

## Chapter 1

The book consists of 10 chapters, with the pages a third blank or without type, totalling 248 pages, and eight appendices, one, at most, being Thompson's writing. (The fifth is noteworthy because it is "Official Correspondence of Representative Theodore R. Kupferman, as though his letters to the Archives on this subject are any more official than Thompson's, of mine, which preceded his and is more complete, and as though they had not earlier been printed, as in the Congressional Record, the New York Times, etc. They were, in fact, a press release by the Congressman. This is padding intended to give the unoriginal book the trappings of a well-researched one. Comment on my second and third books, which did have extensive and original reproduction of really official documents that I had personally dug out of Archives oblivion, was favorable and may have suggested duplication to the non-commercial pair.)

If, because of time, we restrict ourselves to the first chapter, we will not have an unfair reflection of the book.

On the very first page he adopts abbreviations I invented for WHITWASH and used in no other work: 7H370 to represent Volume 370 of the Hearings, page 570; #97 to represent page 97 of the Report; File No. 80 to represent the Commission's meaningless method of referring to its files as "documents, viz, Document No. 80.

On the next page, page 4, he says "Zapruder wound the camera, set the speed control on 'Run', the lens on 'Telephoto', and tested the mechanism..." Here he has his first footnote, which is printed on page 13. At that point he attacks me for accurate quotation of an FBI report that the Commission suppressed. He does not say that it is accurate or that the Commission suppressed this report. Instead, he says, "if this report were true then the speed of the assassination would have to be boosted by 30%..." Here he does some suppressing on his own, for the FBI's photographed re-enactment was exactly that, 30% faster than the time the government computed from the Zapruder film, as it timed it. He then says, "Weisberg made quite a lot of this report." This is one way of presenting a 14-word note added at the end of a chapter of about 7,500 words. What I really did is to print a photographic reproduction of the suppressed FBI report.

The Zapruder camera was also suppressed. Important as it is to the crime and its solution and understanding, to the evidence and to history, the government had strenuously avoided taking possession of it, borrowing it instead whenever it wanted to see it. It was finally taken into government possession after publication of the book in which I exposed this, WHITWASH II, the book Thompson did present when he wasn't borrowing from it, and following a campaign by me alone for its become government evidence and property, a campaign during which Thompson was entirely unheard from. He then says, accurately, that the camera could not be "set" on "24 frames per second", which the FBI report stated, implying that it could not take pictures at any rate other than 18 or 48 frames per second. The thrust of Thompson's complaint against me here is that I should have done what he did, ask the manufacturer. He did only in an attempt to answer me. My publication was or two things he does not and cannot challenge: official inaccuracy and official suppression, of which he is also part. However, he did what he should not have. What I smoked out was not available to me. It was, because of it, to those who copied from me. His scholarship, typically, was secondhand. If he had the slightest idea of how that camera operates, he'd have known that it can expose film at rates of speed varying from 18 to 48 frames per second-or it can take single exposures, like a still camera.

On Page 8 he prints what he represents are the best copies of Frame 207 available to the Commission and a clearer copy as "acquired" from Life (Life seems to think the right word is "stolen". In any event, it is deception. As he knew or at least

should have known- the copies printed for researchers by the Archives are not the best copies available to the Commission. Those are first copies. From these, which are in color, the FBI made copies in black and white. From these the Archives makes copies for researchers. He cannot ignore the splice through the Commission's frame 207, so he says, "even ignoring" it. Now, he does not ever print the entire frame 207, for he cannot. That, in the original, was destroyed. The patch on the original caused the splice. He prints a copy from Life without a splice. What this means is that he has a copy of a copy from Life. The Commission had a clearer ~~part~~ frame than that- a copy of the original, hence the splice. It is quite false and knowingly false to say, as he does, that the only film "the Commission studied" is the remote copy. He knew that slides from the original-first copies were made only for Commission study. There can be no clearer or closer copies. (7H139). As a matter of fact, the Commission, despite his misrepresentation, saw what he did not, the original (7H138). The only valid comment he makes here is only what I had earlier published and he read, in my writing.

He made so little "study" that he doesn't know that the Archives projector did not have a "bulb" as its source of light. It is an arc projector. It is I who was able to persuade the Archives to allow me to bring in an 8mm projector to see a closer copy than what was usually shown, and I offered the use of my 8mm projector for the use of others. Unless Thompson's work was very much later than he represents, the Archives had no bulb projector for him to see. And the camera does not have four "settings", as he writes. The control lever being spring loaded, it can be set but three ways, single-exposure, normal and slow-motion. The fourth, stop, is not a setting but is the usual position of the lever unless it is used. At the time I wrote this book a duplicate of the camera was unavailable to me. At the time he wrote his the Zapruder camera had been in the Archives, thanks to my work, for nine months and available to him for examination. So, he did worse than he criticized me for, he failed to examine the camera itself!

9-footnote 5 (page 17), consistent with his pretense that he saw what others, including the Commission, did not, says that the official slides were not made from the original Zapruder film. He accomplishes this two ways, first saying "there is no doubt in my mind that the Life's transparencies are the better of the two sets" and then that Shaneyfelt "implied" that "both sets were made from the original film". The better quality of the Life transparencies, if it exists at all, can exist only in his mind, for there is no doubt of the fact or the sworn testimony (7H139), the Commission's slides were made "directly from the original movie". The least-knowledgeable examination discloses this, for they include the two splices that exist only in the original, that having been damaged after the copies were made. The fact is that Thompson prints as better copies those that were made from a copy and are not as clear as the Commission's slides, about which he pretends and represents otherwise. He fails to report the making of a black-and-white ~~original~~ copy of the film made by LIFE-for all his touting of the association with it, fails to note that all the crucial ~~part~~ frames were not made into slides, and thus seeks to protect the FBI and the Commission staff from negligence that is inexcusable. But his own reference, to showing the Life transparencies to Congressman Kupferman, denies the meaning he seeks to impart. After the Congressman had seen all that LIFE could show him, I took him to the Archives and showed him the slides, showing him also how they could be projected backward and forward and in duplication of motion, and he told me he saw what he did not at LIFE. He then quotes Sylvia Mesgher and her book where, he says, on page 27 she "points out how unclear she found the Archives' 35-millimeter slides of the Zapruder film to be." What she actually says has nothing to do with this. She says is that with respect to the moments of impact, "neither the film nor the color slides made for the Commission by the Life photo laboratory (now available for examination at the National Archives) enables the viewer to pinpoint this moment. Nevertheless, careful study of the color slides has other rewards". (On page 8 he says that it was Sylvia who pointed out how more could be understood of the film when it was projected backward.

Apparently she did not tell him her source: me. Sylvia was unable to spend time

at the Archives. I got things she wanted for her. And it is I who first projected the film backward and reported it to her.) quoting Sylvia as an expert on the Archives and what is and is not there is less than meaningless for she has spent virtually no time there and has never made any detailed study of the Zapruder film. However, with Aufferman saying the opposite of what Thompson wants to say, with the facts being against him, and no one else who has made a close study of it to quote, there was nothing else he could do except stand on his own, which, at best, is hazardous. He and she did become close collaborators, which possibly explains how his book, which appeared first, could contain page references to hers, even if they refer to a non-existing text, and to how both of them misrepresented the date of publication of WHITEWASH exactly the same way.

Also on page 9 Thompson says, "But on Life's blowups, I saw for the first time enough evidence to prove that Connally had not been hit until thirteen frames (or three-quarters of a second later", when he could not have been hit by a bullet that also hit the President. Now it is not Thompson who saw this "for the first time". Nor did he learn of it from his viewing of any version of any part of the Zapruder film. He was then working with Salandrie, who was then devoutly convinced that the governor had not been hit until long later, at frame 237. It is Ray Marcus who much earlier established this, from his own study of the least distinct versions of the pictures-the printed ones-and who told Thompson of it at LIFE's offices. Ray made this knowledge available to others working in the field, including me, in July 1966, before Thompson was working with LIFE. In a further effort to carry this lie off, in a note on the bottoms of pages 8 and 9, he repeats what I had earlier published in WHITEWASH -and alone had published - that the FBI working copy of the Zapruder film was a copy of a copy and this less clear than it could and should have been. He concludes with a false statement, here quoted in full: "On Feb 25, 1964, a representative of Life projected the original film for Sheneyfelt" (SH138). That is a reference to the testimony of Sheneyfelt, who said, not that the film had been shown him alone but also to "Commission representatives and representatives of the FBI and Secret Service here in the Commission building". Had Thompson quoted this testimony accurately he could not have lied that the Commission never saw the original film, or pretended he saw what they didn't. The legitimate point he does not make-and cannot, because he is the defender of the Commission and the FBI- is that there was no excuse for the Commission not having the original, which was available to it, if not with Life's cooperation, under subpoena. This is what I published, while also publishing frames from the Zapruder film-but in meaningful context, not as part of a public relations ploy. I also, and severely, criticized LIFE, among other things, for pretending to release the missing frames of the original film when they didn't. LIFE did not sue me-but they did sue Thompson. The difference is in our approaches. Mine was legitimate work, his flackery.

10-Here he quotes Dr. Cyril West on "another interesting phenomenon", that the President's head moved backward at Frame 313 in response to what the Commission said was a shot from the back. This is an obvious impossibility and requires no genuine expert, which Dr. West is, to establish it. Of this Thompson says merely that it "had not been mentioned in the Report". How could it have been unless the Report was an entirely different one. It is utterly destructive of the Report. By this means he avoids mentioning that I had published this in WHITEWASH II (Page 221), and that Ray Marcus had independently and by other means also observed it-it is very obvious- before he began writing his book. Rather Thompson pretends that this is his own original work, his "discovery".

Here also he reveals the scholarly incompetence of his own field investigation, presumably for Life, and at its expense and while on its payroll, for he interviewed the Phil Willises. Now without going to Dallas I learned that Mrs. Willis saw the President's head go backward in reaction to this shot. Her husband and she made no secret of it and believe this is the reason she was never called as a Commission witness and that neither was ever interviewed by the FBI until June 1964, when he made his pictures public. Thompson makes no mention of any of these things, even though he quotes other witnesses who say less than this. Had he, he also would have had to acknowledge the reason Mrs. Willis was not called as a witness and admitted the official investigation was a deliberate coverup.

4

Interestingly enough, in his examination of one of the Willis daughters, Liebeler reveals he has called the wrong one as a witness. Thompson also has no comment on this. Yet the Commission accounted for all of the Willises, all of whom were present, in its testimony, except the one who saw the fatal shot most clearly and was not called. Just as interesting is the fact that the FBI report, which I publish in full in PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITENASH (179-80), contains no reference to any FBI interest in what Mrs. Willis saw.

In this connection, Thompson reprints a copy of the Max Phillips Secret Service memo that I printed in Photographic Whitenash (pages 138-9) on page 311. He was either rewarded with a legible copy by the government, which assured me it had none, or touched the official copy up to make it legible. But what he failed to note, even though it would seem to be important to his argument that he pretends is his own, is that Zapruder also, before he was officially brainwashed, said the shots came from the front of the President. Had Thompson, he would also have had to point out that there was an official misrepresentation of what witnesses saw. This, as a man who really seeks to protect the official investigators, he could not do. Instead he prints this Phillips memo as a shell, denying it any meaning, but seeking by its inclusion to impart an air of authenticity to his book. In fact, here again

Thompson fails to mention I dug this up and published it - about three months before he finished his book. I found it a year earlier. So little interest had he in this Phillips report that the name Phillips is not even in his index. The real fact is that Thompson has no serious purposes in his appendix of documents. He reprints them illegibly, four 8x10 sheets to a 6x9 page where the text of an 8-inch wide page is reduced to an inch and a half - and thinks so little of them and their significance that he does not even include them in his index. (They cannot be read by the unaided eye and only with inconvenience under magnification).

11-"No fewer than 22 people were taking pictures in Dealey Plaza that day", he says on this page. True. No fewer also than about three times that many. What he does, again without credit, is to quote the first memo by the man who has taken over my work on suppressed pictures (Thompson never says the government suppressed pictures, for that would destroy any chance of defending it, his real purpose). He goes further and says "understandable" the Report does not mention some. Thus, in addition to hiding the deliberate suppression of essential pictures of the assassination, he personally suppresses the fact that the close eyewitnesses who took these pictures were never called as witnesses and the FBI interviews with them, in the files, were not even published when there were 20,000 pages and more available and when there was no limit on what the Commission could publish. Rather than expose the horror of the federal government that was investigating how it came into power deliberately suppressing the most vital evidence, he instead becomes part of its coverup. For example, he says of the Hughes film, that "scant mention is made of it in the 28 volumes". This is a great kindness, for no meaningful mention is ever made of it. Thus Thompson is himself able to misrepresent it, suppress its proof of Oswald's innocence, and shelter the FBI from its destruction of the film and the gross misrepresentation of it made to the Commission. Thompson does not lift, as he has from so much of my work, the official FBI documents which show it misrepresented by 10 minutes the time this assassination movie was actual made, when the Presidential car was under the sixth-floor Depository window. (PAGES-51). He says, instead, "The FBI apparently studied one frame". The truth is they had the entire film, as I proved, and selected one frame to doctor for the Commission. Hoover included it as exhibit 29 in his first, so-called definitive report. Had Thompson himself not misrepresented the official handling of this film and its exonerating evidence he could not himself pretend there was any possibility of Oswald's guilt - and without that there was no possibility of carrying off his defence of the government, which is his real purpose, despite the coverup contrary pretense.

Page 13-Here is an example of his careful scholarship and precision in language and writing, that of the man who was critical of my writing for its "lack of editing", which I made public in apologizing for it:

Polaroid

"A photograph snapped by Mrs. Mary Moorman from the grass in the middle of Dealey Plaza..." He also says it was never reproduced in "sufficient detail". It was never reproduced at all by the Commission. It is one of two she took. I alone set forth their sad history in FW. Ray Marcus and others have done detailed analysis, also unmentioned by Thompson. But the obvious thing is that she was not in the "middle" of Dealey Plaza, but along the southern edge of Elm Street, where the sidewalk would have been had there been a sidewalk, and she is clearly visible there in many of the Zapruder frames he tells us he studied so closely. She was not in the middle but at the northern side. Nor is the grass there the middle.

13-14. He says the Commission "was hasty in evaluating" the photographs, which shelters them for suppression and understates what it-and he-did with what was not suppressed. His sole criticism is "haste". He cites as an "example" the "combination of" Zapruder and Willis (without even specifying it is the fifth of the 12 of the Willis pictures the Commission saw and had-not all of those he took.

Of this he says the impossible, that they "prove without a doubt that the first shot fired was the one that hit". No magic can have a movie showing nothing, and a shot that missed cannot show, in either a movie or a still.

The photos he says, "constitute the only inviolable form of evidence". He is too modest, for he, as well as the FBI and Commission staff certainly did violate it, in every way possible. (And he says on page 15, without telling their history, that the missing frames of the Zapruder film are "inconsequential", although they are those frames that could show the essential evidence, he and the Commission both saying that the first shot could have been fired for the first time at just this point.)

He and the Commission both say no shot before Frame 210, and that Willis's fifth shows the instant of the hitting of the first shot. He goes into this on pp. 31 ff. His word is that the picture was taken "simultaneously" with the first shot. For him to say this is not just a simple mistake, nor is it a casual lie. It has to be wilful. What is important about the missing frames is not necessarily what they show but what they do not show. The Zapruder pictures clearly show, as Thompson knew for I printed it in WHITEWASH II, which was out before he began to write his book and he lifted enough from it to know of its contents, that Willis had finished taking his picture before frame 202. In even the unclear black and white, remote-generation copies printed by the Commission, even blurred as they are by the screen of the reproduction process, and even further magnified ~~twofold~~ to four times the size in which the Commission printed them, this is clear. In Frame 201 Willis has taken the picture and has begun to walk. In Frame 202 he can be seen walking into the street, his camera coming down.

This is irrefutable and it was known to Thompson. It is one of the many evidences that, while seeming to criticize the government, he really seeks to protect its fake inquest and to show the modification that is now required in a new effort to make the unacceptable conclusions acceptable.

Why Another Book? ( introduction) vii

vii-"...there is much evidence that has either been overlooked or improperly interpreted..." His book is "neither a critique of the Warren Report nor an attack on its critics." It "takes up where the others leave off".

viii- Everything was discovered by Vincent Selendria (whose help he was getting and who had no book). He then lists the appearance of the "second generation" of books, in this order: Epstein, Inquest; Lane, Rush to Judgment, Whitewash series, Popkin's Second Oswald; Sauvage's Oswald Affair. He includes Ray Marcus's monograph The Eastern Bullet, which appeared the end of 1966 and is the only one in its proper sequence. Sauvage's book, which first appeared in France, and Whitewash, are of about the same date. Whitewash was finished in mid-February 1965, well in advance of the magazine writing to which Thompson alludes, and was first published privately in August 1965, before any other book. Then came a book apparently unworthy of Thompson's scholarship, Sylvan Fox's Unanswered Questions (perhaps unworthy of mention because that also is the title Thompson took for his chapter 10). Whitewash went into general distribution the first of May 1966. Publication date of Inquest was ~~two~~ months later, ~~May~~ June 29, 1966. Lane's book and the United States edition of Sauvages were published in mid-September. Throughout the boom Thompson's scholarship kept him from the copyright page of WHITEWASH, which clearly bears a 1965 date, and he says it wasn't published until 1966, thus hiding its priority and his indebtedness. At one point (p.249), he even pretends that a revised edition of Lane's book, published in 1967 and using material from 1965's WHITEWASH, "raised" the question Whitewash raised, as he then acknowledges in a separate footnote. On this page he also attributes to Popkin what appeared in Chapter 11 of WHITEWASH, the development of the "False Oswald", renamed by the Second Philosophy Professor.

ix All these books display "two common threads: (1) a deep debt to Selendria's pioneering and largely unsung research, and (2) a critical and negative stance vis-a-vis the Warren Report". The interesting thing is that the only book really indebted to Selendria in a major way is Thompson's, and if his is not criticism of the Warren Report, no matter how second hand, it is nothing, unless, as he does not say, it is an elliptical defense of it. It adds nothing new, save irresponsible conjecture and inexcusable, deliberate error on which he, as a "scholar", could not have been ignorant.

Interestingly, to this "scholar" Manchester's book also does not exist. Anyway, this "second generation of assassination studies has ended in public confusion and frustration. A first step of a radically different sort is now required." Enter James Bond Thompson, whose book attempts to take that step. Why not? It took everything else.

x-"Up to now critics have gotten by with simply discovering errors of the Commission and displaying them. It is the responsibility of future works to address themselves to the questions asked above (straw-man questions, how did it happen.) to begin drawing all the evidence together and to attempt to make sense of it." Well, Thompson did draw all the evidence together, especially mine. Whether he made sense of it may be questionable, but he certainly is trying to make some fit from it. He adds nothing worthy of serious consideration, no tenable contention of what happened that was not already quite public, save the public relations misrepresentation.

The next interesting thing here is the date of his Foreword, apparently the date of publication, August 1967. His book contains data not then available unless the Commission had already shown its favor to him, as there is solid reason to assume- and

iv-xviii A N to From the Publisher.

Mr. Geis's concept of truth is direct from his major line of filthy writing that he so successfully commercializes. After admitting, without realizing what he was doing, that it was not until after the October 1966 LIFE column by London Wainright "calling for re-examination of the evidence and re-opening of the investigation", the conclusion of WHITWASH alone that Thompson was first connected with LIFE, Geis says the "most important benefit from Thompson's point of view was that he now had access, for the first time, to Life's own copy of the Zapruder assassination film (spent endless hours) examining it frame by frame..." Thus Geis dates Thompson's work with Zapruder as after everyone else's, particularly Ray Marcus's and mine. It is consistent with Geis's high standard that he say, as he does here, that the association with LIFE gave Thompson access to a clearer set of Zapruder to examine "frame by frame". The only permitted frame-by-frame examination, whether it was on the Life copy, the Life still transparencies, or the set of slides made for the Commission by LIFE and available to researchers in the National Archives, cannot be any closer to the original than the Archives set, for it, like any other copy, was made from the original. It is impossible to get any closer.

Geis is also helpful to those who wonder about what Thompson is really up to in giving a history that is in direct contradiction to that advanced by his "scholar". Geis said that Thompson was working on the book for him all along. Thompson said on WTOP-TV January 7, 1968, that Geis didn't contract for it until about December 1966, after publication of every one of the other books except my second pair.

As a dedication to his singular interest in public service only, a reflection of his horror at the thought of profit, Geis proclaimed "our offer to donate the entire profit on the book to LIFE in exchange for these few frames of the (Zapruder) film". He doesn't specify which frames, but they are those "on which he (Thompson) had labored so long and on which his argument rested." This is really an odd one, for Ray Marcus had developed his proofs (exactly the same ones Thompson was to adopt and call Thompson's) with only what had previously been printed. I have the workup Marcus sent me in July 1966 consisting of his copies of the printed frames, the least distinct possible, but clear enough for him. It is also a spectacular estimate of the profit the savvy Mr. Geis expected to make from the Thompson book. By that time the rights to the Zapruder film he sought to buy with these profits from this book had been so large that the royalties alone, paid to Zapruder, had come to about a half-million dollars!

If Mr. Geis was serious, he is a very canny businessman. If he were not, which is quite possible, he at least harvested a vast crop of publicity that then cost him nothing. It may, in the end, however, be that Thompson proceeded to steal Life's property, as Life saw it. Life promptly filed suit.

And thus we have a clear delineation of the noble, non-commercial Geis-Thompson motivation.

### Acknowledgements-xi-xiii

The most important one is missing. That is to the already-published books, particularly the Whitewash series. Without imitating them Thompson would have nothing.

He quotes Publisher Bernard Geis as saying "publication of this book is not dictated by commercial considerations." He might have titled this the Geis Revolution. Geis is the renowned manufacturer of filthy books, created to serve the mark he thinks exists, and commissioned to fit that mark once he is satisfied it is ready to be milked. Thompson's book thus takes its place with Valley Of The Dolls and Exhibitionist.

This statement also represents a Geis convolution. In November 1965 he said, after having had Whitewash read, that he would never do any book on the subject because he could not do a subject like it justice. Two years earlier than the appearance of the Thompson book he was correct. TIME and LIFE have devoted much space to the extolling of Geis's skill in designing smutty books for profit.

Among those to whom Thompson acknowledges his indebtedness are six people to whom I had given my unpublished material in confidence to help them in their researches. Before the book appeared, one of these people told me I'd find Thompson very generous in his acknowledgements. This is correct. The wonder is in the long listing of names if he omitted the garbage man. The effect of this is to make it seem that he is honest and does acknowledge his sources and his helpers. The truth is this is part of his deception, for what he does not credit is the major source of his material what others, mostly I, had already published.