

20 "The great bulk of documents in the room, about 80%, were published by the Warren Commission in 1964 or were made public later".

Comment: this is a mixture of deception and falsehood. It is a deception to mix what the Commission did publish with what it did not. What it did not publish has never been "made public". That unpublished material not still suppressed is available to a very small number of researchers who can spend a lifetime plumbing it without being able to draw any of it to public attention. The practical effect of what the Commission did with what it did not publish was to suppress it. Nothing else has gotten that attention or can. Worse, what it suppressed it expunged from its conclusions.

70 "Here are sample titles of ~~the~~ secret documents". This is another deception and it cannot be accidental, for most of the descriptions are entirely meaningless and what Wise here lists are among the few whose descriptions have meaning and in addition suggest good reason for withholding. A much more typical selection of the descriptions of the documents can be found in the first three pages of the official bibliography. Here there are 68 files listed. Of these only one has a meaningful description, No. 48, "miscellaneous threats to Kennedy". Only eight do not read, in some form or another, "Oswald, Internal Security, -Russia", and not one of the seven undescribed has even the suggestion of meaning, four are entitled "Oswald", one has no title at all, one is called "Summary"-and it is not, and the other is called "Ruby (3 volumes)".

Among the kinds of files that were suppressed are 479 and 480, the tape recordings of the public broadcasts by "arguerite Oswald in Cleveland and Boston". Of No. 449, documents relating to Marina Oswald's hotel room in the name of an inspector of the Secret Service!

71 of the "locked" files, "I believe that more could and should be made public". This is a repetition of a lie by a late-joiner whose parroting of what has so often been said before distinguishes him because for him it was profitable.

71 "The transcripts (of Commission executive sessions) were ~~marked~~ classified TOP SECRET until a few weeks ago when most of them were declassified as the result of a request that I made".

Is it not strange that when others who spent a considerable amount of time working in the field and in these files and who knew much about the subject matter wanted them, these transcripts were not released. It is only in response to the request of an uninformed reporter looking for a cheap-buck sensation that they are declassified. And what does it reveal of the genuineness of the secrecy when it can be dropped for a reporter who has not studied the subject but is not for those those who have? What does it say of secrecy when material so readily declassified is kept secret for more than three years?

71 "Several Commission members complained that the initial FBI report on the assassination, delivered to the Commission on December 9, had already leaked to the press and had failed to clear up the question of what bullets struck the President and Gov. John Connally". This is something less than a major Saturday Evening Post sensation, for ^{it} published it in WHITENASH. The description of the deficiency of the FBI definitive report is a monument to the ignorance of the writer, for it also failed to account for all the firing and all of the President's wounds. But this matter is apparently so minor the Post and the kind of writer it hires for such creations ignore it.

71 In quoting the dialogue about the so-called "surveillance" of Marina Oswald, Wise does not indicate what it was in reality, her imprisonment, termed "protective custody". He here has no word of adverse comment about the FBI and Secret Service that did this, pretending it was to protect her from some great danger, or the net effect, to deny her impartial advice and counsel. Instead he pretends she might want to escape, the last thing Marina wanted, as the transcripts of her interrogations show. She and the Secret Service made an immediate deal.

71 Any discussion of efforts allegedly made to obtain the pictures and X-rays of the autopsy beginning April 30 is irrelevant, for the testimony to which they would have been pertinent had by then been completed.

(Note to self- analyze the deceptions and scheming represented by the transcripts in the last column)

72 Finally, after the expenditure of article length words that add nothing new except what is misleading or false, this sensation on "Secret Evidence On J.F.K. Assassination", dribbles a bit of it: Soviet defector Yuri Nosenko said "Oswald was an extremely poor shot and it was necessary for persons who accompany him on hunts to provide him with game". That Oswald was a poor shot was not a secret (the Commandant of the Marine Corp so certified WHITEWASH 30). The Commission published this, concluding, because to do otherwise destroyed its fairy tale, that the Commandant of the Marine Corp didn't know his business and that Oswald, to a veritable William Tell of the rifle. That others gave him game likewise is a secret, Marines having so informed the government.

73 In casual mention of the fact that "the CIA's U-2s were flying out of the Naval air base at Atsugi, where Oswald was stationed as a radar operator", it makes casual, left-handed depreciation of his importance by saying "there are indications that Oswald's organization may have performed guard duty on the U-2". What he does not say is not secret, for it is in the testimony, that Oswald, the alleged U-2 "Communist", had at least a secret security clearance and in all probability top secret plus crypto, which I had published months earlier. He also does not say that the Commission did not look into Oswald's connection with the U-2. It does not require a top-secret security clearance to do guard duty. That vital function is customarily performed by soldiers carrying no security clearance. Nor does he indicate the significant nature of the military secrets Oswald did possess, which also are in the testimony and were published and also were published by me before Wise became the well-paid "Johnny-Come-Lately".

72 There follows a listing of CIA documents on Oswald, without any reference to the fact that they were brought to light by Tom Bethell, of Jim Garrison's staff. From the writing, this would seem like a major revelation and a startling Wise discovery. Here also the meaningless statement that Oswald "was never an agent, employee or informant of the CIA" is repeated, as though this covered everything and as though the head of the CIA could honestly so state. He has no way of knowing who the contact agents of his agents are. Certainly none was about to curry favor by bragging he had an accused Presidential assassin on his payroll. There remained the question neither raised nor answered, ignored by Wise and the post, of the possibility of Oswald's connections with CIA groups. This indication does exist and is solid, hence it is here ignored, as it was by the Commission.

73 Among the suppressed files is, as Wise tells us, No. 941, the FBI "investigation of concerning telephone numbers found on the 47th page of Oswald's address book". How earth-shaking the investigation of these phones can be is denied us by that great digger after fact so that we may have the "Secret Evidence on J.F.K. Assassination", for Wise failed to turn to the published address book (16H54) where loc. page 47 is reproduced both photographically in in type, where three entirely non-mysterious phone numbers are in each form identified. They are those of the U.S. and U.S.S.R. embassies and Cubana airlines. Now with Oswald in Mexico to get to Russia through Cuba, which is what the Commission says, there is nothing untoward about his listing the phones of the Soviet Embassy and the Cuban airlines. But if he is all that pro-Soviet and anti-American, what was the phone number of the US Embassy doing there? These are the only three numbers there. Which are first the FBI and now the government generally keeping secret!

73 of the testimony, Wise says, (all published except six pages, including one page of Mrs. Kennedy's testimony about the President's wounds). If there were the slightest justification for this language, there would be none whatsoever for the fact that the stenographic transcripts are still classified "top secret".

Testimony was altered. I have printed in facsimile one sample of it. If there were no substantive changes and no substantial omissions, how can there be any excuse for the "top secret" classification on the stenographic transcripts.

From this Wise's avoidance of the non-publication of frequent lapses "of the record", such as one in which a Commission lawyer called the witness a perjurer, after which the Commission depended on the testimony of this witness, can be understood.

73 The concluding passages are thinly-disguised pro-government propaganda, designed to justify what the article pretends to criticize. The so-called "guide-lines" are dutifully printed, without reference to their violation whenever it fur federal purposes, as I proved by publishing samples. Nowhere is there any suggestion -also a matter of public record- of the fact that by the raw exercise of unbridled power the FBI, for example, simply suppresses what it wants suppressed.

Most dishonorable of all is the self-demeaning exercise in propaganda by the head of the Archives, Dr. Robert H. Bahmer. Wise poses the question, "Is it possible that there is anything sealed in the files that mocks the Warren Commission's conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald, acting alone, killed the President."

He quotes Bahmer's answer, "From what I know of the records I'd have to say no."

This immediately raises the question, how much does the busy custodian of all the government's important archives know of the content of this single, very large one. How much time has he taken to go through it. With what background of what is not secret has he analyzed it. Suppose Bahmer knows absolutely nothing about the records. Or is unprepared to comprehend them. His answer would still be truthful but still deception and propaganda.

No less dishonest is the formulation by Wise. What is wrong with what the Commission published that destroys its own contrary conclusions. What is wrong with

what is not still secret but is in the files and makes the Commission's conclusion entirely untenable. These things are eliminated, asking only about what may be "sealed in the files", of which no one knows anything.