

Jack White
301 W. Vickery
Fort Worth, TX 76104

8/13/93

Dear Jack,

With all there is in today's mail and all else I had to do I responded to Evica without reading your letter to me and to Evica of 4/29. You can judge how useful it has been to write Evica from my today's response and my 8/4 to him, of which I'm ^{also} mailing copies to HARRS, although he has not responded in anyway. It is possible ~~that~~ with all the crap Evica was feeding me I did misunderstand ~~him~~ ^{that} and it is not his fault that somehow the one letter got mislaid, but it is obvious ~~that~~ if he had even just once been responsive nothing else would have followed. And as I think is natural, the more he evades and refuses to respond the more suspicious he makes the whole thing,

I see nothing wrong with your 4/29 letter to him or in your 1. in it. But I now wonder if he twisted that to evolve the question I quote directly:

"We would like to have you respond to the following question: 1. Has Harold Weisberg been a significant source of disinformation in the JFK investigation? 2. Why?" Note that he not only puts this in the affirmative but by using "significant" he in effect says that there is no question but that I have been a disinformation agent, the only question being ~~was it significant that he raised this so I could be defended has no sense to it at all.~~ was it "significant". His claim that he raised this so I would be defended has no credibility at all, particularly not as phrased. Raising the question at all is both infamous and a measure of the common sense such people have - none. Plus their own arrogance of mind and spirit.

I made no objection to any such paper and I waited two weeks, until that long after the conference ended, to ^write him. I had to write him again to get any response.

I have no way of knowing what all the nuts with a high opinion of themselves may think of ~~as~~ say but as I told Evica, the only one I ever heard suggest anything like that is Livingstone - and he has a book coming out defaming all who do not bow to him as disinformation agents, worse in some of his letters to me and to others. I want to be prepared for that infamy from a certifiable man.


Thanks and I'm sorry about this waste of time for all of us,

(^{There is the only return address on his 7/12/93}
^{mailing!})

sincerely,



Harold Weisberg





JACK WHITE GRAPHIC ARTS 301 WEST VICKERY FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76104 PHONE 817-332-3913

August 9, 1993

Dear Harold...

...a followup letter to the one mailed earlier today regarding an alleged derogatory statement of Geroge Michael Evica.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I sent him in response to a list of questions he sent. He wanted answers to use as part of his presentation at the Third Decade Conference. This has been my only correspondence with him as far as I can remember. As you can see, you are not mentioned.

I hope this will help clarify your concern.

I suggest you contact George Michael personally or by phone to find out who is behind this smear tactic. If you find out what is going on, please let me hear from you!

Cordially,


Jack White



JACK WHITE GRAPHIC ARTS 301 WEST VICKERY FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76104 PHONE 817-332-3913

April 29, 1993

To: George Michael Evica
Re: Third Decade Conference

Dear George Michael,

Thank you for the information on the conference and the invitation to participate. For economic reasons (certainly not lack of interest) I will be unable to travel to Providence for the event. However, I will by this letter attempt to answer the questions you pose, though not in the form of a formal research paper.

First, though, I'd like to respond to several points in your letter:

1. You say you intend to "initiate an in-depth self-examination within the JFK assassination community." I'm not sure what you have in mind, but I hope it is to address a distressing trend I have observed among researchers. I am told that others have noticed it also, and that it was discussed at the Chicago symposium as "the new agnostics." Quite a few well-respected critics, as well as some newer ones, seem to have come under the influence of some mysterious outside force and are defecting in whole or in part to the "other side." Some of them may have been made privy to certain "sensitive information." Others have come under the influence of persons who have somehow "brainwashed" them. Others may have been somehow threatened or blackmailed. And some merely seem to be protecting their long-established turf. Some latch onto, without question, obviously spurious "new evidence" and other disinformation. Some renounce good research they themselves have done in the past. Some even say the single bullet theory is probably true and that Oswald probably was a shooter. It is all very disruptive to effective research. The current fall-back position of the conspirators seems to be "Divide (researchers) and conquer!"

2. You say the focus will be on three questions (How, Who, and Why?). I thought there was a general broad consensus among most researchers:

How: Military/intelligence scenario with tacit or actual approval of political/governmental/civilian power structure.

Who: Tactical...military/intelligence. Operational...assorted paid or ideological "hit men" (mafia assassins, foreign assassins, CIA assassins, etc.) with designated patsy and coverup.

Why: Various groups' hatred of JFK and his policies (military and CIA... Cuba and Vietnam and anti-communism; professional war machine...profits; mafia...revenge; Cubans...revenge; LBJ and JEH...power; etc.)

3. You say you "hope to reveal the identities of the conspirators." Does this mean someone at the conference is prepared to "name names"?

Now to respond to your specific questions for me in relation to the conference:

1. "Why are the Oswald (backyard? ID? I'm assuming you are referring to the backyard pics) photos so obviously faked?"

This question is based on the erroneous assumption that the faking of the various Oswald photos is obvious. Actually, for 1963 technology, the faked photos were quite well done, almost state-of-the-art. I think the reason they were not perfect fakes was that the conspirators never dreamed that they would be examined in such great detail for 30 years. They thought they could control the investigation and evidence, and that the photos would only be used for propaganda, certainly not subject to 30 years of study by curious people like me. The fact is, the photos were good enough to fool many people for many years, and in fact, even today some serious respected researchers still believe they are genuine. Paul Hoch, for example, has expressed the opinion that degreed academics on the HSCA photo panel are by definition more respected experts than an amateur like Jack White, so he thinks the backyard photos have to be genuine. This is more of an intellectual bias than an objective analysis based on indisputable facts that prove beyond doubt that the backyard photos are fakes. My video documentary FAKE covers all the obvious reasons supporting fabrication, but here is a quick summary:

a. All the backyard photos (CE133A, 133B, and so-called 133C) can be shown to have backgrounds that are absolutely identical, yet the photos were allegedly taken by Marina with a cheap hand-held camera. It is absolutely impossible to achieve such a feat unless the camera is on a tripod. It could be achieved, however, by starting with a single photo of the empty backyard, and through matte insertion (or maybe cut-and-paste) insert another photo of a person "standing" in the scene. If the conspirators had only faked one photo instead of three, we could never have proved this. The HSCA "experts" claimed they could prove through "photogrammetry" (taking measurements within a photo) that the backgrounds were different. But I can prove that these academicians were not expert at all because they failed to consider "keystoning". Keystoning occurs when a projected picture image being printed is not precisely parallel to the negative. In fact, the backgrounds only can be shown to be identical by keystoning, thereby reversing the procedure which the conspirators used to make the "B" photo appear to have a perspective different than the "A" picture. When keystoning is used, photogrammetry is useless because it distorts measurements and stretches the picture in the direction of the easel tilt. By "un-keystoning" I was able to remove the false perspective and make the backgrounds absolutely identical except for places where retouching was done. This procedure also proves that the "B" background was the one keystoned.

b. A single photo of "Oswald's" face was superimposed on someone else's body, and this was composited into the background, not by an amateur, but by a very sophisticated graphic arts process called matte insertion. Looking at visuals in my slide presentation or videotape, anybody can easily see that the faces in "A" and "B" are absolutely identical except for retouching in the area of the lips. Again, it is totally impossible for a person to appear in consecutive photos made with a hand-held camera and have the face be identical in pose, lighting and perspective. To say this can be done is the photographic equivalent of the single bullet theory. Like Cyril Wecht on that theory, I challenge anyone in the world, using a cheap hand-held box camera at with a waist-level reversed-image viewfinder to duplicate such a feat with both the background and the person's face. Any photographer will tell you it is impossible.

c. Much other evidence of fakery is evident, as can be seen in my slide presentation or video...such things as wrong proportions, lack of proper sizing and balance in inserting the person in the background, improper lighting and shadows, missing fingertips on the right hand, much too much to outline completely in a brief summary like this.

Now to your second question about the backyard photos:

2. "Since they are not sophisticated work, what does that tell us about the disinformation people behind the photo frauds?"

Again this question assumes that the fake photos were not sophisticated. Quite the contrary is the case. I think they were produced by the graphics process called matte insertion. This is a sophisticated process requiring expert technicians, artists and photographers using equipment not available to the general public and using techniques and processes known to few outside of certain specialized industries, such as publishing, platemaking, photography and movie production. Such work is most commonly used in print advertising to seamlessly insert one photo into another. It uses a technique of reciprocal masking when combining pictures to hold back an image by means of a reverse mask and then using a positive mask of the same shape to print in another image in the area shielded by the previous mask, at the same time protecting the first image during the exposure of the second. Properly registered, a seamless image insertion is accomplished. This method has been widely used since the 30s, and I'm sure would have been available to experts in various government agencies since that time. Nowadays, such work is done by computer and traditional matte insertion is now little used. But in the 60s, it would have been the favored method of faking a photo. But I must emphasize it cannot be done by an amateur because it is a sophisticated process requiring technical know-how and elaborate commercial equipment.

I do not know how to answer the second part of this question, because it presumes the introductory phrase is true. In a sense, I have already answered this, because I think the disinformation people behind the fake photos underestimated the persistence and intelligence of us buffs. Allen Dulles himself said that the American people would never bother to read the report. (He was almost right; fewer than 1% did.) But those of us who did read it and have studied the evidence have found things out in 30 years that they thought they could keep secret. Had they known they could not totally control the evidence, they would have kept more of it secret. And had they guessed at the determined persistence of some of us Sherlock Holmes fans, they would have done fake photos that would have gone undetected forever instead of just 10 years.

I hope this answers your questions. If you have further questions or if I can help with anything else, let me know.

Cordially,

Jack White