

BARB Man Snaps Back At Xon Man

I wrote the series for the BARB on the Kennedy assassination critical of the "last word" on the assassination: the Warren report. I think it proper to reply to Joel Pimsleur's article, in the Sunday S.F. Examiner & Chronicle of November 20th, criticizing one article of my series.

Pimsleur said that "at times" the "amateur sleuthing" into the Kennedy assassination got "unbelievably silly". He cited the BARB story I did October 14 in which a headline ran: "Proof: Ruby Near When JFK Was Slain". Pimsleur airily dismisses a noted resemblance between a photo of a TV shot of Ruby and one of a man spotted in front of the Texas School Book Depository Building moments after the assassination.

Actually, I stated in my article (in the very first sentence, in fact) that Ruby "may have been present". I merely offered this photo as possible evidence of his presence. It was a trivial thing, indeed, for Pimsleur to have chosen just this story in mentioning the BARB's series on the assassination.

But my reference to Ruby's possible presence at the scene of the assassination was neither trivial nor "silly". I cited other witnesses who also claimed to have seen Ruby there. There were four mentions in my article. There may have been more.

The Commission chose not to look into these reports because it concluded that Ruby was not there. And on what basis did they conclude so? Simply because Ruby says he wasn't there at the exact moment.

Imagine all the testimony published in the Warren Report and the Volumes concerning witnesses who saw Oswald that would have to be rejected because they had never seen Oswald before!

I note, too, that in the same article Pimsleur makes a reference to Life magazine coming under attack ("sharp criticism", as he calls it) for "mishandling of critical assassination photos." That "sharp criticism" actually came from the Berkeley BARB which Mr. Pimsleur fails to credit. This story I wrote (see BARB, Oct. 7). It detailed the five different issues Life printed of its issue on the Warren Report (Oct. 2, 1964). All of the changes were made to conform to the "lone

assassin" theory - a theory, incidentally, which both the Commission and its willing handmaiden, Life magazine, successfully forced upon the American public.

The Barb was the first to call the public's attention to all of the five altered versions of Life. Ironically, Life is now demanding a new investigation of the assassination. If such an investigation should develop out of the growing clamor for something to be done it would seem to this writer that one of the first witnesses that should be called is Life itself.

It should be mentioned at this point that a certain confusion exists concerning the photo appearing in the BARB (Oct. 14, see bottom of page two). Certain critics have taken me to task for allowing the photo taken by Phillip L. Willis showing the back of a man in the foreground looking apparently in the direction of the Texas School Book Depository Building to appear in a cropped version. In the full print of the picture (obtainable from Willis) there is a man to the right of the man with his back turned.

In Lan's book (page 349) Willis is quoted as saying that the FBI seemed to think the man at the

see page 8

from page 3

far right (not the man with his back turned) was Ruby. Lane mentions that this particular photo was printed in the Volumes by the Commission in a cropped version, so that a portion of the man's face was removed from the far right end of the film.

The BARB photo was taken not from the original print but from that which appeared in the Commission's Volume. This BARB photo was then cut down further for reasons of space and thus it left off the man at the far right. The cutting is not significant since the point I was raising was that not the man on the far right but rather the man with his back turned resembled Ruby.

It is my contention that the cropping by the Commission was done not to question the appearance of a man at the far right who resembled Ruby but to avoid bringing it up altogether so that no one could go looking for a man in that photo who did look like Ruby.

In questioning whether the man at the far right was Ruby I noticed the resemblance between the man with his back turned and the other photo (see BARB Oct. 14) similar to this one. Of the twelve photos Willis took this was not the only one published that was cropped.

FILED
WR-C

FILED
RUBY

FILED
WR-C