

CC Voice Letters from William 1/15/67

2500 Alameda St. 7, Frederick, Md.
301-772-8180
11/20/67

Dear Jack,

Since the assassination, only two things have denied me sleepwork or my own participation in a radio or TV show on it. This morning, for the first time, something else did your Thompson show. Particularly because I have just returned from a trip that began before I last did your show, on which I averaged very little sleep and on some occasions did not get in bed at all, so I exhausted and this is unusual. I was only slightly prepared for it by having read the difficult piece.

It is only because you have been so kind to me that I asked not to be aired questioning him, for you asked me though he is your friend, and I know he is a friend and colleague of Vince, who is your friend, and I did not want to embarrass you. Instead, I asked Neury's replacement to ask you, off the air, to ask him what is used and unpublished in his work that is fact. I emphasize fact, for from what he said and what I read the only thing he has added is a remarkable speculation in the name of departing "speculation". The point of this is that, whether or not you were aware of it during the show, he was indeed referred to his "discoveries" as when he "found in the archives" that, without exception, are neither new and unpublished nor his "discoveries". I had close to 100% reception on your show, and there is but one thing that he aired that is not in my work and that comes from Ray Brown, who not only published it but also told the press about it a year ago (I told the press about it a year ago this past summer and gave me permission to use it but I didn't). Even the one thing that is not in my published work is a thing I have to observe working in the field, including LHM, in whose files it is, and tell them about it in your studio. That is the FBI date on the finding of the piece of skull in Valley Forge. I gave that to others working in the field, not just telling them about it, in confidence, to help them in their work, more than a year ago, well in advance of his "discovery" date, which he, rather strangely, identified by date this past February.

Were it not for the studied dishonesty of your film, that said these things that were published before he wrote his book and his "discoveries", in this case I might be willing to believe he did discover it on his own.

Now it is inevitable that people working in the same field come upon the same material and use it, often in the same way. That is unusual in the sciences of originality when this is no less than a deliberate falsehood.

This, in turn, should be considered in the light of the position of the person's work, about which I'll comment. Let me tell you about Ray Brown's analysis alone, to the best of my knowledge-for it fits very well with what I have charge. Ray worked entirely with the published versions of the Zapruder film. In the Summer of 1968 he sent me a set of what he had done, with the printed pictures mounted in. I still have it and you are welcome to it. He proved, conclusively, by what he calls the shoulder dip, that Connell had been hit at Zapruder frame 337-8. While I was in California last week and earlier this week, Ray told me of the SEEast thing, which I read at the plane back. He also told me that he told Thompson about this a year ago. I have never had a day to lie, and I do know that he has made his work on the Zapruder and the plane pictures available to everyone working in the field. The one thing he could hope to get out of the tremendous investment in time and money is credit, and that he is now denied.

On this point, for the first time, I have found all of those working in the field in California uniformly unhappy about any work that attempts to be on our side. They accepted-welcomed-even Epstein, who assumes the basic conclusions of the Commission without question. I was too busy to ask why. It seemed from all-and except for Ray's monograph on Bullet 399, all are unpublished and only one plane any publication-that the reason is Thompson's taking credit for what was without exception done by others.

Thompson's formula is a simple, highly-commercial one, the only one that can achieve publication with a great fanfare (by a publisher who told me he would under no circumstances publish anything in this field) and republication in a magazine (which transferred the editor who was a specialist in this, Mike Mooney, to another assignment; Mooney told me, well in advance of publication, a day or two before I last saw you, that he had no connection with this, for a reason now clear) simply because of what he really does: he criticizes the official account adding only conjecture and inaccuracy to what has already been said, while softening it and justifying the government by agreement with its most fundamental conclusions on Oswald's guilt and the absence of a conspiracy. He insists, in the face of unassailable evidence to the contrary, that the fatal shot came from the sixth-floor window, and that no shot was fired before the first time the Commission said one was.

It was not easy for him to conclude there was no conspiracy, for the one thing he has added to what others of us have written is an entirely untenable theory about how many assassins there were. Those of us who are reasonable and who really seek the truth (and I believe that this is explicit in my writing alone, not Lane's), all say the same thing: there was not fewer than two assassins. Yet while talking of them as "accomplices", Thompson says these three were not "conspirators". The terms are mutually contradictory. Conspiracy is a combination to do wrong. Two alone make a conspiracy. Yet he comforts the government, the publisher and the editor by claiming, in the face of even his own writing, that there was none.

Pretending the Zapruder film is the be-all and end-all (and it is, without doubt, as I alone have insisted from the beginning the most important single bit of evidence), he also pretends it says everything by itself. This is false. Disturbing to me in his presentation, however, is the irrefutable evidence of this film of the first shot: that it had to be prior to Frame 210. And Thompson said the kind of careful study he pretends, he would know that even the Commission acknowledges that the fifth of the 12 published Willis pictures was taken after the President had been hit. In fact, all the evidence is that Willis was not prepared to expose his film but was startled into it in reaction to the shot. Now the Zapruder film shows that, from Willis, who is in it, this shot had to have been prior to Frame 202, and Thompson knows it. At this point, Willis takes the camera from his eye, having exposed his picture. He is clear in the Zapruder film. I would suggest that the real reason there is no publication of the missing frames is because they do not show Willis, who disappears from even the margin of the film within a few frames of 202 and prior to 207.

What pictures Thompson prints that show two "objects" in the sixth-floor window I do not know, but I have printed from the highest film a shot that shows no one in that window at the time he would have to be to be an assassin. J. Edgar Hoover and his FBI and the Navy Photo Labs and now Itak for LIFE (which carefully understated in the current issue) all confirm there is no man there. About three seconds after Frame 313, Miller took a picture that shows no one there after it.

The evidence that Oswald could not have been there is overwhelming and there is absolutely no evidence that he was. Thompson's handling of the Lovelady picture is just as dishonest. He knows the FBI lied (he phrased it differently) because I proved it and published it in saying Lovelady wore a striped shirt. However, existing pictures, including that of CBS, which he referred to, show the shirt Lovelady actually wore to have been of very prominent red and black squares, exactly what I describe in PHOTO. WHITWASH on page 294.

On item after item there was this kind of falsehood on your show. If you want, from the few notes I made I will document it. A few examples: the misquoting from bullet 399 (here he chided the "critics", careful to describe himself as something else): Dr. Shaw testified that there were more than 3 grains of metal in the wrist alone. No one disputed him. You cannot, as Thompson did, equate what was recovered ^{what} from what was lost by the bullet, for much was very small and washed out in the cleansing and could not be recovered. There remains the size of the fragment in the Governor's thigh, which you will see in my fifth book that I will publish as soon as I can risk the added debt (it has been completed for months), and that in the chest, which everyone else ignores. Even if Thompson were right in limiting the metal in the wrist as he does, the added

metal in these two additional parts of the governor's body on this basis alone disqualifies the bullet on this basis alone. All the rest of us are not inaccurate on this; Thompson alone is, and he chides us for it. As you will also see, if his studies of the bullet were at all competent, he'd had still another basis (we all agree on the lack of mutilation, which was first in my first book). I postponed taking pictures of this bullet until the last minute, hoping some of LIFE or CBS would do and save me the money. The Archives offered me the negatives they shot for Thompson. Because these are nothing but flackery and duplicate what was already published, I took my own. You will see them and the very obvious meaning in POST MORTEM, the fifth book.

While Thompson acknowledges that the Commission acknowledge a "missed" shot, his subject chart and account lack it. The reason is simple: he had to. With his theory about where the assassins were (and there is nothing new in the essence of it, not even the NeSoms building--I have dozens of pictures taken for me in Dallas from a number of possible similar locations, including that and various offices in it; Penn Jones has definitely decided on this and published it long ago) he cannot account for it except as coming from the sixth floor window and he cannot do that, for it was impossible in his scheme. His presentation on your show also did not account for this missed shot, about which there is no doubt, nor James V. Lague did blast from the spray.

That Frame 150 bit that is so grossly misrepresented, pretending that after it every shake of the Zepruder camera had to come from a shot, did not originate with CBS, as he also knew (if you play the tape back you'll find he only implied it did). CBS plagiarized it from the bottom of page 47 of WHIP-CRACK, which Widgeley saw in the limited edition.

I understood him to say that there had been no previous comment on the fact that Connally and JFK had not been hit by the same bullet, according to the official evidence. This is false. I publish one of the many reports then in my possession in WHIP-CRACK II, by photocopy, and two of the assortment of the Secret Service photographs showing this in the appendix (pp. 108, 109). Vince probably gave him this, because Vince had such documents also. Again, I repeat there is nothing wrong with writing about what others have written about or discovered. What is wrong is the dishonesty in claiming it hasn't been done previously and in claiming originality for it.

It, like any other word is not honestly possible--in saying that the LIFE copy of the Zepruder film was never available to the Commission. The original 8mm movie was shown by Harry Orth, of LIFE, and the Commission's slides are of exactly the same generation as whatever prints Thompson may have seen of LIFE. They were made directly from the original. Properly used in the Archives, they are more meaningful than the prints, as Congressman Kaufman continued to be when, after he had studied these prints, I took him to the Archives and showed him the slides in motion. They are also vastly larger and show more detail than the prints when they are projected. Just tactile copy of the Zepruder film is a copy of a copy does not cogitate with him; I published it a year ago at the latest. But it is also a lie to say that the Commission and its staff were restricted to this copy. The fact is that the copy that is in evidence is an original copy, as I also published. The substitution was documented in Fall. However, Thompson said that all the work was done with the remoter copy, which is false. It is part of his false buildup of himself and his "work". This is also consistent with his lament about how hard he labored for a year to puzzle out, as it could be done only from the originals, that Connally was hit at 2337-S when Ray Marcus did it from printed version of whatever generation. That then of the plea for the LIFE release of the entire film (and need I remind you of my own writing on this) and the offer of all his profits for the release of these two frames? Flackery. Dean has published the Zepruder income from LIFE. Months ago it was about \$450,000. There need have been no secrecy on this, nor reference only to the secret contract he had seen. Does Geis think there is any chance of LIFE sweeping whatever they are getting for the profit Geis can make when E's share was this great months ago. And this is one of the few parts of the film where the original is unnecessary.

Even Thompson's conclusion that I believe he said "I am crying for right now", for a Congressional investigation, is not his own. Here I am alone among the "critics" (most of whom fear Eastland) and I do concluded in mid-February 1965. How utterly strange

it is that after all this great personal labor, Thompson could come up with nothing save this single Ray Marcus thing that I did not publish or make available from my own search of the Archives--and not a single thing of my vast accumulation that is unpublished did he refer to! What are the odds on this?

(In case you do not know the Archives works, all you need do is describe what you want and those working in the files almost without exception deliver it. Hence why published work constitutes an index to the Archive.)

Of even the obscure stuff is this true. No one else has ever made any reference to Alameda. Look in WHII on page 37. Here you will find the only published account of that FBI report, and Thompson quoted nothing from it that I didn't print. (On the same page you will find one of my many printed accounts of how the FBI and Secret Service said Connally had, indeed, been struck by a separate bullet.) What is not warranted is the interpretation Thompson put on this: that the bullet that wounded Connally, after exiting his body, made a right-angle turn and had sufficient energy left to gouge four inches out of the concrete. In the GEB tests, with no provision made for Connally's rib and its resistance, no single bullet had the energy left to penetrate the gelatin used in approximation of the thick. Some, as I recall it, did not have the energy to penetrate the ribless representation of the chest and wrist alone. But this man who on your show said he shunned conjecture and held to the "hard evidence" speculates that this particular bullet could have with such violence performed these gymnastics. And it was at this point that he said the "critics" were "embarrassed" by our "speculations". Naturally, he cited none, but how honest is this comment, even if it were true!

How distressing it is to find that the two men who pretend to be scholars and who because of their degrees are unthinkingly accepted as scholars and get the real press and other attention for it, are those who turned out the least scholarly work.

Another example of Thompson's honesty--and I'm surprised you let this go uncorrected. Only Garrison and Delandrie said that Oswald had a government connection! I said this first, in "HITLER'S", which dates to February 1965. I alone have done original work in this field. You may remember I did a story for you on a book on this subject. But generous, honest Thompson, credits Vince and Jim!

How neat it was of him, when asked about his relations with the critics, to mention only the two whose books were published prior to his, and then to say only that he had never met us. Has he never read our works?

What remains of Thompson's major claims. The doubleshit: Ray Marcus and I, independently and by different means, discovered that long ago. Ray from the Commission's printed pictures alone (those even poorer than Thompson says the Commission worked with because they are less clear and resist enlargement because of the photoenlarging screen), and I from the movie, in April or May of 1961. As a measure of the honesty of the Post on this, let me tell you that when I salvaged them, when Helen ^{W.D.} Bloudering around getting nowhere saw they wanted so to beat look and the Winchester series, I persuaded the Post editor then in charge, to come to the Archives. He and Helen were there together when I showed it to them, I think in November 1966. I published this in WHII(221). So shocked was I that all those who had earlier examined this film did not see the violent backward thrust of the president's body at frame 313 immediately after the less violent forward movement that I feared, being the first, I just wouldn't be believed. Just before I published WHII, I rewrote this part to tone it down. Nonetheless, what Thompson and his flacks now take credit for I published a year ago, and it was written well before then. In fact, it was the draft of this me that persuaded Harrison Salisbury to have the Times take another look. This happened when Gene Roberts found nothing in the Archive that I hadn't. I suspect he wasn't looking hard.

What is the effect of Thompson's work. I heard Wesley Liebeler approve it the night of November 17 in Hollywood! He was, in fact, quite pleased with it. But Thompson and his flacks have done is to pretend they alone know the answer, to improve what is needed, in a blatant attempt to get the government off the hook by basic agreement with them while showing only error that had been previously established and put the most favorable possible face on that. It is a cheap and openly dishonest commercialization accurately designed to meet the requirements of the commercial and political marketplace.

In the interest of trying to get at the truth and not further fraction our small side, I have refrained from public criticism of those generally on my side, I save for the doctrinal content in the diploma of WHITMAN II, where I deal only with fact. For example, "Anna's cavalier dismissal of the story of the false Oswald and of Sylvia Odio based on incompetent and misunderstanding and misreading of the Commission's File 1551. (This is the essence of the Garrison case, for which Lane now seeks to claim credit and with which he associated himself, with the chance for profit, despite his contrary writing.) I have also made no public reference to the numerous plagiarisms. In the work of the one "critic" Thompson now fit to mention, I can show you typographical error identical with that in WHITMAN and quotations abbreviated 100% as I did. Mike Mooney, who is the OZPost expert on the assassination and who sent Whalen to me when Whalen was stumped on the autopsy and other matters, told me in September 1966 that as of that time he had seen my work under the names of eight others, including identical paragraph structure. For me to do something about this would hurt what I seek. At how unhappy I am when I consider that for what I have done - I have more than \$50,000 in debts and my wife works and dives as she does to make it possible while others pick up my chips.

Now let me ask you to recall the time you had Vince and Curtis with me, way back in the summer of 1966. Do you remember ~~xxxxx~~ that I gurgressed my songs until the show was almost over. Please add Vince's association with Thompson on this book. Now read the two letters enclosed, which I have never before revealed, even though I know Vince is your friend. (I have phoned him and invited him to the studio every time I have been there despite his foolish filibustering on his then theory that "ourally was not struck until around 1907.") Please note the dates in these two letters. Ballinger asked Vince to review WHITE SMITH on May 17. I sent Ballinger a copy May 9. Vince wrote me May 23. Note his letter to Ballinger, with or before the copy of the book I sent him could have reached him. Note also what I take to be the blackmail. WHITE SMITH was completed February 13, 1965. I had a contract with a publisher calling for delivery on that date and I met it. I sent the chapters in, taken, each with a dated covering letter. There was nothing else published at the time of my work. I never saw any of Vince's writing until May 1966, and I saw no other writing until well after I finished this book. I think there had been only two articles anyway, and both together had very little of the material. One was Vince's, as I later discovered when Steve Farber of the London Sunday Telegraph gave me a copy. I then did not know of the "minority" of One.

Naturally, Ballinger did not carry any mention of my book nor his ~~etc~~ of the others, to the best of my knowledge. Like the "minority" of One, Arnold and the same I see charge against me, rather violently and irrationally. I offered him access to all my files, specified the dates I had written the various parts of the book, and challenged him to show me what he or anyone else had then published. His reply was to tell me I was mad. He called that a point by point, factual refutation. I leave you to your own decision about who is mad.

However, I point out that there has never been any mention of any of my four books in any of the liberal or left-wing press save a single one the National Guardian was pressured into doing by Cedric Belfrage, then editor in exile, when his daughter sent him a copy of the book, and one in the New Republic, brought about by the same Steve Farber. I had sent copies to each publication. Each failed to mention. And this, too, just another "coincidence":

There remains a single comment I want to make, to Thompson's reference to what "he" publishes in "his" book about the missing pictures. They are more by far than he states and there was a considerably lower percentage of the existing pictures seen by the Commission, about 60% only. I believe what he does here is to use a copy of an early memo by Jack Sprague that Vince certainly received if he didn't. Now it happens that Sprague is following my work. I gave him all my leads. My work on this dates to the early summer of 1966. Thompson pretended there is no book entitled PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITMAN: SUPPLEMENTED HISTORY AS SASSIUTIC HISTORIC. But you know about it. I discussed it for the first time on your show, as I have each of my books after the first. I have done this because of the respect I have for you and the debt I feel for your decency and honesty. I chose you instead of the "Tynes show for the second book.

This was not a pleasant letter to write and there are other things for which I never have enough time. But when I know that I have done almost all the basic publication on the cost it has involved, personally and financially, and wonder what will happen to my wife should anything not happen to me, I am bitter at the kind of thing Tompkins has done, I regard it, whether or not he is your friend, as an intentional dishonesty. Perhaps most of all I resent it because it does not help us get the truth and can, very much, impede that.

It is not this bitterness that dictates the letter, that I write in the interest of establishing a record, your integrity and mine. I know you are not capable of deliberate unfairness. May I not seem how far back and you will learn to be fair, as on the Black sheet I did with you, when you see both Curtis and I face there.

As an expression of vanity, let me annotate one comment you made, about those on the other side who suddenly became silent, and suddenly forgot their names. With Jerry Cohen as with the others (including myself), they all fell silent after debating with me. I can think of no exception. The commission staff gave up their "Majority Report" program after it was set and agreed to rather than face us alone in a gangway. I have asked you to invite others to face me, as you will recall. This, too, is because that is a way of establishing truth.

If this offends you, Jack, please believe it is not my intention. Of all the men in your business, you and I have the most similar reputations, none is fairer than you, none are more at work on this subject, and personally I have the highest regard for you, which is saying something that you think of some of the others and who they are. It is just that I have some lines in me, and I have seen I think of me as at least of some of my friends (and only some of the genuine critics or would any profit), and I have seen some of the others a few back from everyone else or so to be in and so to be fair, involves a struggle that can be set with the best of us as well as with you, too.

Sincerely,