

~~IV~~ ~~XII~~ Oswald's Tale, Really Oswald State, is Void on The Assassination

Mailer finally struggles to the assassination, as much as does in any event, in his long Part VI, which he titles "Denouement," (pages 743-30) It begins with a rehash of what he ~~selects~~ ^{selects} from what had been widely published about Oswald's life in Dallas. Naturally, of all there is in the Commission's records Mailer begins with what it intended to prejudice the reader against Oswald and against others. But in Mailer's rehash of the testimony of Roy Truly, who Mailer introduces without identifying him as the superintendent of the Texas School Book Depository where Oswald went to work for a dollar and a quarter ~~an~~ an hour, Mailer cannot avoid reporting that Oswald was "above average" and unlike most of the others "did a good day's work," (pages 650-1) Oswald, according to Truly, "paid attention to his job" and did not fritter his time away with idle chatter.

After several pages of rehashing what he selects from McMillan's book, he says, "The question is..."

After several pages of rehashing what he selects from McMillan's book Mailer

goes off on his COINTELPRO kick over an Oswald letter to the USSR's Washington embassy.

283A-

Of that he intones, from the profundity of his ignorance and the limitlessness of his imagination, "The question we have to ask once more is whether Oswald ^{was} indeed working with the COINTELPRO or some analagous group." He follows the stupidity of his own invention, for as we have seen there was no FBI component COINTELPRO for which Oswald could have worked, by saying that reporting this impossibility of his own manufacture "is to encourage another question: Was Oswald trying to escape from such a group," which is to say from one that did not exist. This is Mailer who does not realize that he speaks so eloquently of himself and of all he invents to have his book, (page 659). *end 419*

With this Mailer eases into Hosty again and to ^{the} pre-assassination Note Oswald left at the FBI office for him. It is typical of Mailer that with a great volume of FBI records of its investigation of itself over that note Mailer makes no reference to that or even to the investigation of it and instead resorts to the prejudice of McMillan for his source, her book, page 507 (page xxxii). Whether from intended ignorance or intended dishonesty Mailer's account of that is not honest. He begins it, after a McMillan prejudicial formulation, by saying of that note that "we are left with no more than Hosty's

(That ~~xxxxx~~ Mailer uses McMillan's ^{of it} ~~rehash~~ rather than the Commission's published testimony is Mailer's own reflection of what he says was his "thorough" study of the Commission's published ~~xxxxx~~ evidence!)

In fact
and the FBI's inspector-general investigation included the questioning of all the employees of the Dallas ~~the~~ office who could have had any knowledge, including both special agents and clerical personnel. So it is obvious that ~~only~~ ^{only} a determined liar or a determined ignoramus could have said that he or ~~some~~ ^{anyone} else is "left with no more than Hosty's recollection" of what Oswald wrote "Hosty."

recollection of the contents" (page 660).

Whether from ignorance- and the papers were full of that great scandal and there were ^{Concession of} hearings ^{on} ^{made} ever it -or intended dishonesty, this is even for the ^{glibly} lying Mailer a very big lie. Hosty's is far from the only ~~one~~ "recollection" that was publicly available, in my files or in the FBI's public reading room.

Because of their importance I made duplicate copies of all the disclosed and relevant FBI records that in its filing were so scattered and made a separate file of them for the use of others. This is to ~~be~~ say that all the FBI disclosed was available at a single point, with no time required for searching. 284A

Mailer follows this with added dishonesty, telling his readers the added lie that it was only because his boss ^{ordered} ^{Hosty} told him to that he destroyed that note, ^{what} as Mailer also manages not to say ^{that was} as soon as Oswald was ^{lead} ^{garden} and there would be no trail at which that note would have to be presented by the FBI. (Shanklin was, in fact, ^{ordered} ^{to} destroy ^{that} that note that day by FBI headquarters. end
420

Without regard to what was readily available to him in the official records ^{again} Mailer retails McMillan (or made up-it is not worth the time to check) that ~~McMillan~~ "Oswald's note told Hosty not to visit or bother his wife, and then suggested that if Hosty did not desist, he, Oswald, was ready to take action against the FBI. Whether that action would be legal or was a personal threat could not be determined." (page 660).

The FBI inspector general's investigation and report includes what all those in the FBI office who had any knowledge of that note - and the receptionist, "Ammie Fenner, showed it to all she could - not a single one reporting any ~~kind~~ indication that Oswald would take "legal" action.

Nor did any one of them report That Oswald's note was a "personal threat" against Hosty.

The consensus was that ^{if} Oswald threatened to bomb, with recollections varying between the FBI's office, the police headquarters of both places.

It is not easy to believe that if Oswald did no more than say he would take legal action the FBI would have any reason for keeping the existence of that note secret until

knowledge of it and of its destruction was leaked to The Dallas Times-Herald.

That it was leaked, that it had been kept secret or anything else about it that was so well known is what Mailer found not worth reporting. After all, he had only eight hundred and twenty eight pages.

"While casting doubt on other elements of what Hosty said about this note Mailer then says, Mailer-like citing no source of authority, that as of the time Hosty got that note (which he even pretended was not even signed) "Hosty knew that Oswald had been to Mexico City and had visited the Russian Embassy twice and had been in conversation there twice with a KGB agent ~~was~~ who was, according to the FBI, ^{conversant} with 'wet jobs.'" (page 660). end 421

(Mailer's own lie and thus he cites no source for it.)

This is ~~also~~ a lie. The Oswald case file had not yet been returned from New

Orleans. Hosty testified that it reached his desk only on the day of the assassi-

nation. That Kostikov fiction also surfaced later, after the CIA reported on what its tapes of those ~~taped~~ ^{conversations} embassy conversations included. *Oswald delivered that note ⁵ days to two weeks before then.*

days to two weeks before then.

with this and with other angled rehashing that Mailer cites only to McMillan or to his selections from Commission testimony, he gets to the assassination itself in

the chapter to which he gives a title taken from what Dallas Policeman Harrison Baker

said he saw, "Pidgeons Flew ~~to~~ ^{up} from the Roof" of the RTSED when the shots were fired.

Although they would not on hearing shots from any other nearby ⁵ source. Mailer begins this

chapter with his permatig dishonesty, ignorance or both, with a deliberately mis-

leading account of what Mrs. Annie May Randle said she saw as Oswald approached her home for his ride to work with her brother, ^{Buell} Wesley Peazier. ^{the morning of the assassination} To be able to be as dis-

honest as he is Mailer's claimed source for the little he says that is so deceptive and

misleading he cites not her Commission testimony (2H 245 ff) but a self-serving FBI

report buried all the way back in the Commission's Volume 24 on page 407. That FBI

report quotes her as saying the ~~opposite~~ ^{opposite} of what she told the Commission under oath.

How Mailer was able to find this buried and less than fully honest ^{FBI report} report and not find

what Randle testified to under oath is a mystery ^{6E} not worth persuing but of the seven-

from this chapter

teen sources he cites (page xxxii-xxxiii) nine are to testimony of others, not of her.

Three are from Manchester, three from McMillan and the other is to another exhibit. end 422

~~the~~ Mailer does not entirely ignore Frazier. He just ignores his testimony. ^{T M}

In fact, in all eight hundred and twenty-eight pages Mailer fails to report that ^{either Frazier} ~~either~~ of them testified to the Commission, under oath. That of course hides the fact that ^{he deliberately} ~~he deliberately~~ ^{or Randle} ~~by limits what he says to the one~~ with both his sources is the same FBI report on what the FBI had very much to cover the FBI's ass about.

Mailer limits what he says about Frazier to his saying that he saw Oswald carry the package he had in his right hand and under his arm^{pit}. The latter was, as Mailer is careful not to say, a significant fact. So the reader has no way of knowing its significance. ^{and from both Randle and Frazier} ~~But from both~~ Mailer eliminates all else, the all else that is the only claimed evidence of Oswald taking the rifle to work that morning when in fact all of the evidence is to the exact opposite, that he did not and could not have ^{thus} ~~thus~~ Mailer's need to avoid the sworn ~~test~~ testimony and instead to use the incomplete and entirely self-serving FBI ex parte report.

~~on~~ ^{IN} less than a page of total dishonesty Mailer has the rifle into the Building.

There is no ⁱⁿ ~~in~~ innocence in this and there can be ~~is~~ none. Mailer knew better and he was determined to keep Oswald the assassin he began believing ^{him} ~~him~~ to be in the posture knew was the only one any major publisher would consider and the only one the major media could find acceptable.

Aside from what is in the Commission's evidence ^{he} ~~he~~ boasted or having studied so "thoroughly" he knew ^{of} ~~of~~ my work. ^{He} ~~He~~ knew me and he knew I have offered him access to all ^I ~~I~~ have. Because this matter ^{is essential} ~~of~~ getting Oswald and that rifle into the building that morning ^{to} ~~to~~ Mailer's and the official preconception of his being the assassin, Mailer had to ignore what was ^{readily} ~~also~~ available to him - where in fact it had all been put ~~together~~ together for him and for all others in the very first book on the subject, ~~is~~ cited to the official sources. *end 423*

The third chapter of Whitewash is aptly titled, which is clear after three decades, clear beyond any reasonable question at all, "THE SETUP FOR THE ASSASSINATION" (pages 12ff).

The Commission

I began this matter of getting that rifle to the building for the assassination, for Oswald's planned rendezvous with destiny, what Mailer says was his great ambition, what would make him famous, but noting that he had in fact so slept through the alarm when the clock went off. ~~and that~~ ^{that} He was ~~so~~ determined, as Mailer ^{el} joined the official mythologizers in saying, ~~for~~ ^{for} his moment of greatness that he would have missed it if his wife had not awakened him when ~~ten~~ ^{ten} minutes after the alarm he was still ~~sound~~ ^{but} asleep. (page 15)

I continued, with the actual, official evidence based on which the government claimed ~~it~~ ^{he} had ~~proof that Oswald~~ ^{this} ~~disclosed~~ ^{the} opportunity for the place in history the

Commission said was his driving compulsion. Oswald had to hurry ^{to make it}. ~~The government~~ ^{The government} claimed it had proof that Oswald did take that rifle to work that day. But before repeating that is it necessary to call attention to the utter irrationality of the official mythology and that of all those who parrot it like the sycophants they are, like Mailer in particular in what has no basis in fact at all and is, in fact, proof of the exact

not he did not and would not have carried that rifle that morning.

~~opposite,~~ But when there is a predetermination to be made real, no matter how unreal, how impossible it is, those who seek to make their preconceptions appear to be real are limited to what they can develop as evidence and by how they can then misrepresent it to make it ^{appear} ~~appear~~ to support ~~the~~ ^{is} what they began wanting to make ^{appear} ~~appear~~ reasonable no matter how unreasonable it ~~was~~ ^{is}.

en 2424 based

As the Commission report was ~~based~~ ^{based} on its amateur shrinkery, so also is Mailer's boring eight-hundred-plus pages of ~~swill~~ ^{based on his} amateur shrinkery, mind reading and ESP from the grave ^{along with} and his assorted distortions, misrepresentations and lies he found essential to it. But for Mailer's Tales he found it necessary to ~~alleged~~ ^{alleged}, with no support for it at all, that Os^wald dreamed of fame by killing the President that he in fact respected.

Mailer was so extreme in this, so far beyond belief, so disturbed by the failure of the market to go for his hogwash ^{June 18} that when he appeared on the CBS-TV Sunday Morning nationwide telecast in an effort to improve the those ~~devastatingly~~ ^{devastatingly} poor sales ~~to~~ and to perhaps recapture some of the reputation he lost, this is what ~~the~~ ^{the} happened.

I found Mailer's speech ~~more~~ ^{shrill,} more rapid and excited than on his ~~other~~ ^{earlier} efforts

to promote his book on TV. He was so visibly excited, and his face also reflected ^{this} that, I found it hard to ^{some of} understand what he said.

When he was spouting the nonsense he liked in his book, as in saying of ^a Marin's rebuffing his advances during their sleep, Doctor Mailer offered his diagnosis, "If they had made love the night before it might not have happened."

Doctor Mailer, having ^written all eight-hundred-plus pages to tell the world that Oswald was completely dominated by his inflexible determination to achieve greatness by killing the President would have lost that fierce and dominating determination if his ^{info} way had let him have sex.

Dan Rather led into Ruby's killing of Oswald with slow-~~motion~~ motion pictures taken of it. Rather has been an apologist for the official mythology as he should be because his very first departure from ~~obvious~~ obvious ^{truth} in support of it is what led to his CBS-TV career. He then was only a local reporter. But when he hit the network with his account of what the Zapruder film shows he started his upwardly mobile career. and 425

In Rather's version, which was ridiculed as soon as bootleg copies of that film ~~were~~ were available, the fatal shot drove Kennedy violently forward. Penn Jones put ~~a~~ ^{the} sound track of Rather ^{saying this} on the film and while the ~~so~~ President is actually driven very violently backward, Rather is heard saying that backward was forward, saying that he was going forward when so visible he was driven backward.

~~So~~ ^{So} Rather fed Mailer lines and his voice rising with the beginning of those slow-motion picture of Oswald being shot to death, Mailer ~~grew~~ ^{grew} more visible excited.

Then that shot ~~killed~~ killed Oswald and the victim's face contorts in pain and from surprise, not an unnatural reaction to a shot ~~a~~ that was inevitable fatal, from the testimony of the doctors who sought to save him at Parkland hospital, Mailer, ^t Rather-
line, says that Oswald did not reacting to surprise, ^{or} to pain. Mailer actually said that Oswald shouted in protests at being denied his moment in history!

With more intensity than at any other point in ~~the~~ that ~~a~~ telecast what Mailer himself exclaimed is that Oswald was actually complaining about being denied that

imagined moment in history, his call to fame:

"Oh! How can you kill me now?" is ^{what} M^{ail}er, become a lip-reader when he had that need, ~~is~~ says Oswald was saying, that "now" ~~ad~~ M^{ail}er explained being at the very moment he could ~~eng~~ enjoy that imagined fame that Oswald had spent the last two days denying himself in any event.

What M^{ail}er said caused no reactions from ^Rather.

The point ^{is} here in M^{ail}er's Tales, which my friend Paul Haller says ~~is~~, punning on M^{ail}er's title, Oswald Stale, is that beginning with the Commission all such ~~end~~ amateur shrinkery is in defiance of the established fact and has no basis at all. That ~~426~~ is why in Whitewash, that early on, I began ~~this~~ treatment of the actual, evidence of allegedly getting that rifle into the building that morning, ~~ad~~ I did.

Recently as I write this, which is thirty years later, I've been told that Wesley Liebeler sent a respect^{ed} psychiatrist at the Mayo Clinic a collection of ~~its~~ the miscellaneous junk in ^{the Commission's} pretended supported ~~its~~ amateur shrinkery about Oswald and his^y allegedly dominating compulsion to kill the President.

"It tells me more about Liebeler than it does about Oswald" is what ^{that psychologist} ~~he~~ is quoted as saying.

What follows, which was all pulled together for him from the official evidence ^{M^{ail}er and others,} for ~~him~~ tells us about M^{ail}er ~~and as M^{ail}er~~ and the official mythologizers and their sycophants ^{more} ~~than~~ it does about Oswald.

With this single exception.

M^{ail}er, it will be remembered, told that history students at Penn that the JFK assassination evidence is "imp^ent^rable" and thus he avoided it. (Except as we have seen for ~~his~~ misrepresenting it in his book.) What I had finished writing only a few months after the Commission's twenty-six volumes were available - they were published in November, 1964 and Whitewash was completed in ^{mid-}February, 1965~~4~~ - indicates how "imp^ent^rable" the actual, official evidence ^{is} ~~was~~:

And so we have a new mystery, how Oswald made that "long and bulky package " entirely undetected when he was known to have spent ^{his} time with his children or ^{and} asleep ^{and} how it remained undetected, especially when Ruth Paine spent some of that night working where the rifle was ~~suppose~~ supposedly hidden without seeing that ^{is another mystery.} "long and bulky package" that Oswald had no time to make after he was wakened so late.

Apparently this was "impenetrable" to Mailer because in all those pages he has no hint of it of any kind. *end 428*

indented
single
space

He was due half a block away, dressed and with his "large and bulky package" 10 minutes from the time Marina awakened him. His "ride", Euell Wesley Frazier, testified the normal departure time was 7:20 (2H210ff.;7H531ff.). In 10 minutes he had to dress (Marina was disturbed because he had not eaten) and get to Frazier's home, meanwhile either picking up the package the Report says he carried or, so far as we know, even having to make the package. On this the Report says nothing except in conclusion. It merely places his departure from the Paine home at about 7:15 a.m. (R131). It quotes Mrs. Paine as saying that the previous night she had worked in the garage, the place in which the rifle was normally kept (R130). Mrs. Paine noticed the light in the garage was on and was certain she had not left it on. She "went out to the garage to paint some children's blocks, and worked in the garage for half an hour or so". That garage was a monument to clutter (see photograph in appendix). It was so stuffed with the Paine and Oswald property not elsewhere in the home there was hardly room to move about in it. The Report makes no reference to this, nor does it reveal how Ruth Paine could have worked in it for a half-hour or so without noticing anything odd or foreign, such as the "long and bulky package". And, although the garage provided little walking space, the Commission does not explain how Mrs. Paine could have maneuvered about in it for not less than half an hour, first collecting her paint, brushes and blocks, and then painting and arranging the blocks and storing the paints and brushes, without at least stumbling on the rifle, which the Report insists was "usually" kept lying on the floor, wrapped in a blanket (R131).

The Report leaves us to assume that Oswald had made his package earlier the night before, even though he was known to have spent much of his time playing with the children. Neither Marina nor Ruth saw him in the garage, which was entered from the kitchen. We must also assume that, having removed the rifle from its blanket wrapping, it was normal for Oswald to replace the blanket in its "normal" place on the floor, being careful to make the blanket look as though it still contained the rifle. And, of course, we must assume that such an elaborate operation served a purpose not served by merely putting the blanket elsewhere.

290A

The narrative continues with Mrs. Linnie Mae Randle (2H245ff.), Frazier's sister with whom he lived, noticing Oswald approaching with a "heavy brown bag", in the Commission's words rather than Mrs. Randle's. He "gripped the bag in his right hand, near the top. 'It tapered like this as he hugged it in his hand. It was ... more bulky toward the bottom than toward the top'." If this seems like a novel or dangerous way to carry a rifle, especially with the metal portion not attached to the stock and more likely to punch a hole in paper, it did not seem so to the Commission. And if Oswald's "gripping" and "hugging" might be expected to leave marks of at least crumpling on the bag, the Commission did not so expect and the bag itself (Exhibit 142, 16H513; Exhibit 1304, R132, etc.) shows no markings of the shape of a rifle, assembled or disassembled. The creases where it was folded in four are still sharp and clear. After untold handling, examination and testing, these creases are strong enough to keep the bag from lying flat when extended to its full length.

"Mrs. Randle estimated that the package was approximately 28 inches long and about 8 inches wide," according to the Report. It was not quite that way. Mrs. Randle first described the manner in which Oswald was carrying his package. In the part the Commission does not quote in the Report, Mrs. Randle said, "... it almost touched the ground" (7H248).

This was not lost upon the Commission, for when Assistant Counsel Joseph A. Ball misinterpreted Mrs. Randle's testimony, asking, "And where was his hand gripping the middle of the package?" Mrs. Randle corrected him, saying, "No, sir; the top ...". Ball reiterated her correction and her description of the package as almost touching the ground.

indented
single
space

This is not all of Randle's testimony. It is my summary^a of it. For this *version*
Mailer found a single sentence adequate. He must have because that is all the space he
gives Randle and the little he uses that he could attribute to her when in fact he does
not use her words, as we have seen, preferring¹ the second-hand version of the FBI.

Mailer was less chinchy with Frazier but the few sentences more space than he gave Frazier's ^{sh}sister are hardly enough to report what I did in summary of his testimony:

Knowing Oswald's sleeve length and height, as the Commission did, measuring the length of a package he could have held in his grip without touching the ground was simple and provided an accurate means of approximating the length. Actually, it requires a tall man, which Oswald was not, or a man with abnormally short arms (we don't know his arm length), for a 28-inch package to even barely clear the ground. The Commission had a passion for reconstructions. All of them had unsatisfactory results and at best jeopardized the Commission's findings. Some disproved the Commission's theories. The minimum length of the disassembled rifle was 34.8 inches (R133). The Report does not quote a package reconstruction.

Instead, it worked on its witnesses. Shown Exhibit 364, a replica bag, Mrs. Randle maintained, "Well, it wasn't that long, I mean it was folded down at the top as I told you. It definitely wasn't that long." Asked to stand up and use the bag as a prop, she reiterated it was too long. Then asked, "About how long would you think the package would be, just measure it right here," Mrs. Randle did, saying "... like this." Ball confirmed her markings, saying, "From here to here?" and is given an affirmative reply, concluding, "... with that folded down this much for him to grip in his hand."

The measurement was neither taken nor recorded. Anxious as the Commission was for a specific measurement, one can only speculate about this "oversight". Counsel Ball continued working on his witness, even asking her to guess the length of the entire bag, which she had not seen. Finally, she folded the bag to the length she thought it might have been, while Ball told her he was not sure which was the top and which the bottom of the bag. This time the length was measured, and it would seem the new length suited Mr. Ball better, for he measured it at 28½ inches. Mrs. Randle informed him, "I measured 27 last time." Earlier Ball had described another estimate of the total length of the bag by Mrs. Randle at "about two feet". She had indicated it might have been "a little bit more".

Thus, by both her description of the haphazard manner in which the bag was carried and in her repeated estimates and markings of the length of the bag, Mrs. Randle emerges as a consistent, highly credible witness. She was neither persuaded, cajoled nor deceived into altering her account in the slightest. Certainly the manner in which Oswald was carrying the bag is the kind of image she could clearly have kept in mind. And it fixed the bag's maximum length.

Her brother, whom the Report next quotes, was completely consistent with her, and his account likewise never varied. The Report says, "Frazier recalled that one end of the package was under Oswald's armpit and the lower part was held in his right hand so that it was carried straight and parallel to his body". On December 1, 1963, he had shown FBI agents the space he recalled the bag occupying on the back seat of his car (and who would have put a knocked-down rifle on the back seat, from which the first sudden stop could have hurled it to the floor, attracting attention and risking the rupture of the bag and revelation of its contents?). By the FBI measurement, 27 inches was the maximum possible length. Frazier's own estimate of the size when he first saw the package, which he assumed contained curtain rods, was two feet. When Frazier was questioned (2H210ff; 7H531ff.), it turned out that he had once worked in a department store and had, in the course of that employment, handled packaged curtain rods.

At the time of the assassination, Frazier was picked up by the police. Before the Commission he was grilled and pushed in an effort to get him to change his description of the length of the package. At one point, when Frazier conceded the package might have been a bit wider than the five or six inches he remembered, Ball tried to interpret this as a concession of greater length un-

in hand of single space

in hand single space

end 429

291A+B

end 430

indirect
evidence
space

til Frazier specified "widthwise not lengthwise".

After Ball declared there were no more questions, he suddenly told Frazier the Commission had the rifle in the bag and asked him to "stand up here and put this under your arm and then take a hold of it at the side". Frazier demurred. Ball ordered him, "Turn around." Frazier continued to demur, with explanations that accomplished nothing. He again insisted Oswald had the package "tucked under his shoulder" when asked by the Chairman, adding again that Oswald "had it cupped in his hand". The Chief Justice said, "I beg your pardon?" and Frazier replied, "I said from where I noticed it he had it cupped in his hands. And I don't see how you could have it anywhere other than under your armpit" without the end being visible. To Ball he insisted the package was not and could not have been carried in any position other than the one he described. After reiterating his observations to Ball, Frazier added that he had followed Oswald to the place they worked for two blocks "and you couldn't tell he had a package from the back". Then, viewing Frazier holding the packaged rifle, Ball conceded the package extended "almost to the level of your ear".

In the course of attempting to get Frazier to modify his testimony, which the Report accurately depicts as two feet "give or take a few inches", the Commission merely established the clarity and positiveness of his recollection. As a by-product, this hearing called attention to the Commission's failure to allude to the third dimension of the package, its thickness. Frazier, however, unintimidated even if nervous, did this in two ways. First, he testified that from the manner in which Oswald carried the package "you couldn't tell he had a package", hardly a description of a bulky military rifle, especially when carried in two pieces (2H243). Earlier, when pressured by Ball about the narrower width of the package than suited the Commission's theory, Frazier gave the lawyer a polite lecture of measurements, saying, "if you were using a yardstick or one of these little - " Ball interrupted to declare, "I was using my hand." Frazier replied, "I know you were, but there are some different means to measure it," and specified the difference between a rigid yardstick and a flexible tape measure, which would follow the contour of the package and, by including some of the thickness, result in a greater width measurement.

end
431

In the Report (pp.133-4), of all the testimony by Frazier pinpointing the maximum length of the package, testimony in which Frazier never budged from either his opinion of the length or his observation of the position in which the bag was carried, the Commission quotes (from 2H241) this: "'Like I said, I remember that I didn't look at the package very much ° ° ° but when I did look at it he did have his hands on the package like that,' and at this point Frazier placed the upper part of the package under his armpit and attempted to cup his right hand beneath the bottom of the bag."

The direct quotation is accurate. The rest is not. It is, in fact, a distortion and misrepresentation difficult to regard as accidental. Where the Report says, "at this point Frazier placed the upper part of the package under his armpit", Frazier was actually in the middle of his explanation, previously quoted, of the width, not the length, of the package, concluding with the specification that he was talking about the width and not the length. The quoted excerpt related to width, not to length.

This is not the only part of Frazier's testimony reflected in the Report in a manner other than as intended. The Report states that, when they arrived at work, "Frazier parked the car in the company parking lot about two blocks north of the Depository Building. Oswald left the car first, picking up the brown paper bag, and proceeding to the building ahead of Frazier. Frazier walked behind ... It was the first time that Oswald had not walked with Frazier from the parking lot to the building entrance." (R133)

The sinister implication is that this had something to do with secrecy or stealth on Oswald's part, or was at least a reflection of his state of mind because of the dastardly deed he plotted. This is

Of all the people in the ~~world~~ world only ~~two~~ two are known to have seen Oswald with that package. Both were firm in testifying that it was not possible for that rifle - even disassembled - to have fit in the bag he ^{was} carrying. As that presented no problem for Mailer, who could and did eliminate all not consistent with his preconception of Oswald's guilt, The Commission also had no problem. It merely concluded the exact opposite of every word of testimony, of all the evidence it had.

indent
single
space

indent +
single
space

not only unwarranted; it is diametrically opposite to the truth, on which Frazier was explicit: "(I) looked at my watch ... saw we had a few minutes ... sat there ... watching (railroad) cars ..., but I was letting my engine run and getting to charge up my battery, because when you start and stop you have to charge up your battery" (2H227-8). A glance at Frazier's ancient vehicle (Exhibit 447, 17H167) would seem to remove any doubt of the desirability of this practice.

There is none of Frazier's testimony about Oswald that is not opposed to the Commission's theories. He found Oswald truthful, quiet, devoted to his family, especially fond of his children and smiling and happy in talking of and being with them. Oswald never talked politics and made no mention of the President's visit or the motorcade (2H219ff.). Frazier's account of the clothes Oswald was wearing that day was in contradiction to the Commission's, and Frazier saw more of these clothes than anyone else. Frazier also insisted the shots came from a point other than the one the Commission alleged, and in this he was in accord with a majority of the observers, including police of various kinds.

end 432

Frazier's truthfulness was established, according to Detective R. S. Stovall, by a polygraph examination (7H190, 21H602). Stovall's words were, "The examination showed conclusively that Wesley Frazier was truthful and that the facts stated by Frazier in his affidavit were true."

293f

But the Commission had to use Frazier to get Oswald to the building with any kind of a package, even though Frazier, as did his sister, proved Oswald could not possibly have been carrying the rifle. With complete and total disregard of the only testimony it had, the Commission concluded exactly the opposite from its only evidence. It said simply, "Frazier and Randle are mistaken" (R134).

293A

So Frazier put Oswald at the building and was himself about 50 feet behind the presumed about-to-be assassin. This is how the Report gets him into the building: "One employee, Jack Dougherty, believed that he saw Oswald coming to work, but he does not remember Oswald had anything in his hands as he entered the door. No other employee has been found who saw Oswald enter that morning." (R131) At this point the Report refers by footnote to that part of Dougherty's testimony (6H373-82) appearing on pages 6H376-7.

The excerpt from the Report needs clarification. It was Oswald, not Dougherty, who was then coming to work, and Oswald, not Dougherty, who went through the door. Dougherty was trusted with extra responsibilities by his employer and reported to work an hour earlier than the other employees.

Asked, "Did you see Oswald come to work that morning?" Dougherty told Ball, unhesitatingly, "Yes - when he first came into the door." "When he came in the door?" the interrogator repeated, and Dougherty said, "Yes." Then Ball wanted to know, "Did you see him come in the door?"

end 433

"Yes; I saw him when he first came in the door - yes," was Dougherty's unqualified reply. So much for the use of the word "believed" to describe Dougherty's testimony.

Now for the language that says Dougherty "does not remember Oswald had anything in his hands".

Dougherty had answered the question less positively than satisfied Ball, saying, "I didn't see anything if he did." Ball then asked him additional questions, to which Dougherty replied, "I didn't see anything in his hands ..."

"In other words, you would say positively he had nothing in his hands?" Ball demanded. (All emphasis added.)

"I would say that - yes, sir," was Dougherty's equally unqualified response.

Oswald was now in the building. The only person who saw him enter swore "positively" that Oswald had no package in his hand, and the package the Commission was concerned about was in a bag 38 inches

(pages 16-19)

479
After managing to suppress almost all he could and all that had any significance Mailer skips around, as is his wont, to the schmalz of how happy Jackie was over the Fort Worth hotel's efforts to "brighten this dingy hotel suite." He then goes into her opposite reaction on seeing the indecent political attack on the President ~~edit~~ in that morning's Dallas Morning News. For this Mailer took almost two pages but for the evidence he dared not use and he therefore said was "impenetrable" he had no space at all and the little he did have on that was dishonestly selected to support the official mythology that is also Mailer's, what he began with. This is the novelist's way of pretending that is the preconception with which he began, the only one that was politically acceptable and acceptable to publishers, is validated by the evidence.

What I ~~is~~ used above from Whitewash I use because it reflects the actual evidence about which Mailer was so upstating dishonest. ~~and~~ There is more that is relevant elsewhere in Whitewash and more that came to light years later. ^{none of which exists for good according to the walls}

To go with the magic rifle that could fire more rapidly for Oswald than for the country's fastest shooters; to go with the magic bullet of which the less than all that we have seen is more than enough; there is a magic "bag". And if that is not enough official magic, all essential to the made-up case against Oswald, there is also a magic blanket! All unknown to Mailer's readers. Unknown as well to those reviewers and columnists ^{who} that raved also about Mailer, his research and his ^{"exhaustive"} ^{"definitive"} book.

As a brief digression that really is not any digression at all let us recall a few of those ecstatic welcomes of what is really Mailer's Tales:

The April 24
In a highly laudatory review in TIME Lance Morrow praised Mailer for his "shrewd eye." (How true, but as Morrow did not intend!) We have seen Funder's rhapsody in The Washington Post one word of which also has applicability Funder did not intend: "Brilliant!" Then as we also saw, Lis Smith in her Newsday column referred to Mailer's woeful tales as the "definitive account" of the JFK assassination. And almost twenty years earlier, not intending commentary and characterization of this book then so far from the front of Mailer's mind there is what he told David Braaten of the since-discontinued Washington Star in the story ^{of March 25, 1977} from which we quoted earlier:

295

indent
+ single
space

"A clear idea of the character of events of the recent past is essential to a democracy. Without knowledge of what happened in an event how can one debate its meaning?"

Having ^y just had a peek at what Mailer regards as giving his reader "a clear idea of events" so indispensable to the "meaning" it has in the JFK assassination, a peek, and it is, really, no more than another peeks, at what else that was relevant remains

unknown to those who get their ~~own~~ knowledge of the assassination from Mailer. ^{That} we see how Mailer ^{and} meets the standards of the Spring in Mailer. ⁴³⁵ For example, that ~~bag~~ has more magic than what I reported in Whitewash so early in the

assassination writing, the magic that shrank the ^{eight} thrity inches of disassembled rifle into that bag that Oswald had in his palm and under his armpit, a space of little more than two feet; that in the bag he hold by ^{its} ~~the~~ ^y crumpled top that rifle still did not drag that bag down to the sidewalk, ~~also~~ ^{the} also much less than thirty-eight inches; ~~that~~ ^{the} bag allegedly held that rifle. The FBI's lab reported that the rifle was "well oiled," but the lab also reported, elsewhere to be sure, that the oil was magical too because there was not the tiniest smidgeon of it on that bag.

That magical bag had the additional magic, again according to the FBI and again in an entirely different report, of holding a print or two from Oswald on its inside but not one at any of the many places he carried or held it that morning. That magical bag also smoothed out all the wrinkles at its top by which, ^{it was} ~~wrinkled~~ wrinkled up to give him a firm handhold, because the existing, post-assassination pictures show no such wrinkling.

That was three-dimensionally magic in a still another way: it shows not the slightest trace of a rifle having been carried in it/several different ways of the ~~mark~~ ^{of} imprinting on it as Frazier's old car bumped and bounced its way from Irving to Dallas.

Perhaps the most impressive of that bag's magic was its ability to disappear and then to appear because when the Dallas police investigative officers first photographed the area in which it later appeared it was not there to be photographed. ^{and is not in any of those photos neither,} Later it was there to be seen, to be photographed and then to become the most vital ~~of~~ the evidence said to establish Oswald's guilt.

Not to be outdone by other magic, that rifle exercised its own magic.

the Oswald's possessions into
 Ruth Paine loaded her stationwagon in New Orleans because Marina was ~~preg-~~
 pregnant and her time was not far off. She did not, ~~she~~ she testified, load any
 rifle and she would not have so strong was her opposition to them. Oswald, of course,
 could not have carried it unseen on the buses too and from Mexico City. In Irving
 Michael Paine, no less opposed to owning rifles, unloaded that stationwagon and as he
 testified, he did not unload that rifle. So, from the actual evidence, from all of the ~~actual~~
actual evidence, the rifle got from New Orleans to Irving unseen and unaided, not a
 slight and inconsequential magic.

296

end 436

That assassination magic was so free-floating that some of it lingered in Irving, in the ~~Prime~~ garage of Ruth Paine with whom Marina had lived from the time she ~~left~~ left New Orleans through the birth of her second girl and from where, as Mailer had no interest in reporting, she and Lee planned to move to their own apartment in Dallas, as she told the Secret Service. So, in that Paine garage in the official account of the assassination, by means also completely magical (but there is already enough magic without going into that), ~~was~~ where Oswald allegedly had that rifle stored in a blanket, the FBI got and tested that bal blanket in its fabled Lab, *and found no trace of that rifle,* What ~~it~~ ^{the FBI} found worth great attention, complete with sketches ^{and} crosssection of hairs from various parts of the body was its proof that ~~Oswald~~ Oswald's blanket held Oswald's pubic hair! That was ^{so} impressive to the Commission it reprinted those ^{sketches of sections and} cross sections in devoting about six printed pages to that earthshaking discovery, ~~so~~ that Oswald's pubic hairs were on Oswald's blanket.

For all the world as though that was a great discovery, the blanket being indubitable Oswald's. And for all the world as though anyone other than his wife should care about who's pubic hairs were on her husband's blanket.

This was, however, a great discovery to the FBI and the Commission devoted inordinate space to it in its Report.

But what was not worth any attention at all, as the magic of the bag was not worth any official attention at all, is that the magical oil that did adhere to the rifle and refused to permit the tiniest ^{trace} ~~smidgeon~~ to get onto that bag, which did ~~preserve oil in contact with it,~~ also ~~asserted~~ asserted the same magic in refusing to deposit the slightest trace on that blanket, which did hold oil as well as it held pubic hairs.

296A

end 437

McBrow's "shrewd" is on target, so to speak, about Mailer and his book, as we see,

Finder's "brilliant" is no exaggeration.

And Liz Smith's "definitive" is surely no less than that, as we here see.

To expect any one of them to refer to Mailer's writing as daring, which it certainly is, is perhaps to expect too much from them.

Where the report was content to conclude to the exact opposite of all its evidence on Oswald getting that package to the TSBD that morning, when the only person in the world who saw him enter the building said "positively he had nothing in his hands" the Commission lawyers who wrote this part of the Report merely lied about that saying instead that ^{Jack} ~~the~~ ~~daughter~~ Dougherty "does not remember that Oswald had anything in his hands." That is not the same as "positively" he did not, which is ^{Dougherty's} the sworn testimony.

Then there is Oswald's story that he ^{was} in fact carrying curtain rods because he room needed curtains.

Having followed the Commission in more than assumption of guilt, ^{and} in ignoring what was inconsistent with ^{that} the assumption, it was not necessary for ^{the} "ailer" to point out the seeming inconsistency between Frazier's ~~testin~~ statement that he saw Oswald carry that package to the TSBD and Dougherty's statement that Oswald carried nothing into it. ~~Myxprochaps~~ From what Sylvia Heagher, who wrote the magnificent Accessories after the Fact, told me in 1966 when she had Dallas sources I did not have, it was the practise of TSBD employees to deposit any packages they carried in the large shed-like separate structure on the main building's west ^{side}.

Then there is Oswald's story that he carried curtain rods because his rooms needed curtains. That presented no problem for the Commission. The Commission merely wiped that out by calling Oswald a liar (R182). In this the Commission was not burdened with any evidence, as Mailer would have learned by going a bit farther in Whitewash;

end
438

298
evidence
single
space

On what basis did the Commission prove Oswald had no curtain rods with him that fateful morning? Was there an immediate and thorough search for them (if for anything)? Not at all. The Commission's "evidence" is a long-delayed afterthought. On August 31, 1964, almost as the Report was going to press and more than nine months following the assassination, the Commission wrote the FBI Dallas office asking that Roy S. Truly, manager of the Depository, "be interviewed to ascertain if he knows of any curtain rods having been found in the TSBD building after November 22, 1963."

The FBI reported, "... He stated that it would be customary for any discovery of curtain rods to immediately be called to his attention and that he has received no information to the effect that any curtain rods were found ..." (Exhibit 2640, 25H899).

Aside from the inference that Truly had special regulations about the finding of curtain rods, this means nothing. After more than nine months, who knew what might or might not have been taken from a building into which a rifle was taken without detection? Truly had testified twice, at great length and under oath, without having once been asked about the curtain rods. Nobody cared to ask him. On August 3 he supplied the Commission with an affidavit (7H591) attesting that the door in the vestibule outside the employees' lunchroom was usually closed because it was controlled by an automatic mechanism. It would seem that it was not until the Commission called Oswald a liar in the draft of the Report that, too late for the inclusion of a sworn statement, the staff belatedly asked for a secondhand, unsworn and meaningless opinion.

One possibility remained: Did the "room" Oswald rented need curtain rods? The Report quotes the owner, not the housekeeper (R130), as saying the room "had curtains and curtain rods". It may well have, but the Commission need not have depended upon the word of a landlady who could hardly be expected to say her tenants lived in a fishbowl.

end 439

(Page 22)

In referring to Oswald's room as a fishbowl I was too generous to the ~~land~~ landlady. She had divided each room in half, making two rooms of them, and thus renting each room twice by renting it by halves. Oswald's room was barely wide enough for the narrow bed and for passage on the side of the bed not up against the window, a series of windows that were most of the outside wall at that point.

It was not until 1967 that I got ^{about} the proof that the Commission lied ^{and} Oswald did not.

Richard Sprague, then of the prestigious accounting firm of Touche, Bailey, wrote me after hearing me discuss the assassination and its investigation on a New York City radio talk show. How could he help? Sprague asked, as did many concerned citizens. When he told me that he travelled quite a bit I suggested that he search for the pictures officialdom avoided in Dallas. I gave him some lead and he followed them and more, discovered many on his own. Among these he got a print of a the ~~thirty~~ ^{thirty} six film roll of thirty-five millimeter film exposed by a Black Star photographer whose name I remember as Gene Danish. The prints Sprague got from Black Star do not include the photographer's name. But they are dated. The date ^{is} was the day of the assassination, November 22, 1963. The last pictures on that roll are five of the Oswald room. And what they

show

his curtains being put in place! They show the man standing on the bed to do it, with his toolbox on the foot of the bed. And those curtains? ^{They were placed} ~~After being~~ put up, over the ~~vent~~ Venetian blinds that if close^d on a hot day or evening would have been stifling in the Dallas summer heat, ~~and~~ ^{with those blinds open} ^{for air} Oswald would have been in a virtual fishbowl, the room had little privacy.

end 440

The installed curtains were ^{actually} ~~that~~ diaphanous, ^{adding little privacy!}

No^on of this was important to Mailer, not nearly as important as quoting Manchester on Jackie's emotions in that hotel room in Fort Worth or on seeing the scure^o rulous ad in the next morning's paper. And so, having ~~skipped~~ from his revision of what Randle and Frazier ^{said}, without mention even of the fact that they did testify under oath, with his trusted method of recording our history by literary ^{pop-} ~~no-~~Scotch, by jumping and skipping back and forth, immediately Mailer is back at the TSEB. He does that by stating that an employee, Bonnie Ray Williams, decided to remain on the sixth floor to have his brown-bag lunch ^{Williams brown-bagged} ~~and even~~ that Mailer does not mention, saving that little ^{space} space for his conjectures and imaginings ^{because from the sixth floor Williams would} ~~get~~ "a boss [sic] view of Kennedy" and the motorcade. Then the usual "Mailer conjectures and conditionals so indispensable to his recording of our history:

^{As per Williams was there, as Williams did not say,}
^{he}

could
single
step

~~The~~ Even if [sic] Oswald was esconced behind book cartons at the other end of the sixth floor [sic], he must still have [sic] been put into a state [sic] ~~by~~ at all these comings and goings. How could he tell whether he would be alone when the time ~~was~~ ^[sic] came? There might ^{be} be a crowd of workers hooting and hollering on just the other side of those cartons (page 671).

In this Mailer just puts ~~of~~ Oswald there by willing him there. No evidence at all puts him there and in fact the official evidence ^{itself} proves he ^{was} not there.

But if putting him there when he was not there was good enough for all the officials in all the investigations, can mailer be faulted for his copycapping, for his resort to nonevidence, to his imagination, his conjectures, the needs of his writing as he saw those needs?

end 441

Williams was not at that "other end of the sixth floor. Not only is the evidence,

Williams testimony and the remains of his lunch, the proof, those remains were one of the first ^{and} ~~conclusions~~ ^{to be} when they were misrepresented as the remains of Oswald's lunch and were misused to place him on the sixth floor when not a bit of ^{the actual} ~~other~~ evidence ^{does} ~~did~~ that.

And then there was what was well known, other than to Mailer and his trusting readers: the other side of that sixth floor was a mess but was entirely open. A new floor was being laid and that half was the first part of the floor being laid. All the cartoned books had been moved from that western half to the eastern half of the sixth floor. That, not any Oswald construction of any "sniper's lair," the description liked by officialdom and media sycophants, is why all that those stacks of books were all over the entire eastern ^h half, not just at the windows.

Those windows were in pairs, in the official mythology all the ~~shots~~ ^{shots} were fired from the easternmost of the eastern pair. Williams had his lunch ^{slightly} ~~behind the pair~~ ^{to the west of} ~~of windows next to them~~ and that is where its ^{chicken-bones} ~~remains~~ were found.

In the official mythology, unencumbered by any actual witness, ~~thus~~ all the officially-acknowledged shooting, three shots only, ~~came~~ ^{came} from that easternmost of those sixth-floor windows. That was the immediate police presumption because that window was open and ^{because} ~~presumption~~ was of as much evidentiary ~~importance~~ ^{importance} to the police as it ^{was} ~~was~~ to all other investigator official investigators who followed them.

While Mailer had hardly qualified as an investigator, it was important to him, too. Moreover, it gave him another of those opportunities he uses and creates for his amateur shrinkery and those conjectures that to him become evidence:

end 442

Simple
of the
what

Let us put ourselves in the mind of a rifleman who has set himself up in a nest of book cartons on the sixth floor. As the motorcade on Houston Street approaches the Depository building, there is an open view of the face and body of the President in the rear seat of his open convertible. It is a direct head-on shot with the target steadily growing in size through the eyepiece of the telescopic sight.

On the other hand, trained professionals are staring at the Book Depository windows from the lead car in the motorcade, and police on motorcycles are scouring the building with their eyes. A sniper's instinct would probably pull him back into relative darkness a few feet from the window.

as for Hailer's conjecture about an "amateur" who ^{should} "should choke up on ~~ex~~
~~fire~~ ~~and~~ ~~shoot~~ the ~~fire~~ trigger, the chances of this were less if he stood back inside
 the building, invisible to all outside it, and unseen ^{and} ~~shot~~ ^{when} when he had the best shot,
 with the motorcade on Houston street and approaching, rather than in the open window
 and certain to be seen if shooting from there. As Oswald was not! end 443

Hailer's conjecture about all those "professionals" in the first or lead car
 "staring" is also less than one would be expect from a boy because there were after
 that first car ~~a~~ ^{and following them} ~~scads~~ more of those "professional" of the Secret Service is the
 two limousines and eighteen motorcycle police alone. Then there were all those
^{and photographers back} reporters in the motorcade. All behind the lead car.

At its best Hailer's conjecture is childishly silly.

298
301

If the sniper is, in addition, an amateur and not certain whether he will or will not have the stuff to cross the irrevocable bridge that leads to squeezing off his shot, if he should choke on the trigger and not shoot, will he ever trust himself again? (p. 445 672-2)

Whether this is what was ~~to~~ ^{THE} was "shrewd" or to Newsday was so "definitive" or to the Post so "brilliant" we have no way of knowing but it was is garbage. It is entirely unreal.

If mailer was no so ~~addicted~~ ^{addicted} addicted to the official mythology, hooked on it beyond healing, and instead of depending on his fellow mythologizers and official sycophants had ~~turned~~ ^{turned} a few pages more in Whitewash he would have found that J. Edgar Hoover himself raised this identical problem before the Warren Commission and with his knowledge of shooting did not ~~resort~~ ^{resort} to the Mailer silliness of explaining away ^{why} why there was no shooting as the motorcade approached the TSB by attributing that to all those "trained professions" who were allegedly "staring at" those windows. Any shooter there could have been deep inside the building and entirely ~~unseen~~ ^{unseen} ~~unseen~~ by any "trained professionals." 301A

Hoover, certainly his own kind of "trained professional," like Mailer, was adept at creating his own facts and situations:

One glaring omission deserves a final comment. The Commission was reconstructing the crime, ostensibly to find out what happened, not to prove that Oswald alone committed it. When the motorcade turned toward the Depository Building on Houston Street, for several hundred feet there was a completely unobstructed view of it from the sixth-floor window. The police photographs and the forgotten Secret Service reconstruction of 1963 also show this. There was not a twig between the window and the President. There were no curves in that street, no tricky shooting angles. If all the shots came from this window, and the assassin was as cool and collected as the Report represents, why did he not shoot at the easiest and by far the best target? Why did he wait until his target was so difficult that the country's best shots could not duplicate his feat?

J. Edgar Hoover raised this point (5H105) in non-response to a question about Oswald's possible motives: "Now, some people have raised the question: Why didn't he shoot the President as the car came toward the storehouse where he was working?" Unimpeded by the incontrovertible and obviously contrary fact, Hoover supplied his own answer: "... there were some trees between his window on the sixth floor and the cars as they turned and went through the park ..." (p. 405).

Incident
Sunday
April

This arrant nonsense by Hoover did create a touchy situation at FBI headquarters when I stated the fact on a Washington radio talk show, that the one place in that part of Dealey Plaza that had not a single tree was Houston Street, on the motorcade's approach to the TSBD. The headquarters problem was how to tell Hoover that he was right, as he always was, no matter how wrong he really was, as in this instance. Thus the headquarters solution was simplicity itself. Those under Hoover pointed out that sometime after the motorcade left Houston Street, after it was on Elm and inside Dealey Plaza, there were trees so, because there were trees, even if not on Houston Street and not obstructing vision from that window, because there were trees elsewhere there were obstructions of vision on Houston Street and I did not know what I was talking about. Besides which, ~~as~~ was always the case, "The Director was correct."

en 444

It is to the FBI's credit that it did not invoke ~~that~~ ^{the} tree that grew in Brooklyn.

In favor of Mailer's formulation, look at all those ifs and other conditionals he could invoke along with his favorite, getting "in the mind of ~~the~~ a rifleman"

for his shrinkery. *if in fact he knew and cannot, as usual, just make it up,*

What Mailer forgets / so conveniently for him and his theorizing, if forget is what he did, is that most of the motorcade with many more "trained professionals" who were already left Dealey Plaza before the first shot was fired

~~is that "the lead car in the motorcade" was not for in the "lead" it had ahead of that motorcade, ahead of the Presidential limousine, "was unable to see which window the shots came because his car was by then on Elm Street in front of the President's Lincoln.~~

^{else} What Mailer says here is also gibberish because "by then" at the least the

four cars behind the limousine ~~was~~ ^{were} on Elm Street before the admitted shooting was over.

These "trained professionals" saw nothing of shooting a any Oswald.

Mailer then devotes three pages to quotations from the testimony of Dallas motorcycle policeman Garrison Baker. Baker is the one who says he spotted Oswald going into an employees lunch room on the second floor. Baker became a problem for Mailer,

but not in his book. What Mailer eliminates despite devoting three pages to Baker's testimony is the fact that Baker alone proved that Oswald could not have been in that sixth floor firing away still south floor window/and have gotten to where Baker saw him. Confronted with this on a

end 445

Larry King/CNN show two months after his book was out and when he asked about "the evidence," Mailer passed that off by saying not that the evidence was "impenetrable" but that it was "transcendental."

It would not have been ^{ne} either "impenetrable" or ^{no} "transcendental" to Mailer if he had not been ~~tho~~ thoroughly addicted to and hooked on the asszssination dope that in time he ~~will~~ ^{realize} create & ruined him. ~~On~~ Also very early in Whitewash (pages 36-38) it was neither "impenetrable" nor ~~transcendental~~ "transcendental." Unless, of course, like Mailer was, one ~~was~~ was doped up to begin with:

incident single page

Marion L. Baker is a Dallas motorcycle policeman who heard the shots and dashed to the building, pushing people out of the way as he ran. He is the policeman who put his pistol in Oswald's stomach in the dramatic lunchroom meeting. The Commission also used him in a time reconstruction intended to show that Oswald could have left the sixth floor and been in the lunchroom in time to qualify as the assassin (3H241-70). The interrogator was Assistant Counsel David W. Belin. As so often happened, despite his understanding of his role as a prosecution witness, Baker interjected information the Commission found inconsistent with its theory. It is ignored in the Report.

The time it would have taken Oswald to get from the sixth-floor window to the lunchroom was clocked twice (3H253-4). Secret Service Agent John Joe Howlett disposed of the rifle during the reconstructions. What he did is described as "putting" it away or, in Belin's words, he "went over to these books and leaned over as if he were putting a rifle there?" Baker agreed to this description. But this is hardly a representation of the manner in which the rifle had been so carefully hidden. With a stopwatch and with the Howlett streamlining, they made two trips. The first one "with normal walking took us a minute and 18 seconds ... And the second time we did it at a fast walk which took us a minute and 14 seconds". During this time Oswald had to clean and hide the rifle and go down to the lunchroom and 20 feet inside of it, and a door with an automatic closure had to shut. This was an additional time-consuming factor ignored in the reconstruction and the Report.

We ought not, like Mailer, rush past that business of Secret Service agent John Joe Howlett "disposing of the rifle during the reconstruction." In Whitewash I published an official picture allegedly of the rifle as found, on page 211. Later I learned that before that picture was taken by the Dallas police a considerable amount of debris was removed. It was so well hidden two police missed it in their examination of that floor a half dozen time. As with all the Commission photographs of evidence that was incongenial to it, that official picture was less clear than it could have been. Nonetheless it did show that when found the rifle was sitting neatng upright and parallel with

end 446