

PROOF AND MORE PROOF

By
Millicent Cranor

In the September issue of this journal, Dennis Ford said that I (and others) made claims about fraudulent evidence that cannot be proven or disproven. [1] In July's TFD, I provided the ultimate proof of a fraud: two tapes of the same interview, before and after doctoring; a passage lasting only 3.5 seconds was removed—almost seamlessly—from a historic statement by Governor Connally in which he says he turned to his left after hearing a shot, and saw Kennedy "slumped," after which he himself was shot, action that, according to the FBI, had been on the Zapruder film. It is now gone from that film as well. Connally's full left turn, performed before he was hit and after Kennedy was grasping at his throat, completely contradicts the single bullet theory. [2] Does Ford suggest I don't have such films? I played them before hundreds of people at COPA. Did I splice footage of an actor impersonating Connally into the film? Or put words into his mouth? NY Times writer Martin Agronsky put the same words into his mouth. FBI film expert Lyndal Shaneyfelt spent considerable time studying the Zapruder film; did he imagine this left turn which he says occurred at the exact time Connally said it did (before he revised his story)? Are witnesses only right when supporting the single bullet theory?

Ford says publishing papers like the above "lessens our standards of proof." It is instructive to examine the sort of work that meets with Ford's standards:

Dennis Ford on Gerald Posner's Case Closed:
"...scientific... brilliantly written... well-researched... a literary model for all books of this genre." [3] *[emphasis added]*

There is a great deal of proof in Case Closed—proof of conspiracy. But you might not know it unless you compare Posner's versions of facts and testimony with the actual source, something Dennis Ford would never suggest you do. The following samples from Posner's degenerate book show his unethical methods of discrediting eyewitnesses. For Howard Brennan he performed the opposite service.
 SAMPLES FROM A "LITERARY MODEL"

Millicent Cranor
 630 W. 246th St., #921
 Riverdale, NY 10471

On page 234 of Case Closed, Posner says Will Greer "slowed the vehicle to almost a standstill." Few would argue. Robert MacNeil put it more strongly, saying Greer "slammed on the brakes," [4] and this description was echoed by many witnesses, some of whom say the car swerved to the left at that time. Apparently Posner's source of information is eye witness testimony: It can't be the Zapruder film, for it shows no such thing, one more possible indication the film has been cut. The change in the car's speed is barely perceptible, except when it finally speeds up. Why is it that neither Ford nor Posner have mentioned this discrepancy?

Ford gleefully states that "[t]he most exciting aspect of Case Closed is the debunking of conspiracy theories. Posner attacks such theories in the most decisive manner, by impeaching the testimony of crucial conspiracy witnesses." Decisive or just derisive? You decide:

CAROLYN WALTHER

Carolyn Walther swore that, just before the motorcade arrived, she saw two men in a southeast window of the Depository building, one had a white shirt, blond or light brown hair, and a gun with a "short barrel and seemed large around the stock." to the left of this man, she could see a portion of another man...with a rifle...As the window was very dirty, she could not see the head...She is positive this window was not as high as the sixth floor. This second man was apparently wearing a brown suit coat..." Mrs Walther said she heard at least four shots. [5]

In an effort to discredit this witness, Gerald Posner points out that (a) she said nothing about the gunmen to her companion, Mrs. Pearl Springer, and (b) Mrs. Springer did not see the two men. [6]

Mrs. Walther said she "thought there were guards everywhere." Is it not possible that Mrs. Walther made no remark about the men because she thought their presence unremarkable? In fact, what is remarkable is that guards were not everywhere. Secondly, although her companion Mrs. Springer did not see the two men, her statement explains why: "They stood there for about fifteen minutes waiting for the parade. During that time, she looked around at the crowd but never looked up above the ground floor of [the TSBD]."[7]

ARNOLD ROWLAND

Arnold Rowland said he saw two men on the sixth floor about fifteen minutes before the motorcade came by, an

apparently white (or "light Latin") man with a gun whose face he could not see well, and a balding "elderly Negro" in the "sniper's nest." [8] His testimony presented two problems for the Commission: (a) He saw the man with the gun at a time when Oswald was said to have been elsewhere, and (b) he continued to see the Black man until very close to the time of the shooting: "Approximately 5 minutes prior to the time the motorcade, he wasn't there. About 30 seconds or a minute prior to that time he was there." [9]

Posner tries to cast doubt on Rowland's testimony because he did not comment on the "Negro gentleman" to his wife. But numerous Black employees were leaning out of windows in anticipation of seeing the President, and both Rowlands commented on this. [10] Rowland probably made no remark to his wife about the one on the sixth floor because, once again, the situation was not remarkable. But contrary to Posner's false claim, Rowland did try to report it later.

"...I told them I did see the Negro man there and they told me it didn't have any bearing or such on the case right then. In fact, they just the same as told me to forget it now." [11]

Posner also tried to discredit Rowland with seemingly damaging quotes from Mrs. Rowland.

"I know there weren't any other people on that floor looking out the windows that could be seen from the outside." [12]

Posner omitted: "I mean I know they couldn't be seen from the outside because I couldn't see them. I am nearsighted." [Emphasis added.] [13] Posner continues:

"When asked, 'Do you feel you can rely on everything that your husband says?' she replied, 'At times my husband is prone to exaggerate. Does that answer it?'" [14]

Posner omits her direct reply to the question above: "I don't feel that I can rely on everything anybody says." [emphasis added] He also omits "Usually his exaggerations are not concerned with anything other than himself..." [15]

Posner also tries to discredit Rowland with false information:

"Rowland also claimed that while the gunman was standing fifteen feet back of the window, he could see all of the rifle and two thirds of the man. The author [Posner] stood at the same spot...it is impossible to see inside the sniper's nest because of the right wall, and also to see anyone more than a few feet behind the

window." [16]

As Posner himself says, Rowland said the gunman was in the west window [17] which is not the sniper's nest. On two occasions, Rowland explained the gunman stood only 3 to 5 feet back from the west window, and complained that the FBI mistakenly recorded 15 feet. [18] As for seeing the black man, he was leaning out of the east window, [19] making it unnecessary to "see inside." Posner is as sloppy as he is deceptive.

AMOS EUINS

Posner writes that "After the third shot, Euins remembered the sniper "pulled the gun back in the window." While he could not describe the shooter, he ran..." [20]

Euins said he pulled the gun back in after he heard a fourth shot. Euins' did describe the man originally, and that description corroborates Rowland's. Reporter James Underwood testified that Euins told him he was sure the shooter was a "colored man" [21], to Agent Sorrels, "he couldn't tell whether he was colored or white." [22] In Euins' statement to the Sheriff, the man became white; [23] by the time he testified before the Warren Commission, the "white man" had been reduced to a "white spot" [24] (the forerunner of the blue dot?); elsewhere, he described a man of indeterminate race with a "bald spot" [25] But there is more: "Another man told him [the policeman] he seen a man run about the back...He said the man had kind of bald spot on his head." [26] I have no opinion on the race of the man or men in the window, but it is very clear that neither the Warren Commission nor Gerald Posner pursued any leads that might contradict the case against Oswald.

HOWARD BRENNAN

Howard Brennan, the Government's star witness, testified that he only heard two shots. [27] There is nothing wrong with this—one shot can sound like two, two shots can sound like one, and four shots can sound like two—but Posner does not tell you Brennan only heard two shots. The following paragraph suggests Brennan heard three:

"He [Brennan], like many others, thought it was a backfire. "...Then came the sickening sound of the second shot...I wanted to cry, I wanted to scream, but I couldn't utter a sound." A woman next to him screamed when she realized the noises were rifle fire. Brennan's eyes locked on the solitary figure steadying his rifle for the final shot. "He was aiming again and I

wanted to pray, to beg God to somehow make him miss the target... Then another shot rang out." Brennan hit the ground, afraid there would be more gunfire. The President's car started to speed away. He looked up at the window a final time. "To my amazement the man still stood there in the window. He didn't appear to be rushed..." [28]

The above is a composite of two separate descriptions of the same shot, the second and last one heard by Brennan; it gives the impression that the second description refers to a third shot. Or did Brennan change his story?

Posner glosses over a far greater problem with this witness—his ability to distinguish one man from another, both of whom he saw up close and spoke with: Inspector J. Herbert Sawyer, and Secret Service agent Forrest Sorrels. Who provided the description of the man in the window at 12:45 to Sawyer? And whom did Brennan give his description to shortly after the shooting? According to Posner, "Brennan mistakenly called the plain clothes officer "Sorrels," the name of a Secret Service agent he met about fifteen minutes after he met Inspector Sawyer." [29] But Brennan never said he met a second Secret Service agent after the first. It is one thing to confuse names, and another for a star witness to confuse faces.

Brennan testified that the same man at the car who took down his description (Sawyer?) also took him to the sheriff's office (Sorrels).

Brennan said that within seconds of the last shot, he ran to an officer who "had to give some orders or something on the east side of the building on Houston Street. And then he had taken me to, I believe, Mr. Sorrels, an automobile sitting in front of the Texas Book Store...I related my information and there was a few minutes of discussion, and Mr. Sorrels had taken me then across the street to the sheriff's building." [30] Sorrels testified that he returned to the Depository building and was directed to Brennan whom he interviewed, and then took to the Sheriff's office. [31]

Inspector Sawyer did not identify Brennan as the man who came up to him with a description, not even with hindsight; Sawyer said he never saw him again. [32] Surely Sawyer would have seen Brennan again and again. He described the witness as "white, around 35" and could remember nothing more. [33] If Brennan had been the man, wouldn't Sawyer have mentioned something as emblematic as his hardhat? James Jarman, Harold Norman, and Sorrels said Brennan was wearing it at the time he was talking to the police, leading them

to characterize him as a "construction worker with a hardhat."

Another reason to suspect the witness was not Brennan: Asked about the gunman's clothes, Sawyer replied to his dispatcher, "Current witness can't remember that." [34] But Brennan had been very specific, saying the gunman wore "light colored clothes, more of a khaki color." [35]; and his pants were "similar to the same color of the shirt or a little lighter...that was another thing I called their attention to at the lineup...That he was not dressed in the same clothes that I saw the man in the window." [36] Sorrels testified that Brennan described the gunman's clothes to him. [37] Was Brennan's memory prompted, or did he only speak with Sorrels? Sorrels says he returned from the hospital within 20 minutes after the shots, i.e., 12:50, just five minutes after the gunman's description was broadcast. [38]

ANOTHER FILM CUT?

Photographic evidence that could have cleared up the mystery has disappeared. Consider this fascinating exchange between Commissioner Belin and Brennan:

...I believe you said that the car that you talked to the Secret Service agent in was at point "G" approximately?

Right.

Now, are these accurate or approximate locations, Mr. Brennan?

Well, don't you have photographs of me talking to the Secret Service men right here?

I don't believe so.

You should have. It was on television before I got home—my wife saw it.

On television?

Yes.

At this time we do not have them. Do you remember what station they were on television?

No. But they had it. And I called I believe Mr. Lish [FBI] who requested that he cut those films or get them cut of the FBI. I believe you might know about them. Somebody cut those films, because a number of times later the same films were shown, and that part was cut." [39]

Once again, it seems that critical seconds were cut out of a film. It would have shown Brennan talking to either Sorrels or Sawyer. What difference would it make? If it was Sawyer, it would prove that Brennan mixed up two people. If it was Sorrels, it would prove that Sorrels got back faster than he says

he did, but so what? It would prove that a witness other than Brennan reported a gunman with perhaps too many specifics to be observed from such a distance. What else was on that film? It would have shown the front of the TSBD within minutes of the shooting.

CONCLUSION

A president of the United States has been violently cut out of office. Action contradictory to the official version of this event has been cut out of films and testimony. Effective critics are cut out of the media. The truth has been cut to pieces, and now some very strange people want to keep us from examining the pieces. What next?

Notes

1. Dennis Ford, Letter to the Editor, *The Fourth Decade*, Vol.1,#6, September, 1994, pp. 30, 31.
2. Milicent Cranor, "FBI Copy of Z Film," *The Fourth Decade*, Vol.1,#5, July, 1994, pp. 38,39.
3. Back Currents, 1/93
4. Robert MacNeil, *The Way We Were* (New York: Carroll & Graf, 1988).
5. Warren Commission Hearings and Exhibits, vol. 24, p. 522. References from this source cited hereafter in format: 24H522.
6. Gerald Posner, *Case Closed*, (New York: Random House, 1993) p.231.
7. 24H523.
8. 2H188.
9. 2H178.
10. 2H175.
11. 2H183.
12. Posner, *Case Closed*, p. 231.
13. 6H185.
14. Posner, *Case Closed*, p. 231.
15. 6H192.
16. Posner, *Case Closed*, p. 231.
17. 2H169.
18. 2H171,182.
19. 2H175.
20. Posner, *Case Closed*, page 247.
21. 6H170.
22. 7H349.
23. CE 367.
24. 2H208.
25. 2H204.
26. 2H205.
27. 3H144.
28. Posner, *Case Closed*. p. 248.
29. Posner, *Case Closed*. p. 249. CC 249, Sawyer/Sorrels
30. 3H145.
31. 7H349.
32. 6H317. 3H197,207.
33. 3H197,207.
34. 7H348.
35. 3H144,161.
36. 3H144, 161.
37. 6H317.
38. 7H348.
39. 3H150.