The record, I believe improperly, trades on my name and others, as does the book. Our names were then much in the news wine is one of the three names used on the cover, under the head, "The Truth About". The book and the record have hever been known by the full name. This was design. They are known as and we are a called "Seavengers". The rest of the title, the small print, is " and Critics of the Warren Report". It is obvious that the qualification was so that one who could complain could be told he was a "critic", not a "scavenger". This whole thing began immediately after "owerner Connally called us "scavengers", Mark Lane by name the rest of us by description. The real intent in disclosed on the very first page, under the heading "From Dallas to Dollars", where they say "self-andointed critics have emerged from the national woodwork and have apparently and profitably convinced a large segment of the public that the Commission's conclusions are subject to doubt."

The record ; s called "The Controversy".

I will reture a to this alander about commercialism and "scavenging" in comment on what they was about me.

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

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

Knowing nothing about the introduction, the foreword or any other comment at the time, but having heard they were doing a book for Dell, and being with Carl Tobey and 5 teve Beir (I think after the Forld-Journal-Tribune piece appeared) I werned them of the probability of libel. John Starr was with me.

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

What follows will not . exhaust all the error they print with the purpose of libelling me, but I hope it will be enough. This relates to both the Dell and the Meredith printings, for this 2 is the chapter Meredith reprinted, using me to give it credence and making the Ir own malice clear in the commentary prior to their use of the last chapter of writtewash III, without permission. Maredith had to use such defenatory meterial to offer the pretense of impertiality. Neither they nor ell made any effort to check accuracy with re, not even after I warned obey and Bair that what Schiller a nd Lewis hed already used was libellous. In the Meredith case, their printing was so late that anyone making the sightest pret use of knowing the field, as their enthologist does, had to know of the gross inaccuracy of the writing.

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