

1. *31st May As Perry Mason*

First a word about myself, about my assassinations^{me} work and about the series of which this book manuscript is a part.

I am a first generation American^m, the first member of my family ever born into freedom going all the way back, so to speak, to Adam and Eve.

I have been a reporter, an investigative reporter, a Senate investigator and editor, and in World War II I was an intelligence analyst and an occasional investigator for the War Office of Strategic Services, the OSS, as a trouble-shooter, when all others had failed. These special assignments included work for the White House. Although all other involved OSS components had failed on them, I found none of the difficult. On the job that awaited me when ~~my~~ security was cleared, all the lawyers had failed and a small squad of brave men who had volunteered for a parachute drop behind Nazi lines in France, having lost all their appeals, were serving their time in an army jail. They were free six weeks after my security was cleared and although I then did not know it, that gave me a reputation in OSS headquarters and led to my being assigned to jobs on which others had failed.

When Harry Truman killed the OSS, I was in the part sent to the State Department. Soon the crazies in its so-called "security" office were bent to rid the State Department of all not far into the sick right ^{political extreme} ~~winner~~ as they were. I was fired without charges, ^{with out} with no reason given, with no legitimate reason existing, along with three other men in the Latin American Division of the OSS Research and Analysis branch that had been transferred to State. In all, although we then did not know it, ten were in that firing. All were to have been Jews but there was a case of mistaken ^{identity} so only

a hearing

nine were of the ten were Jews! *The tenth was married to a Jew.*

I arranged a ~~pro~~^A bono defense by the law firm of Arnold, Fortas and ~~Porter~~^U. I had know ~~the~~^U Thurman Arnold, a former federal appeals court judge, when he was head of the Department of Justice ~~component that handled anti-trust matters.~~^{Anti-trust} ~~It~~^{It} also handled what related to Nazi cartels, and I did a series of articles on them. I took that work, all my research, to Arnold. I also knew Paul Porter when he was in private practice, after he had been a federal communications commissioner. I did him a big favor for one of his major clients of the time. Warner Brothers. But I'd not known ~~the~~^{Ab} Fortas, who was later a Justice of the Supreme Court.

Before that case was over, we had been ^{re} hired with a public apology and we then resigned, our names cleared. And the ^{State official} ~~one~~ said to have been ~~with~~ behind this was fired. *Publicly.*

That ^{also} was an educational experience and I did learn from it.

As I ~~had~~ had from a similar earlier experience, when the Dies Committee of the House, forerunner of Joe McCarthy ^{is} in the Senate, had set out to ^m frame me. I had no firm like the Arnold, Fortas and ~~Porter~~ ^{to defend me then} people, and the United States attorney ~~was~~ under great ~~pressure~~ to indicate me. Not that I had done a single thing except let it be known that I planned to write a book on the Dies ^{with} committee.

That case, ^{was} also very educational, ^{it} ended when I took the grand jury away for the assistant United States attorney who was handling it. ~~It~~ refused to indicate me and it did indicate the ^{Dies} ~~so~~-es agent used in the effort to frame me. Two felonies were charged to him and

Dies was humiliated by being forced to make a public plea for leniency for his agent.

^{it} After these two experiences I decided to live ~~the~~ dream of ^{many} ~~many~~ soldiers, that we would be free and independent by becoming

^{As I think}
 a farmer. As did most who had that dream and did become farmers, life has exchanged so much that for ~~most of~~ us the dream of being free and independent was only a dream.

My wife and I had won every first prize that existed then for poultry. She became the National Chicken Cooking Champion. I then became the National Barbecue King and together we won first and third prizes in the first national chicken-raising championship.

With that good beginning for a successful business of farming, ^{It soon} was ruined by ^{army} mostly helicopter pilots ^{who} who overflowed our small farm. They ~~scared~~ frightened the chickens, some to death and some to tearing each other up.

^{That chicken raising}
 It made ~~that operation~~ impossible. When the ARMY REFUSED TO ABIDE WITH THE AMICABLE SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATED WITH THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SECRETARY OF Defense, ^{my subsequent law} used and in that suit established a new principle of law, of the property owner's ownership of the air space above his property ^{the point necessary for him} to ~~enjoy his~~ ^{enjoy} Constitutional right of ~~an~~ ^{own} and enjoy property.

I was liquidating the farm and had returned to writing when John Kennedy was killed.

I had just begun to gather the eggs after lunch. I was in the downstairs east of ^{our} the four-pen hen house. I hastened ⁱⁿ through that gathering of the eggs to get back to the house and see what ~~at~~ there was on TV. Until he was buried I stayed as close to the TV set as I could be. With ever-increasing questions about the whole thing. About what was being ^d done and ~~it~~ said by official ~~dem~~ in particular.

On Sunday, the second day after the assassination, when I'd made the second round of tending the chickens and was at the TV after breakfast I told my wife about Oswald, "This guy is going to be killed." "Why do you say that?" ^{she} asked, and I replied "because everything that is being done is making it impossible to try him. That means

Somebody
 they want to shut his mouth, and there is only one ^{way to be} ~~day~~ certain of that, to kill him."

Because I believed it was coming, although ~~in~~ ^{my reasoning} was not relevant in any way, I ^a was even more shocked when ^{a little while} later I was looking at TV and saw Jack Ruby kill Oswald ~~when it happened~~.

Two weeks later I sent my New York agent the lead and summary of a proposed magazine article. Her reply was that nobody in New York was considering anything not in accord with what the ^government was saying. I asked her how could ^h that be in this country, that a President can be killed in ^{board} daylight in the streets of a major city ^{and} obvious questions ^{could} ~~can~~ be asked.

That cost me my agent. She was afraid that representing anything other than the official assassination ~~story~~ story would cost her her contacts. *Also, she was right.*

~~But~~ I was shocked that ⁴ such a thing could ^{be true} ~~happen~~ in this country. I decided to keep a close watch on what was being said and to write ~~about~~ about the Report when it appeared.

¹⁷ Which is what I did. My first book, Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report, was the first book on the subject. It also could not be published commercially. It received more than a hundred rejections, ~~without~~ ^{without} a single adverse ^{editorial} ~~editorial~~ comment, before I published ^{d/} it myself. When it ~~was~~ still was the first book on the Subject. And it was ^{based} ^{on} ^{evidence} entirely the official records, only with different conclusions. It remains the basic book on the subject. In the three and a half decades since then not one of the man ⁴ of whom I was critical, some it ^{could} ~~can~~ be said ~~to~~ harshly criticize, then or since ^{not one} ~~then~~ has ~~written~~ written or phoned me to claim I was unfair or inaccurate in what I wrote about him. In all ^{mine} ~~line~~ of my book on

the JFK assassination are in print and I've not had any such call or letter from any one of the very many of whom I wrote critically in which he complained that I had been unfair or inaccurate in what I said about him.

After the Freedom of Information Act became effective I tried to get the American Civil Liberties Union to represent me in efforts to bring suppressed information to light. It would not do that but it did introduce me to counsel who would represent me after the FBI came after me, as they thought it would, and said.

In time, Jim Lesar, who then had never appeared before a jury, did represent me in many FOIA lawsuits, about a dozen of them, and before a series of medical problems forced me to discontinue FOIA lawsuits we had obtained about a third of a million pages of FBI records that had been withheld. My own work on these lawsuits represented the large effort it was,

(The list of those lawsuits prepared by Lesar appears at the end of NEVER AGAIN)

for medical reasons When it became possible for me to continue with that FOIA litigation it also became impossible for me to use all that valuable information for writing. All those records were filed in our basement, the only space *we had* large enough to hold all those records and the large volume of my own work. *I could no longer use it.*

Over the years I had received many thousands of letters. We estimated in *then* about 1984 that they totalled about 20,000 letters, all from strangers, But with the 1994 appearance of my Case Open *there* as was a change in *the* these letters. Almost all were from younger people and most of them by far told me that they had not been born when the President was killed or in what grade in school they were. The questions they asked included new questions *often* not asked as much before.

~~lengthen~~. Most wanted to know what had happened, who had killed the President, and almost as many wanted to know how I had done ~~it~~ what I did when it is not taught in ^{colleges} school. Neither question was easy to answer and I could not do it in response ^{to} ^{the} more than five hundred letters I received in ^{the} three months after Case Open appeared.

In addition, from all those formerly suppressed documents I got by all that FOIA litigation, there was much that was not generally known and at the least, as a record ^{of} ^{for} history, should be available.

A formula for doing this began to take shape with the appearance of the disgraceful series of articles ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) in which that prestigious publication actually devoted a series of articles in which it agreed ^{that} the ~~no~~ military prosecutors of the President's autopsy were right no matter how wrong they were, right because they said they were right no matter how ^{overwhelming} the proofs that they were ^{not right} ~~wrong~~ were.

I did not expect it to be published but it was, as NEVER AGAIN!

What I did with Posner's Case Closed was, in manuscript, ^{his book} eight hundred and ten pages. There ~~was~~ that much wrong with it, it was that dishonest. In it I referred to him as a shyster and as a plagiarizer, with his plagiarism running ^{what he took from} ~~from~~ the faulty work of a bright boy of ten to an elaborate ~~pre-ent-~~presentation to the American Bar Association by Failure Analysis ^{intended} to show lawyers what could ~~but~~ be done by some of the new means available. Posner adopted ^{only} apart of the prosecution side and pretended so successfully that it was done for him that the Philadelphia inquirer wrote an editorial, of all things, praising him for going to all that trouble and expense—when he had only stolen it.

I had ~~not~~ expected it to be published but when there was the offer to publish the beginning ~~twenty~~ ^{to} twenty-five percent of that large manuscript I accepted that because it permitted that many

(The first of these thefts of which I know was by a Baltimore policeman, Richard Waybright, who was working for both Harrison Livingstone and David Lifton. What he stole was what I had written about Lifton's mistitled Best Evidence, mistitled because it is neither. He also stole, and again Lifton is the one with greatest if not the only interest, is a duplicate of what Lifton got under FOIA from the military District of Washington relating to the assassination and to the autopsy.)

to ^{of the truth.}
 people know ~~that~~ that much. (Posner was silent after Case Open appeared
 but in the paperback reprint he eliminated ~~that~~ major plagiarism,
 from Failure A Analysis. ^{He also eliminated his thank to me for the unsupervised}
^{days he spent in my files and the hundreds of copies he had gotten.}

From these two ^{books} manuscripts, which I had written without hope of
 commercial publication but so there ^o would be a record exposing
 those two incredible dishonesties came the idea for writing books
 in response to the ~~extreme~~ extremes of both side in the assassination
 controversy as a record of the truth, of the ignored and misrep-
 resented established fact.

As of the time I write this there are at least thirty-five
 such books, all rough drafts. There may have been more because
 when I was hospitalized there were extensive robberies that did not
 include the valuable antiques in our home but did include some of
 these books and quite a few of my files. ⁹ The existing book manu- 27A
 scripts are, gradually, being placed on a CDRom, along with many
 files and two rare indexes. One of those indexes is ^o to all of my
^{books} work that has been printed. The other is the once-secret Dallas
 JFK assassination index that in its original form is forty-two feet
 inches of 3x5 cards. ^{was a secret.} (I obtained it in FOIA litigation. That it existed

In the records I obtained by FOIA litigation and by the threats
 of FOIA litigation I discovered the proof that the assassination
^{investigated and was not} of the President was not intended ^{to be investigated.} and was never made. We see in
 the foreword the language in which ^{this} is ordered politely when the
 man made President by that assassination approved the formule
 prepared for him to approve ^{made not} and in that ^{investigation} ^{the}

^{order our national policy.}
 That does not tell the young people (and others) what they want
 to hear, that it is not possible to learn who did the assassinating
 or why they did it, but it is the ^o truth. The grim truth that we

All these hundreds of thousands of pages of once-withheld
official assassination records, all the many thousands of pages of
my own work, all these book manuscripts written as a record for our
history and all the information recorded on those CDROMs will be
available to scholars with the completion of the archive holding
all of it at local Hood College, a small and a fine college.

had a coup d'etat, whether or not that was the intent of the assassins, ^{that} and ~~it~~ we can do nothing about this terrible truth, it is better to know the truth than to ~~live~~ believe the lie.

So, we do not know who killed the President or why and it is better to live with this ~~truth~~ truth than with any of the substitutes for it, beginning with the official fabrication and including all the others.

In examination of these others, and they are of both extremes, it is possible to include much of the new evidence and much of the old evidence that was ignored officially and to a large degree by supporters of the official mythology.

The purpose of this series ~~is~~ to make as much ~~of~~ a record of this, of the fabrications and of the truth, as is possible for an old and feeble man. *(an eighty-eight as I write this)* 28A here

The Blakey book is different than the other supporters of the official assassination mythology. It is more evil, more ^{dis}informative, more determinedly dishonest and untrue, ^{because ~~of~~ ~~his~~} and it has the support inevitable because he ran the official ^{supposed} re-investigation.

There is much too much ~~that~~ ^{herein} is wrong, very wrong, in ^{his} the book for all of it to be addressed, and there is ~~immeasurably~~ more that is atrocious in the Blakey committee acts and life, but it is possible to go into more than enough to validate these criticisms of Blakey, of his book and of his committee. ~~It~~ ^{It} was his committee, despite the fact that it was a committee of the House of Representatives, for he ran it, he decided what that would look into and how and what they would ignore, who they would listen to and who they would not, ^{and} what would have crippled it if nothing else did, ^{the} preconception which he denies was a preconception, his childish belief that the assassination was a mafia job. Only a man blinded by his preconception

or one unable to think, one without common sense, one who refused to think that an assassination required more than an imagined motive, could begin, as Blakey did, with the belief that the JFK assassination was a mafia job.

The fiction which was motive to most of those who believed that the mafia did the assassinating, is that the President was killed to force Attorney general and end to his brother's campaign against the mafia.

Obviously, that, if something was to be tried against it, called for the effort to be made against the attorney general, not anyone else. And the fact is that the assassination of the President did not lead his ^{attorney general} brother to end or even reduce his efforts against the mafia.

Or, the ^{imagined} basis for that alleged mafia assassination did not exist. There are also many other factors to be considered, traditionally means and opportunity. Blakey ignored them and all of the others of whom I am aware also did.

They all just assumed ^{Blakey included that} the mafia did (and and, like Blakey, none came up with any of the required evidence, *which does not exist.*

The reason is obvious ^{and they are} except to the Blakeys, who need no reason when he ^{imagined himself} Perry Mason returned.

Which he was not, in any sense other than in ^{his} ego.

The title of ^{Blakey's} his book is The Plot to Kill the President. It is not The Mafia Plot to Kill the President, although ~~it~~ there is no doubt that ^{this is what} ~~is~~ what Blakey means, as there was no doubt about it when he got more mafia records from the FBI than he ~~did~~ ^{got} for his committee about the assassination they ^{was} supposed to investigate.

While he spends a little time on other irrationality, like that Castro did it, he means the mafia and he has one chapter ^{in particular}.

Chapter 10, "Organized Crime in Perspective," which is a hundred pages long, pages 179 to 279. Other chapters also include some of this. But that one chapter, is close to half of the ^{entire book} book. It is longer than ^{all} the nine preceding chapters are. Much of those preceding ^{chapters} ~~chapters~~ is rehash of what was previously published, what is not in any sense new. As their titles indicate: "The Fateful Trip to Dallas"; "The Aftermath- Confession, Grief and an Inquiry"; "The Decline of Credibility; 1964-1976"; "Congressional Inquiry-1976-1978"; "The Warren Commission Evaluated"; "Dallas in the Light of Modern Science"; "A Message from the Soviet Union"; "Castro and the Risk of Retaliation"; and "Cuban Exiles and the Motive of Revenge."

Of these nine chapters, Blakey's on his own investigation he ~~re~~considered was worth only nine pages! and what he says about his "evaluation of the Warren Commission" is but sixteen pages.

Compare these with his allegedly "reconsidered" "role" of Jack Ruby, which is of ~~sixty~~ ^{sixty} pages.

Ruby had no "role" ~~to~~ "to be reconsidered" and Blakey does not even make ^{it} up.

When he starts to get into fact Blakey has problems. His versions are not in accord with the well-known facts, facts I published long before his committee existed. Of the two threats he goes into on page eight, where he talks about the more than 400 threats against the President ~~from~~ between March and November, the month of the assassination. One, attributed to Thomas A. Vallee in Chicago was not an articulated threat. He was an extremist of the political right and the ^{Chicago} ~~Dallas~~ police did arrest him the day the President was due in Chicago but Blakey reports no articulated threat against the President and the records of the Chicago police and of the Justice department that I got hold no such threat.

The actuality of the second alleged threat is even more ludicrous. It (also I) brought to light, along with the related FBI records that I published in Frame-Up ^{together} along with as much of the transcript of a bug the Miami had ^{in the refrigerator} in the home of an informer, not named by Blakey, William Somersett. Blakey lies in what he says of "a secretly recorded ~~conversations~~, ⁱⁿ Milteer," who told of a plan to assassinate Kennedy with a high-powered rifle from a tall building."

There was no such ~~plan~~ "plan."

The Miami police and ^{had Milteer} ~~him~~ under microphone surveillance because they ~~feared~~ he would ~~incite~~ racial violence. He was not suspected of and he was not under ^{surveillance} microphone or any other kind of surveillance because of the non-existing plot to kill the President Blakey makes up. In the course of his ^{big shot talking} chatting with Somersett, in which Milteer ^{was} just running off at the mouth, and the talk got to the President, what milteer actually said is that killing the President, any president, would be easy, with a rifle from a high building. But there was no ^{plot} ployt to kill this one, as Blakey says.

In what follows Blakey is ignorant in an area in which he ~~sh~~ should not be ignorant if he ran a real investigation. His very next words, in the same paragraph are "There was no mortar ~~casade~~ when Kennedy came to Miami on November 18. Instead he ~~trav~~ travelled from the airport to a Miami ^{Beach} hotel by helicopter, ^{although} ~~althi~~ ~~ough~~ there was nothing to indicate this precaution was dictated by the Milteer threat," the one Milteer did not make. After more conjectures, this and Blakey just run out.

That Kennedy trip to Miami, as I remember it, was not on November 18. It was the next days and it was for him to address the Cubans ^{to} and make them promises and it was to ^{address} a Latin American press convention. ^{pages 8-9.}

There had been Cuban threat in ~~the~~ Miami area and for that time so the Secret Service had the President cancel his planned motorcade and use a helicopter. *to when he was to and did speak.*

~~no~~ ^l ^s ^l miltzer, no Somercett, none of the ~~Blakey~~ baloney, he can't even get the date right, he knows nothing about the real threat ^{and} he makes up threats that do not exist, and he has conducted an official investigation of the ^{assassinatio}, of its predecessor investigations and of the threats against the President.

This is a legitimate portrayal of the supposed Blakey official investigation and it is by Blakey himself. Not alone but an accurate reflection of the degree of credibility that can be placed on his word.

This also explains why so much of this ^{Blakey's} rehash ^{was} spikked, ^{without} without searching for other Blakey boobos, *they are not needed.*

In the next chapter, "The Aftermath..." Blakey soon gets to that Katzenbach ^{name} ^{to} Moyers about which Blakey knows so little, much as he should have investigated it, that he dates the ^{night} the 25th whereas it was ~~written~~ ^{written} the 24th ^{when} but there ~~was~~ no typist available that Sunday for it to be retyped. Blakey is also ignorant of the fact that Moyes conveyed ^{it} verbally to Johnson at about nine the night before ^{the 24th} after which Johnson conferred first to Hoover and then to Katzenbach. Nor does Blakey quote Hoover's several ^{statements} that he and the FBI were proceeding as they ^{had} agree that Sunday night.

Which was to assume Oswald's guilt and claim ~~that~~ that before any real investigation, ^{and} they ^{never} made ^{one}, they had enough to ^{convict} ~~Oswald~~ Oswald at trial when in fact they never had any such evidence - could not even place ^{ch} him at the scene of the crime at the time of the crime. ^{In fact,} ^{when} there was actual evidence that at the time of the crime he was on the first floor. *Oswald*

All that Blakey found worth ^cquoting from this memo, the one we have already seen, is that Katzenbach recommended a Presidential Commission to investigate the crime (page 23).

Blakey does quote ^{it} ~~the~~ ^{it} ~~part~~ part of that significant paragraph, ^{it is} without indicating that ^{it} is only part of that paragraph, but ^{it is} enough to ^hmake it clear ^hthat he knew very well what ^hhe was ^homitting ^hand what ^hits significance was. *J. Earl Perry messin' stuff. Suppressing*

In his note to Moyers, Katzenbach was merely echoing Hoover when he listed certain "facts" of the assassination that he believed ought to be made public "...Oswald was the assassin...he did not have confederates... and the evidence was such ^h he would have been convicted at trial." (page 24).

On the next page Blakey avoids mention of the fact that Warren's choice for general counsel was, abnormally, prevented by Hoover acting through others, notorious Commission Member Gerald Foad.

On page 26 Blakey departs from practise to pretend that he is bringing to light what was not ~~known~~ previously knowⁿ when he quotes only part of a sentence from the Commission executive session of January 22, 1964. The ^hfull text, which I had to ^hresult to FOIA ^hlitigation to get, I published, in facsimile, ^hin ^hPost Mortem, beginning on page 475. ^hAll ^hRankin ^huses ^hit ^hpart of what was ^hsaid ^habout the FBI not having run out all the leads it had. He even refers to that ^hcrisis executive session, which the Commission then decided to suppress, as no more than a "meeting."

Then, for all the world as though the session of January 27 was part of that of the 22nd and not indicating that it was not but treating as it though it was all one meeting, Blakey quotes a trifly from the January 27 ^htranscript ^has part of that of the 22nd.

Here he again departs from normal practise and simple honesty in presenting this as his work when in fact I got ^{ann. published} that withheld transcript, ^{SVI if also} which was ~~also~~, improperly, classified TOP SECRET, ¹ by a different FOIA lawsuit and published it, a long one, ^{85 pages} also in facsimile in Whitewash IV, in 1974. That book which does include the ¹ full transcript, is devoted entirely to that ² session and to that transcript, (pages 26-7).

On the next page Blakey is again careless with fact. He also quotes that January 27th transcript as though it comes from his own work and he had yet to mention that both of those transcripts were improperly classified as TOP SECRET.

Then he refers to the "testimony of 552 witnesses" ² when there was no such thing although the Commission did list that number of "witnesses." It included newspaper stories as witnesses, as it did ^{of} those who did not appear before the Commission, those ^w who were ~~be~~ ^{affiants and} deposed without a single Member present.

Blakey ^{then} refers to the Report as of 888 pages. In this he did not include twenty-four pages with roman numbering. In fact, the Report was of 912 pages.

Then he quotes Warren as saying that if it had been an ordinary crime, Oswald would have been tried in two or three Days, with no doubt about the outcome (page 28).

The likely ~~was~~ would have been true, with Oswald freed, because despite the Report and the massive ^a campaign in support of it, there was no ^{real} case against Oswald at all. There was only the official propaganda. ^u which was refuted by the actual ^{official} evidence the Commission and Blakey and his committee all ignored..

^{made} In making up his case, which duplicates the one the Commission ~~made~~ up, Blakey writes that

*2 incidents
2 pages
2 pages*

The origin of the shots was based on the testimony of witnesses who said ^{she} ~~they~~ has seen a rifle being fired from the sixth floor ~~the~~ window, from ballistics test on a nearly whole bullet found on Connally's stretcher ~~at~~ ^{at} Parkland Hospital and on bullet fragments found in the front ~~seat~~ ^{of} the limousine indicating they had been fired from a 6.5 millimeter Mannlicher-Carsanno rifle found on the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository... ^{from} ~~from~~ inspection of the windsh^hield... the nature of the ~~wound~~ ^wwounds suffered by Kennedy and Connally. ... ^h the location of the limousine ~~at~~ ^{at} the time of the shots... (page 28-9).

If, as we see, this was not enough for Blakey to describing Blakety and the kind of investigation he headed and directed, he continues, speaking of "Oswald's guilt" that " he had been at the window ^{at} the time ~~of~~ ^{of} the shots were fired... along with a paper bag ⁱⁿ which he had brought the weapon into the building" and that ^{the} "he Commission had established that a rifleman ^{of} Oswald's capabilities could have fired the shots ^{from} the Mannlicher-Carsanno in the elapsed time of the assassination," which Blakey is careful but to give,

~~But~~ Blakety then ^h ¹ as a few words about the Tippi^g killing that deserve attention for what they say ^{of} of Blakey, ^{of} his his book and ^{of} the supposed official investigation he supposedly headed to establish the facts, once and for all:

*incident
2 pages
2 pages*

...nine witnesses identified Oswald as Tippit's killer, cartridges ^{cases} found at the scene had been ~~fired~~ ^{from} ^{a revolver} ~~from~~ ⁱⁿ Oswald's possession ... and Oswald's jacket had been found along the path of flight from the scene... (page 29).

This is Blakety being Blakety, the phony pretending to be the expert and so ignorant he does not realize that he is making a spectacle of

himself as no enemy could.

The origin of ~~the~~ the shot, was not and could not be based on the "testimony of witnesses," chiefly because no witness testified to the origin of any shot, leave alone the plural, shots, meaning at the minimum three shots, the three shots of the Commission's ~~fabrication,~~ ^{fabricated} because nobody could do that shooting in three shots and any ~~more~~ made it impossible to ignore the ~~conspiracy~~ ^{even} that ^{actually} three shots meant.

Nobody said he had seen ~~it~~, not a single person had seen what Blakey refers to in the plural when he ~~says~~ that "witnesses...said they had seen a rifle being fired from the (sic) sixth floor window."

One witness ~~did~~ did say he saw a rifle in that window but with all the many people along both sides of Houston and Elm Streets and looking in that direction at the time of the assassination, not ~~one~~ testified to seeing any shots fired.

With regard to that Parkland Hospital bullet, about which only suspicion is ~~just~~ justified, it did not and it could not identify the origin of the shots ~~some~~ some distance away, in Dealey Plaza. Ballistics test ^{could} state that the bullet had been fired from that rifle but that did not prove it was fired from that rifle at that ~~time~~ ^{time} and other evidence proves that could not have been ~~so~~.

It was not found on Connally's stretcher, as the man who found it testified so emphatically. When ~~Harlem~~ Harlem Specter was trying to get Hospital engineer Darrell Tomlinson, was pushing him hard to say what he was steadfastly refusing to say and saying that he could not say that that bullet had come from Connally's stretcher, when DSpecter put his big push on the Tomlinson, who was determined not to say what he ~~could~~ not honestly say, testified "I am going to tell you all I ~~know~~ can, and I'm not going to tell you something I ~~cannot~~ can't lay down and sleep with at night with either"

(Whitewash, page 162).

Tomlinson and Tompson alone "found" that bullet. Nobody saw saw him pick it up when it fell from underneath the mattress, ^{where} ~~an~~ ~~here~~ no bullet could get on its own. But what he refused to testify to and did with such emphasis was thereafter, in all official inquiries, ^{not} ^{as him saying} quoted as what he refused to testify to. In what he says here Blakey is a plain, ordinary every-day liar. Not a word quoted is true and if h did not know he was lying he did not do the most basic part of his job and he ^{then} has no business writing a book.

The bullet fragments found in the front seat, and they were also found in the back seat and under the jump seats, did not and could not indicate "the origin of the shots." They could be identified as having been fired from that particular Mannlicher-Carcano but they could not ~~and~~ they did not prove "the origin" of the assassination shots. That was presumed, ^{not} ^{it was} proven. It could not be ~~proved~~ proven despite Blakey's saying they ~~did~~.

Not could "inspection of the windshield." It did not and it could not.

"The nature of the wounds" suffered by both men also could not-- and did not-identify the origin of the shooting.

Nor could the location of the limousine at the time of the shooting. ^{The} ~~The~~ Zapruder film did not show a single bullet being fired and Blakey cites it as his source.

Blakey says that Oswald was seen at that window at the time of the shooting. That is not true.

Blakey says that along with the rifle, found on the sixth floor is the "paper bag in which he brought it into the building."

^{Blakey} He had to know that ~~this~~ this was not true. Not only had the only person who saw Oswald enter the building ~~not~~ testify that Oswald then carried nothing and not only had all other's who saw him that morning

Under heavy pressure

insist that he was not carrying a rifle and testified to what confirmed them, or nobody saw Oswald carry any rifle that morning. Now with regard to that bag, which was made of TSBD paper and tape, it could not have been made outside that building because the tape was wet when dispensed, but the testing of the bag ^{proved} ~~proved~~ that it had not held ^{that} ~~the~~ rifle.

For one thing, the FBI records establish ^{that} ~~that~~ ^{that} when it received that rifle it as well oiled, but there was not a drop of oil anywhere on that ~~the~~ bag. ~~Q~~ If Oswald had carried that rifle in that bag that morning, he had to have left fingerprints where he had held it. Not only is there no such crumpling on that bag, on all of it, inside and out. only a single thumbprint ^{was} said to have been Oswald's was found anywhere on that "bag" and it was on the inside. *An impossible fiction that Oswald had carried that rifle in that bag*

that morning
In simplification Oswald could not have carried that rifle from the Paine residence to the ^{the} ~~the~~ home of Linnie Mae Randle, with whom Oswald's ^{her brother} ~~brother~~ Buell ~~Wesley~~ Wesley Frazier lived. That rifle, lying flat on the back seat, left not the tiniest trace of oil on that bag in ^{all the way} which it bounced up and down from Irving to ~~Texas~~ ~~and~~ Dallas and then all over the inside as Oswald ~~allegedly~~ carried it from the parking lot some distance to the building (which he was seen entering without any bag or rifle in it) with the carrying of the rifle inside the building, to and from the elevator, and with all of that not the tiniest smidgeon of that oil, ^{it} ~~which~~ must ~~be~~ have been an exceptionally magical oil!

The ~~most~~ most exceptional of the many Blakey lies in what is here quoted may be when he says that the "Commission established that a rifleman of Oswald's capabilities could have fired the shot from the Mannlicher-Carcano in the elapsed time of the assassination."

Careful as Blakey was not to give the time taken by the assassination shooting, and the Commission said it could have been as little as 4.6 seconds, Blakey is ~~also~~ careful not to provide Oswald's rifle "capabilities." Like him, the ~~Commission~~ Commission found it easier to ^{just} attribute all that shooting to Oswald and to ~~him~~ alone, without any expert opinion, none being available, on Oswald's rifle capabilities.

But earlier, when he was in the Marines, and he is not known to have fired a rifle since then, the Marines evaluated him as a lousy shot. The official Marine evaluation of Oswald ~~was~~ a rifleman, ^{given} ~~the~~ *Commission* in writing by Lieutenant-colonel A. G. Folsom "by the direction of the Commandant of the Marine Corp," is that Oswald was "a rather poor 'shot'." This is printed ⁱⁿ facsimile in the ^{same} first book on the assassination, on page 30. It also was Blakey's responsibility to know this to conduct the investigation he pretendedly did ~~conduct~~.

With Blakey referring to Oswald's rifle "capability" and not saying what it was ~~and~~ without any means of actually knowing what it was when he had not fired a rifle in so long a time, we can turn to tests made ~~for~~ for the ~~Commission~~ ~~by~~ by the very best shots in the country and under ~~vastly~~ ~~improved~~ improved conditions, including the overhaul of the rifle and correcting its sight. Blakey should have known that. It was his job to know ~~that~~ that in particular. ~~Here~~ Here is the little I said about that in ~~that~~ that same first book on the assassination, which was completed in mid-February 1965 and published for general ^{distribution} ~~circulation~~ on May 7, 1966, where aside from the ~~official~~ official Commission publication Blakey should have seen it:

There is much more on this

(~~Micu, pre o n this~~ appears in NEVER AGAIN! ON PAGES 301-5)

*indist
single
space*

So, Oswald at his military best was only "fairly good" and at the end of his service was a "poor shot".

To offset this destruction of its sand castle, the Commission compared Oswald with a number of men who have spent their lives firing and studying weapons, men of the highest competence, firing weapons regularly as part of their livelihoods for all or most of their adult years, men who had had scientific weapons training. Then on July 24, 1964, the Commission called James A. Zahn, a Marine non-commissioned officer in weapons training (11H306ff.). Zahn was willing to call Oswald a good shot. But even he specified a minimum of ten practice shots as prerequisite in the use of the telescopic sight (R192). And this, of course, assumed a good telescopic sight.

After deliberation, the Report concludes that Oswald's Marine experience, "his other rifle experience (a bad performance with a .22 rifle) and his established familiarity with this particular weapon (totally non-existent) show that he possessed ample capability to commit the assassination" (R195).

Just how easy were these assassination shots? Could the performance be regarded as within the "capability" of a man who was at the time less practiced than when the Marine Corps several years earlier had evaluated him as a "poor shot"?

The Commission arranged what it presumably considered a fair test, with its three genuine marksmen, "rated as master by the National Rifle Association" (R193). "The marksmen took as much time as they wanted for the first target and all hit the target. For the first four attempts, ... missed the second shot. ... Five of the six shots hit the third target ..." (R193). And they were firing at still targets, not moving, living things!

These three really were "masters". Two were civilians in the Small Arms Division of the Army's Development and Proof Services, and the third man was in the Army and had "a considerable background as a rifleman" (3H445). Yet even they were not able to do what the Report says Lee Harvey Oswald, the poor shot in the Marines, when out of practice, "had ample capacity to commit" (3944).

40 A now

Not a single one of the very best shots in the country, under vastly improved conditions, could do what the Commission and Blakey and his ~~Commission~~ committee attributed to ^{Oswald} ~~in~~ when if they did not, all else they said about the assassination was false, not ~~one~~ could ^{commit} ~~we~~ do what Blakey says a rifleman ^{of} Oswald capabilities, which were poor, very poor, could do.

The few words Blakey has about the ~~Tippit~~ Tippit shooting are too much for any ~~Blakey~~ reputation to survive ^{them} ~~them~~.

He says that "nine witnesses identified Oswald as ^{Tippit's} ~~the~~ Tippit's killer," ~~when~~ when not a single dependable witness did that.

He then says that the "cartridges ^{cases} found at the scene of the crime had been fired from a revolver in Oswald's possession."

There ^{is} what in court would be serious problems with this. First of all, the cartridges ^{cases} said to have been found at ~~the~~ the scene of that crime do not match the bullets recovered from the Tippit shooting. Then what Blakey does not mention also found there was a bullet ^{coming} that ~~would~~ not have ^{been fired from} ~~fit~~ in Oswald's pistol.

Then there is the fact that there was no identification placed on any empty shell ~~xxxx~~ⁱⁿ about seven hours and from the time the police got to ~~the~~ headquarters with Oswald, ~~and~~ those empty shells were, without any identification, laying unprotected in a desk drawer. All sorts of things could have happened to those empty shells in that time.

A jacket was fund but not "along the ^(alleged) path of flight" but off to the side and it was not one of Oswald's two such jackets.

Or, we begin with Blakey as Perry Mason.

^{special}
His kind of Perry Mason.