

Mr. Roy L. Schaeffer
1136 Wilmington Ave., # 1
Dayton, OH 45420

10/25/91

Dear Mr Schaeffer,

All of the multitude of JFK assassination theories of which I know are written either in ignorance of the established fact, misrepresent it, by design or accident, or both. All serve to further confuse the people who still care very much; and all have the effect of exculpating those who then and since failed us when they did not meet their obligations.

So I begin by stating what you may take as a prejudice: I oppose these theories and I do not know of a single one that is even tenable.

I've not read your novel manuscript but I did, several times, read what you enclosed in your yesterday's letter because your letter states that your novel is being reviewed by Scott-Meredith's legal department.

If you have any self-respect or care for your reputation, you'll get it back fast! As to a degree I'll explain. I won't take time for all that is so very wrong with what I've just gotten from you.

Your letter says that after watching the 1988 Nova show you "came up with the idea of how Secret Service Agent Greer had shot the President." From my recollection of that show there is nothing in it that could trigger this impossibility, which is what it really is.

The second page of the stapled enclosures is a reproduction of a published version of Zapruder's Frame 313. You say, "A critical look at this frame determines Secret Service agent William Greer's guilt." It does no such thing. Aside from all that is so very wrong in basing so serious a charge of a greatly magnified and then printed enlargement of a tiny portion of what was only 8mm wide to begin with you have what you refer to as a "puff of smoke" you attribute to his firing his pistol or revolver backward ^{it is} more than twice the height of his head above his head and quite some distance in front of it. There is much more than this simple description that is terribly, terribly wrong with what you say.

Of the upper left reproduction on the following page you say that "the first bullet struck the inside of the Presidential windshield...." Absolutely false! If a bullet had hit that windshield there would have been a large hole through it rather than the tiny defect that at most was caused by a fragment. There is more that is frightful on this page but I refer to one that appears later again, that Greer fired his weapon with his left hand while holding the weapon under his right armpit. Aiming is of no consequence to you? Have you tried this without even aiming? And what in the world do you think ~~he~~ kept all the people looking at the limo and him from seeing this or Kellerman and the back-seat survivors from hearing or feeling the detonation? This isn't even greasy kid stuff in a novel. It is irrational.

The calculations you have on the next page are based on Zapruder being 40 feet from the limo. And you were there and still say this? It was ever so much farther.

The next two pages, of 35mm contact-print size reproductions of the Z film, have those beginning with 311 first, 204 second. Opposite 313 you say there ~~is~~ a puff of smoke "separate from the head blast (sic) smoke from Greer's revolver." You did not mark it and it is not there. PERIOD!

On the ~~next~~ sheet you have nothing between Z207 and Z 212 yet they are not there and you have this explanatoon after 207: "Oswald shot Kennedy with revolver Z208. Horizon shot marked out."(?) Could be "masked" out. In any event, what kind of world do you live in when there are all the people there were on the front steps with Oswald, all looking in that direction, and not one saw, heard of felt that shot? Among the innumerable things ~~wrong~~ with this concoction? Have you ever fired a revolver? One as cheap as that one? With ammo that could wobble in the barrel? To call this merely absurd is to dignify it, it is really that bad!!

Of the many things wrong with the page of text that follows I refer to just a couple/

"Zapruder stated in a sworn affidavit [is there any other kind?] that was received by the FBI (DL 89-43) that he had his camera set at a 24 setting...."

"(DL89-43)" is a ~~phony~~ ^{phony} citation, designed to give the impression of knowledge you do ~~not~~ ^{not} have. ~~That is the main JFK assassination file in the Dallas office.~~ ^{89-43 is the main JFK assassination file in the Dallas office.} It requires a third number to be an accurate and meaningful citation. If you have that record the number is on it. I think you do not have it because it does not exist. I think you are referring to an FD302 interview report by SA Barrett that is inaccurate (and that I used not knowing it was inaccurate) in facsimile in my second book. You say you have a duplicate of that camera. It has been many years since I held it but my recollection is that it has no 24fps setting. Yet you ~~used~~ base your or at least what you represent ~~as~~ ^{are} calculations on this, at least in part.

"The Warren Commission has established the minimum mechanical ~~fitting~~ ^{fitting} time of ~~the~~ Oswald's rifle at 2.3 seconds." While this can be stretched to not call it dishonest, in ~~context~~ ^{context} it is dishonest and deception. ~~One~~ ^{ve} ~~man,~~ ^{FBI} ~~one time,~~ ¹ on a firing range, at shorter distance, from a prone position, and after the rifle had been overhauled, did fire it that fast one time. As a practical matter the best shots the Commission could get could not come close to the shooting attributed to Oswald and not ~~one~~ ^{of them} fired a single shot this fast.

On the next page, after saying you used the same model camera, you say "The reason I started at Z 208, there appears to be a horizontal line appearing at frame 207. I believe the horizontal line is the actual path of the bullet." You follow this with an untruthful account of Life's explanation.

I am constrained to remind you that with this letter you ordered a copy of my last book. All the foregoing is in my earlier books of which you are grossly ignorant. This includes what LIFE actually said and an explanation of what you ~~imagine~~ ^{imagine} is "the actual

depth of the bullet." ^{and film with a shutter and} A camera ~~with~~ so slow an exposure captures the path of a bullet moving at more than 2000 feet per second? I think this is pretty sick!

But why do you not tell the truth about that ~~line~~? It has been available to you and to others for 25 years and was not secret since 1965. And what reason consistent with honesty of intent or anything other than carelessness and ignorance have you for making no reference to the missing frames between 207 and what is numbered 212?

What LIFE actually said is that in making a copy of the original film it was broken and the technician, instead of reporting this, merely discarded 208-11 and cemented, ^{the top of 208} the line you see in 208, ^{to} the bottom half of 212 to it. (Earlier ^{Zapruder} copies hold these frames.)

Especially when you seek to explain the "horizontal line" along with this significant omission of which you have to be aware, saying that LIFE attributed it to it being scratched by accident, will it be impossible for critics not to blast the hell out of you for being intently dishonest.

You next have an invention "to make the scenario work, "which it doesn't even with inventions, and you say of it that it "probably was the case since one of the three 6.5 mm shell casings was so badly dented at the top of its rim [which reflects ignorance of shooting and ammo, by the way, yet you write as though you have real knowledge] it would have been impossible to fire." I see I omitted what you should have omitted because it is false, "on display at Daley Plaza."

This comes from my first book because neither the FBI ^{na} ~~and~~ the Commission explained the appearance of the neck of the empty shell indicating it could not fit inside the chamber to be fired. However, later I got a duplicate of that rifle and had an expert try to duplicate that for me in firing it at the local range used by the police. It can be done with extraordinary ejection. Which is after firing.

In any event, it cannot have the meaning you attribute to your nightmare, "This would mean that Oswald fired the first shot at Z208," which you in plain English lie about, nothing omitted, in saying, "(Confirmed by the bullet line in Z-207)"

In saying that here Oswald fired his revolver from the steps, as with the ludicrous alleged Greer shooting, you have nothing to say about trajectories inside bodies and how other people were not struck.

You just made up (and I'm finding this too difficult to waste time on, it is that incredibly unreasonable, bad ~~ex~~ and inaccurate so I skip more) that the alleged sixth-floor sniper's second or last shot "struck the chrome strip on the Presidential limousine at exactly Z-328." I ignore the latter, which has no basis in fact or reason, and ask you if you have ever fired a rifle at anything like that strip, which you do not describe or locate on the car? Have you bothered even to look at it? It is the merest dent, not the impact of a bullet.

What follows, about Maurice Bishop, I do not dignify by saying anything serious

about it at all.

If you think I'm taking this time because I enjoy it you are quite wrong. I was able to sleep little last night and I should be taking a nap. But I do take the time, usually wasted, to keep people from making fools of themselves with their baseless and usually irrational "solutions" to the crime about which, and you are no exception, they are too ignorant to undertake any writing at all.

Were this to be published, and the record of publishers is that they go for conspiracy because it usually sells, you would soon be a laughingstock.

There is not a word in what I just got from you that makes any sense at all, regardless of known fact of which you are ignorant.

I strongly urge you to withdraw your novel in your own interest. If you have a serious interest in the JFK assassination, first learn to distinguish between what is fact and what is imagined and is dignified by referring to it as theory, read those few books, and then if your interest is serious begin the examination of more than a quarter of a million word now accessible because of Freedom of Information lawsuits, mostly mine.

Please do not ask me to take any more time on anything like this.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg