

Dear Paul, "The Trial of Lee Harvey Oswald"

7/9/77

When I wrote earlier I'd not read the LATimes 7/6/77 big play on the shooting and content of the ABC four-hour "special." I have read it now.

Can Richard Freed be Don? This guy is represented as having spend 12 years looking for the answers.

The puffery, regardless of the source, is pure Schiller. If anything about him is pure, even the evil.

Can you imagine him now exposing himself of the past? Like Scavengers, in which he used tapes he'd agreed not to use and then edited them without indication of any editing to make what was totally impossible appear to have been said? Who lied to get people to talk to him? Who represented that the profits from the record would go to the JFK library while having made no such arrangement - and the library nixed it. This guy who milked even Jack Ruby, taking more than 50% as an agent's fee, according to Ruby's sister?

The claim to fairness has to be phoney. So I'll like every scrap you can find and save, not necessarily as soon as you get it though.

Unless there is the kind of error in this story I'd not expect, in direct quotes, then it is clear that collectively the whole staff of the commercialization does not know the uncontested basic fact of the crime. Two things illustrate.

"Between the second and third shots I want to see chaos," Schiller hollers. Well, there was absolutely no reaction-by anyone, anywhere, in the official account of the first two shots or between the second and the third. It was after the third that there was reaction. Within the tight time frame of the commission of the crime, by comparison some time later

Maybe it is unclear and I took the wrong impression from the Greene complaint about the "stiffness" of the JFK head movement. He claims whole books have been written on this subject (false) and the inference I first drew, there being no mention of any earlier shot, is that he was talking about the first.

There was an earlier story saying they were having a big study made to avoid any possibility of a claim for fairness-doctrine time.

This can raise interesting questions about the Oswald defense, whether it is a real defense or not and the source. I happen to have written and copyrighted the first. They can't do an honest job without using that work. If they don't use an honest job there is a fairness doctrine question, especially with these representations.

At some time Schiller's own past on this will be appropriate for attention, if anyone will fly into the face of all the money invested and of ABC.

I have a file of the Dallas stories. I've not yet read them and don't intend to read them now.

Best,