

RATHER: Incidentally, the search of the Book Depository made after the assassination failed to turn up any curtains and the furnished room which Oswald was then occupying was equipped with curtain rods.

So Oswald made an uncharacteristic trip to the Faine home Thursday night, returning to the Book Depository on the morning of the assassination with a heavy-looking package that could have been the rifle? A difference of

Marina testified he kept oiled and cleaned, how is it to be explained that he left only two prints? The only thing as strange as that was a 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.

"Oswald lied when he told Premier that he was returning to having to obtain curtain rods," the Report declares (R130). Because evaluated as false some of those things Oswald is reported to have told the police, the Commission decided to believe none of what he alleged to have said.

On what basis did the Commission prove Oswald had no prints with him that fateful morning? Was there an immediate search for them (if for anything, not at all). The Commission's "Report" is a long, delayed afterthought. On August 31, 1963, the Report was going to press and more than nine months following the assassination, the Commission wrote the FBI Dallas office asking Roy S. Truly, manager of the Depository, "be interviewed to determine if he knows of any curtain rods having been found in the Depository 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 rods were found ..." (Exhibit 2440,2 (R130)).

Aside from the inference that Truly had special regulations at 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 been fired twice, at great length and under oath, without having been asked about the curtain rods. Nobody dared to ask him. On August 31, he supplied the Commission with an affidavit (7859) attesting that the door in the vestibule outside the employees' luncheon room was closed because it was controlled by an automatic mechanism. It would seem that it was not until the Commission called Oswald a liar in the draft of the Report that, too late for the inclusion of a sworn statement, the staff belatedly asked for a secondhand, unsworn and meaningless opinion.

One possibility remained: Did the "room" Oswald rented need curtain rods? The Report quotes the owner, not the housekeeper (R130), as saying the room "had curtains and curtain rods". It may well have, but the Commission need not have depended upon the word of a landlady who could hardly be expected to say her tenants lived in a fishbowl. 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 shown the markings around with identical pictures repeated numerous times under different exhibit numbers, and both the Report and the Commission have large areas of blank spaces on countless pages. Why, then, were there no pictures showing whether, in fact, Oswald's suburbs had curtains?

Perhaps Joachim Joesten, the German writer, has supplied the answer. He wrote a book on the Kennedy assassination in early 1964. The Commission's general counsel, under date of March 4, wrote to him asking for copies in German and English. His wife was visited by FBI agents in New York. And the Assistant Legal Counsel of the United States Embassy in Bonn located and summoned Joesten. Kennedy and Joesten were interviewed and, declining to discuss his interview with police, he promised to answer questions separately. He wanted the same thing, Joesten's name was supplied.

Joesten's promise to Joesten was only too well kept. We had already been assured that the material you furnish us will not be beyond the files of the Commission.

In page 11 of the book, Joesten said, "With a ground-floor window overlooking the full length of his room and opening out on the neighborhood driveway, Oswald was indeed living, as his landlady herself said

RATHER: Incidentally, the search of the Book Depository Building made after the assassination failed to turn up any curtain rods. And the furnished room which Oswald was then occupying was equipped with curtain rods.

So Oswald made an uncharacteristic trip to the Paine home Thursday night, returning to the Book Depository on the morning of the assassination with a heavy-looking package that could have been the rifle? A difference of opinion exists as to whether the rifle was the rifle? A difference of opinion exists as to whether the rifle was the 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.

"Oswald lied when he told Frazier that he was returning to Irving to obtain curtain rods," the Report declares (R182). Because it evaluated as false some of these things Oswald is reported to have told the police, the Commission decided to believe none of what he is alleged to have said.

On what basis did the Commission prove Oswald had no curtain rods with him that fateful morning? Was there an immediate and thorough search for them (if for anything)? Not at all. The Commission's "evidence" is a long-delayed afterthought. On August 31, 1964, almost as the Report was going to press and more than nine months following the assassination, the Commission wrote the FBI Dallas office asking that Roy S. Truly, manager of the Depository, "be interviewed to ascertain if he knows of any curtain rods having been found in the TSBH 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 31, he supplied the Commission with an affidavit (7H591) attesting that the door in the vestibule outside the employees' luncheon room was usually closed because it was controlled by an automatic mechanism. It would seem that it was not until the Commission called Oswald a liar in the draft of the Report that, too late for the inclusion of a sworn statement, the staff belatedly asked for a secondhand, unsworn and meaningless opinion.

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

Perhaps Joachim Jeaton, the German writer, has supplied the answer. He wrote a book on the Kennedy assassination in early 1964. The Commission's general counsel, under date of March 4, wrote to him and asked for copies in German and English. His wife was visited by two FBI agents in New York. And the Assistant Legal Attorneys General

RATHER: Incidentally, the search of the Book Depository Building made after the assassination failed to turn up any curtain rods. And the furnished room which Oswald was then occupying was equipped with curtain rods.

So Oswald made an uncharacteristic trip to the Paine home Thursday night, returning to the Book Depository on the morning of the assassination with a heavy-looking package that could pass for curtain rods. Was it the rifle? A difference of about the size of the most contentious

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.

"Oswald lied when he told Frazier that he was returning to Irving to obtain curtain rods," the Report declares (R182). Because it evaluated as false some of these things Oswald is reported to have told the police, the Commission decided to believe none of what he is alleged to have said.

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

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

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

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

Perhaps Joachim Joesten, the German writer, has supplied the answer. He wrote a book on the Kennedy assassination in early 1964. The Commission's general counsel, under date of March 4, wrote to him and asked for copies in German and English. His wife was visited by two FBI agents in New York. And the Assistant Legal Attache of the United States Embassy in Bonn located the surprised Joesten in Hamburg and flew there to interview him, declining to discuss his business by phone for reasons of national security. All wanted the same thing, Joesten's information. Joesten said he supplied it.

Mr. Rankin's promise to Joesten was only too well kept. He had said, "You may rest assured that the material you furnish us will not be circulated beyond the files of the Commission."

On page 32 of the book, Joesten said, "With a ground-floor window door running the full length of his room and opening out on the neighbor's driveway, Oswald was indeed living, as his landlady herself said