

HOLY WATER IN THE VAMPIRE'S FACE

If the distinct advantages of having no functioning conscience to interfere with the best Big Brotherly work is not yet apparent, its indispensibility to Posner will be apparent immediately as we examine the corpi delic^{te} of the two now interrelated crimes, that of the assassination and that of this book that with Orwellian dedication seeks to rewrite our history

Posner states the law-school truism, that testimony closest to the event must be given most weight. (Page 235). Having done that he proceded not to practise it because, had he, he would not have been able to write this book. When by dredging the swamps of all the undependable or just plain wrong statements, obviously wrong to anyone with any knowledge of the fact, he could not write what he wanted to, he just makes it up. In plain language, he lied.

There is no personal satisfaction for me in stating that that is not why he lies. I use this word to describe what he does. My purpose is to inform those who lack my subject-matter knowledge, so that they and the record for our history will not attribute his lies to simple factual error to which we can all be prone. His book is full of various kinds of mistakes. Where I

use the unpleasant word that is generally avoided in writing it is to inform and to emphasize the disreputable, really unconscionable means by which he and Random House have created a great evil for their enrichment, for dirty pieces of silver from besmirching this terribly tragic event in our history; for giving a false account of it that he knows is wrong and Random House would have known if it had followed the normal practise, particularly with controversial matters in non-fiction and had peer reviews made by those competent to do that; and to use the not inconsiderable publisher's means of getting maximum international attention to a knowingly false account of the in context most tragic and costly event that turned this country and the world around.

To do this, as they have done, cannot be excused or justified and to be able to do it only by what most will not be able to recognize is premediated, deliberate lies is a true horror.

It is so that the reader will understand this; so that record for history will be clear and unequivocal; so that those who helped this truly nefarious project may better and fully understand what they have been part of and by any means available to them to try to undo what they have done, as an example those who reached even more people with these lies, as the major and the minor media throughout the world did, and so that I can be as

forceful and as explicit and as thoroughgoing in condemnation of doing so evil a thing for money and for any other purpose that I am this explicit and that I have taken this time in this at my age in the state of my health that I made this clear record without mincing words because it normally is not done or because it is unpleasant.

It is not merely to spit in his face and Random House's.

Not being satisfied with mere lying -- and by the time in his book he gets to his "Dealey Plaza" chapter perhaps that was getting monotonous to him -- he enhanced his dirtiness with footnotes to appear to cite official sworn testimony to support his own lies. This is precisely the way he begins his Dealey Plaza fiction to which he gives the title, "I'll Never Forget It As Long As I Live," (Pages 224-62), with its very first words!

S/PC

*midnight
single
space*

S/PC Linnie Mae Randle, Buell Frazier's sister, was at her kitchen sink when she glanced out the window at 7:15 Friday morning, November 22. She saw Oswald walk across the street toward her house, carrying a long package parallel to his body. He held one end of the brown-paper-wrapped object tucked under his armpit, and the other end did not quite touch the ground. Randle later recalled it appeared to contain something heavy.



S

Except for the last six words, which came from what Randle told the FBI, the note referring to them and to them only, the rest is false. This is his permeating Tricky Dickery with footnote, using them to lie.

^

CS/

The truth, what the actual Commission evidence is absolutely clear about, which is not what can be said of the Commission's conclusions, is all set forth in chapter three of my first book that, I repeat, dates to mid-February, 1965. Posner has that book. His problem is that he cannot have truth and formula-book fame and fortune at the same time.



This indispensable dishonesty Posner cannot blame on his contrivance of not trusting Sylvia Meagher's index. Nor did he need the index he said he made himself. He did not have to use either, except to misrepresent so he would have the book that without it he would not have. All he had to do was use the official sources I cited carefully and accurately given to each bit of the same evidence. If he intended an honest book, that is.

But to Posner, truth is like holy water is to vampires.

Without his deliberate lie, that the package Oswald carried extended from his armpit almost to the ground, his false reconstruction is wiped out to begin with, so he does what is

necessary for his commercialization of that great tragedy; he makes it up, and with his trickiness tells the reader that what he made up is what Randle said. The truth, from the Commission's own evidence, and under both oath and under its lawyer's examination is what Posner had to ignore from *Whitewash*, where it appears on page 16. What Randle actually swore to and persisted in when the Commission's lawyers tried to get her to describe a longer package than she saw, is that the package Oswald gripped in his hand and with his arm and hand down, did not quite reach the ground, half the length that Posner lies into her statement:

in all but single page

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

U

#/#

enough to keep the bag from lying flat when extended to its full length.

S.P.
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).

without length space

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."

In *Never Again!* I began the practise I resume here, of using what was published and readily available, what did not require any research in the 10,000,000 published Commission words or the 200 cubic feet of its records in the Archives, or any of that quarter of a million pages of records I obtained by those FOIA lawsuits, to underscore the ready availability without all that research, to anyone wanting to write in the field. Posner boasts of how extensive his reading is and makes piddling and usually unfaithful criticisms of it and others writing in, as we

have seen, of my book that I here and later cite. His reading of it was so close he could spot and misuse four non-continuous words of the 600 words on a single page.

And then not see what I quote from it?

Continuing with dishonesty that is total, Posner skips ahead, as the reader has no way of knowing he does with the official evidence-- he indexed it, remember -- ⁴⁰ the the arrival of Oswald with his ride, Randle's brother, Buell Wesley Frazier, at the TSBD building (page 224).

Unlike Posner, I neither then or since had any interest in fabricating any theory or any phony solution for fame and fortune. I limited myself to the official evidence, evidence closest to the event, in Posner's own preaching (Page 235) that he does not practise because he cannot. And, unlike him as he begins this lengthy false account without which he has no book, I want the reader to begin with an understanding of the importance of this actual evidence and of Posner's false representation of it.

In order to be able to pin the assassin rap on Oswald and for him to have been in that sixth-floor window it is first necessary to prove that Oswald brought the rifle into the building that morning when all the evidence is that he did not. Even when

making up what is not known and certainly was not proven, that the rifle was disassembled, making any package of it thereby shorter, the Commission's failure was total. So, as lawyers do in their opening statements in trial, I began the mustering of that evidence with a summary of what it proves (page 15):

9/9
*Evidence
single
copy* "The Commission had to prove that Oswald had taken the rifle to the scene. With the possible exception of Oswald's alleged and completely unproved attempt on the life of General Edwin Walker (Marina's tale that even General Walker himself did not believe), no one reported any rifle in Oswald's hands for months. Actually, there is no proof that Oswald ever had the Serial No. C-2766 Mannlicher-Carcano rifle in his possession after getting it at the post office. And that is the rifle the Commission held was the assassination weapon. To try and show that on the morning of the crime Oswald might have taken the rifle to work, the Commission called four witnesses, not counting his wife, who was in bed and had not see him leave the house. *0*
11

9/9
By means of these witnesses, the Commission attempted to show that Oswald purloined the materials from his place of employment and fabricated a long bag at home, disassembled the rifle, saving but a few inches in its overall length, placed it in the bag and took it to and into the Book Depository. It never attempted to show how or, in fact, that he DID take it from the first-floor entrance up to the sixth and through the entire *U*

length of that floor, on which a number of people were continuously employed. In questioning those witnesses so employed, the Commission carefully avoided this question.

s/p Should not be capital letters, should be italic *↓*
WITHOUT EXCEPTION, EACH OF THESE FOUR WITNESSES EITHER SWORE THAT OSWALD COULD NOT HAVE CARRIED THE RIFLE (2H245FF.; 2H210FF.; 7H7531FF.), DID NOT CARRY IT INTO THE BUILDING (6H377), OR DID NOT TAKE THE MATERIALS FOR MANUFACTURING THE BAG TO THE PAINE RESIDENCE IN IRVING (2H242), AND, IN FACT, COULD NOT HAVE (6H356FF). Each and all of the witnesses proved the impossibility of the Commission's reconstruction. These were the only witnesses the Commission examined on this matter, except for technical experts on unessential aspects. And even their testimony does not support the Commission. Yet the Commission's conclusion is that Oswald did all of these things. Every single and essential aspect is clearly and unequivocally disproved by the witnesses in one of the unfortunately rare instances in which the Commission pressed its witnesses in search of fact. The more the Commission tried to get the witnesses to change or alter their stories, the more positive the witnesses became in their testimonies. *U.S.S. J*

This is the plain and simple truth Posner fabricates and lies his way around because if he does not do that he has nothing at all --no Oswald in that window with that rifle to be his lone assassin, the basic need of his book.

The Commission, which began as Posner does, with a one-assassin preconception and the preconception that Oswald was that assassin, had the same problem. I therefore treated the evidence as defense counsel does in a trial, the practise Posner condemned when Sylvai Meagher did it, by examining the "prosecution" case, its own evidence. That is what I now do again so the reader can understand the essentiality of his assorted dishonesties to what Posner set out to do, regardless of truth, fact or evidence.

Here, as frequently throughout Chapter 3 of *Whitewash*, the length of the package Oswald carried, the maximum length it could have had -- is the first official disproof of the Commission's unsuccessful effort to make it long enough to have contained the rifle disassembled:

... 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.

3/17
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."

3/17
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 28 1/2 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.

midnight
single
of day

S/S/

(Whitewash, page 17) (C)

This Posner knew. This Posner could not live with. So, he lied about it.

Frazier's sworn testimony is that when they got to the TSBD building he sat in his old car for a while to run the motor to charge the battery up. He then was looking at Oswald when Oswald walked toward the building without him. What Posner knew if not from his alleged reading of all the Commission's evidence and indexing of it, he knew from *Whitewash*, here from pages 17 and 18:

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

midnight
single
of day

width
high
space

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.

#

S/

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 remember, Ball tried to interpret this as a concession of greater length until Frazier specified "widthwise not lengthwise."

After Ball declared there were no more questions, he suddenly told Frazier the Commisison had the rifle in the bag and asked him to "stand up here and put this under your arm and then take a

*indist
single
space*

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 had 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

without single space

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....."

Despite immediate police pressures and hassling, the young man refused to tell other than the truth, well aware as he was of how unwelcome the truth was regarded by the police and later by the Commission. Much as a few phrases can be misrepresented and quoted out of context to give them a meaning they do not have, Frazier remained firm in his testimony. As I wrote on page 19, and as Posner knew:


without single space

^S 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."

Posner thus faces the same problem the Commission did, but it did not dare his open dishonesties in an official Report, much as they took liberties with their own evidence, even concluding exactly the opposite of what all its testimony said merely because it had to in order to be able to conclude that Oswald was the lone assassin. Continuing with what Posner knew, from Page 19:

8/4
*Andent
Frazier
Frazier*
"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).

8/4
"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 6H376-7.⁴



S/

Posner is not alone in playing with words to convey what the

evidence does not say and mean. As we shall see, his is a different trip around this pitfall:

5/A
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?"

"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**

not caps, italics

Hand, not cap
HIS HANDS?" Ball demanded. (All emphasis added.)

*without
single
piece*
"I would say that -- yes, sir," was Dougherty's equally unqualified response."

Ball made the classic lawyers' mistake, asking one question too many. As a result, the actual evidence is that the only person who saw Oswald enter the building swore "positively" that he carried nothing. This means that the only existing evidence that Oswald did not carry the rifle or anything else into the building. *is /*

In summary, one hundred percent of the official sworn evidence by witnesses questioned in secret and pressured to say what the Commission wanted them to say refutes it. They refused to change what they said they saw and what they testified to. All of the evidence is that Oswald not only did not carry the rifle into the building, the package he carried as long as Frazier could see him was much too short to have contained even the disassembled rifle. 

Posner's approach to the problem posed by Dougherty's testimony, the official proof that Oswald did not carry the rifle into the building, testimony of which he knew from what he presents as his own diligent study of all that evidence and then his indexing it, is simple and straightforward dishonesty. He

mentions Dougherty at three places; pages 226, 227, and 237. But he does not once refer to this testimony. He suppresses entirely the (ONLY) evidence of how Oswald entered that building to become the official mythology's and Posner's lone assassin -- carrying nothing at all!

Putting that rifle in Oswald's possession and getting it into the building with him is essential to alleging that he was the assassin. Every single word of the official evidence says and means the exact opposite of what the Commission and Posner say. The Commission's solution to getting around every word of its own evidence was merely to conclude the opposite of what its own evidence proves.

Posner is not content with that. His is an even greater dishonesty. He made a non-person in the evidence of Doughty^{er} and makes mention of him where it is not necessary at all, as merely present with other employees on other occasions. In those places Posner contrives criticism of other assassination books but he does not even mention *Whitewash* or the repeating of the Commission's own evidence in it.

He has problems with that evidence too, of course.

Not unwisely Posner depends on his falsifications, like the length of that package, and on his omissions to give the

impression that Oswald did carry the rifle into the building. Having ignored Dougherty's only-witness testimony that could not have been more explicit, Posner then resorts to tricky writing and footnote arguments to make his fabrications appear to be the actuality when they are not.

He does not write what he knew, the reason for Oswald walking to the building without Frazier and, citing no source, he writes that "Frazier watched him enter the Depository, carrying the package next to his body." If Posner had a source for either of the two separate statements, first that Frazier watched Oswald to the building's door and into and that he was "carrying the package next to his body," he would have cited his sources. He does not. What he says is contrary to Frazier's testimony and as we have seen, Frazier's description of how Oswald carried that package is graphic, he refused to change what said when pressed to under oath, and once again it is clear that Posner lies for his purpose of creating a false case.

Pretending that there is none of the sworn testimony repeated above from the book he had and ^{was} impossible to miss if he really did study those twenty-six volumes and really did index them, he argues in his footnote: "Unnamed Critics claim that Linnie Mae Randle and Buell Frazier described a package too short to contain Oswald's rifle" (page 224)

J

⊙

Unnamed critics say this and only they? Not the Warren Report and its testimony, its only testimony on the length of that package?

He continues to argue in the continuations of this footnote onto the bottom of the next page, after more deceptiveness for which we need here take no time, Posner lies again in saying that "The FBI discovered the bag contained microscopic fibers from the blanket with which Oswald kept his rifle wrapped in the Paine garage (WC Vol. IV, pp. 57, 76-80)" More Dirty Dickery with footnotes, that Posner standby. Neither of his citations is to the FBI testimony on those fibers. The reason is obvious; it gave no such testimony and no such test results are possible. The most expert examination can show is consistency between the specimens and an enormous number of things are made from similar fibers. And that is what the FBI did testify to, and only that. Not only did the FBI not give the testimony Posner attributes to it, which I repeat means he lied, and not only does his trickery with footnotes in this writing compound his lie, it is also a lie to cite Paine testimony, which he does, to any statement saying they knew Oswald had a rifle in their garage. They knew no such thing and testified they would have prohibited any weapon in their property.

Posner's lying to pretend support from the Paines draws attention to what he, like the Commission, ignored about Oswald

and that rifle and getting it, allegedly, into the Paine garage at Irving, Texas.

The Commission elicited pressured testimony from Marina that elsewhere Posner exploits to the effect that Oswald practised with that rifle on their porch in New Orleans but only after dark. This does place that rifle, at least in Commission and Posner argument, in New Orleans. They never got it --never even tried to get it --to Texas and into that garage.

Oswald, obviously, did not take it to Mexico and back on all those many buses.

Ruth Paine testified that she did not load the rifle into her stationwagon when she loaded the Oswald possessions into it, Marina then being far along in her second pregnancy.

Michael Paine, who unloaded that stationwagon in Texas, testified that he had not unloaded the rifle.

And both (Quakers), testified that they would not, as a matter of conscience, have permitted a rifle in their property.

Like the Commission, making reference to the scientific testing of that blanket, neither report any oil on it yet that rifle, as the FBI laboratory report on it states clearly, was

well oiled.

In the face of ALL of the evidence, the Commission and Posner just willed that rifle from New Orleans to Dallas and then, as we have seen, they just willed it, again in contradiction of ALL of the evidence, into the building because, if they did not, they had no case against Oswald at all.

Returning to this same footnote Posner ends with a cutie, "Although Oswald claimed to have curtain rods in the bag, none were found at the Depository."

There is no cited source on this last deliberate deception, which as much as says that once Oswald made that claim there was an immediate search for those curtain rods. There was not. Not by the building management, not by the police or the Secret Service or the FBI. And from his own diligent examination and indexing of all the Commission published, if Posner wrote the truth, never a safe assumption with Posner, and if not, from page 22 of *Whitewash* in which I note again his examination of it was careful enough to spot four noncontinuous words on a page of six-hundred words, he did know the truth:

S/P
"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

*misprint
being
space*



*incident
summary
page 4*

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 living in a fishbowl. This room was so thoroughly searched by the police immediately after the assassination that on a check the following day nothing was found except a single paperclip. Many police and media people were there. The hearings abound with identical pictures repeated numerous times under different exhibit numbers, and both the Report and the Hearings have large areas of blank spaces on countless pages. Why, then, was there no picture showing whether, in fact, Oswald's cubicle had curtains?

With Oswald having claimed that he had curtain rods for curtains because his cubicle was like a fishbowl, not his exact words as quoted by the police, but the actuality, no element of public authority dared search to see if there were curtain rods at the Depository. The reason is obvious; no part of public authority wanted the truth. They had a bird in hand and they were not about to beat the bushes.

After she read this chapter in *Whitewash* Sylvia Meagher told

me she had read what I missed in the Commissions volumes, that it was common practise for employees carrying parcels to work for those parcels to be left in a ^{large, shed-like} part of the Depository about which readers cannot learn from Posner's text or from his incorrect and also incomplete floor plan diagram in his appendix B_f (Pages unnumbered 480 and 481).

The question I posed in this writing completed early in 1965 was never really addressed by any official body or authority. After discussing this I asked the obvious questions, of all the innumerable pictures taken, "Why, then, are there no pictures" showing whether or not Oswald needed more privacy. When I learned the answer, this question should really be whether Oswald had the need for any privacy in that cubicle of a room partitioned in half to be able to rent two rooms from that one.

As with everything else, if Posner had asked me he would have had the proof.

But, still again, had he that proof I here present for the first time after all these years, he would not have had his book and all it gave him.

There is ^{this} the photographic proof, and if I could get it without leaving home, all abdicated public authority, to say nothing of the hotshot investigators like Poserⁿ, also could have

gotten it -- had anyone wanted it.

My friend Richard Sprague, then of Hartsdale, New York and then a vice president of the prominent accounting firm, Touche, Bailey, asked me how he could help bring facts to light when he travelled, as he did often often in his work. I urged him to start a search for all available pictures of all kinds. He did that and he was able to collect a large number of pictures not sought by any official investigators and not had by them. Among the pictures Dick located is a sheet of thirty-three contact prints of a roll of thirty-five millimeter pictures taken the day of the assassination, or the next day, in Dallas. These pictures are the property of Black Star, a well-known photo agency.

That cubicle did have venetian blinds. But it did not have curtains! Black Star's pictures show the room without curtains, apparent when what is on the outside is seen between the slats of the blinds, they show the curtains begin installed and they show the diaphanous curtains after hung over all the windows!

Through those curtains Oswald would still have lacked real privacy.

H Here, ~~for the first time anywhere,~~ is proof that Oswald told the truth and that he did have a need for curtains in his room.

As we have seen, every word of the testimony the Commission

learn the truth? Is his failure, his disinterest, confirmation that he began self-cast in an entirely different role, the role we are uncovering.

[If these chapters that were butchered out of Case Open do not raise the most substantial questions about why they were removed, about whether it was normal publishing considerations that led to it, patience- more follows.]

Extra space

~~Pointed~~ Pointed, straightforward writing is frowned upon by those responsible for the glorifying reviews of the Mailer and Posner books. On a subject like this, the assassination of a President, which means a coup d'etat and with a coup d'etat itself being the deepest subversion, I believe that what is written should be as straightforward and as pointed as possible. There should be no questions ^{that can be answered} in the minds of the people about ~~what~~ what took place and how it took place. If a writer ~~lies~~ lies about it, there is no honest reason for saying other than that he did lie, ^{there} and every reason why the people should know and understand the truth, ^{about him, too.}

The reality is that without lying Mailer could not have had his book, as before him without lying Posner also could not have had his book. They are in the tradition of the Warren Commission. It also could not have ^{prepared} had and issued its Report without ~~lying~~ lying. Sp, like its successors, it lied.

It, like ^{these} this and other authors, lied about much because without lying about much it is impossible to make a ^{case} case against Oswald. The ~~lying~~ lying about the shooting begins for all with having both Oswald and the rifle allegedly used in the crime at ^{at the time of the shooting.} and in the allaged sniper's nest. The first step in making that story up was getting the rifle into the building. For the Commission, which proceeded entirely in secrecy, that meant merely concluding the exact opposite of all of its testimony and evidence - ^{all its own testimony and all its own evidence -} it lied about them. Facing the same problem, the Posner and the Mailers and all of their preception, reach the same solution to this problem: they, too, merely lied.

For Mailer ^{getting the rifle to and into the TSBD} this begins with his first words of his ~~in~~ Chapter 3 of his Part VI of his Book Two, on page 668. There he uses a second-hand source despite having the primary source in front of him, the testimony of Mrs. Linnie Mae ~~Rag~~ Randle. She was the sister of Buell Wesley Frazier, who ^{and} worked with Oswald and give him rides to and from ^{and where Mamma and the babies lived with Ruth Paine in Irving.} work. ^{D.} Instead of quoting her testimony Mailer quotes what FBI agents Bardwell Odum and Gibbon E. Mc Neeley said Randle told them. And then Mailer omits what is most important in what Randle said because it eliminates the possibility that Oswald had that rifle with him:

*indnt
single
space*

Mrs. Randle stated that at the time she saw Oswald . . . he was carrying a long package wrapped in ~~brown~~ ^{brown} paper [which] appeared to contain something heavy. . .

What Mailer eliminated and what ^yrules out the possibility that the bag, not a ~~the~~ wrapped package, held that rifle, ^{is} ~~it~~ ^{is} She stated that it was long but did not touch the ground as ~~he~~ he walked across the street" (24H407).

With all the uck and goo and ^{these} long stretches of this omnipresent mindreading and ESP Mailer did not lack the space space in his more than eight hundred pages for this short and simple statement. That the rifle ^{almost} ~~that~~ was ~~more than~~ three feet long even disassembled ^{it} would have been ~~been~~ ever so much longer that the space between Oswald's ~~had~~ hand as he held that bag and the ground and ~~that~~ it would have been dragging on the ground at the least. Commission measurements later proved this and more.

For Mailer to have that FBI report in front of him and to quote it deceptively by eliminating these few words means he knew the truth and he lied about it.

Thus, ^{Mailer} ~~he~~ like Posner, lied because he had to lie as each lied his way to being able to perpetrate the fraud each began intending to perpetrate.

What follows is what ⁺ wrote about this before Mailer wrote his book.

It is as pertinent to Mailer's writing as to Posner's's.