

IGNORING THE TRUTH

Aside from the dishonesty in so much of what Posner writes there is also the equally omnipresent dishonesty by omission. Of all the many illustrations of this in preceding chapters, notably what with all his uninhibited chest-beating in his boasting of the CIA's great favor to him in making Nosenko available, as we saw, Posner suppressed from what he claims is the most definitive biography of Oswald very much that Nosenko had told the FBI and I published in 1975, that the KGB suspected Oswald was an American sleeper agent, that he hated the USSR, that he was the worst of shooters, unable to hit even a rabbit with a shotgun, things like that, uncongenial to the new Oswald Posner created for his special purposes.

On the evidence of getting that rifle into the building in Oswald's hands that Friday morning, Posner ignores the most probative, official evidence that he did not.

As we have seen, Posner was untruthful in saying that the fibers recovered from the blanket in which that rifle was allegedly wrapped were positively connected to that blanket. He knew the truth from *Whitewash*. Yet his invested "new" solution that he claims closes the case did not address the incontrovertible evidence that proves Oswald did not in fact carry that rifle into the building with the package that from all

of the evidence he did not take into the building in any event. This is Posner's pattern in next next chapter, "He Looked Like a Maniac," with the subtitle: "Oswald's Escape". (Pages 263-285).

We have just seen Posner's lying to fabricate his false case by that means. Now we study his also indispensable dishonesty by deliberate omission of solid, official evidence; evidence requiring that he omit what he knew that destroys his contrived case. The evidence, scientific and first-person, that disproves his and the Commission's false story about Oswald's carrying that rifle into the building inside that bag serves also to introduce Posner's omissions with which this next chapter begins, how he has Oswald "escape" that building.

The Commission had to expect extensive critical reading that could or would spot gross omissions. The record on Posner is clear: he did not expect this and his judgement was correct, he did not have to face it. The major media was preconditioned to accept any support of the official mythology.

The magnitude of Posner's dishonesty and its importance to his counterfeiting an impossible "solution" is what we now address, preparing the reader for this amazingly successful dishonesty in Posner's account of Oswald's "escape" with a brief account of what he knew, omitted and got away with omitting that was really an indispensable part of his and the Commission's explanations of how Oswald supposedly got that rifle into that

building, inside that special bag he is supposed to have made to hold it, by stealing the paper and the tape from the Depository the day before the assassination. What we quote is from *Whitewash* which Posner had and which was available to all of those who abandoned all their critical faculties and praised his book as the best of possible books on the subject.

As Pulitzer prize winning *Newsday* reporter, Patrick J. Sloyan decribed it ⁱⁿ a syndicated review two columns long with a picture from the Zapruder film included as it appeared in the *Louisville Courier Journal*, it is a "landmark book" that "is required reading for anyone interested in the American crime of the century."

As the actual evidence is laid out in *Whitewash* (pp. 22ff) it is a landmark of successful, multifaceted dishonesties that should be "required reading" for all who review controversial books:

*Indent
single
space* 5/10
= "The Report does not consider it necessary to do more than get Oswald to the building and into it. It dismissed the unequivocal and uncontradicted testimony of Frazier and his sister by deciding they were "mistaken". It paid even less heed to Dougherty, the only witness who saw Oswald enter the building when he said "positively" Oswald carried no package -- it just ignored him in its conclusions (R137).

inhibit
weight
of bag

§

"These conclusions also state Oswald "took paper and tape from the wrapping bench of the Depository and fashioned a bag large enough to carry the disassembled rifle".

§

Just as there is no evidence of any kind that the rifle was ever disassembled, there is no evidence that Oswald ever took any paper and/or tape. There were no eyewitnesses. There was absolutely no evidence -- not even a wild rumor about either. The Commission simply decided that, because the unassembled rifle was 5.4 inches shorter, it was 5.4 inches closer to the only testimony on the size of the package. It did the same with the packaging materials. Having decided that Oswald carried the rifle into the building in a bag, despite the fact that its only evidence was exclusively to the contrary, the Commission had no problem deciding that Oswald had just taken these materials and made the bag. It does not say whether he made the bag in the building before taking it to Irving -- which involved the possibility, if not the probability, of detection --or made it in Irving, which the statements by Marina and Ruth Paine would seem to eliminate as a possibility. He just made it, unseen and somewhere. Each reader may decide for himself where and how. It made no difference to the Commission. And it makes no difference, in any event, for there is no evidence that he made or used it. (Page 20).



Omitting this, which is indispensable in his omission of what follows it, is one reason Posner had to simply ignore this

and the following evidence in his supposed step-by-step account:

15/
without
single
piece
"Having made the bag of a material that had the remarkable quality of preserving fold markings imperishably and accepting none other, or having just stolen this paper, Oswald had to get the bag or the paper to Irving. The only man who ever took him there, and without doubt the man who took him there the evening of November 21, was asked ^{by} Commission Counsel Joe Ball ~~asked~~ about both a package and about "anything", and Frazier was positive in his ^{denial} response to both forms of the question (2H242).

at And the package was much too large to have been pocketed.

Meanwhile, the Commission's identification expert is invoked in a section erroneously entitled "Scientific Evidence Linking *Rivle* and Oswald to Paper Bag" (R135-7). Through FBI questioned-documents expert James C. Cadigan, the Commission established that a sample of paper taken from the wrapping table the day of the assassination could be identified as from the same roll as that from which the paper for the bag came (R135;4H93). This related no more to Oswald than to anyone else with access to the building. But in also establishing that a roll of paper was consumed in three days (R136), the Commission clearly proved that Oswald could not have taken the bag and/or the paper to Irving, for the materials could have been taken at most two days (if, indeed, at all) before the day of the assassination. Unless, of course, it could prove that the Depository had other rolls of paper from the manufacturer's same batch, which it could not

prove (R136), " (page 20).

Posner was no more anxious than the Commission to explain how Oswald could have carried and hidden paper tape that was thoroughly wet by the time it came from the machine that dispenses it in those days before self-adhering tape was invented.:

S/A
"Mr. Cadigan's science further weakened the Commission's theory in two additional ways, which the Report ignores. First, he established that the tape had been run through the tape-dispensing machine. The significance of this will become clear in discussion of the totally suppressed testimony of Troy Eugene West. Then he reported on his careful scientific examination of the bag to see "if there were any significant markings or scratches or abrasions or anything by which it could be associated with the rifle..." The result? There were none (4H97).

S/A
"The Commission found it expedient to ignore this part of its own expert's testimony on his scientific inquiry on its behalf in referring to the "Scientific Evidence Linking Rifle and Oswald to Paper Bag." S

This was no less expedient for Posner. His misrepresentation of what the FBI's testing of the blanket fibers shows which follows, was known to him from *Whitewash*:

incident
single
page

S/P

"Instead, it quoted Paul M. Stombaugh, another FBI laboratory expert, on his examination of "a single brown delustered viscose fiber and several light green cotton fibers". Stombaugh compared these few fibers with the blanket and found they did match some of those in the blanket. Despite this, "Stombaugh was unable to render an opinion that the fibers which he found had probably come from the blanket..." (R137).

Briefly, then, the "Scientific Evidence Linking Rifle and Oswald to Paper Bag" did not do any such thing. It may fairly be said this "evidence" did the opposite. (Page 21).

S/

OK

(In 1986 a Paul M. Stombaugh was expelled from the USSR in an espionage scandal that also led to the expulsion of Nicholas Daniloff, correspondent of U.S. News and World Report. The Soviet aviation engineer ^{said to have been spy ing for the United States} ~~was case officer that~~ Stombaugh was Adolf G. Tolkachev, was executed. The accusation against Daniloff is that he was a courier for another alleged spy who reported to Stombaugh. Of the accounts of this in the newspapers and magazine and book I saw no reference to the name of that expelled attache being identical with that of the former FBI lab agent.)

U

~~In the book of the British reporter Tom Mangold, Molehunt, page 300, the expelled attache's name is given as Paul M. Stombaugh, Jr. Mangold cites the book of one of Posner's promoters, David Wise, The Spy Who Got Away, New York, Random House, 1988), PP.261-2 as his source.~~

S/

The custodian of the paper and tape, Troy West, who rarely left his wrapping table, does not entirely escape Posner's attention. Posner refers to him as sitting and eating lunch (page 227) . In this casual mention Posner discloses that he not only knew what is here repeated from *Whitewash* about West, but that he also read West's testimony, citing his reading of that testimony as his source (Page 541). Yet Posner says no more about West than that when he was sitting and eating lunch he did not see Oswald. What Posner did not burden his readers of the success of his book with is:

Widant
Wyle
ofdy
A/S/
Custodian of the wrapping table at which these materials are kept was Troy Eugene West (6H356-63). West had been employed by the Book Depository for 16 years and was so attached to his place of work that he never left his bench, even to eat lunch. His only separation from it, aside from the necessary functions of life (and this is presumed, it is not in his testimony), was on arrival before work, to get water for coffee.

S/
"He knew of no time when any employees had ever borrowed any tape or ever used it for themselves. Asked if Oswald ever helped him or if he ever noticed Oswald around either the paper or the tape, both of which are at his bench, West replied, "Never."

Asked "Do you know whether or not he (Oswald) ever borrowed or used any wrapping paper for himself?" West declared, "No, sir; I don't." Assistant Counsel David W. Belin, conducting the examination, repeated, "You don't know?" and West reaffirmed his

*without
any
of*

answer, replying, "No; I don't." (6H360)

If this is not the reason the Report ignores West's testimony, what follows is equally destructive to what the Commission wants believed. West reiterated his testimony that, so far as he knew, no employees "ever" used or borrowed the tape for themselves, ^{They} and Belin turned to questions about the dispensing machine itself. The Commission had already established that two of the cuts on the tape had been made by the machine, presuming them to be the cuts at the end of a length of tape that was later torn into smaller pieces by hand. Hence, Belin wanted to know, "If I wanted to pull the tape, pull off a piece without getting water on it, would I just lift it up without going over the wet roller and get the tape without getting it wet?" West explained this would be impossible, saying, "You would have to take it out. You would have to take it out of the machine. See, it's put on there and run through a little clamp that holds it down, and you pull it, well, then, the water, it gets on it." (6H361)

Having proved that the tape on the bag had been dispensed by the machine, the Commission thus established beyond any question that the tape was wet when dispensed and had to be used immediately, if not at the bench, at least very close to it. And the man who was always there established that Oswald never was.

Q "The only possibility remaining, an effort to get West to admit

*intent
single
page*

that he was away from his bench, was totally unsuccessful and had the opposite effect." (Page 21).

Even in Posner's account of how Oswald allegedly carried that mysterious bag he has to have left many fingerprints all over it. But it was another bit of magic evidence, like the magical bullet. *[Resuming quotation from White Wash:]*

5/11
*intent
single
page*

"No, sir," he reiterated, "I never did hardly ever leave the first floor. That is just stayed there where all my work was, and I just stayed there" (6H362)

The only suggestion of any connection between Oswald and the bag was through fingerprints. Because Oswald worked where the bag was reported to have been found, the presence of his fingerprints was totally meaningless. Sebastian F. Latona, supervisor of the FBI's Latent Fingerprint Section, developed a single fingerprint and a single palmprint he identified as Oswald's. More significantly, "No other identifiable prints were found on the bag" (R135).

After all the handling of the bag attributed to Oswald, first in making it, then in packing it, then taking it to Frazier's car, putting it down in the car, picking it up and carrying it toward if not into the building for two blocks, and then, at least by inference, through the building, and when removing and assembling a rifle Marina testified he kept oiled

and cleaned, how is it to be explained that he left only two prints? The only thing as strange is that this bag was also handled by the police and was the only evidence they did not photograph, according to their testimonies, where found. Yet the freshest prints, those of the police, were not discovered. (Page 21-2) *5/10*

Marina's testimony was confirmed by the FBI lab. It found the rifle was well-oiled.

If it were not that magic becomes indispensable to Posner it might be possible that he shunned and omitted this official testimony of which he was well aware because it depends on magic the last of which we here have seen is a magical paper and a magical blanket that reject the oil of the well-oiled rifle because no such oil showed in the FBI lab's testing. The paper had the added magical property of refusing to accept all the fingerprints having to have been deposited on it -- if the official history of that bag is true.

Which is hardly possible.

This demonstrates how Posner creates his proofs by the overt omission of what was well known, a less polite description is by the crudest suppressions. His skilled practise of it in what he says is his account of Oswald's escape is actually indispensable to the possibility of the crime as Posner and the Commission state it follows.



o/a/2

*madman
search
gave*

No-Source Posner begins his Oswald escape chapter with exploiting his Hartegsian practise of mind reading. He opens it stating that Oswald had little time to prepare for what would make him famous that he so longed for and that one evidence of this is "the fact that he had only four bullets with him, though the rifle's clip could hold six." (Page 263). In fact the rifle could have held an additional bullet, as if he knew anything at all about rifles, Posner would have known. That additional bullet could have been chambered before the loaded clip was inserted.

This quote reflects again Posner's gross ignorance of the established facts of the case about which he writes glibly pretending there is nothing he does not know. How else can he say it is a "Case Closed" other than that based on all the evidence?

His and the official mythologies are based on the same and entirely unproven conjecture, one of those things he was praised for never resorting to in those dust-jacket encomiums, the conjecture that the rifle was in the Paine garage and that Oswald got it from there the morning of the assassination and carried it to the scene of the crime in that magical bag. The problem No-Source has here is that "no kiddin'" is more than justified. Unless, as I doubt, Posner would accuse the Dallas police of planting evidence. Their search disclosed there was other such ammunition in that garage. So, there was not a blessed thing to

keep Oswald for not limiting himself, albeit with utter irrationality if the official mythologies are true, to those four bullets.



In admitting what certainly casts some doubt on Oswald's expectation of getting away with what is attributed to him firing all the shots from that sixth-floor window, Posner says he "could not be certain of finding a deserted floor or area from which to shoot." Posner ends this consideration without going further, but the fact is that Oswald, most of whose work was on the floor, knew very well that it was the floor of the warehouse least likely to be "deserted" because a new floor was being laid on it. That put people there all the time other than at lunch time and with the low wages paid, there was no certainty at all that one or more of the men paid so little would not brown bag. Or, as Posner does not spell out, the floor with the least probability being "deserted" was the very one Oswald supposedly selected

^)

+/

o/

As part of his No Source mind reading Posner says that it was not a suicide mission. Oswald wanted to escape. That no doubt accounts for his leaving all but fifteen dollars of what he had for Marina, keeping this insignificant sum for any escape *[not for what he would live on until his next payday.]*

Without any other word about the crime, with which he later does toy around, disconnected from the vital evidence he here plays his special kind of games with, Posner begins the second page of this chapter (Page 264):

invented
single
fact

s/9 After firing the final shot, he slipped through the narrow gap he had created between the cartons of books. He hurried diagonally across the sixth floor, toward the rear staircase. Next to the stairs, Oswald dropped the rifle into an opening between several large boxes. It hid the gun from view unless someone stood almost directly over the boxes and peered down. s/s/



This is quite a jumble and it jerks the readers mind quite a bit, not an unwise trick considering what Posner is up to.

Including his skilled practise of omission of the best evidence. He need not have left his account of how Oswald supposedly disposed of the rifle so vague when the Commission, as he certainly knew from that devoted reading of its evidence he says he indexed, too, had photographs of that rifle as found. They were taken by the police identification unit photographer, Lieutenant Carl Day and his assistant, Robert Lee Studebaker. Studebaker's testimony is included in what Posner read in his diligent research of all those Commission volumes. It is in Volume 7, beginning on page 137. But then Posner is prejudiced against Studebaker, or may be against crime-scene pictures, because with more than 600 pages he makes no mention of Studebaker's name. Not one time.

S

Of course in his own book Posner is entitled to decide for himself what pictures he wants and does not want. Posner has 16

pages of pictures most with more than one picture to a page, yet for a book supposedly the most definitive on the crime itself he has not a single crime-scene picture, not one having any evidentiary value. He decided that baby pictures of Oswald and of others already widely published of Oswald in Minsk were more important. Pictures of evidence were less to his liking. It is his book he has his rights, and so do others, to question and to interpret.

While Studebaker is a non-person to Posner, his boss, Lieutenant Carl Day, appears on six pages of this chapter without Posner mentioning him in connection with the finding of that rifle. He also took pictures of it as did Studebaker. And testified to its finding.

All the evidence is that Posner wrote what he knew is untrue on Oswald's alleged getting rid of that rifle, Posner's words, quoted above, are that Oswald [↓]dropped the rifle into an opening [↑]between several large boxes." "/

Posner's knowing ^{ly}by false representation of this is essential in his phony time reconstruction of Oswald's alleged flight, but it has another and considerable importance: it is actually proof that Oswald did not and could not have put the rifle where it was found and, if in flight, he could not possibly have put it there as it was found, the reason Posner does not mention those pictures. ly/S/

The FBI tried similar shenanigans with her second statement. Posner reflects his ignorance of this. Compounding his serious offense, writing prejudicially from gross ignorance, he just plain, straight-out lies in saying, his words: "...in the second statement she did not see him at all." His supposed source on this is the second of those two FBI records I published facing each other.



8 5 A
incident
single
photo

"By this time what happened when the identification experts were called over to where the rifle had been found should be comprehensible in a streamlined account. There is no indication the area was checked for fingerprints at all, even though the rifle was completely surrounded by boxes and carefully hidden in a space 'just wide enough to accomodate that rifle and hold it in an upright position' (4H259). By "upright", Day meant horizontal. He and Studebaker clambered all over the unfingerprinted barriers behind which the rifle was hidden to take pictures, but they took only similar pictures from exactly the same spot. Studebaker's even show his own knee as he photographed downward (21H645).

After the rifle was photographed, Day held it by the stock. (2) He assumed the stock would show no prints. Then Captain Fritz, perhaps because of the presence of newsmen, grasped the bolt and ejected a live cartridge. Day had found no fingerprints on the bolt. If there was any need for this

operation, it was never indicated. There was no print on either the clip or the live bullet.

As with all the evidence, the pictures of the rifle also have other minor mysteries. Day testified that he made a negative (Exhibit 514) from one of his two negatives (Exhibit 718) of the rifle in the position in which it was found. What useful purpose this served, especially if the result sought was greater clarity, is not apparent (4H257ff). If these are identical, they were at the very least cropped differently. The confusion extended to the Commission's editor, who described the copied negative as "depicting location of the C2766 rifle when discovered" but of the original negative said, "Photograph of rifle hidden beneath boxes..."

In any event, the rifle was almost clean of prints, as were the shells, and well hidden. Two men appear to have found it at the same time. The Commission saw fit to call only one to Washington. He is Eugene Boone, a deputy sheriff (3H291ff). The other was Seymour Weitzman, a constable and one of the rare college graduates in the various police agencies. He had a degree in engineering. Weitzman gave a deposition to the Commission staff in Dallas on April 1, 1964 (7H105-9). Under questioning, he described "three distinct shots", with the second and third seeming almost simultaneous. He heard some one say the shots "came from the wall" west of the Depository and "I immediately scaled that wall". He and the police and "Secret Service as well

noticed "numerous kinds of footprints that did not make sense because they were going in different directions". This testimony seems to have been ignored. He also turned a piece of the President's skull over to the Secret Service. He got it after being told by a railroad employee that "he thought he saw somebody throw something through a bush".

Then he went to the sixth floor where he worked with Boone on the search. With Weitzman on the floor looking under the flats of boxes and Boone looking over the top, they found the rifle, "I would say simultaneously.... It was covered with boxes. It was well protected...I would say eight or nine of us stumbled over that gun a couple of times... We made a man-tight barricade until the crime lab came up...." (7H106-7).

(Aside from its intended purpose, exposing the true character of the massive disinformation campaign of which Posner was the point man and timed to coincide with the thirtieth assassination anniversary, these quotations are of and are based upon the official evidence little known today. The no-conspiracy theory books like Posner's and those espousing conspiracy theories on the other side argue preconceptions in which the basic and established fact of the assassination and its investigation are not used. It is evidence universally ignored yet is essential to full reader understanding.)

Constable Weitzman's is only some of the testimony that

ruins Posner's book. He omitted this testimony, of which he knew from more than this publication of it. His intent is to hide, as is his initial description of how Oswald allegedly got rid of that rifle.

In his paragraph quoted above he says that Deputy Sheriff Eugene Boone and Weitzman found the rifle. His source on that sentence, after his use of "they" to refer to both, is the testimony Homicide Captain Will Fritz, and that of Luke Mooney, another deputy sheriff, neither of whom had first-hand information. No mention of Weitzman or Boone (page 546) or to Day's ^{testimony} as we see soon. Citing Weitzman's or Boone's ^{testimony} directed readers attention to it, and Posner does not want his readers to know the truth he suppressed from his book.

[Handwritten signature]
[Handwritten initials]

And that truth is that the rifle he said as merely "dropped" casually was in fact hidden so completely that Weitzman decided that this description just quoted fell short of how completely it was hidden. As we resume quotation of what Posner knew from *Whitewash* with what Weitzman testified to, he said it was better hidden than the police pictures that Posner also keeps secret reflect:

S/P
--"When shown three unidentified photographs that seem to be those the police took, Weitzman said of the one with the hidden rifle, "it was more hidden than there" (7H108). If it had not been so securely hidden, he said, "we couldn't help but see it"

*undent
single
photo
no
Harris*

weird
mystery
of all
no
it takes

from the stairway (Ibid). In addition to his only too graphic testimony about the finding and hiding of the rifle, Weitzman provided information about seemingly meaningful footprints at a place not in conformity with the official theories of the crime and about a strange effort to hide a piece of the President's skull. All this should have been valuable information for the members of the Commission. Why he was not called to appear before the full Commission is a mystery. Boone, who was called, did not have such testimony to offer.

Weitzman's testimony about the care and success with which the rifle was hidden and about the searchers stumbling over it without finding it is important in any time reconstruction. With the almost total absence of fingerprints on a rifle that took and held prints and the absence of prints on the clip and shells that would take prints, this shows the care and time taken by the alleged user of the ^{we}apon. That this version is not in the Report can be understood best by comparison with the version that is, (whitewash, page 36).

In interviewing Day Posner eliminated any need to cite Day's testimony. But he did testify as Weitzman and Boone did. When Day was asked if the rifle had been moved before he photographed it he evaded direct answer, perhaps because he did not know. But Weitzman did testify that when he found it the rifle was "more hidden" than in the picture. The picture I published in Whitewash on page 211 is in the Commission's volumes. Posner could not have missed it. He also knew what the picture shows

from *Whitewash*. It is not necessary to quote all of Day's testimony (4H257-8). Exhibit 514 (17H224) actually proves Weitzman's point that the police kept peeling the covering from that rifle. And before it was all over, asked again on the next page if the rifle had been "removed", Day responded, "I do not remember."

8/16
-Mr. Day: I met Captain Fritz. He wanted photographs of the rifle before it was moved.

8/16
-Mr. Belin: Do you remember if Captain Fritz told you that the rifle had not been moved?

8/16
-Mr. Day: He told me he wanted photographs before it was moved, if I remember correctly. He definitely told me it had not been moved, and the reason for the photographs he wanted it photographed before it was moved.

8/16
-Mr. Belin: I am going to hand you what the reporter has marked or what has been marked as Commission Exhibit 718, and ask you to state, if you know, what this is.

8/16
-Mr. Day: It is a picture of the portion of the northwest floor where the rifle was found. This is a distance shot showing the stack of boxes.

8/16
-Mr. Belin: Is Commission Exhibit 718 a print from the same negative a Commission Exhibit 514?

8/16
-Mr. Day: The same negative?

8/16
-Mr. Belin: Yes, sir.

8/16
-Mr. Day: No, I don't think so. This is a copy of this picture.

8/16
-Mr. Belin: You are saying 514 was made, I assume, as a copy of

*incident
single
span*

*in about
single
of page*

718. By that you mean a negative, a second negative, was made of 718 from which 514 was taken?

S/A
Mr. Day: Yes, sir.

S/A
Mr. Belin: Otherwise it is the same?

S/A
Mr. Day: Yes, sir.

S/A
Mr. Belin: 718 appears to be a little clearer and sharper.

S/A
Mr. Day: You can tell from looking at the two pictures which is the copy.

S/A
Mr. Belin: Was any other picture of that rifle made in that position?

S/A
Mr. Day: Nos. 22 and 23 were both made.

S/A
Mr. Belin: Your pictures which you have marked No. 22 and No. 23 were both made, one was made by you, is that Commission Exhibit 718----

S/A
Mr. Day: Yes, sir.

S/A
Mr. Belin: And the other was made by ----

S/A
Mr. Day: Detective Studebaker.

S/A
Mr. Belin: Whose knee appears?

S/A
Mr. Day: Yes, sir; showing. Identical shots, we just made both to be sure that one of us made it, and it would be in focus.

S/A
Mr. Belin: For this reason I am introducing only 718, if that is satisfactory.

S/A
Mr. McCloy: Very well.

S/A
Mr. Belin: How did you stand to take the picture, Exhibit 718?

S/A
Mr. Day: I was on top of a stack of boxes to the south of where the gun was found.



Even after the protective covering had been partly removed it is apparent that placing the rifle as it was found took some care and time, should have left fingerprints, which it did not, and none of the considerable amount of time this alone took is included in any time reconstruction, notoriously not in Posner's contrived one.

When a writer can be this thoroughly dishonest when writing about that most subversive of crimes, the assassination of a President, his word cannot be taken for anything at all.

It is beyond belief that anyone could do this for money and for the attention a diligent and competent publisher could and did get him, and then say all he said on all those radio and TV shows. But it is too early to ask, "can anyone be more dishonest?" *th/*

Dishonestly as the Commission also handled the supposed re-enactment of Oswald's alleged departure *from* the sixth floor, with regard to these pictures Day took the table of contents for that volume says of the picture, Exhibit 718 that it is a "photograph of the rifle hidden ^{not caps} ~~BENEATH~~ _{in the line} boxes...." (emphasis added). There Exhibit 719 is described as "showing the boxes behind which the rifle was concealed." (17H xvii). *caps*

In an effort made futile by Marrion Baker's own sworn

testimony and is his ^s (Posner's) ^s customary ^{lc} source mode for
mininformation, Posner had earlier in his skipping around trying
to make a case that it would have taken Baker much longer to get
to where he saw Oswald in that second-floor room (that had pop-
dispensing machines in it) than the Commission stated, but nobody
had a more urgent need to make it appear that Baker took more
time than the Commission said for its story to have any
credibility at all. Oswald has ^d to have time to get inside that
employees' room, the automatic door closure has ^d to have closed
the door slowly and then Oswald has ^d to have had time to go to the
Coke machine all before Baker saw him. The Commission could not
make it work out, even with incredible shortcuts, and it again
merely concluded contrary to all its own evidence, that the
impossible was possible. Posner winds up almost two pages on
this (264-5) with this footnote:

*four
pages*

^{s/a}
Baker claimed he encountered Oswald less than two minutes
after the assassination, and for some it is difficult to imagine
how Oswald could have crossed the sixth floor and been on the
second, not out of breath, in such a short time. The Warren
Commission did a reconstruction. Officer Baker recreated
Oswald's actions (including hiding the rifle) and in two tests
made it to the second-floor lunch room, in "normal walking," in 1
minute and 18 seconds, and in a "fast walk" in 1 minute and 14
seconds (WC Vol.III, p. 254). A Secret Service agent, John
Howlett, also completed Oswald's route in the necessary time.
Neither Baker nor Howlett was out of breath when he reached the

*want
single
page*

*was not
single
spot* spot where Oswald had been stopped (WC Vol. VII, p. 592).

It pays to check Posner out. What he cites is a very short, conclusory affidavit in which Secret Service Agent John Howlett does say at the end, "I was not short-winded." But what else he says, and does not say, is again utterly destructive of Posner's make-up case.

Posner's argument and indeed, the path shown in his Appendix A (pages 480, unnumbered, and 481) is a direct, straightline path for Oswald from that Southeasternmost window to the northwest corner of that sixth floor. That, of course, ^{speeded} ~~preceded~~ the imaginary Oswald up considerably. But as Posner certainly knew, that warehouse floor was pretty solid with stacks of cartoned books. Howlett could not take the path Posner pretends and the appendix show, because of all those stacks of books. Howlett's own account of what he had to do is, that he went "northerly along the east aisle to the northeast corner, then westerly along the north wall past the elevators to the northwest corner. There I placed the rifle on the floor."

He not only could not take the shortcut in the appendix that Posner knew quite well was impossible. He also did not go across that barricade of books to deposit the rifle as it was deposited, that took time and care. He also did not take the time to conceal the rifle by putting it "under" boxes and hiding the whole thing with both boxes and paper.

If what first the Commission and now Posner says Oswald did in fleeing his supposed sniper's nest does not work, as in the reconstructions it did not, then the crime is unsolved and Oswald is acquitted. It also means Posner has no book and all that meant to him. The Commission was willing to and did pull a few shortcuts in "reconstructing" Oswald's time to try to make it work out. It did not stop there. As the story is reported truthfully in *Whitewash*:

3/98
"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?"

Walden
single
space



J/

*included
1
single
copy*

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 streamling, 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.

On the other hand, the first reconstruction of the time the Commission staff alleged it took Baker was actually done at a walk! In Baker's words, "From the time I got off the motorcycle we walked the first time and we kind of ran the second time from the motorcycle on into the building". Once they got into the building, "we did it at kind of a trot, I would say, it wasn't a real fast run, an open run. It was more of a trot, kind of."



(pages 3⁵/₅-6) (3H253).

th/

Is there any wonder Howlett was not "short-winded"?

Imagine an assassin just sauntering off to hide his weapon! They WALKED A "SIMULATION" TO MAKE IT WORK AND IT STILL DID NOT WORK, DID NOT GET OSWALD TO THAT LUNCH ROOM UNTIL AFTER BAKER WAS THERE, and he walked to and into the building in that simulation rather than run as fast as he could.

no caps
no caps

no caps



They could not make it work even when there was no effort made to hide the rifle as it had been so effectively and carefully hidden it had not been detected the many times that space was examined, as we have seen:

incident single fall
3/4
Walking through a reconstruction was pure fakery and the "kind of run" or "kind of trot" was not much better. Both Baker and Roy Truly, who accompanied him once inside the building, described what would have been expected under the circumstances, a mad dash. They were running so fast that when they came to a swinging office door on the first floor it jammed for a second. In actuality, Baker had sent people careening as he rushed into the building. He had been certain this building was connected with the shooting that he had immediately identified as rifle fire (3H247). The totally invalid walking reconstruction took a minute and 30 seconds. The "Kind of trot" one took a minute and 15 seconds. *h/*

The reconstruction of Baker's time began at the wrong place, to help the Commission just a little more. To compare with the rifleman's timing, this reconstruction had to begin after the last shot was fired. Witnesses the Report quotes at length describes the leisureliness with which *allegedly* the assassin withdrew his rifle from the window and looked for a moment as though to assure himself of his success. Not allowing for his leisureliness, the assassin still had to fire all three shots before he could leave the window. Commissioner Dulles mistakenly assumed the Commission's reconstruction was faithful to this necessity. He

asked Baker, "will you say what time to what time, from the last shot?"

The nonplused Baker simply repeated, "From the last shot." Belin corrected them both, interjecting, "The first shot" (3H252). Dulles asked, "The first shot?" and was then reassured by Baker, "The first shot". The minimum time of the ^aspn of the shots was established by the Commission as 4.8 seconds. Hence, that much as a minimum must be added to the Baker timing. During this time, according to Baker, he had "revved up" his motorcycle and was certainly driving it at something faster than a walk or "kind of trot".

Added to this impossibility are a number of improbables. Roy Truly was running up the stairs ahead of Baker and saw nothing. He retreated from a position between the second and third floors when he realized Baker was not following him. Neither he nor Baker saw the door closing, as it did, automatically. The door itself had only a tiny window, made smaller by the 45-degree angle at which it was mounted from the lunchroom. Baker saw 20 feet through this, according to his testimony. (Page 37). " *tt S/*

When it was apparent that this reconstruction proved Oswald was not the assassin rather than that he could have been:

5/19
Walden
Drugh
Spake
At (Commissioner Allen) Dulles was troubled by this testimony.

He asked Baker, "Could I ask you one question...think carefully."
He wanted to know if Oswald's alleged course down from the sixth floor into the lunchroom apparently could have led to nowhere but the lunchroom. Baker's affirmative reply was based upon his opinion that a hallway from which Oswald could also have entered the lunchroom without using the door through which Baker said he saw him was a place where Oswald "had no business" (3H256). This hallway, in fact, leads to the first floor, as Commission Exhibit 497 (17H212) shows. It is the only way Oswald could have gotten into the lunchroom without ~~Truth~~ ^{my} and Baker seeing the mechanically closed door in motion. It also put Oswald in the only position in which he could have been visible to Baker through the small glass in the door. And Oswald told the police he had, in fact, come up from the first floor.

indent
single
para

ly

There are ten references in the Report to this reconstruction. Two are specific. All conclude the reconstruction proves that Oswald could have been in the lunchroom before Baker got there and infer that he could have come from no other place than the sixth floor. The first one (R152-3) says, "The time actually required for Baker and Truly to reach the second floor on November 22 was probably longer than in the test runs." The second says, "Tests of all of Oswald's movements establish that these movements could have been accomplished in the time available to him." (R649).

Exactly the opposite is the truth. Ignoring the flummery in

incident
single
space

these reconstructions and the obvious errors, the Commission itself proved that the unhurried assassin would have required a minute and 14 seconds. And the policeman at a "kind of trot" rather than a fast run would have required only a minute and 15 seconds less than the time-span of the shots, or at least four seconds less time. If things happened as the Report alleges, Baker would have been at the lunchroom before Oswald. And with Baker's gun in his belly, Oswald, having just killed the President, was "calm and collected" (3H252)." (Pages 37-8).

Dulles hit the pay dirt he did not want, that the only way Oswald could have gotten to the lunchroom before Baker and Truly was by coming up from the first floor, the way the sixth-grade dropout Baker said he "had no business." And this is why Posner had to do as he did with Carolyn Arnold and with what she actually said and told the FBI rather than the various revisions of and changes in it. But that meant Oswald was not the assassin so that was unacceptable.

Whitewash's final reference to what Baker volunteered and the fiction that Oswald then was seeking to escape. The imagined means was not possible:

incident
single
space

5/77
"In following his role as a prosecution-type witness, Baker said that in going into the lunchroom Oswald was seeking escape. 'There is a door out here,' he alleged, 'that you can get out and to the other parts of the building.' This door leads to the

invalent
single
space

conference room. The next witness in the Commission's reconstruction proved it was normally locked and, specifically, was locked that day," → (white with page 38)



Posner used Mrs. Robert Reid to say that although Oswald seemed calm she found his mumbled response when she said the President had been shot to be "strange." She could not make out what he said (page 266). She presented more problems with the Oswald alleged escape reconstruction and her testimony indicates that the Commission was phonying it up on the time:

invalent
single
space

3/99
Getting Oswald to wherever he had to be to make the Commission's reconstruction possible was a never-ending problem. In not a single case did the time reconstructions prove the Commission right. Following the fatal Baker reconstruction was one intended to get Oswald out of the building in time. This was attempted with Mrs. Robert A. Reid. Mrs. Reid's reconstructed time from her view of the motorcade outside to her desk was fixed at two minutes. When she began to protest that it was longer, she was interrupted and diverted. Her desk was near the lunchroom and she recalled seeing Oswald walk past it, something not confirmed by other employees present. The Report thus theorizes that, whereas it took Mrs. Reid two minutes to run to her desk from the outside, Oswald could have calmly walked it in one minute. But Mrs. Reid shattered the reconstruction by undeviatingly insisting that at the time she saw Oswald he was wearing no shirt over his T-shirt. All who saw Oswald thereafter

J

without exception say he was wearing a shirt. The Report allows no time in its departure reconstruction for Oswald to have gotten his shirt from elsewhere in the building," (Page 38) ¹³ ₀ → S/

What then is the actual evidence, not Posner's fabrication, and what does it show and mean?

The actual official evidence is that Oswald did not and could not have carried a rifle into the building that morning;  That the blanket in which it had allegedly been stored and the handmade paper bag in which he allegedly carried the rifle to the building did not have any oil on them from the "well-oiled" rifle;

That he could not have been in that so-called "sniper's nest" at the time the shots were fired;

And on this limited basis, from the actual official evidence only, could not have been that sixth-floor assassin.

Posner had cast Howard Brennan in the role of the best of possible but not the only eyewitnesses who allegedly identified Oswald in that window, (Pages 247-50). He did this in violent opposition to his own stated, if not often adhered to credo that "Testimony closer to the event must be given greater weight" (page 235). Posner preferred the ghosted book for which Brennan had precisely the interest Posner cautioned against, that 

witnesses could over the years be influenced. Brennan's ghosted book appeared in 1988, twenty-five years after the event, and of course he did not write that book. Posner just loved it.

In part to continue the narrative most readers today are not familiar with so they can be informed of the official as distinguished from the Posner and other versions and in part to provide still another means of evaluating Posner and his book, I continue with what that earliest of all the books had no trouble finding and reporting, the official evidence, with special attention to Brennan. He, despite all the double-talk, was the closest thing there was to an actual eye-witness of Oswald in that window. That Brennan certainly was not. I emphasize that there is no conspiracy or any other theorizing in it, as there is not in any of my books. I state also that in all the years since I wrote that factual account of the Commission's own evidence and no error has been shown in any of it, including by the Commission staff, their sycophants or now by Posner. His dirty trick is to lump all who do not agree with the official story as what I am not and never have been, ^{a conspiracy theorist,} and thus he misleads the reader because my published work, published before he got the itch for those dirty pieces of silver and fame, proved his book to be wrong, to be a knowing fraud. So, in repeating this factual account of what that official evidence really is and said, a time-tested account, in addition to giving this official fact to the reader there is a means of comparing what Posner got so famous over with the reality that is not in his book:

incident
single
page

The Report has no witnesses to Oswald's presumed trip from the sixth to the second floor. But the Commission had witnesses who gave evidence proving it imposible. Jack Dougherty was working on the fifth floor at the stairway where both elevators were then located. He saw no one going down the stairs. Three employees were at the windows on the fifth floor underneath the one from which the Report says the shots were fired. They testified they heard the empty cartridge cases hit the floor and the slight clicking of the operation of the rifle bolt. But all agreed that even after the shooting, when they were alerted and in some fear, they heard no one moving around on the sixth floor (3H181). Nothing but silence (3H179). Ten minutes before the shooting, Bonnie Ray Williams, one of the trio, had eaten his lunch next to this sixth floor window (3H173). Asked "...did you hear anything that made you feel that there was anybody else on the sixth floor with you?", he explained, "That is one of the reasons I left -- because it was so quiet" (3H178).

to
#



Placing Oswald at that sixth-floor window was one of the most unsuccessful tasks of the Report. They had the testimony of but a single man, Howard Leslie Brennan. Congressman Gerald R. Ford, Commission Member, was to describe Brennan as the most important of the witnesses in an article in *Life* dated October 2, 1964. Brennan had already described himself as a liar when lying served his purposes, as his own words will show. The Report has a section mislabeled "Eyewitness Identification of Assassin" (R143-9).

9/

new page XX XII + 1 pages

~~XXXX~~

~~XXXX~~

XXVII + 1

[For his own novelist's reasons Mailer does not use Brennan in his "Pidgeons Flew Up from the Roof" chapter. But if we skip ahead to his chapter also titled as a novelist would, "The Octopus Outside," ~~Brennan~~ Mailer does depend on Brennan to "identify" Oswald (pages 706-7). While Brennan insists he was the only "eye-witness" the fact is that at the police lineup the night of the assassination he was firm in stating the ^{gun} he ~~was~~ ^{not} saw was ⁱⁿ it, as Oswald very conspicuously was. And what Brennan testified he saw was a physical impossibility. In the account he preferred Oswald would have had to shoot through two panes of windowglass which emerged without a hole or ^{crack} or any other blemish (Whitewash, pages 39-42).]