

August 11, 1966

Dear Bill & everybody,

The envelope gives you an idea of how much too hasty everything is. Like in the Kenobel answer. My wife had no sooner finished typing it when I recalled some things I'd forgotten, I suppose a mixture of haste and time, for it was a long time ago that I finished my work. While I never like to work this way, I have no choice and I suppose when I look back I should be grateful. I haven't yet scripted the radio series, although I've started. I have done ~~xxx~~ or rather finished three more chapters of WHITEWASH II, and my overworked wife will start typing them today or tomorrow. She's just finished setting up a set of books. When the tardy distributors start paying us we'll be better off and we'll feel better, and so will the printer. I should, really, be back on the press now, for of the second 5,000, 4,000 are sold, a not bad record for two weeks! But I suppose unless I find another cork to pull, it will slack off now, especially with the general availability of the Lane book and the skill and money of Holt, to say nothing of their other and less attractive attributes. I'm leaving in the morning for Baltimore, and from there to Phila where I have a four-hour, by audience demand, ~~zzzz~~ question-answering session on the largest radio station. I hope to try and arrange some distribution in Balt., where the Sun is doing a feature story on me - not the book. So we take what we can.

Metromedia plans a special they'll syndicate. I believe what I did on the Alan Burke show sold them. They'll call it The Doubtters, and it will be the four of us with the books. Sometime in September. They are still hearing about the show, and they confessed when they called me that although they were quite excited at the end of the taping, they were apprehensive about the ability of one man to hold an audience for two hours. It apparently happened, but it was not, really, one man. It was those awful lawyers who I now learn represented the American Trial Lawyers' Assn. I have reason to believe that their ringleader, Mansdorf, represents Holt, Reinhart, and if this is the case it is not unlike other things that have happened, except for the turned tables. I'm supposed to be getting a sound tape of it. Sylvia thinks Crehan has one. He hasn't answered me. She says he, perhaps, has the Long John, but she ~~xxx~~ doesn't.

Because I know you people are not about to make public or any unwise use of my stuff when I'm doing a book, let me tell you what I have drafted. The Dubious Kennedy Inquest takes up the story of the autopsy where WHITEWASH stopped, but with a different angle. Remember, this book is to show who Whitewashed, as the subtitle says. The three chapters I have finished deal differently with the photographic testimony, questioning by Liebelor, of Zapruder, Altgens and Willis. Tentative chapter titles on which I'd like your opinion(s) are Doe Pictures Lie? The Lovelady Diversion and Willis by Another Name (i.e., Hudson), respectively. I'll resume these again in three other chapters I did all the preliminary work on some time ago and will have to drag out. These will then be titled Pictures Do Lie, Willis in His Own Name (or Unedited, or something; I've not decided) and The Lovelady Caper. These chapters will do with the pictures and what was done with the pictures what the first ones laid the foundation for. Here what Willian wrote me about Willis is invaluable, as is her picture (Willis hasn't answered me) before it was cut. I already had the proof the pictures were toyed with, because they used different versions, as with Altgens. But I did not know what was missing. If that sign was black and white, it may mean even more.... When you go over Altgens, please tell me what you find sticking out of the open fire-escape window, what is behind the glass on the second, and what has happened to the man in between. I made arrangements for a similar study here today, as soon as the photographer friend of a friend is available. If it is worth the \$15.00 or less to you, \$15.00 for use in an article or magazine, you can now get the supposed original from Meyer Goldberg, Wide World Photos, 50 Rockefeller Plaza, NY 10020. If you do not, when I get into this, I'll have a print of mine made for you.

Back to Knebel, I sent LOOK a copy, for their information only. I've had no response, and they haven't returned it, as I asked. I hope they are as sneaky as one might expect and are showing it to people. I do not shun that sort of thing and some time I'll tell you of the confrontation's I've survived that I engineered. I haven't made up my mind what to do with that material, but I'm inclined to tell the entire Rowland story as a sample of how the whitewashing was done on the witnesses. I'll add the other confirmatory stuff I forgot, such as the existing confirmation, and work in with it some of the other complaints about the sieving by the FBI and its consequences. I thought I'd be specific about made 2-4 cases, selecting the Secret Service and the police and their complaints about the FBI's reporting.

So, if you have anything on the photographic evidence, especially Shaneyfelt, that you think I can use, I'd appreciate it. I have enough, more than enough. But can there be too much? I didn't buy copies of early Zapruder statements, but I have enough, again. I've got his first-day statement to the Secret Service and the hasty, hand-letters report covering transmission of the Zap. film. He was without doubt then, that the shot came from behind him.

It didn't cost me anything extra for the parking, so I'm returning the \$2.00. But thanks. When I get time, I'll send you a list of what I've got copies of. But I'll soon, I hope, be giving all of it. You'll be welcome to it, though.

On the Altgens pictures, the enlargement used in the Wash. Post the next day was retouched around his hand and forefinger...I'm apprehensive about phantoms, mostly because of the harm they can do. I've gotten nothing from Lifton, although he did promise some things. And about "material", I'll use nothing not official or the uncorrupted version of the official, as with Altgens. I think nothing else at this juncture, at least with my approach, is appropriate...Lillian did send me a set of the ~~xxxxxxx~~ Willis slides, but I haven't had time to study them and he hasn't answered my letter and order, so I'm waiting. I'm going to take one set apart. I will not use what he told Lifton, unless he tells it to me or it is in writing. It just isn't worth the chance of error, no matter how slight or technical. But if I haven't heard from him by the time I'm working on those chapters, I'll send him a registered letter with questions. I used the address in his testimony, and I had a return address.

When I can I'll write Stamm, and thanks. He ordered a copy of WHITETASH June 2, with no comment with the order or after reading the book....There is no hurry on returning the P.K. answer. Does any of you recall any but Craig saying Rowland told him?

16
I'm glad you told me about Lillian's husband, sorry as wt I am to hear of it. I'd intended writing her as soon as I got a few minute, and I hope this will do for all of you, with you acting as a filter where filtering might be indicated. On the Oswald-Patsy remark, I've seen the Archives version of the NBC footage. It is closeup and the sound is clear. The editing is obvious. After the film goes blank, the sound track can clearly be heard with the question, "Did you kill the President?" This is the Archives' copy. If I didn't write one of you about the Dallas DCA film, now owned by Wolper, let me know. I think you might want the 8 mm version. It is quite interesting. Especially if whoever DCA is ~~can~~ can put you in touch with those whose footage was used...Separately my visiting nephew is now taking an envelope of about a dozen copies of the index to mail to you (which reminds me, unless there is a big rush on something, save the extra cost of airmail when you send something like the Marina tape transcription). Lane, as I recall, misdated it. He used some of it. Going back to Patsy, the quotes in even the Report, shows the omission, which would have taken up no more space than the blank space and the asterisks....When you talk of those kinds of tape recorders I drool. We have two overused Concord 330s, 17/8 and 3 3/4 speeds. Some day I'm going to get just a decent stereo so my wife can record and enjoy the Metropolitan. ~~It'll~~ It'll be some time before I can take the time to even enjoy out decent music that is available by radio

Yes, Maggie can do worthwhile things. I know the woman who was then McHugh's secretary. I've never mentioned this before to anyone, and I've never had the chance to track it down. He can say things, if he will. (I think it was Hill's testimony.) Another thing I've never taken the time to track down is the utter silence about Burkley, who went to the hospital in the ambulance and stayed there. How the President's doctor could have nothing to say and wouldn't be asked has always excited me. If McHugh will talk and can remember, he can say what is not consistent with the official story... In France, I'd be interested in knowing whether Gallimard is doing Lane's book, and if not who is and what Gallimard is printing on the same subject. I had a disappointing and unpleasant experience with them last June. To whom I do not know, but magazine rights to WHITEWASH have been sold to a German magazine. Harbord, if Maggie sees him, will know. And Harbord now has all he needs (he's my agent) to get an English edition of WHITEWASH done very fast. It will want distribution. I think I can get enough promotion on it to at least get it started, without advertising. And I'm satisfied the others do not compare. (1965)

You tickle with your Hunters story, and I thank you for your purchase. The week of the front-page Book Week review on INQUEST, the wholesalers said that in New York WHITEWASH was outselling it. I often wonder what could have happened to it set in type and with regular distribution - even not set in type but with distribution. As I rush I recall things I forgot. If I didn't ever tell you the tentative full title for the sequel it is WHITEWASH II: WHO DID IT. And on the indexes, they are for those you see who might want them. When I can I'll mail some individually, but I really have too much to do now. I even turned down a radio appearance because of the time it would take in travelling. I also think I can pick it up later.

Sylvia doesn't see what you saw in Popkin. I wrote the NY review a note saying the professor hadn't done his homework and had used a pony, etc. I told no one, but Sylvia told me there was a rumor going around that I had written.... I wonder at the depth of her involvement with Epstein and its effect on her. It has already influenced her judgement and former impartiality. I regret it.

What you tell me of LOOK and Manchester is quite interesting. Can you send me a copy? I've been in touch with the Kennedy's and Harpers in a different way, and I've heard from an English correspondent who interviewed him. It turned out to be another of the knives I've come to feel (this time my wife felt it for me) in advance. That story mentioned all the books but mine, the only one then published, and featured Manchester saying the opposite of what I've quotes from him on. The new pitch is the Commission was right, did a poor job, and Manchester's going to straighten the whole thing out, proving the Commission was right but didn't prove it... And does this explain LOOK's embarrassment at my correspondence and Kaebel? I hear a fortune is involved in the Manchester book already.... People inside Harpers' are discouraging them in the Priscilla Johnson-Marina book. Marina took NBC on her Report interview. She charged ABC and CBS nothing, demanded \$10,000 of NBC and settled for \$5,000! They should love it.

I expected Lane's book to be better, and I was disappointed at the persistent dishonesty, twisted quotes, inflated footnoting and plain error (viz. his dismissal of the Willis and Lane pictures). He doesn't see what he wants so it is no good. His editing of Nancy Rich lacks basic integrity. I'd love to see a set of his original proofs and see whether they include his Appendix X, which has no reason being an appendix at all, etc. Looks like last minute additions to save repaging the entire book, at least from 185 on, with the consequent effect on footnotes, index, etc. At the moment, I'd put nothing past him or Holt.

The few times I sit down to ~~write~~ write I'm always too aware of what I'd intended doing and haven't, should and am not, and I hurry too much and wander. I hope you'll understand and forgive. I'm slowing down a bit, as I suppose had to happen, but I can't get up after but four hours abed and start right off. Cuts my working time by about 2 hrs a day. Thanks, and regards to all, and good luck to Mr. C and Lillian. HW

Tuesday morning, 9 August

Dear Harold:

I am enclosing the material you so generously provided, with the money you spent for parking as I promised. If there should be any additional charges you wish to levy please let me know. We are most grateful.

The Xeroxing was done in the office of Maggie's husband's firm and that way we had complete privacy as I was not about to let it out to someone whom I didn't know. Nor did I want anyone to see what it was. By duplicating everything you may see fit to send us, we have insurance against the loss of the original through an error in mailing or transfer at least in its return voyage to Hyattstown.

The Altgens in its 'nearly complete' form was most welcome. We've had it blown up and we suspect a kind of retouching around the Presidents head and neck. This after a preliminary study that was admittedly cursory. We'll see what else it may yield up that we don't already know. With his fertile imagination maybe Dave Lifton could conjure about an unlimited number of phantoms. (Speaking of him, please, Lillian cautions, don't pay him anything or contract with him for payment of "exclusive" material he may proffer. We have the same things usually and they are not available for money!) I believe Lillian has now sent you a set of the Willis slides that Lifton had promised but failed to transmit to you.

Here, incidentally, is the address of Thomas Stam who visited the National Archives on 2 September 1965: 2705 Bainbridge Ave., Bronx 58, New York. His telephone is LU 45143. You should be in touch with him anyway and can get his memorandum on the analysis of the Zapruder motion picture film, with especial note of the head shot.

The rebuttal to the Look article of Fletcher Knebel was most appropriate and thoroughgoing in its rigor and logic. Not to mention the celebrated Weisbergian cut and thrust technique. From my vantage point it appears that you have impaled F.K. like a butterfly on a mounting board! I want to share it with Lillian and Ray before returning it. Then we'll make what comments we have and I'll forward them along to you.

Lillian's husband has had a stroke and is in the intensive care section of Mt. Sinai Hospital here. Apparently he's going to make it, but I've not had an opportunity to talk with her as she is at the hospital most of the time. And I've been remiss in getting to you a copy of her "Oswald-patsy remark" tape which I had her do over completely. It is much better now, I've reedited it and as soon as they fix my REVOX tape recorder I'll duplicate the copies on my TANDBERG. The repairman promised to come today.

Maggie Field flew direct to Paris last night and I'm sure she is in a huddle with Tom Buchanan by now! Furthermore she expects (and this is strictly entre-nous, not to be repeated to Sylvia or anyone until Maggie should tell it you personally) to visit with General McHugh, the late Presidents Air Force aide who was in Trauma Room #1 at Parkland and at the autopsy in Bethesda! She is not overly optimistic about learning anything in particular, but Mrs. Field is a woman of devastating personal charm and beauty.....The General is a brother-in-law of David Stein (the Jules Steins etc) and was at Courchevelles when the Fields were there for a ski holiday last Christmas. Maggie returned home to California and only then realized whom she had "lost" as a contact when she re-read either the Kellerman or Clint Hill testimony. I hope she contacts your literary agents while abroad. I'll be in close touch with her so let me know if you have any urgent errands for her.

Before she left we lunched and went into Hunters bookshop in Beverly Hills to find Whitewash outselling Inquest. We were so pleased to see your book

doing so well, we each bought yet another copy! Even Lane's doing better than Epstein in sales there so far. As a matter of fact I was surprised to find Lane's book as good as it is.

I took Robert Vaughn, the actor, a copy of Whitewash when I was filming the other week out at MGM. He had read the Popkin article and was impressed so I insisted that he read your book since Popkin had "cribbed" so much theory and fact from your own work while giving it only a left-handed pat on the back. I expect to see him later this week and will get his reaction. He's very interested in the case but is reluctant to discuss the case with any of the Kennedy's with whom he is now rather close, apparently.

The news in Friday's New York Times with reference to Look seeking the serial publication exclusive on William Manchester book with the disquieting conclusion of the author: Oswald lone assassin, was not very welcome in these parts. Ray Marcus has always suspected the Kennedy's would "sell out". I hope this is not true. There must be a great deal going on behind the scenes what with the Goodwin outburst from Wesleyan. Which brings me to another matter:

I had a long telephone conversation with Bram Cavin at World Publishing in Cleveland. He informed me that our fears are groundless and that the Sauvage book will appear on schedule. It has been bound and looks very handsome and should be in the stores shortly. He felt the Lane book would give Sauvage and World a formidable competition and he sounded rather sanguine about the outcome. Sauvage has only added an American edition chapter to his revision of the corrected French text. No appendices or documentary section. Finally, he felt that it was Daniel Moynihan, and not Manchester, at Wesleyan with whom Goodwin was associated in his statement on the Epstein book.

Your conclusions on Zapruder research seem conclusive and I am anxious to see them in your sequel. I hope you will eventually get the reviews in Liberation and TMO as you did in the National Guardian as you genuinely deserve.

Best wishes,

Bill Connel