

5/25/69

Beginning with the title which is intended as protection against the intent and design of libel, this is a malicious book. Lewis and Schiller got me, at least, to talk to them by a series of misrepresentations and by using the name of Capitol Records, and by trading on the name of Penn ones, then my friend. They said they were making an historical document, for ~~libRARY~~ college use. Even then, when I went to Washington to meet them although I was ill, I stipulated that I would offer opinions about competitors only because they were preparing what they describes and then only entirely off the record. I presume this has been edited out of their tapes, but it is fact. It is also fact that the extensive editing of the tapes is transparent. They have been edited to make them mean and say entirely other than I did. This will become clear. Going with this was a misrepresentation of their own beliefs, as fellow critics of the Warren Report. They spoke to me of only a record. They never made mention of a book or any other use.

Before anything appeared, record, article or book, they breached their contract. I was on the "Louis Lomax show in Hollywood in mid-December 1966 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 was stolen by an engineer and that no further unauthorized use would be made of it. He still maintained the pretense of being on our side. And he told what I later learned were lies, like he had a sound tape of the actual assassination, with four shots audible although the official account was of three.

When I finally heard the record, on a radio show to which I had been invited without being told it would be played on it, about January 8, 1967, in Washington, I was outraged. I recall no quotation of or reference to me but the record was so libelous, of such openly defamatory intent, that I immediately wrote Capitol Records. You have copies of the letters. I regarded this and their contract to pay a royalty in my name to the Kennedy library without having made such arrangements as a breach of agreement and I demanded that they make no use at all of what they had taped from me. The Kennedy library had announced they would not accept any payments from Capitol Records. I have never had an accounting of sales nor have I had any royalties paid me. The letters I wrote were received for I got non-responsive replies from both Capitol and Schiller. It now appears that their delay in responding (and they never made meaningful response) was for the purpose of stringing it out so their profit-seeking record would have a chance (it is anything but an historical document and is by no stretch of even a sick imagination designed for colleges), so the newspaper use (New York World Telegram), book and syndication could be cashed in on. This all followed my letter to Capitol, telling them they no longer had any right to use any of this material.

Had Schiller told me he had been Jack Ruby's agent (and, as I later learned, milked him), I'd never have talked to him. Nor would I have under any ~~by~~ the misrepresented conditions. However, he was not content with this, for what he quotes from me has been deliberately and maliciously edited. This cannot be accidental. He cannot produce original tapes that say what his book says. This is a Dell (Disl, also Dell) book, reprinted by Meredith, that is, the chapter on me.

Other evidence that Schiller was aware of what he was doing is in his refusal to confront me. It was on a Friday night that I heard the record, on the Steve Allison Show, then on WDC, Washington. Allison told me Schiller would be in Washington and on his show. I then issued the challenge. Another time, in Philadelphia, when Schiller was asked to confront me, he said he could not appear at a time I could. I say this because of the pretense of his writing. He dare not confront me on it and especially dared not when the record was just issued.

The record, I believe improperly, trades on my name and others, as does the book. Our names were then much in the news. Mine is one of the three names used on the cover, under the head, "The Truth About". The book and the record have never been known by the full name. This was design. They are known as and we are called "Scavengers". The rest of the title, the small print, is "and Critics of the Warren Report". It is obvious that the qualification was so that one who could complain could be told he was a "critic", not a "scavenger". This whole thing began immediately after Governor Connally called us "scavengers", mark here by name the rest of us by description. The real intent is disclosed on the very first page, under the heading "From Dallas to Dollars", where they say "self-appointed critics have emerged from the national woodwork and have apparently and profitably convinced a large segment of the public that the Commission's conclusions are subject to doubt."

The record is called "The Controversy".

I will return to this slander about commercialism and "scavenging" in comment on what they wrote about me.

They interviewed people not used on the record. Schiller has been a partisan from the first, although hidden so we didn't know it. It is reported that one of the people he interviewed, a reporter who had moved to Mexico, was asked questions the very next day by the FBI, which went over the same ground Schiller hid.

Further bearing on malice is the introduction by Bob Conzidine, where we are called "a cult of opportunists and crackpots" (page 9); "grave robbers" (page 10). In the foreword Lewis and Schiller proclaim "our facts are accurate, well researched, and that our motives are honest" (page 13). Their work, as a matter of fact, is as grossly inaccurate as their motive compels and the brevity of the time it covered made inevitable had they decent motives. A minor example, having to do with the Zapruder film, over which they tax me, is on page 17, where they say the Secret Service numbered its frames. The very testimony they cite in the text eliminates this as a possibility. The FBI did it.

Knowing nothing about the introduction, the foreword or any other comment at the time, but having heard they were doing a book for Dell, and being with Carl Tobey and Steve Bair (I think after the World-Journal-Tribune piece appeared) I warned them of the probability of libel. John Starr was with me.

Reference to Dell reminds me that while the contract provides my book would get as good treatment as any other, they have withdrawn it but still have Scavengers on sale. I saw it 5/17/69 at the bookshop in Friendship Airport, Baltimore, where it but neither of the WHITEWASH books has been on sale for at least a year, probably much longer.

What follows will not exhaust all the error they print with the purpose of libelling me, but I hope it will be enough. This relates to both the Dell and the Meredith printings, for this is the chapter Meredith reprinted, using me to give it credence and making their own malice clear in the commentary prior to their use of the last chapter of WHITEWASH II, without permission. Meredith had to use such defamatory material to offer the pretense of impartiality. Neither they nor Dell made any effort to check accuracy with me, not even after I warned Tobey and Bair that what Schiller and Lewis had already used was libelous. In the Meredith case, their printing was so late that anyone making the slightest pretense of knowing the field, as their anthologist does, had to know of the gross inaccuracy of the writing.

I believe the damage continues and is particularly hurtful now (with more reference to Meredith than Dell and with reference to the Epstein-New York Times Sunday Magazine article) because I have three books ready and being offered.

A publisher reading (page 3), "Errors and distortions of fact abound in both Whitewash and its successor, Whitewash II." Similar, and similarly false, charges appear in the text.

Of course, I have no copy of their tapes, the original or the heavily edited and distorted version they use in the book. But the alterations and the malicious purposes are obvious. Sylvia Leagher would not talk to them. They open by changing what I said, in content and context, to convert it into an attack on her. This was in the latter part of 1986. Her book did not appear until late the next year, more than six months after publication of Scavengers. So, they edited what I said (she they had published only an index and I have not seen her book in manuscript-I never did), to make it come out, "My knowledge is more important than Sylvia Leagher's because she specialized in too many things that are trivial. I have a very good (law) suit," Weisberg observed, without naming the potential defendant, etc. Sylvia even misunderstood this to be a reference to her. They follow, however, with a reference to "he". Now that is not possible all that I said about this, yet there is no break in what is presented as a direct quotation. In fact, neither asterisks nor dots are used in what is presented as continuous speaking by men in any of the edited quotations.

Appropos of the slander about commercialism, they present (page 144, "Call, as are all citations) the truth about my not making any money but going into debt in a manner to make it appear I am a liar. They also falsely call me a liar for saying, truthfully, that my work had not receive reviews (same page). There had been a few slight references, but no single review of the book of which I am aware with the exception of one in the form of an apology, on the west coast and we were talking about the east, the New York Times, Washington Post, etc.

They also make no effort to be certain they correctly understood what they did not edit out to suit their own purposes. For example, on page 145, minor as it is, they have me saying geese eat "leaves", when they do not. They also have me telling them that "low-flying helicopters, according to Weisberg, eventually inhibited his flock of geese from reproducing." Perhaps not libel, but another example of their clear contempt for fact and disinterest in accuracy, especially when they claim to have all this on tape. My geese were not a factor in the lawsuit that, rather than "according to Weisberg", I won, in the federal district court in Baltimore, establishing a new principle of law about airspace.

It has just dawned on me that the only reason they would have conducted such long interviews with so many people they did not and could not have used in the short record was that they were using the record and the Capitol name as a cover to accomplish this malicious purpose. They could not have, could not even have attempted it, any other way.

On pages 145 and 146 they edit what I actually said to make it appear as substantiation of their charge of "scavenger", or commercialism, to make it appear falsely that I decided to go back to writing in time to write about the assassination, that it was the assassination that caused this. That is false. I had done this months before, in close contact with the Pentagon, had an agent, and had two books not at all related to the assassination lined up. That I did is later made clear because they quote me in a different context (page 160), at the end, as part of a ridicule. There they quote me as saying, "We had more or less commitment from a publisher on two different books..." They knew, yet they altered the meaning to make it libelous or to make it seem to substantiate their libel elsewhere.

Another, minor but significant because it is pervading, sign of their unconcern for accuracy is the page 148 insertion about my sending the

manuscript in takes. They say (to the printer). This is false and was a year and a half earlier. It was to a publisher out of town who broke his contract. Again, they had this on tape. I think they had a purpose, to disguise the fact that the book was commercially acceptable and written pursuant to a contract, part of their entire scheme with emphasis on private printing as indication of lack of worth.

Beginning on page 149 they are careful to use an edited version of the tapes instead of the very lengthy part of WHITENASH II referring to the destruction of the Rehrder film, for they could not use the unchangeable source and accomplish the intended defameation. Until I brought it to light the absence of the crucial frames of the film were an official secret. It is not referred to in the Warren Report, there was no testimony taken about it (although the lawyer handling this, Schiller's friend Wesley Liebeler, almost let the cat out of the bag-he knew it). There is, in short, no reference of any kind in any of the 37 official volumes. It is, as ~~shown~~ their misrepresentations, even Schiller and Lewis acknowledge, both fact and significant. This is the point at which, by the most remarkable coincidence, the Commission says the President could have been hit by Oswald for the first time. My belief, contrary to what they represent, is not that these frames show something. That I have no way of knowing. But it has been and is published that they do not show what they must, the presence of a photographer who, if the official story is correct, had to be in frame, on the other side of the street. Rehrder is in his picture. They accuse me of slander, yet it is the simple and irrefutable fact that the frames are missing and there is official silence, and they cannot show the other photographer, who disappeared in the marginal film, between the sprockets, several frames earlier. But if he is not in the frames in which the President is hit, and the first of those possible are missing, the entire report is false. Rather than my slandering the FBI and the Commission, they even misnumbered the frames to hide this. If you look on page 203 of WHITENASH you will see that an altered frame is called ~~212~~ "212". It is, actually, the top half of 208 and the bottom of 212. This was done by agent Shaneyfelt. I have not quoted their text because it would likely be too confusing. This part begins after footnote 9, "From his readings" being the first words of the first of the series of paragraphs. Much of their accounting of the film is erroneous, though not in itself libellous of me, though perhaps intended to buttress the libel. I will specify if you want, but it is technical, having to do with details. I note, however, that it is stretching credulity to believe that an unpunished technician in LIFE's darkroom would damage so valuable, in cash and in history, a property and not report it, and that the part of all that was damaged is only this crucial part which could destroy the entire fictitious account of the assassination, and does. LIFE made a down payment of \$25,000 for the film. They confirmed to me that by the end of 1967 they had paid about \$500,000. And the man who damaged this property did not report it? Did not get canned? And the FBI and the Commission hid it? How can they then gloss over the fact that despite the damage none of the film had to be discarded? It could have been repaired with plastic, without removing anything. Also bearing on this, after I exposed this and drew attention to it, LIFE issued the statement of accidental damage and announced they were releasing the copies. I go into this in the first chapter of PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITENASH, where I show they never did, refused copies to me, and the AP put an "over our dead bodies" restriction on the copies given them. They have never been published.

There is no doubt that the material between the sprocket holes, just as much part of the film as any other part, with preserved images on it like any other part, is missing, as Schiller and Lewis acknowledge (page 151). There is no doubt that this was kept out of the evidence and the files, no

doubt it no longer exists. If, extemporaneously, I said the FBI destroyed the film (which is not what I wrote), they did, to all practical purposes, hide the fact that it was missing from the members of the Commission. As I point out where I wrote about this, the FBI agent is the one who numbered the frames, and he numbered around the missing ones and misidentified 318, in full possession of the significance of what he was doing and of what was missing. There is no evidence that members of the Commission ever knew this. Schiller himself told me, in O'Connell's presence, that when they learned it, after I brought it to light, it shook them up. One of the members told him, I think he said Ford.

Their attack on me continues with the charge "there is no evidence of the sinister implications described by Weisberg." Now to their knowledge I explain in detail about the requirement that Willis, the other photographer, had to be in Zapruder's picture when the President was first shot because the President was between them both and Zapruder was in the center of Willis' picture, taken in nervous reaction to the shot, at the very moment of it. There is much space and detail in this in "HITCHHIKER II". They make no mention, not even to attack it in their own dishonest fashion, for they cannot. They just distort and defame instead. There is here the most sinister "implication", perhaps in the entire history of our government. But the suppression in itself has the most sinister implications". They make no reference to the suppression, either. Instead they go into digressions and diversions, with lies. "In the rush to make three copies of the Zapruder film in Dallas (none of which has anything to do with what happened later in Washington, when there was no possibility of alleging "rush" in an automatic operation), technicians did not realize that there was material between the sprocket holes." This is invention. He does not know what "technicians" did or did not "realize" (and the Dallas head of the Secret Service was there, having been sent because the TV and newspaper darkrooms would not touch the film) so he knew it had to be done by specialists). But the technicians who all day long every working day work with movie film like this know, very much know, as Schiller admits, that in copying this material which they also knew always exists, is automatically masked out in copies. To say they did not know or "realize" is to falsely say Eastman Kodak doesn't know the business.

They call me "guilty of irresponsibility" (page 151) for "surmising" that "the Warren Commission misrepresented FBI re-enactment of films taken (sic) at the assassination site to support the theory that there was only a single assassin." The "sic" is because this is not what I said. I did not criticize the FBI re-enactment of films but the FBI re-enactment and the films they took. These are not the same. They then go into a suppressed FBI report. The real significance of this report is distorted to create a further defamation of me and depreciation of my work, to falsely label it inaccurate. This report raises the question of how fast the camera was actually going and says it was going faster than the official conjecture. The word "conjecture" is no accident, for despite the tricky writing here to accomplish the malicious intent, that camera has two fixed speeds, suppressed by the FBI and the Commission and by the FBI from the Commission members in their "expert" testimony. Without analysis of the film itself, it therefore is not possible to know the speed at which it was actually going. But when the FBI agent reported, accurately or not (and I quote his exact words and reproduce his report in facsimile), that the camera was going faster than 18 frames per second, without this analysis it was not only impossible to state the actual speed, but failure to make the simple analysis is culpable. Actually, the camera can run at almost any speed between 18 and 48 frames per second, carefully hidden by Schiller and Lewis and it was by the government. Their writing here on the 30% difference in actual and re-enactment films is so distorting and dishonest I will not, unless you want the great length required, give you the detail. I think the answer to their defamation is

in their own disguised and misinterpreted and misrepresented acknowledgements. ~~THE~~ Let me explain. There was an almost immediate FBI and Secret Service reporting offset that made a single assassin an impossibility. I published these suppressed documents in WHITEPAPER II. There was a Secret Service re-enactment that also established there had to be a second assassin at the left. The head of the Commission, as I later learned, when I got access to the top secret Executive Sessions (I have them) kept delaying the members from going to Dallas until May of the year after the assassination. They were there for this FBI re-enactment, as I recall it, but I may here be in error. In any event, May 25 there was an FBI re-enactment that was filmed. The only time - and time is the crux, for it was not possible for one man to commit the crime in the time allowed by the Zapruder film at the speed they say - given the Commission is what I quote, and it was, exactly as I say and in the testimony I quote, 50 30% less time than the official accounting. The camera used is without significance. Only the time is. However, if the FBI tried the crime with another camera while they had and were using Zapruder's, the only one competent for use, is this not even more culpable? If they failed to use the only one in the world that could be exact and used one that yielded a 30% error, they knew they had to have used the right one and the only time they gave the Commission is the one I accurately quote.

Here there is further deception (page 152) The Bell and Howell "timing", as erroneous as the FBI's, for it is without analysis of the film, which Bell and Howell didn't even have, was made public pursuant to my work and the publicity on it, not for the Commission. It is described in the New York Times story on my work in December 1967, not the time of the Commission, which expired in 1964. The Report was issued in September 1964.

Intent to deceive is apparent. For example (page 152) they say, apropos of my quoting of the Barnett FBI report I dug up and used, "there was no setting on the camera for twenty-four frames per second". The setting is not the thing, the speed is. That is, despite their misrepresentation, variable. In saying there is no 24-frame setting they are making it appear there is but the one setting, but the one possible speed. They had to know better (although by the government and Bell and Howell suppressed it). The second "setting" is 48 frames per second. Nonetheless, they cannot avoid Shaneyfelt's only testimony about the filmed time of the reconstruction (page 143), "I found, in examining the film, that this is a shorter span of time than in the actual film. It is a span of the re-enactment of about three and a half seconds between X (frames) 222 and 315". In the actual film, he testified, it was "5 seconds". Here, may I note, their direct quotation is inaccurate. In quotes, above, they use these words not in the original: "X (frames)".

They make serious charges against my integrity based on several misrepresentations and distortions, aside from the misrepresentation of my complete accuracy, for there was a difference of 30% in the filmed motion-picture re-enactment and the actual assassination film. They alleged that I "just posed" these "two pieces of testimony, which are actually 14 pages apart in Volume V of the Commission hearings. Weisberg leads the reader to believe that ~~WHEN~~ Shaneyfelt was using the Zapruder camera when he testified about the difference in time span of time. Weisberg fails to tell his readers that Shaneyfelt is only comparing the film taken by different camera (at a different location) with the actual Zapruder film". Location is immaterial, for the time is the same from any point. But two pages of Shaneyfelt's testimony intervene between the two quotations I made, and there is no interruption in content or context. He began his testimony in the hearing room. He resumed it in the room in which the film was projected - carefully hidden by Schiller and Lewis, although quite explicit in the testimony and the record. The very first words of the resumed hearing are by Commission Assistant Counsel Specter, "May the record ~~show~~ now show

that the Commission has now reassembled on the first floor of the VFW Building where a motion picture projector and screen have been set up for the viewing of the films (SH175). What I quote is what follows next, on that page.

Now, about that other camera; where I am accused of deception in "feeling" to tell the readers of the other camera Shoenfelt allegedly used/ It is not in Shoenfelt's testimony, just ~~after~~ (the adjournment to the projection area (SH177). On the very next page, he is asked, right after he ~~projected~~ projected a copy of the Zapruder film, "Could you now show us the film which was taken at the reconstruction from the Zapruder position?" The record then notes "(Film). Commissioner ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ McClay then asked, This is 16mm?" Shoenfelt responded, "No; 8 mm." Commissioner Ford asked, "Is this from his camera?" I have left nothing out of this dialogue and do not here. Shoenfelt's response was, "Yes; taken ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ with his camera. Frame 221, frame 226, his is frame 221." and so it goes, with even discussion of the explosion of the President's head re-enactment frame. On page 169 he had testified, when asked what he took and what he used, to a Speedgraphia and Zapruder's camera only in response to "That motion pictures, if any, were taken during the reenactment". He there responded without mention of any other camera. Here, in the second paragraph of this response, he said, "After establishing all these points and making these film records of it, we ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ then had the car proceed along that Elm Street route at approximately 11 miles per hour, and filmed it with Mr. Zapruder's camera loaded with color film from Mr. Zapruder's position and simultaneously photographed it with Mr. Mix's camera from his. Mix's position and Mrs. Muchmore's camera from Mrs. Muchmore's position, and this was done twice." On the same page he also testified that "after positioning the car in the street at the specific locations and making the movies with the Zapruder, Mix and Muchmore cameras with the car running at 11 miles an hour on the route, I then went to the sixth-floor window and mounted the camera on the rifle and photographs were made with black and white motion picture film of the car in fixed positions (emphasis added-JW) from frame 161 through frame 315..."

So, regardless of his use of a 16 mm camera, of which Schiller and Lewis have detail not in the evidence (presumably his FBI connections yielded this; they will not even send me a press release), Shoenfelt's testimony, on exactly the page they cite, says precisely what I attribute to it. They are the ones who deceive by omission and use this deception as the basis for malicious hurt of me. It is specific, as I said, that Shoenfelt testified to taking re-enactment pictures, in motion, with the Zapruder camera. This, in any event, is the only meaningful, the only admissible reconstruction. If you require it, I can provide photocopies of the written testimony. There was no deception by me. If there is any, it is by the FBI and especially by Schiller and Lewis.

Further, they quote testimony they attribute to my use by saying, after quoting them, that "By juxtaposing these two pieces of testimony" and so forth. Casual examination of my book (page 190) shows that they do not use the testimony I cite. I use, verbatim, and precisely that quoted above, precisely ~~what~~ they omit while pretending I had misused testimony. This is willful, deliberate misrepresentation and seriously damaging, by intent, I believe. They make this more explicit by their next writing (page 155), saying "By placing two different pieces of testimony adjacent to each other, without informing the reader of their true meaning, Weisberg fabricates his case." In every sense this is false. Each of my excerpts of testimony, in this as in every other case, ends with precise citation of the page and volume. This particular chapter is largely direct quotation of Shoenfelt, verbatim and in context. It is, in fact, mostly direct quotation, so identified, some of the excerpts being more than a thousand uninterrupted words long. This is not "different" testimony, not in any sense, not in subject, not in time. I did not misplace them. They are on the same subject. I did not misrepresent "their true meaning", quite the contrary. Here I note that at no point do Schiller and Lewis deny there is this 30% error in time I brought to light, hidden in the Warren Report, for it is suppressed from it.

I do not "fabricate" my case; they do, and they fabricate to defend me. The error is sufficient, in itself, without all the above-cited evidence of malice and dishonest intent, to establish my point and this they concede.

This is particularly damaging, to falsely accuse me of "fabricating" the case, for it is what will discourage every publisher to whom I submit a book, discourage sales (for there was very extensive promotion behind them and their book). I note also that when challenged, the government was silent on precisely this point. It is without complaint.

They next describe my writing as "misleading" (page 155)

Next they go into my use of the Altgens picture, only severely-edited version of which were used in evidence. It is I who, after a long effort, got and printed the original, for which they later took a edit for themselves, in this book (center, "This image (emphasis in original) photograph is published for the first time"). They and will know better, for it is for the first time in WITCHAMER II. They acknowledge I had it (page 156), and both know I used it. Otherwise, they'd not have known of it, for the owner insisted for more than a year that it didn't exist any longer. If I go into all of it, there will be no end. The burden of their attack is that I misrepresent by deliberately omitting a dividing stripe visible in the picture. It is not visible in the picture. It does, however, exist, if not visible in the picture. I will return to this. Then they allege further misrepresentations by me about what the unedited part of the picture shows. My basic point, which they suppress, is that no editing is acceptable as evidence, on the unedited original (the words I use) and that the editing also served to eliminate information and potential information. There is no doubt of this. In the course of this deliberate and erroneous attack on me they get so worked up (page 157) they deny themselves, for having falsely taken credit for themselves for getting and printing the suppressed original evidence, they have alleged, "The complete version of the Altgens photograph has been printed in newspapers and periodicals". Their next sentence makes clear their function, official or unofficial, as defenders of the government and the Commission, "The Warren Commission cropped the picture not to censor vital information but merely because the balance of it contained nothing of significance". (!) They then go into the road stripe (page 157, bottom and say of Mark, "Weisberg draws the line incorrectly on what he represents to be Commission Exhibit 354, neglecting to place the accurate line on the surveyors chart in his book." That is immaterial, for there are three contradictory but allegedly identical such charts, not one of which is either complete or accurate, as my book proves (without evil from them). It was ex post facto, and is particularly contradictory in even the number of such stripes, as I also established (again to their silence). It is not the "represented" exhibit but the exact one that I used, and their contrary inference is designed as slander. It is an exact photograph, from the government itself. I discuss it at length in the text, pointing out that it was altered to eliminate these same road stripes. The re-enactment is not that, it is both irrelevant and incompetent, in no sense a duplication, not taken from the same position or even with the same camera and lens, both available. It is clearly and I describe it as incompetent. The original photo was the best thing to use, obviously, despite their snide, defamatory comment. And, I did not place this line incorrectly". It is described at great length in the entire latter part of WITCHAMER II beginning on page 158, with lengthy explanations of each step, with exact quotations of the relevant testimony. What I did was to reproduce what Commission lawyer Liebelor did, and in doing it, at each step I specify and quote. I point out for example, that he departed from accepted if not required legal practice and instead of having the witness locate himself on a chart or map or picture does it himself, making the mark larger than an automobile, which, as I point out, makes reconstruction difficult and denies it maximum accuracy. I get to the end beginning on page 213. "Repeatedly in handling this I begin with "I", for Liebelor's entire handling requires this. Several times I go further

and begin with "If this is true". (pages 218-9) Inadvertently, this qualification was left out of the caption on one of the pictures in the appendix. I discovered this after Dell contacted to reprint the book and before Schiller's was written, certainly well before Dell published it. I wrote Dell and gave them the correction. I want to get this in the mail so I don't take the time to dig it out of that large file. My recollection is that the words I added there are "If Wesley Liebeler is right", etc. It was Liebeler who handled all of this, all the photographic evidence. There is a point in my emphasizing Liebeler, aside from the stark fact of his responsibility: he is a friend of Schiller and they have worked together. I can produce witnesses to this, I have some of their joint work as published where both live, and I can produce a tape recording (ultimately the witness, a respect radio news-director where they live) setting this forth, as told him by Schiller, complete with the details of what Schiller knew Liebeler had apparently stolen from the Commission's files and a description of it. So, I think this gives Schiller additional motive for his malice and malevolence.

I don't want to leave much out, but this is getting long. They next go into another alleged misstatement by me which is not wrong. They write the different sections with this language, false and, I think designedly defamatory, "Time after time in both books Weisberg trips himself up in errors of fact, assumption, judgement and truth". They quote me as saying of the testimony of three Negroes who allegedly were on the fifth floor and is intrinsically without credibility, "Not worthy of much credence" and as "Some of it falls apart". I think enough evidence of this is the fact that they didn't even know where they were (and this is the best possible representation) the moment of the assassination, and they were looking at it. They swore they were in different windows at that end of the floor. The government took posed pictures of them in this pose and published them widely. However, it had a contemporaneous picture it suppressed. I dug it up and publish it in PSYCHOLOGICAL JOURNALISM, rather than being where they swore they were, these men were at a simple window and the camera captures them there.

In another example of mistaken information, Weisberg implies that the Commission limited its investigation to material supplied by the Secret Service and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Actually, the Commission, through painstaking effort, enlisted the services of 25 government agencies, including, (and here they cite some-IV). They wind up citing foreign government. They fail to quote or cite any source for this deliberate misrepresentation of what I said and what is true, that the Commission had no independent investigators of its own, depending instead on those already parti pris, chiefly the FBI, less the Secret Service. It is fact that the FBI was in charge of the investigation. In fact, what the Commission got from other agencies and non-federal agencies, like the cited Dallas police, it got through the FBI. What I said is precisely correct. It was the Commission's intent, it's deliberate way. It, in fact, brags about the some 15,000 reports made to it by the FBI and 1,500 by the Secret Service. I quote directly in my writing.

Next they take a case where I tried to help a friend and distort it (page 180): "At the same time he is becoming knowledgeable in the ways of stimulating book sales. 'I'm trying to get Penn Jones in touch with my agent in England,' he says, to place his book in competition with mine in Italy." Whether these are my exact words or not, it is a fact, as my agent, Gordon Harbord, will certify. I did try and help Penn, and when I knew that in England the threatened appearance of a competitive book was enough to kill a contract for mine then being written (I have the letters from the publisher, Leslie Frawin), and when it was touch and go in Italy, this was anything but the slanderous suggestion they make. In fact, I wound up not getting my second book published there at all and losing the promised advance. There was nothing ulterior at all, and their own tapes reveal the feeling I then had for Penn. But this is consistent with the miserable thing they did to him, which I'll tell you if you want to know.

So, I think there is virtually nothing in their writing that is accurate, nothing that is not of malicious and defamatory intent, and I have covered most if not all the major points.