

6/26/67

Dear Joe,

PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH: SUPPRESSED KENNEDY ASSASSINATION PICTURES, is on the press. You will get one of the first from the bindery by air. It may go out as early as toward the end of this week. I hope it can be ready by then for I have to go to New York Thursday a.m.

In order to speed it up, I am binding a few press copies without an index. If you get one of these, please ask your secretary to send me a label as a reminder if you'd also like one with the index. Then, as soon as we get the orders out, we'll send it to you. We do stay pretty busy, and the days have not shortened.

Since we spoke one thing has become partly public and I feel I can therefore tell you part of it, but not for any public use. When I was in New Orleans NBC tried to use me to plant bad information about Clay Shaw with Jim Garrison. It was carefully designed to be exciting and provocative. If it turned out to be true it would be an unimaginable shock. It related to both his professional and private life and his past. Garrison has not used it. As you know, it is foreign to my format, from which I make few departures. I did have other spend a very considerable amount of time checking it out to the degree that it can be. Now it happens that I was able to make a tape of part of this, quite openly, on a tape recorder that cannot be hidden. The tape includes the voice of the NBC man. As of now, I intend making no use of this. I prefer, as I told you, to stick to the evidence and stay away from the diversions and digressions. I am content for Garrison's case to go to court. I will send you a copy of what I wrote before I went down there when it is published. It is being done by a small publisher.

The Washington Post yesterday printed all the instalments of the AP series that I understand the Frisco papers begin as a series today. It is one of the more carefully dishonest pieces of writing. Before getting too far into it and checking it out I was on solid enough ground to challenge the general manager of AP to have his writers meet and debate me, in writing or in person, in and on any medium of their choice, and on their writing. It is a ~~careful~~ careful distortion belted with outright lies. It selectively quotes and mis-quotes testimony and pretends that the parts it quotes are all. For example, it says of me: "Critic Weisberg says 'the report refers to no fragments elsewhere. Shires says there is still one in the chest'. But examine Shire's testimony in Volume VI, Page 111, and you discover that Shires said that any knowledge he had about damage to the rib was 'only hearsay from Dr. Shaw, that's all'." But on exactly that page of Shires' testimony, from which I quote on 174 of the first book, Shires says his "knowledge as to what fragments there were in the chest" came from "postoperative X-rays" and "there is a small fragment remaining." He also says that Shaw saw the "initial fragments before I arrived". Fragments and damage to the ribs are not the same thing. The language AP quotes immediately precedes what I quote. I quote accurately, in context and to the point. They quote ~~was~~ ^{was} true of damage and though it were true of fragments, which it is not. I think that actually this language justifies the statement that there were additional fragments in the chest but that Shires had no personal knowledge of them because the chest surgery was accomplished before he arrived. However, this is quite typical and quite dishonest. It is the kind of problem on which

we did not see eye to eye and on which it is difficult for those not intimately familiar with the fact and themselves honest to conceive that a writer with a reputation could and would engage in such selectivity in his writing.

What Gavzer and Moody here as elsewhere do is pretend they are quoting entirely when they are not, quoting exactly when they are not, quoting to the point when they are not. You can satisfy yourself on this when it appears in the papers out there. You have my book. Hal has the 26 volumes. They do the same thing with my quotations of Kapruder.

Is there any way I can catch up with these lies, all the places AP prints them, all the prominence they get? Is there any way I can even begin to undo the damage? AP will not give me a chance to reply. They cannot and will not admit they did such a deliberately dishonest thing.

The entire series of articles is constructed this way. While doing it, they accuse me and others of doing it. I do not. I do not think there is a single case of unfair quotation that has been charged to me, and I have challenged enough people and officials to do it.

This is part of the problem I see from my side that may not be as clear on yours.

Much of the same happened on the CBS special, the first of which was aired last night. Almost without exception the things they went into come from my writing. There is but a single thing that does not, yet I got credit for none. Even the timing of the camera is a nonsequitur. They talk about the "one critic" who says the camera was set to take pictures at 24 fps, and I went through all of this with them, with the understanding they would credit me with what they used of mine. Then, on the show, they present not a single test at 24 fps, while pretending their testing proves a range near 18. Would you rather go to Catalina or by bus?

The NBC special is even worse this way. What it left out, edited out or said in part and did before airing is hard to believe. Only time will bring it out, but who will use that kind of stuff against anyone as powerful as NBC. Did you see anything in that special on their collaboration with a man in the Garrison case who they say they gave a lie detector test to (and it was on an openly rigged one that had nothing to do with what is at issue)? Or that he has announced his defense against Garrison's charges will be his CIA connection? They did not mention his name. Another example is the reference to the woman whose past was, so far as Garrison and the "critics" (of whom I know only one interested), a secret until, in the transparent falsity of defending her led NBC to proclaim it. Rather than offering to bribe her, Garrison guaranteed her immunity (more like, suspect then the reality misused by NBC), while in answer to her complaint that she was poor, had no decent clothing and nowhere to stay, they offered to properly clothe her so she would not be conspicuous and house her where she would be comfortable. I have seen no NBC denial of Perry Russo's charge that they alternated threats and bribes to him.

This got longer than I intended. When you get the new book, if you have any questions or interests, let me know. Ditto on the AP story. Best,