

CHAPTER 51

The Killing of the Truth by the Killer of the Truth Continues

Next in what is quoted above he again flaunts his ignorance of photography in general and of movie film in particular in saying, "... the film Schwartz describes taking to Stolley was for making stills, and thus would be a copy, not the original."

Needing no source, and for this there could be none because it is absolutely false, he just again says what he thinks can help the phony case he phonies up at such great length.

Copies can be made from any version of any film, including original film and remote generation copies of original film.

The stills that Life used were made from the original and not from any copy of it.

The copies Life gave the Commission Life made for the Commission from the original. Unless he is a world-class liar in addition to a world-class subject-matter ignoramus Livingstone knows this because it is the testimony before the Commission on that very subject. [Later he writes that it was the FBI that gave those slides to the Archives. The Archives in fact inherited them when it inherited all the Commission's records. In that it also got the black-and-white copies of these slides made from the original slides made from the original so they could be printed by the Commission.]

Atop all of this self-portrayal, which is of being both a liar and a subject-matter ignoramus, he concludes this paragraph and this page with another of those endless contrived conjectures he wants to be taken as fact.

"It would seem [my emphasis] that Life did not 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."

What to him it "would seem" was not true and he should have known it was not true because Life did have and did damage the original film before that Monday. And "theoretically Life did not need a day to prepare the photographs." It needed time not for the making of copies, which can be done rapidly, but to learn which of those many frames it wanted to consider using, to make copies of them for later selection and it needed time also for writing the copy and for tailoring what it wrote to fit the space available for it. It also had to know what those pictures show and what it would say about what they show so it would know what to write in the accompanying major article and then to decide on the space it would devote to the matter. This means the knowledge was necessary for proper planning of the entire issue and the time for its printing and publication were inflexible.

And there is nothing at all "theoretical" about any of this.

He continues with his pontifications that flows from his ignorance, and his imagined need at the top of the next page [118] saying that

Since Life was a news magazine and they had a very big story, if they were willing to spend an extra million bucks or so to speed it up, there may have been no problem at all with the short lead time.

Where he got that million and a half bucks of cost he does not say and because Life had no such need, having the film, he did not get it from Life. Because there was not any such need he makes it up to cover his gross misrepresentations of just about everything in any way connected with that film. He has the compulsive need to regard himself as fully informed about everything but in his writing of it it always comes out as his personal exposure of his omnipresent exposure of his omnipresent ignorance of

just about all he writes about.

Soon he has the Schwartz, if he exists, the same Schwartz who has been wrong about each and every thing Livingstone attributes to him through Bartholomew, as "confirming" who saw the film for all the world as though with this record of what is attributed to him it can be said that he can "confirm" anything. He then quotes Schwartz as saying the impossible, the "he" and he alone, I interject, "insists that he saw blood and brains coming out the back of JFK's head, even though we do not see this in the film today." Thus Livingstone suggests that what the film once depicted in it is no longer in the film, meaning that it was doctored.

Neither Schwartz nor anyone else ever saw that in the film - and I emphasize Livingstone can quote nobody else on this. Only Schwartz and him by proxy - because it was not and could not have been there to be seen.

It was my telling Livingstone that my examination of the formerly-suppressed nine slides made from the original film showed the back of the head to be intact, without a visible drop of blood on it that inspired Livingstone's need to invent the case for "The Hoax of the Century."

Livingstone's next authority has, in general, excellent academic credentials. Philip Melanson, who is a professor of political science at Southeastern Massachusetts University. It is at North Dartmouth. But on the subject of the John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King assassinations he is as solidly undependable a source as even Livingstone and his numerous associated assassination loonies.

His book supposedly on the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., The MURKIN Conspiracy is a mockery of scholarship he began with childish preconceptions that even with his extensive use of and devotion to the silliest theories is worse than worthless in bringing nothing both new

For personal use only, not for distribution nor attribution. © 2004 Harold Weisberg Archive

and factual to light and in its misrepresentation of what was known. His later Spy Saga, supposedly on the JFK assassination and on Oswald, is a virtuoso display of professorial dedication to the least credible of the wildest of assassination theories and fabrications. In both books he contributes mightily to the existing confusion about those crimes and their investigations. When Greenwood, with the reputation of a scholarly publisher, asked me for a peer review of it I found it so flawed, so disgraceful that I wrote quite a lengthy and detailed report on it, with permission for it to be given to Melanson. I also promised to respond to any comment he might make about my peer review. I heard nothing from him and Greenwood did not publish it. Praeger, which owns Greenwood, did publish it. So much for using Melanson as a source. To use him is also to confess ignorance of the existing, established fact of the assassination and of its investigations. Livingstone thus has all the reason he needs to use Melanson's baseless conjectures as established fact (pages 118-9).

To Livingstone's credit he does say that Melanson "argues" and that what he argues is "that the original film in fact went to the National Photographic Interpretation Center [of the CIA] and could have been altered there." Those whizbang boys, both say, could do anything, that nothing is impossible for them.

He then quotes Melanson as writing, "Apparently the CIA had gotten the film from the Secret Service" after which he asks, "Did the NPIC make extra, unaccounted copies or did the NPIC copies somehow end up as the Dallas copies?"

The record is clear, except perhaps to the Melansons and the Livingstones and their brethren who are so contemptuous of existing, established fact. Or is it that if they are restricted to existing, established official fact they are intellectually castrated and can write nothing. In any event, the original,

with no possibility of question, a) went to Life immediately and Life retained possession of it for years, until it preferred to revert the rights to Zapruder's heirs to taking those who made unauthorized use of the film to court; and any Secret Service copy Life may have had of it was not the original and was some time after all of Livingstone's manufactured razmataz about it.

While the timing alone makes all these conjectures and fabrications irrelevant, this is far from all that is Melanson's personal representations of his "scholarship" and of Livingstone's judgement in using it as though it had either relevance or any credibility at all.

Melanson does say correctly that the records disclosing that the NPIC had a copy of the film were disclosed under FOIA.

What neither Livingstone nor Melanson state is that I published the more significant of those few FOIA-disclosed NOIC records in the 1976 reprint of Photographic Whitewash. That was before the Melanson article Livingstone quotes. I go into this beginning on page 295. I then print in facsimile several of the tables NOIC disclosed. The one that totally invalidates any claim that the NOIC had the film and doctored it in time to influence the uses made of it beginning with Life's is the NPIC analysis on page 303. This tabulation includes the use Life made of the film, by frame. On this basis alone, and all the other bases are also made up, NPIC did not do its work until after Life was published.

This the scholars do not mention. Instead they conjecture about the meaning of abbreviations referring to the processing of the NPIC's copy of the film, giving meaning that does not exist to their would-be Dick Tracey. And much of that is in the form of questions rather than statements. By means of those conjectures and questions having to do with the film processing - and remember, there is the most solid proof that Life alone had the original and that the NPIC did not get any copy until quite some

time after Life's publication of frames from it - Livingstone quotes Melanson as saying all that gibberish about abbreviations relating to processing is "strong indication that the NPIC had the original" (page 119).

Livingstone then refers back to his quotation of the Schwartz who has in even the Livingstone rendition the record of never being right about anything, and he is speaking of the NPIC copy of the film, conjecture as proof again, too, "The print they made may have been from one of the three negatives Schwartz mentions."

If Schwartz had any way of knowing and if there were any need for any negatives of the positive movie film, he alone mentions negatives.

Livingstone in all of this avoids the problem with which he began, having identical alterations of those he imagines were made on all copies of the film. It is obvious that so long after all the known official copies were made they could not be altered in any way. Melanson who from ignorance is reduced to conjecturing suits Livingstone fine because having no case at all and determined to make one he is delighted with any conjecture, no matter how impossible or irrelevant:

Melanson suggest that Zapruder may have made a bargain with the Secret Service on the day of the assassination. `Whether someone in authority asked or told Zapruder (their emphasis) indications are that he did indeed relinquish it....If Zapruder did manage to strike a bargain with the Secret Service, the terms may well have been that the Service took the original for a brief period of time (perhaps only eighteen hours) but promised to keep the loan secret so as not to jeopardize Zapruder's chances for a deal....

Atop all of this nonsense, all proven impossible to begin with, Melanson then asks, as usual, never offering any proof, "And why should the Secret Service be satisfied with a copy which was less clear than the original?" This of the White House Secret Service that did not even have its own photo

lab and whose photo expert could not process color film, which the Zapruder film is. Melanson then adds, "Since it seems certain [why he does not say, naturally, because it is impossible] the NPIC conducted its analysis the night of the assassination this greatly increases the likelihood that NPIC had the original." This scholarly Melanson magic puts Harry Houdini to shame. He has the NPIC making its analysis the night the assassination and include in that analysis what would not be known or published until the coming week.

The CIA knew before Life did what uses Life would make of the film!

It knew, according to Melanson, even before Life had the film!

It therefore knew even before Life's experts saw the film what they would conclude, what they would use and how they would use it.

This certainly made a jerk of Houdini - and a rare scholar of Melanson.

It was all a real inspiration for Livingstone for he next writes:

We have always been watchful for false trails and red herrings in the evidence. To my way of thinking [if thinking it is], the film might have been first roughly altered and then a new 'original' struck off that day in Dallas... (pages 119-20).

Do not ask what "roughly altered" means or why it was done or why it was a prelude to "A new 'original' struck off that day [sic] in Dallas" of how all the alleged new versions were substituted for those already distributed or what reason there is for even suspecting that this was possible because if you are a genius like Livingstone with magical scholarly sources you need make no explanation, do not have to show that what you want to have believed is even possible.

Inspired by Melanson, not that Livingstone's special kind of genius needs external inspiration, he next writes, with his customary explicitness and devotion to detail and to fully informing his reader:

For personal use only, not for distribution nor attribution. © 2004 Harold Weisberg Archive

I had high-level information in Dallas that the original Zapruder film (from Zapruder's camera) was first obtained by H. L. Hunt before *Life* bought what they thought was the original. The FBI, the Secret Service, and the military allowed Hunt to either control the evidence or be used as the front for control of it by those using him. The indication is that Hunt's people obtained it and passed it on to the FBI who sent it to headquarters in Washington shortly after it was developed. (page 120)

The reader who takes Livingstone on trust does not wonder whether his "high level" sources were official or private or why he does not give their names. Besides, he gave their names, if not much else about them in his killing the truth, his prior book of that title. Paul Rothermel, Jr., and John Curington (right) were among the higher officials of the H.L. Hunt organization. As Livingstone's Killing the Truth did not report, they were fired by Hunt's sons as common thieves. Their defense was that the old man prided himself in underpaying his executives and as a result he expected them to steal from him enough to bring their take up to what it should have been.

"High level" enough?

How the Huntniks got the "original film" and "from Zapruder's camera," which is what Livingstone says, he does not explain nor why. Now what was there was for Zapruder and entourage take to have professed and get processed if the Huntniks had the film "from his camera?" Or for Schwartie to see being made into negatives, as Livingstone earlier said about that processing?

But if by chance Livingstone did not mean literally what he literally says, how else could those Huntniks have gotten it from the actual and proven history or from the Livingstone variations of that history? He accounts for its possession outside Hunt hands in the preceding pages.

Even for a Livingstone with his intellectual and evidentiary gymnastics having Hunt have and not have the film at the same time is quite an exercise.

nor does he explain how when Life had the only version of the film with those sprocket holes that exist, not the original and not any copies made from it, it "bought what they thought was the original" but somehow wasn't.

Life would not have known this?

He does not explain how it was possible that "The FBI, the Secret Service, and the military allowed Hunt to either control the evidence or be used as the front for control of it by those using him." Nor why. No federal agency could compel Zapruder risk the young fortune he got from his film when, as Livingstone himself says, on the preceding page, by letting the feds have he risked losing "exclusivity," what Life was paying for. As Livingstone himself on just the page before also says, "Exclusivity was very important to the deal" with Life.

Well, perhaps that was important on page 119 but it clearly is not important on page 120 because there is no mention or consideration of it on page 120.

Why of all people the devious feds preferred the Hunt who hated them most of all Livingstone does not say. Nor does he say how the Hunts "controlled the evidence" or in the alternative, and he does not say which, the feds used Hunt "as the front for control of it." The Hunt who was the greatest enemy the government had.

Livingstone says it, wants it believed, and that is that. There is no more.

Of "The indication is that Hunt's people obtained it and passed it on to the FBI" is not an "indication" worth stating for it is not stated. Nor the evidence, even reason to believe that Hunt "passed it on to the FBI who [sic] sent it to headquarters in Washington shortly after it was developed."

If when Livingstone says he "had high level" sources for all of this and those sources were

For personal use only, not for distribution nor attribution. © 2004 Harold Weisberg Archive

dedicating themselves to getting even with Hunt's sons for firing them, is that not enough to explain all that is not explained and in fact cannot be explained? Especially when it without question is totally, absolutely completely impossible from the evidence that is beyond any question at all? In each Livingstone's own corruptions of that *****?

From this, again with total disregard for the unquestionable reality - and remember the damage to the film in Life's Chicago lab for which it made public apology - Livingstone proceeds with supposition or at least what he refers to as supposition:

case was being faked, then they might have fed frames from the film to Life as needed to fulfill the emerging official story.

This is what Life spent, Livingstone's figure, \$150,000 for?

If so, we can suppose as Livingstone supposes and suppose that the Life people who were writing the article on the pictures and the captions for them under close deadline pressure and who had never seen the film may have used mental telepathy to learn what the film shows from FBI headquarters and then, after pondering that, telepathetically told FBI headquarters what it wanted so that by the same mental telpathy the FBI could get copies of those frames to the Life staff.

If the FBI in Washington had the film and Life did not, is there any other way in which the issue could have been published featuring as it did that same Zapruder film if not by mental telepathy?

Livingstone then says that the film was being faked at FBI headquarters and "for this we have a witness," good old Schwartzie boy with his record of never being right on a word attributed to him albeit at best second-hand. So Schwartzie in Dallas in a witness to the film fakery in FBI Washington headquarters.

The need for mental telepathy grows.

Everything about Hunt at the top of this page and his having the film from the camera self

Livingstone gets it to Washington not only that way but also by another way. On film, that is:

Schwartz told Bartholomew that after the film was developed, Schwartz took either the original or a copy of the film to Hensley Field Naval Air Station the night of November 22, and it was flown to Washington about nine or 9:30 P.M. Actually, the time may have been a little later, as Schwartz has the work being finished at Kodak at this time - or the developing was done a bit earlier. This would have allowed for alteration in Washington at NPIC or somewhere else.

Secret Service Agent Max O. Phillips is now in the memory hole of history.

with all that has gone before no longer in his mind and in total disregard of it, after all of this stuff about the feds getting the film, Livingstone next quotes Schwartz as telling Bartholomew who told him that Zapruder said he was not going to let anyone in authority have the film, "I'm not giving that film to them."

But is not the same, the only film Livingstone has already said in several contradictory ways that Zapruder did not have to give anyone?

How many different places has Livingstone had that original of the film at the time in question? The CIA, the Secret Service, the FBI, the NPIC, H.L. Hunt, Zapruder, Schwartzie himself.

All the one film, all at the same time.

When only Life had or could have had it.

There is more of this high-quality Livinstonia that we can spare ourselves so we slip slightly ahead to page 122 when he has still another version but one that wipes all the immediately above out.

The official story [his emphasis] from Stolley is that he got the original film on Saturday, the day

after the assassination. The Chicago Life office had it on Saturday." Then it reverts:

We might theorize that the *Life* sale was being set up without Zapruder knowing that they might already have the film. A copy might have been made that Zapruder did not know about and sent to *Life*, while quick alterations had already been made in Washington or Dallas. (page 122)

There is a bit more Schwartz but there has already been too much of him even though at this point Livingstone refers to him as "solid." Solid what he does not say. So again we slip ahead slightly to the end of this beginning subchapter of the "Hoax of the Century" chapter, less than a full page on pages 123-4:

The CONTRADICTION AND CONFUSING CHAIN of possession for the Zapruder film would seem to identify it with the other bogus stage props in the National Archives. The evidence is fast developing that all this material is fake - faked by the conspirators who planned the murder of John Kennedy. None of it was ad hoc, after the fact, because somebody was trying to prevent a war, but was faked in concordance with the plot to overthrow Kennedy and all he stood for.

"Ad hoc" is not Latin for "after the fact. "Ad" means "toward."

None of the rest of this conclusion is true either.

There never was any "contradictory and confusing chain of possession for the Zapruder film."

That is his invention and we have seen that it is not even a reasonable or a good invention. It is internally contradictory, confused, irrational, impossible. It depends on sources that have no credibility at all and then on special interpretations of what is supposedly cited. It depends, too, on bald lies that he should have known are lies. He had to make it up, as I indicate earlier, because the Zapruder film proves his claim that the back of the President's head was blown out is false. As he admitted to me before the full import of it hit him.

In saying that "The evidence is fast developing that all this material is a fake" he seems to be

referring to the Zapruder film, but with him one cannot be certain. However, there is nothing else in this subchapter to which he can be referring. If this is so, then in these words he confesses that the proof that the Zapruder film "is a fake" is only indicated in all the belabored gibberish we have just examined. He presents it not as "fast developing" evidence of it but as proof that the film was faked.

The Zapruder film is as much of a problem to him as it was to the government.

The government's lone-assassin preconception is jeopardized by the film, by any reasonable interpretation of what it shows, and Livingstone's fabrication of the faking of the film is indispensable to the survival of his work that he not only thinks but has said should have him crowned king of those who do not agree with the official assassination mythology. Because the film actually disproves him he had to make up his "Hoax of the Century" mythology in the hope that in it he somehow saved his work that has no value without this disqualification of it.

His is the hoax of the "Hoax of the Century."

There is much else, ever so much else in this monstrous monster of a chapter that is as pathetic, as palpably false, as obviously made up and/or irrelevant, as childish, as dishonest and as reflects his determined ignorance of the established official fact of the assassination and of its investigations but when reading it alone was a waste of time, commenting on it, exposing it, would be an even greater waste of time. However, because there is so much more, I add a few samples. A detailed and exhaustive commentary would make a long book. That is neither necessary nor not unpleasant.

Under "Alterations of the Zapruder Film," which begins of page 124, his imagination and those of his most dubious sources run wild. He reports seeing what is not there, at least was not there thirty years ago when I made a careful study of the slides made from the original film, until he gets to frame

335. He says of it that the President's hair "sticks out toward the back." Before getting to this frame he claims that he sees the "hole," a version of his claim that the back of the head was blown out. That frame is where I told him to make a careful study of it and the several following it. Beginning with 334 Shaney felt did not prepare the next nine slides of that exhibit for printing. Why Livingstone goes no farther, than being where he began his alleged study of the film, as suggested, naturally he does not say. But I say, without equivocation, that I told him that in the next two frames, as the President is turning to fall over onto his wife, the back of his head is clear and not only is it clearly intact, there is not even a trace of blood visible on it on the top his collar, which visible alone his jacket collar and is also clear, or on the back of his jacket. (page 125)

Next he has the fantasy, "Versions of the Zapruder Film." There are none other than are made up by the Livingstonians.

He does refer to studying the slides enlarged so little that they can be examined "about a foot away from the screen," but that is negligible enlargement. Little enlargement as that is it would make clear that the frames I cite do show the back of the head to be intact.

Despite enlargement on projection to about five feet in width those 35mm slides, made from the original, are so clear individual hairs can be made out and I recall none in disarray on the back of the head that was in this hoaxing of our history allegedly blown out, exploded out.

He still makes no reference to the frames to which I referred him. He uses as one of his alleged experts one "Doug Mizzer." he quotes this man, unknown to me and one who has never been in touch with me although he lives but an hour away, as saying these is a "cleaned-up version." There is no such thing. Clearest is the original and the other official copies are made from it. What else is floating around

has no place in any discussion of the official handling or alteration of the film and is not and cannot be any official "version" of it (page 126).

Those he misrepresents by referring to them as "researchers" made up names like "the Life version" and "the Secret Service version" (page 126); "The Kurtis version" because it was shown on a TV program he had (page 128); the "clumsily forged version" and even "the official version (all on page 128) along with others but there is but a single "version" of that film in official hands, the original and the copies made from it being the same "version" other than those four frames missing from the original.

Mizzer is his whizzer through most of this and he could hardly have selected a better expert for seeing what is not there to be seen and giving the most original and imaginative explanations of it all.

In this total ignorance of the available official records is a major asset. His and their expertise extends to not seeing what is so sickeningly obvious, the amazing spray of tissue from the explosion of the right side of the President's head seen in frame 313. It not only is seen so graphically spraying around in almost all directions, there is the most explicit testimony from eyewitnesses and those coated with it. Of this his Mizzer whizzer says it "could not" have happened. In fact the astounding extent of this spraying around of that brain tissue was to a large degree kept secret by both the FBI and the House assassins committee. Although by law the FBI was required to have given me those records it withheld in my C.A.75-226, it perjured itself instead. Among what those FBI reports of the lab's examination of the limousine show is the extensive deposit forward, relatively far forward of the President, onto the hood of the limousine, as I report in the Afterword of NEVER AGAIN! where this and more like it was first published. As of this writing I know of no other publication of it although I have given copies of those FBI reports to a number of others.

It even got behind the sun shields behind the windshield.

Which, according to the Livingstone dizzies, "could not" have happened (page 137).

In his own name Livingstone gets even crazier, and getting crazier than he has always been in his writing and his various Livingstone-created experts are in his now representation of them is no slight or easy accomplishment.

For example, of page 140:

Is it possible that Zapruder was a plant? I think the masterminds who planned this wanted to document the assassination on film so they could alter it, if need be, to support their story. It just seems too convenient otherwise....

For this, they had no expert photographers with infinitely better equipment to be there among the rather large number of people who were at that point with their cameras?

They would have selected a Zapruder who, as Livingstone knows from my first book, immediately disputed the official version of the assassination by first telling the Secret Service that he felt a shot from the front, from behind him, as it passed over him and then, when he testified months later repeated that and added that his interpretation of his own film is that there were shots reflected in it?

So dedicated and so thoroughly a dependable a "plant" that he left his camera home, not intending to take pictures at all, as Livingstone seems to forget he did report, as the official testimony also does?

A "plant" who would, had he not been officially and be the media ignored, have destroyed what he was supposed to have made possible, the official assassination mythology (page 140)?

As usual, without giving this source but based on an FBI record he got from me he says, knowing it was false and from his own writing is false,

For personal use only, not for distribution nor attribution. © 2004 Harold Weisberg Archive

It is reasonable to assume that the FBI would have possession of primary evidence in the crime (or in any crime they investigate) and in this case, the original film.

His basis for this is the November 23, 1963 memo by FBI Dallas Special Agent in Charge Gordon Shanklin.

Livingstone says that because of this memo the FBI had "possession" of "the original film."

His alleged proof that the FBI possessed what it never possessed and never wanted is what he cites from that same memo. If he were not the determined subject-matter ignoramus he has been through all of this writing and speaking he would have known, as he also should have known from my Photographic Whitewash, which is on the suppression of the photographs of various kinds, that when the FBI begins with a predetermination of what it is going to say the last thing it wants is picture to have to try to explain away. But to get to what is proof for Livingstone, and he is quoting Shanklin's memo on this,

Shanklin "stated he did not believe that the film would be of any evidentiary value; however, he first had to take a look at the film to determine this factor. (page 140).

Thus in Livingstone's mind Shanklin's saying that the film was worthless, that he had not even seen it, is proof that the FBI had "possession" of it, of the "original film."

With this kind of "interpretation" and "reasoning" is there anything in the world that he cannot "prove and write books about?

If this is not insane enough, then he has long passages of the alleged removal of frames he claims show "decoy" shots. I refer again to what I brought to light in 1965, that Zapruder not only testified to earlier shots he was so nervous his camera giggled, giving the impression he was reacting to other shots. (Page 145 is one of the examples of this.)

For personal use only, not for distribution nor attribution. © 2004 Harold Weisberg Archive

He accredits his Newcomb and Adams authority as the most conservative and dependable by saying of them that they "are convinced that some Secret Service agents shot at Kennedy from two directions or more" (page 146).

All the Secret Service agents at the scene are clearly visible throughout the entire crime in quite a few motion and still photographs. They could not be more convincing in establishing that not one of those agents even had a weapon in his hand until after all the shooting, when George Hickey, in the follow-up car, had difficulty getting his AR15 rifle from under those in the back seat who were sitting on it.

Livingstone even sees what was firmly planted in the ground, "the Stemmons Freeway sign jump[s] around wildly and changes shape [!] from frame to frame" in "different versions" of the Zapruder film (page 150).

Because not one of the movies shows that the limousine stopped during the shooting or after in "Certain frames showing the car stopped had to be removed." This was apparently to confer on directions and what had just happened" (page 153).

With the President mortally wounded and the governor perhaps fatally wounded, too, and with the chief of police, the sheriff and all those motorcycle cops who all knew where the closest hospital was and how to get there the motorcade "stopped" so the federals in it could "confer on directions" to the hospital or try to figure out "what had just happened" rather than as from all accounts doing what without question it did, rushed with that local escort leading it to the hospital which had already been radioed to expect them and what to expect.

There is more, sickeningly more, that I have annotated for the record for history. This is more

For personal use only, not for distribution nor attribution. © 2004 Harold Weisberg Archive

than enough to leave it without question that what is the real "hoax" is what Livingstone puts on paper and is so welcome for publication along with publisher promotion for it.

That he is no less politically ***** also is worthy of comment.

As this long hoaxing up of a hoax nears its end this man who is, in his own belief and representation, completely informed about everything and anything, hints at still another conspiracy involving poor dead Secret Service Agent William Greer, the dependable driver Kennedy preferred and asked for and whose driving he liked very much:

Ultimately, the background of the fatal car's driver, fifty-five-year old William Greer, will go down in history as a key to the truth of the assassination. This man did not drive off when the shooting started. Instead he turned around twice and stared at Kennedy after the shots began and did not get the car out of there until Kennedy's head was blown apart.

Livingstone cribbed this indecency from William Manchester. Manchester actually wrote that if Greer, an exceptionally competent driver, had not been an old man the President would have been saved. What applied to Manchester applies even more to Livingstone thirty years later - what in the world was any driver to do in that cul de sac? Was his car to suddenly become a helicopter? With an instant jet vertical takeoff?

There was nothing anyone could have done, anyone of any age.

Especially when in the official version from the sound of the first shot, which took a little time to identify as a shot rather than a backfire, until the President's head was shattered there was a fraction less than six seconds.

Who, cul de sac or not, could have done anything in that minute fragment of time?

Other than ignorant writers imagine?

For personal use only, not for distribution nor attribution. © 2004 Harold Weisberg Archive

Maligning Greer did not satisfy Livingstone. He then goes after Roy Kellerman, the agent in charge of that detail. He had the decency and integrity to dispute the official version of the shooting that limits it to three shots by saying there was a "flurry" of them. As I also brought to light in the book Livingstone has, Whitewash, Kellerman saw to it that there would be official observers to make a record that located the wound on the President's back much lower than in the official account it is misplaced.

And what of Kellerman, who sat beside him [Greer]? Between the two Secret Service men, they should have gotten that car [which never stopped and accelerated slowly because it was overloaded with armor] moving.

Repeating as his own Manchester's foul defamation Livingstone as much as says that those two dedicated men caused the President's death:

Kennedy would have survived his first wound easily. Why did the Secret Service permit a man that old to drive the car in the first place?" (page 177).

Paranoid as Livingstone is and has been, if he believed that irrationality he would never get on a commercial airplane!

Before getting to this is of his innumerable imagined and non-existing conspiracies Livingstone even alleged that because Greer came from Northern Ireland

He must have felt some antagonism for Kennedy, at the very least, for his trip to Catholic Ireland and for his peccadilloes. Kennedy's driver was linked to a man who benefitted from the assassination: Henry Cabot Lodge, a scion of an old, very prominent and very political New England blue blood establishment family. Lodge became the ambassador to Saigon and literally ran the war from his embassy. (page 177)

Lodge was and had been the ambassador to Viet Nam! He was appointed by Kennedy!

He did not become ambassador as a result of the assassination, as Livingstone says.

This is enough, I believe more than enough, to make it apparent that in his Killing Kennedy he is still Killing the Truth.

And the only hoax of which he writes is the one he made up out of nothing real, nothing factual, nothing of any meaning; not of truth or a desire for truth; in a futile effort to defend what cannot be defended, his writing all of which is fairly depicted from the above. His career is that of his title, of "killing the truth."