

## **CHAPTER 32**

### **The Case of the Faking of the Assassination Film**

Livingstone's very first words as he lays his case for the film-faking out have a nice touch in them, "The fact that Charles Leslie Bronson had taken a film of the assassination came to light for the House Assassinations Committee in the closing days of their investigation on December 2, 1978." (page 300) His source note here reads , "A one-paragraph discussion of the Bronson film can be found in 6 HSCA 120-1. Also see pp. 308-9." His reference to pages 308-9 are not what they ordinarily would be taken to refer to, those pages of his book. They are to be the committee's volume. The 13 lines the committee devoted to the Bronson film say nothing at all about what it shows or its history.

I added emphasis to the "a" because Bronson took two kinds of pictures, motion pictures and still pictures. I emphasized the "Leslie" as a nice touch because the man's middle name does not appear in the FBI's records or in the committee's volume. So, Livingstone has time for added detail, a nice touch indicating how deeply he probed to have what does not exist in the official evidence while all else in this opening sentence of his delineation of what is to be his proving that the film was all faked is not factual.

This is a polite way of saying that he is all screwed up.

I do intend to convey the idea that this is his normal state, in life and in his writing.

He has a special problem when it comes to being honest about those he regards and says are accessories after the fact in the JFK assassination. Here it is me and later Gary Mack.

He knows very well that Bronson and his film did not "first come to light" in that December 1978 House hearing and he proves it in this very chapter, nor was it "for" that committee. What he also

knew and could avoid telling is that Bronson and his films “first came to light” when I obtained records he cites in my FOIA lawsuit for the Dallas FBI office assassination records, C.A. 78-0322. I keep these and similar and related records in a special file of duplicates I show all who come to use my files so they can get a better understanding of how the investigations were conducted and the nature of those investigations. Livingstone and his moonlighting cop assistant were no exceptions. I showed them that file their first time here. It is only a yard from our copier and they had free and unsupervised access to that copier, too. And they used it.

But strangely, they did not make a copy of those records even after I put them in their hands and explained their importance. Then Harry developed a sudden special need for it and pestered me until I copied these pages and mailed them to him. Through his cop/thief.

Why through him? Because by then Harry’s great investigatory talents had me heading a conspiracy against him and as an accessory in the JFK assassination and was he ever laying that out in letters! So, naturally, he could not have any direct contact with me. And no less naturally he does not soil his sources by giving his source.

The man is that pure.

Pure but he has a hangup about people like me. He quite explicitly said that H.L. Hunt was one of the vast, Texas-wide conspiracy to kill the President and me as giving “help” to Hunt the nature of which not atypically he does not state or identify. I am in what he has made explicit in his letters and his publisher made less explicit in the book, an assassination accessory. Then, again as specific as it can be in his letters but toned down in the book, he has me the “leader” of the “gang” he alleged conspired to keep him from “breaking the case open in a couple if weeks.”

So, knowing that like the foregoing it is repetitiously false, he says that nothing at all about how

Bronson and his film “came to light” before December 2, 1978.

This reflects the true, the authentic Livingstone genius.

It is a genius in a class of its own in a field in which the competition for primacy is rather stiff, too.

This self-exalting scholar’s next sentence is “The existence of the film was revealed when the FBI record was declassified.” Then, having kept his record for inaccuracy at a perfect 100 percent Livingstone finishes that sentence and the rest of the paragraph with another of his endless attacks on his former collaborator, Robert Groden.

That record, and there were two, not one, was never classified. Its existence became known despite the fact that the FBI headquarters “declassifiers” and all others there did not even know existed.

It is of no significance to the expert of experts on the JFK assassination, as he so modestly regards himself and makes that clear, that there existed film of the assassination of which its Dallas field office did not even inform headquarters.

It required no great diligence for Livingstone to confuse himself but here he also confuses the innocent reader, also not a rare Livingstone accomplishment. His second perfect achievement in inaccuracy was followed by a digression to attack Groden for allegedly - and with no citation “allegedly” is the least that can be said of anything that Livingstone says - because “he claimed that some of the frames of the film ... showed movement in the sixth-floor assassin’s window...”

Because Livingstone has yet to say that Bronson had two different kinds of cameras and took two different kinds of pictures, it does not hurt - not that anything short of burial can help Livingstone’s account of this particular one of his accounts of film fakery - to understand that it is not the still pictures he took with his Leica later but his 8mm amateur movies that are referred to.

Before getting to Livingstone's own confusion in his confused account of what he does not understand and did not even try to understand, between these two is a prime example of the true wisdom and the perceptiveness of his personal opinions that appear throughout these unended pages of them.

Movement in itself means nothing, of course, he says. Of the at least six minutes before the shots were allegedly fired from the alleged snipers nest when it took FBI expert six minutes to reassemble the rifle that in the official account had to have been disassembled for it to have been snuck into the building that morning?

Nothing?

Why does it mean nothing? "since there were plenty of employees in the building who could perhaps be seen (but not identified) from a block away, where Bronson was standing."

Movement in that window means nothing when that rifle had to be reassembled there?

Movement thus might indicate it did not happen.

As the lack of movement indicates it did not happen.

And that nothing else was happening there - that nobody was there.

At the very instant the motorcade was due to be there. It was running late, behind schedule, as no assassin could figure on.

The official evidence for which he has no regard at all, even if by chance he does have copies of it, is without question, no single employee could be placed at that point anywhere near that time. In addition to which people can be identified in movies taken from that distance when the film is enlarged on projection. This is even more true of Bronson's movies. His camera had a telephoto lens.

Livingstone's rare understanding and unequalled knowledge of the established fact is

immediately established in his “sniper’s lair” wisdom that follows: “I submit that this hiding place might just as well have been there a long time for malingering employees to hide in, a common situation in such a warehouse.”

Perhaps it is in his long personal experience in “such a warehouse” that gives him this insight into malingering, but I have difficulty believing that malingerers would consider themselves hidden in front of a high window the bottom of is less than two from the floor and by boxes only half their height only part of the way behind them and none higher than the sill in front of them.

Livingstone here reveals his truly awesome command of the known fact, of what is entirely unquestionable: there had been no “hiding” place. Those cartons had just been moved from the other side of that same sixth floor so that the new floor being laid could be laid where those boxes had come from.

History is better for his not explaining why employees would pick their lunch hour for malingering or could mangle where a floor was being laid. He does not enrich history on these points.

But he did take a swipe at Groden and it is but a prelude to his swipe at him and at Gary Mack, another of Livingstone’s conspirators in what he wrote was my imagined “gang” when he gave the imagined leadership to me after taking it away from Grandmother Mary Ferrell.

“Gary Mack and Robert Groden claimed from 1978 that the film shows the assassination itself.”

To this point Livingstone has not yet informed his readers of what he knew, that Bronson also used his 35mm Leica. This is because he has already, on this very first page (313) gotten himself mixed up when there are only two cameras to keep straight. His very next sentence represents that he is talking about the movies when to my knowledge Gary Mack is not. However, Earl Golz and The Dallas

Morning News studied the film and, after examining ninety-two frames, “found nothing that could be printed in their story showing any part of the shooting.” His source note here is to that paper’s November 26, 1978 issue “and the author’s discussion with Earl Golz (October 10, 1978).”

If he ever intended telling the truth there is little doubt Livingstone would have been no less lost in the confusions of his own creation, they being his sole claim to fame. With almost 800 pages but also with the conviction that Mack was a conspirator against him, Livingstone omits him as he omitted me from the actual obtaining and “discover” of these Bronson records.

With a copy of these two Bronson Dallas FBI records disclosed to me in that lawsuit, Mack and Golz looked Bronson up. He than had moved from Dallas and lived in Ada, Oklahoma. First they assured him of the protection of his right to the film and they did get it copyrighted for him as soon as that was possible. Then, still at Ada, Mack and Golz, not “Earl Golz and the Dallas Morning News,” studied the entire movie film. It was not only the ninety-two frames Livingstone refers to. They found that 87 of those frames had some importance. They showed that “sniper’s nest” window.

To understand this, and after reading Livingstone on anything at all to understand that is inevitably more difficult, if he allows the possibility to remain, it is necessary to know what those FBI reports stated. He does not get around to even his slight quotation of the one he knows about for another five pages — although I gave him both.

The first, identified in the Dallas FBI records as 89-43-518, is a memo to the special agent in charge by FBI agent Milton L. Newsom: “Mr. Walter Bent, Sales Manager, Eastman Kodak customer service division,” phoned to inform the FBI that they “had received two rolls of 8 millimeter Kodachrome and one roll of 35 millimeter film” from Charles Bronson with “a letter...stating that the film had been taken at the instant President KENNEDY was assassinated.” And that “he feels quite

certain that the Texas School Book Depository building was clearly photographed and he feels that the window from which the shots were fired will be depicted.”

Bent had Bronson’s assurances that the FBI would be welcome to the film. Bent also said he would arrange to have Bronson there when the FBI looked at the film. Bent set the time for 3 p.m., when he was certain the film would have been processed.

Newsom took another agent, Emory E. Horton, with him to Eastman Kodak. It is not only Livingstone who is responsible for what can be confusing for those who do not understand how the FBI files. The serial number of the report on their later examination of the film is 493, that of their earlier memo, 518. That is because the file clerks apply serial numbers as they mark them for filing, not chronologically.

Newsom’s report that he was going to review the film is longer than the one in which he reported what he saw. The first report extends onto a second page. The second is of only four paragraphs and of them only this one refers to what the agents saw, other than a passing reference to another photographer later dubbed “the Babushka lady” by some of those interested in the assassination:

Films taken by Mr. BRONSON at the time of the President’s assassination including 35 mm. color slides which were taken with a Leica Camera, and 8 mm. Kodachrome film were reviewed. These films failed to show the building from which the shots were fired. Film did depict the President’s car at the precise time shots were fired; however, the pictures were not sufficiently clear for identification purposes.

We are still on Livingstone’s first page on the Bronson film and we do not depart it immediately. We return now to Livingstone’s quoting Golz as saying, if not within quotation marks, that they “found nothing that could be printed in their story that showed any part of the actual shooting.”

Now Livingstone claims to have this report, for he soon cites it as his own work although he got

it from me.

So, surprise! The FBI itself says that “Film,” referring, clearly, to the 35mm, “did depict the President’s car at the precise time the shots were fired.” And that certainly would indicate that it is not true, as Livingstone says, that the paper, “found nothing that could be printed in their story that showed any part of the actual shooting.”

Another similar surprise lurks ahead, dear reader, so caution!

Do not be misled by Livingstone’s next paragraph’s attempt at putdown that is a new kind of putdown, the boomerang variety, “Nevertheless, claims continue to be made that the films show the assassination.”

Perhaps for a scholar/investigator like Livingstone the FBI is not a good enough authority and that is why, with full knowledge of the FBI’s Bronson report and film, he threw his boomerang aimed at Mack and Groden rather than the subject matter of the report.

Newsom cared so little about pictures showing the President actually being killed he declined even free copies! This is how to survive in the Hoover FBI. So he did not identify which film he had in mind in referring to them. To anyone other than this most outstanding authority of even the minutiae of assassination what he writes about it clear. When Newsom refers to “films” that he said “fail to show the building from which the shots were fired” he refers to the movie film. When he writes “film” in the singular that “did depict” the “precise time shots were fired” and killed the President, he is referring to the still-picture film, in individual films.

Newsom’s reason for finding that despite this he refused to take even free copies does require some translation from survival FBI language into plain English. When he says those 35mm stills “were not sufficiently clear for identification purposes” he is really saying they do not show Oswald with a



smoking gun. This soon will be without question.

What Golz and Mack observed as soon as they looked at Bronson's movies on their trip to Ada is that not only is that building shown but the very window is clearly visible in 87 consecutive frames of it.

Livingstone aside, this is to say that Newsom and Horton knew very well what the FBI wanted and more what it did not want. Their street-agent judgement was confirmed when the man in charge did not put these reports on the delivery line to xeroxes of what would be sent FBI headquarters.

At the bottom of this page Livingstone finds it necessary to make another crack at Mack in saying that in November 1991 showed "versions of the (Bronson) film on KXAS TV." There is only one version of the real Bronson film, the original, and the copy Mack has and showed me is made up from it. But in this sentence, after "Mack" Livingstone has "(a.k.a. Larry Darkel.)"

And he could not even get that straight. Mack's name was not "Darkel." As in common with many in the movie and electronic fields he took a name, as so many have done, that appeared to be better suited to his career in radio before going into TV.

There is so much of this most exemplary of scholarship that with reluctance we skip a bit of it and of his other indulgences, those that have nothing to do with the alleged faking of the film as he plods through that.

He quotes Golz as saying in the November 26 issue "that 'FBI Agent Newsom viewed the movie with Bronson as soon as it was processed...' Bronson was quoted as saying, 'He (Newsom) told me the film was of no value because it didn't show the book building.....'" Then Livingstone uses his own words, his own depiction of his own understanding of the realities of the assassination investigation, the field in which he presents himself as Number One.: "Did the FBI lie? I don't think so.

Why would they lie about this?"

Aside from this perfect reflection of Livingstone's judgement, that the FBI had nothing to lie about, with all those records he claims to have the very best knowledge of and thus is Number One, there is what he quoted above., Newsom doing precisely that in his report. Not only did I tell him that, he quotes Newsom's report himself on page 318. His source on page 597 is, not being otherwise attributed, claimed as his own work, "FBI Memorandum, Milton L. Newsom, 11/25/63."

Livingstone's unique subject matter knowledge does not extend to how the FBI records and cites its records — always by their file and serial number. There is no way of knowing how many memos one agent can write on any one day. Citing the day only can send people searching through dozens of records. The serial number, however, applies to only one record.

Golz spoke to Newsom prior to writing the story for that November 26, 1978 issue (page 314). He said that when he told Newsom that the windows do show, Newsom replied, "whether or not we actually saw what you are talking about of course [we] have no way of knowing that. Whatever was reported there in the memo is what we saw."

Again Livingstone's rare scholarship and knowledge takes over: "But what was the point? Was it to create composite film with portions of some other film? Did they ("they" undescribed but apparently not referring to the FBI) create another hoax? Surely we have enough fraudulent evidence perpetrated upon us over the years."

To say nothing about what is perpetrated on readers, and readers even have to pay for it!

Perhaps Livingstone can be excused because he has four pages to go before he himself quotes Newsom's words.

But Livingstone cannot miss all those hoaxes, can he? Or reasons for them. He gets either into

another hoax or a switch immediately, based on his sublime faith in the conscience and rectitude of each and every FBI agent who ever lived.

Based on Newsom's claim that the building does not show in the Bronson movie Livingstone says, "It would certainly appear that the films were switched, or tampered with. What does this do for Bronson's reliability as a witness" (page 315)?

Is the question really of Bronson's reliability?

To now this maven of assassination mavens has told us that the FBI does not lie because it has no reason to lie, that the Bronson film was switched, suggests that it is a hoax if not a composite, of what he does not say, an addition to the "fraudulent evidence perpetrated on us over the years."

With no reason given for describing that movie as a hoax or anything other than what it is, what Bronson's movie camera captured shortly before the assassination shooting.

All of this based exclusively on his certainty that the FBI doesn't lie, a belief easier to hold, if such genius requires any reason for anything at all, with the profundity of his ignorance of the FBI's record and records in this matter.

Livingstone demonstrates the incisiveness with which he examined records when, as rarely he did, in what he takes from the Newsom memo, that the FBI does not lie. But there is something else that can be attributed to Livingstone's rare talents in examining and understanding records, particularly those of the FBI. It is in the short Newsom sentence he quotes from what Golz wrote, what Newsom told Golz, "Whatever we saw is in the memo."

To the ordinary inquisitive mind, a mind not looking for hoaxes where there are none, a mind that asks itself what words mean and say, a mind that does not dismiss all in the firm belief that the FBI never lies and has no reason ever to lie, what Newsom told Golz might be taken as literal truth. Not

assuming this is safe with the FBI in this case. But as a means of thinking it through, it can be literally true that Newsom and Horton did not see the TSBD as they looked at the film. If for example they have been diverted for a few seconds they would not have seen it although it is without any reasonable question there. With 18 frames of those 87 projected each second, only a few seconds are taken by all the TSDB sequence in the Bronson film. They could have missed it.

And then, to the normal inquiring mind, there does remain the possibility that the agents did lie. But as Livingstone gives no reason for any faking of the film of any kind, does not address even the possibility of it, he also does not wonder if the FBI could have had a reason for lying if the agents did see that sequence.

Was it possible for Bronson's film to have been switched or altered in any way? If so, by whom, when and for what reason?

The record is clear. The original film left Eastman Kodak in Bronson's possession. The original is readily distinguished from any copy because the original alone has the exposed film between the sprocket holes by which it is advanced. When copied all that film picked up in that 20 percent or so of it is eliminated. And without any question at all the original remained in Bronson's possession until Golz and Mack looked him up after they got the memos the Dallas FBI disclosed to me in my lawsuit for those Dallas records. Nobody knew about it or saw it for 15 years. Not even FBIHQ knew about it.

What is there in the film that Livingstone says was not in the original, and why would anyone want to eliminate from or add to it? For a Sherlock Holmesian genius like Livingstone's these questions are not worthy of asking or answering, fact being irrelevant when there is the alternative of baseless theorizing and categorical statements that can be made with neither reason nor support.

Bronson's movie film shows the supposed sniper's nest a few minutes before the assassination

with nobody in it. Why would anyone want to add that to his film if it is not already there? Such an addition serves no purpose because the same thing exists in the movies taken by Charles Hughes, as I reported in *Photographic Whitewash* and the FBI said in its fabled five-volume report on the assassination. I even published the frame from the Hughes movie the FBI used in its report. It is in that book on page 279.

As Sherlock Livingstone knows.

So, there is no need to fake any film to show that window was empty before the shooting.

But if there were this imagined need, where would the phony footage come from? Did anyone else take movies from where Bronson did that day so that there would be footage to “switch” or to add to the Bronson film?

No.

So that was not possible.

But, I suppose, rare genius may believe it is entitled not to encumber itself with reason and fact. Just as the FBI did not want to encumber itself with pictures it might have to explain away, with pictures of anything other than of Oswald with a smoking gun.

If it is wondered why Bronson, who alone had access to his film for those 15 years, had any reason at all to do anything at all to it, these earthly considerations do not intrude upon the true genius as it travels weightless in the stratosphere of the mind, in that rarified atmosphere of no gravity high above such mundane distractions.

But if this genius deigned to suffer such a distraction he can always sneer it contemptuously aside with the intellectually overwhelming proof so indispensable in his book in which he proves so much by it, “some say.” Besides, anonymity is sometimes a blessing. “Some” can count their blessings.

While it is true that “Some” does not appear in his index, that undermines nothing at all because most of his book is not in his index.

So, Bronson did whatever was done to his film — with no “some say” telling us what it was that he did — whether or not he had any motive for doing anything at all to it and whether or not he had that capability, which is not an everyday handyman skill.

It was not possible for anyone else to do anything to Bronson’s film for the 15 years it languished unknown and unwanted, lost in Bronson’s collection of reels of his movie footage.

Is it any wonder that Livingstone’s claue loves him as it does? Or why his *High Trash 3* was a best seller?

Or why his cop/thief he refers to in his *High Trash 2* as his “chief investigator” enjoyed and undisturbed and profitable career as a thief whose thievery extended to Livingstone’s own materials? As Livingstone himself told me.

It must be acknowledged how sad it is that this rare genius is so little appreciated except, of course, by publishers and that claue of refugees from rationality for whose assistance he has expressed gratitude when not also boasting of their spying for him. His book reflects his indebtedness to them. But those of us who are fact junkies not being worth the time or attention of any real, live Sherlock Holmesian mind. What was worth the time and attention, the genius of that mind of exceptional penetrating power, of such incisiveness it requires 800 pages for a book?

Must we not be patient with true genius?

Livingstone next says that the Dallas paper printed one of Bronson’s stills. (Actually, it printed more than a page of them.) And, then, having planted the notion that the film-faking business was working overtime and cast aspersions at Bronson, he gets into his own re-enactment. He does not refer

to having just seen a rerun of an old Keystone Kops movie. But then maybe for him that is not necessary for him to be properly inspired.

Clearly, in his own mind of minds, he is proving flamery by proving that what Bronson said he did is not possible:

I stood on the pedestal where Bronson stood taking his still pictures. It is a short block up Houston Street from the Texas School Book Depository and Elm Street, and it was clear to me that by the time the car emerged from the trees on Elm, which blocked the view from where Bronson stood, he would have had little time to switch cameras and get his movie camera aimed and started if there was a chance of capturing the remaining sequence. Also, it's doubtful that his lens would have captured Jackie on the trunk, due to the trees.

The kindest thing that can be said about this is that as usual trying to hide it and giving his paranoia more than its usual lack of control Livingstone is once again in his natural state of self-befuddlement and is writing about what he knows nothing at all about. It is not that he here got lost in his own convoluted imaginings that as usual were immediately real to him about that Newsom memo. Yet, if he had that Dallas *Morning News* of November 26 he would have known more than enough, unless he examined it only for conspiracies and film fakery that does not exist so he could, as with Bronson, allege that there had been film fakery.

He begins by saying that Bronson said he took his stills and his movies from the same place. He did not. Nor were they at the same time. He took the movies first, close to Houston Street, and then he moved west, into the plaza, and took his stills from there. It was no trick at all for Bronson to switch from his movie camera to his Leica while moving that distance.

If Livingstone did more of his investigating in reality rather than in the hopes of his mind, which then makes those hopes the reality for him, he would at very least have taken a peek at the Morning News for Sunday, November 26, 1978. If he had he would have known that it devoted almost the

entire front page to the Bronson films and two complete inside pages.

It selected one frame of the 8 mm movies to use on its front page and that frame is clear enough to have been enlarged from its actual five-sixteenths of an inch in width to almost nine inches in the paper! It shows that special window, the paper's purpose in using it on the front page, and many people who can easily be identified.

It devotes an entire inside page to nine other frames showing that window. The frame widths are narrowed because all is not necessary and the heights are magnified to almost six inches. This enormous enlargement was of sufficient quality to be judged useable by the editors.

When Bronson took his movie he clearly was filming almost directly north while standing near Houston Street.

The paper used but one his stills. That was clearly taken quite some distance to the west because he is farther west than the pergolas and concrete structures on the north side of the Plaza. He is so far to the west in the plaza that the TSBD does not show in it. Filming almost directly north with his Leica, the still picture the paper used has the entire Presidential limousine in it and more that is to the east of it even if cropped by the paper.

All accounts of this film are true save one, Livingstone's.

Yet he wrote all of this, all those accusations, aspersions and other defamations without having seen either the film or the newspaper he cites so often. If he had, stupid as he is with astounding regularity in his writing, I doubt he could have been stupid enough for this writing.

Yet he next, on the same page, quotes "Martin Shackelford's comments on what he wrote about the alleged impossibility of what Bronson did, indicating fakery. Often as he quotes him throughout the book as the oracle of oracles, Shackelford is not mentioned once in his index.



What special credentials Shackelford has, other than Livingstone's affection, - and he may well have many - Livingstone does not indicate. That he is to Livingstone the most authoritative of experts is clear from his special qualifications revealed in what is quoted from his memorandum to Livingstone of December 10, 1992, months after Livingstone perceived his assorted and interrelated conspiracies, against the President and against him, Livingstone. Shackelford cannot have seen either of Bronson's films or that newspaper special issue and wrote what he did.

Martin Shackelford comments on the above: "The position from which the Bronson film was taken is consistent with the position from which the Bronson slide was taken; the fact that the view of Jackie on the trunk would have been obscured by trees may simply be further indication that Bronson's memory on the contents isn't that sharp, or that he has difficulty distinguishing between what HE saw and what THE CAMERA saw."<sup>12</sup> The problem with this is that it would be very difficult to put aside one camera and select a lens, focus, and start a movie camera so quickly.

It did happen. There is no possible question of that unless Eastman Kodak is one of the unindicted co-conspirators. That it happened is all the proof necessary for Livingstone to establish that it did not happen. And thus is it proven that the film was faked.

John Sigalos is Bronson's lawyer. He would not answer Livingstone's questions and that makes him a suspect. With Gary Mack, his refusal to try to influence Sigalos to get Bronson to show his film to Livingstone made him a conspirator. If it is considered they did not have what they regarded as an adequate basis for refusing to have anything at all to do with Livingstone, be patient.

What from the depths of his factual ignorance Livingstone intends as a slur on Sigalos, getting

even with him, is, "I'd like to point out that since January 1992, FBI agents have been attempting to look at the film but Sigalos...refuses to allow it."

It is not only with whoppers like this that there is no source, but this is one of his biggest whoppers. Even for this eminent practitioner of them it is large and robust.

It was before 1992, it was with the end of the House committee's life in 1979 that the committee asked the FBI to make a study of that film and perhaps some enhancements. If Livingstone did not check my file on that, that merely proves against he is such a genius he is above mere fact.

Sigalos's reply to the FBI was prompt. He would give them a first generation print of the original film and if he were with the film at all times it could also use the original, but not without his presence.

For the cat whose shrieks that all the film is faked to question the wisdom of not letting the original out of sight is a strange position. If one expects consistency.

The FBI refused to accept a first-generation copy and it refused to allow Sigalos to be present when it did whatever it wanted with the original and these are the only reasons it has done nothing with the film. It is anything but that Sigalos "refused to allow" it to have the film at all. It is the exact opposite.

Thus Livingstone concludes "The whole thing seemed to be a publicity gimmick."

Having, he thinks, dumped on Sigalos and Bronson, Livingstone resumes.

With one exception the rest of this section is still more baseless conjectures and suspicions and the artificial, from ignorance, creations of suspicions when there is no basis for them. This is to say for Livingstone, par. The one exception, also par in its area, is when Livingstone writes that "the FBI agent" who looked at the film is "agent Walter Bent." (page 315).

Bent, as we have seen and as Livingstone would know if actualities were not so foreign to his

interest, his thinking and writing, was the Eastman Kodak customer-service manager who phoned the FBI to offer it the Bronson films. He was not an FBI agent.

Apparently short memories and great minds go together in the making of geniuses because Livingstone does have the Newsom memos and Newsom did report that he and the FBI did not want Bronson's films when they could have had them on November 24, 1963. So, even if what Livingstone says about Sigalos were true, as with Livingstonian consistency it is not, it still would be unfair because the FBI declined those films after examining them.

Most of what there is under "Some Additional Comments" (page 316-9) is not worth any time at all. It is tiresomely more of the same, these kinds of mistakes hardly acceptable from the young.

Livingstone quotes Earl Golz, to weave his conspiracy webs, as saying the day after that big story appeared and when he had those Newsom reports that "The FBI had discarded the film four days after the assassination." As Golz knew, it never had the film to "discard" because it declined to accept them - on the third, not the fourth day after the assassination.

There is also the Livingstone omniscience on display. It enables him to provide answers to what he knows nothing about:

The FBI report, written by Special Agent Milton L. Newsom, stated, "These films failed to show the building from which the shots were fired. Film did detect the President's car at the precise time shots were fired: however the pictures were not sufficiently clear for identification purposes."<sup>21</sup> The problem with the later part of this statement is that Newsom failed to differentiate between the Leica still pictures and the moving picture film.

There is no problem except with Livingstone's mind and his imagined conspiracies and fakeries and his endless attempts to manufacture proofs that cannot exist and do not.

He winds this up with another of his unending and baseless complaints and slurs of those he imagines conspired against him: “But what we really have is one more of the countless examples of the evidence, exaggerations.” This he attributes to those associated with the Bronson film (page 318).

Livingstone says it often elsewhere and begins this chapter saying that among the films that were faked Bronson’s is one. It is the first with which he deals, if that is what he really does with it.

What we have seen is his proof of film fakery. He says.

Is it to wonder why, with a law degree, he never practiced the law? If he even took the bar exam, which he’d have to pass to be able to practice.

Any of his alleged reasons for believing that there were two sets of evidence, including these films, he has yet to show.

There being none, except in his mind.