remember what you wanted to say is a defect which I, as a listener, cannot accept.

For instance, two days ago I telephoned the New York City office of Life Magazine because there was a New York Times story that Life was releasing photographic copies of Zapruder frames 209 through 212; the N.Y. Times story stated that Life admitted that, of all the Zapruder frames, 209, 210, 211 and 212 had been, were, and still are, destroyed.

I spoke with a gal at the Life Magazine Office, apparently in charge of telephone calls inquiring about the release of Zapruder frames 209-212. This girl told me that Zapruder frames 209-212 had been inadvertently destroyed by the technician at Life Magazine in charge of photographic reproduction because there had been so many demands and requests for the Zapruder film. I told this girl that I had purchased the Life Magazine Edition of February 3, 1967, because of the New York Times story about release to the general public of Zapruder frames 209 through 212, or, copies thereof. And, I explained to her that there was no original or copy of the important Zapruder frames in that issue of Life Magazine. She told me that the copies of the destroyed Zapruder frames had been released and sent to each major news service, but, that because Zapruder frame # 209, 210, 211 and 212 show only the reverse side of a traffic-sign, and nothing more, that probably that was why I couldn't find any publication of the released photos in the local press. She did not say anything about the fact that there is nothing in the February 3 Life Magazine concerning Zapruder frames, and, in thinking about it, I don't think I pursued that closely. What I did pursue was the fact that she repeated, authoritatively, that Zapruder 209-212 shows nothing except the back of a traffic-sign, and that the originals were destroyed, and, yet the other frames still exist, original to FBI, copies made, and some pedantic, erudite argument about photography.

Mr. Weisberg, I know, as a matter of fact, that the original Zapruder frames No. 209 and 210 show the President and his wife and that these frames of the Zapruder film show important and crucial facts which are over and above the traffic-sign. I'm sure that you, also know this by reason of Commission Exhibit No. 893.

Again, my critique of you is that I, too, can be convinced that because of the demands for Zapruder frames 209-212 that these original films were destroyed by a Life technician. Yet, the other frames of the Zapruder film were not destroyed, albeit, important and crucial.

Can you keep the facts absolutely straight and recollected in your mind? Can you proceed forward under this fantastic burden?

Can you accept critiques, such as that you were superlative in that WOR Radio broadcast, and that all you have to do is to keep going. And that's the reason I'm writing to you now.

Sincerely,

Carl Schreiner

2/11/67

Dear Mr. Schreiber,

My wife told me of your letter when I was in New England earlier in the week. If I'd have had time I'd have phoned to thank you. Nizer's lack of conscience and scruple shocked me, for I'd had a great respect for him, coming from his writing. He is entirely unembarrassed about it, but very practical, for I was bounced off of a TV show that is being aired in NYC this weekend and on which he'd agreed to confront me.

Let me moderate your anguish (and I never feel it, knowing that slanders are the only "answer") I wrote NBC asking how come they used my copyrighted title to promote the work of my competitors, and I also wrote them asking why they did not refer to Eisenhower as a bull merchant, Romney as a grease monkey and Rockefeller as a South American grocer or an oil operator. No answers. And no repetitions. These people will know enough about chickens at roasting time.

It is a defect not to have total recall. I am credited with this but do not possess it. These things go so fast you cannot make adequate notes. And I feel them so deeply, it impairs my efficiency. Much as I'd like to correct this, I do not believe I can, and I will not be a Nizer, for all his wealth, and manufacture evidence with the quick twist of the tongue. If I am uncertain I will not pretend otherwise. To do this is to be dishonorable and worse on a subject such as this one, to mislead the people.

If you ever get copies of the "released" Zapruder films, I would very much like them. What they show may not be the important thing. This may be what they do not show. In any event, they show more than the back of a sign.

For the most part I do keep the facts straight. I do not believe my recall is inaccurate. I know, however, from the vastness of the material, that it is less complete than I'd like.

Again, my appreciation for the time you took to be helpful and say nice things that I appreciate and that help keep me going.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg