

CHAPTER EIGHT

STONES FROM GLASS HOUSES

As we have seen, despite being on the board that is by law to see to the disclosure of all possible assassination records and despite the inherent claim to have read many, many books on or supposedly on the assassination, after several years on the board Hall remains resolutely a subject-matter ignoramus. This does raise the question, would he know an assassination record if he saw one, or how does he know what an assassination record is?

His simple formula, which appears to be that of the board, is merely to assume that the Warren Report is correct and that Oswald is the lone and unassisted assassin.

But as we have seen throughout, the actual official evidence proves that Oswald was not the assassin and could not have been rather than proving as Hall et al assume, that he was, from the evidence.

It is true that this kind of exculpatory evidence is scattered throughout all my books. I did not begin with the intent of acting as Oswald's defense lawyer and proving him innocent.

As part of what he refers to as the national appetite for bogus revelation, Hall is critical of my having written, he does not say where, that my purpose in my first book, the first book on

the subject, was "to show that the job assigned to and expected of the Commission . . . has not be done." He says of that book what is a blatant lie, one of the innumerable instances that raise questions about whether Hall read any of the works he criticizes or understood them if he did. He refers to it as a book "propagating theories of conspiracy" when it does no such thing. It does what Hall does not do, it addresses the official evidence of the crime. Had he been really scholarly, or had he intended honest criticism, he might have quoted the last words of the preface to the first book on this subject. They state the purpose of the book, and even a Hall can't distort this into "appetite for bogus revelation" or "propagating" and "theories of conspiracy." It states the honorable and accepted function of the writer in this country.

It does seem that a dean of the humanities who is also a professor of history and law would be sympathetic to these objectives rather than the source of dishonest, unfactual criticism of the stated purpose of that first book on the most subversive of crimes in a country like ours, a crime that results in a coup d'etat whatever the intent of the assassin or assassins. But Hall ignores them and distorts words he selects from the conclusions.

Those last words in the preface are:

The national honor and integrity, history and the memory of the dead President, demand that, to every extent possible, the Report should have ignored no important question nor have left any question unanswered; and if the Report does not adequately do this or if it is in error to any degree whatsoever, then it becomes a necessity for someone to fulfill the Commission's purpose and to rectify error.

This book is one man's effort to do just that. (xii).

What is wrong with stating the "the Report should have ignored

no important question nor have left any question unanswered" or with stating if it "does not adequately do this or if it is in error to any degree whatsoever it becomes necessary for someone. . . to rectify [that] error."

Is this not the function of the American writer?

The proper and necessary function, so proper and so necessary that our founders saw to protect them from errant government so they could fulfill this necessary function.

Despite the honor paid Hall in asking him to deliver the Simon Sobeloff lecture and then the added honor of asking him to convert it into an article for the Maryland Law Review he in fact speaks the opposite of the traditional American belief. In a different way he does what the Constitution protects writers against. One can only wonder how, if he teaches it, he teaches this most basic of American beliefs, of the function of the writer in our society.

As what is quoted above from the preface and as I state elsewhere in this writing, in it as in all my writing I address the actual official evidence, not any twisting or corrupting of it by any in official roles, by the earlier Halls.

In a sense it would be unfair to Hall to state that he twists the evidence because the fact is he is ignorant of it and instead of doing that twisting he assumes the conclusion^s of the Warren Report, which do not come from the Commission's evidence but are contrary to it. Yes, contrary to the official evidence. This may be difficult for those who have not made a close study of the official fact to believe but it is the fact, the painful fact, the fact that

in the quoted preface I said I believe raises questions about "the national honor and integrity."

It is a sad, a very sad commentary on what has happened to us since the assassination of President Kennedy when anyone in any official role is in any way critical of a writer who seeks to address "any question unanswered" or "error in any degree whatsoever" in any crime and most of all this most subversive of crimes.

Doing what to the degree was then possible I did had to be done in terms of the evidence, the evidence ignored, the evidence misrepresented, the evidence said to establish guilt. Obviously, all of that could not be attempted in any one book. It is not attempted in all the books I wrote on this subject because my objective was not that of one who would have been Oswald's lawyer. I was addressing the Report, what it said and did not say. I wrote what I intended as "The Report on the Warren Report." That was an analysis of it, and that, too, had to be in terms of the evidence, the actual evidence.

When I wrote that first book I did not anticipate writing those that followed it, I did not try to include all the relevant evidence in it. For an analysis that was not necessary in any event. It did use some of the evidence. In the books that followed I used more of it. Those who heard Hall's Sobeloff lecture or read his Mayland Law Review article have no way of knowing, not even of guessing, it is so foreign to what Hall actually said and wrote. But as we see, it is the truth.

So, to a very limited degree we take a glimpse at some of what exculpates or tends to exculpate Oswald, from the official evidence, and in that we also get a glimpse of Hall and what he is and has been up to, what we can expect of him in his official role on that board, and what he did to those who trusted him with the Sobeloff lecture and that Maryland Law Review article.

At a time when Oswald had no way of knowing what the police knew and did not know, in response to their first questioning he told them what was in itself exculpatory and had the truth built in, the truth that proved that he could not have been the assassin. This comes from one of Hall's supposed sources but by now, really before now, it is clear that he misused them, that they are not his real sources, that he is ignorant of them or worse, deliberately misrepresents them.

What follows is from Whitewash's chapter titled: "Oswald's Legal Rights." The first name is that of Dallas police chief of homicide, Captain Will Fritz. The names that follow are those of federal agents all of whom participated in questioning Oswald:

Where Oswald said he ate lunch: Fritz, "he said that he was having his lunch about that time (of the first shot) on the first floor." (R600); Fritz, ". . . he said he ate lunch with some of the colored boys who worked with him. One of them was called 'Junior' and the other was a little short man whose name he didn't know." (no reference to what floor) (R605); Bookhout and Hosty, without reference to companions, "On the first floor in the lunchroom," where, certainly, Oswald knew it was not located (R613); Bookhout, "he took this coke down to the first floor" (R619); Bookhout, "He had eaten lunch in the lunch room . . . alone, but recalled possibly two Negro employees walking through the room during this period. He stated possibly one of these employees was called 'Junior' and the other was a short individual whose name he could not recall but whom he would be able to recognize" (R622); Kelley, "He said he ate lunch with the colored

boys who worked with him . . . "(R626); and Holmes, "when asked as to his whereabouts at the time of the shooting, he stated that when lunch time came, and he didn't say which floor he was on, he said one of the Negro employees invited him to eat lunch with him and he stated 'You go on down and send the elevator back up and I will join you in a few minutes.' Before he could do whatever he was doing, he stated, the commotion around the assassination took place and when he went downstairs . . . " (R636), page 71.

Some of those police, local and national, having no choice, accused Oswald of lying. I picked this up two pages later:

An example of one of the Oswald "lies," it is worth noting that his account of what he did during lunch hour, if one version by FBI agent Bookhout is believed, is supported by the testimony of the Negro employees. Bookhout and Hosty place this "on the first floor." (R613), and Bookhout alone said Oswald recalled possibly two Negro employees walking through the room during this period. He stated possibly one of these employees was called 'Junior' . . . (R622). 'Junior' Jarman so testified. And had Oswald been anywhere but on the first floor, he would have no way of knowing this.

James W. Bookhout and James P. Hosty were both FBI agents. Hosty was present at the first Oswald interrogation only. Because what was involved this in and of itself is close to totally exculpatory of Oswald and it was at the very first interrogation of him early the afternoon of the assassination. He had just been arrested.

The time Jarman walked past was fixed at only minutes before the assassination. In that time, if Oswald had been the assassin, he had to have made his way up six flights of stairs not seen by anyone coming down those stairs to see the President go past; to make his way unseen across that sixth floor, to then assemble the rifle the Commission says he brought into the building disassembled, a procedure that took six minutes of an experienced FBI expert, which Oswald was not; and all this before 12:25, when

the motorcade was due, all in less than ten minutes. That is impossible and nobody planning any assassination would have been depending on anything like this.

Or would have been on the first floor at all.

In the official account Oswald had much more to do in that time but I have not included it all for two reasons. One is that without it he still did not have the time to be the assassin. The other is that the made-up reason is a lie: Oswald did not build, did not have to build, any "sniper's nest" or "den" as it was called, of cartons of books. That is because all those books stacked up near that window had been moved that morning, willynilly, from the other half of the floor where a floor was being laid.

The location and the finding of the rifle said to have been used in the crime is another official story that just does not stack. This also is from the book Hall supposedly read so he could use it as a source, Whitewash, the first book:

Two men appeared to have found it at the same time. The Commission saw fit to call 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 'come 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).

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 from the stairway.' (page 36).

Weitzman testified that he and others looked at where the rifle was many times and not seeing it, it was that well hidden. This is why not he but Boone was called by the staff to appear before the Commission--to avoid that part of Weitzman's testimony to the Members because in fact the finding of the rifle would have been totally exculpatory in a trial. Some of this evidence follows.

These were police pictures Weitzman was shown. They were not of the best quality. I had an artist draw arrows pointing to where the boxes overlapped over that rifle which, rather than being tossed in behind those cartons of books in flight, was carefully placed neatly and upright, or by placing it with care under those overlapping boxes where, with the other boxes there, the rifle could not have fallen over. (see Exhibit 52).

With the passing of time that picture printed in Whitewash, that first book, on page 211, faded somewhat. I then got a better, clearer print of the official police picture and include a xerox of it. (see Exhibit 53).

Two boxes can be seen overlapping a third box and they are all behind a square of cartons stacked as high or higher than a man's waist. Yet the police and the FBI did not fingerprint those boxes

to pick Oswald's prints up off of them. The reason is obvious: it was clearly apparent that Oswald could not have placed that rifle in that place and in that position while in flight and having to hurry.

As I wrote before continuing with the Commission's case no part of which survives careful examination,

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 that care and time was taken by the alleged user of the weapon. That this version is not in the Report can be understood best by comparison with the version that is. (page 36).

Our next quotation from that source of Hall's, Whitewash, is a bit longer because it recounts, in the Commission's evidence, its reconstruction of the time it took Oswald to rush from his alleged sniper's nest on that sixth floor to where he was seen by officer Marion Baker on the second floor.

This quotation followed immediately what is quoted above and continues onto the top of page 38:

Marion L. Baker is a Dallas motorcycle policeman who heard the shots and dashed into the building, pushing people out of the way as he ran. He is the policeman who put his pistol in Oswald's stomach in that 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 the 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 those books and leaned over as if he were putting a rifle there?' 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 Howlett streamlining, 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 be 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, '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.'(3H253).

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. This 'kind of trot' took a minute and 15 seconds.

The reconstruction of Baker's time began at the wrong place, to help the Commission just a little more. To compare with the rifle-man's timing, this reconstruction had to begin after the last shot was fired. Witnesses the Report quotes at length describe the leisureliness with which the assassin withdrew his rifle from the window and looked for a moment as thought 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 span of the shots was established by the Commission as 4.8 seconds. Hence, that much as a minimum must be added to Baker's 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 a 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 that Baker was 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.

Dulles was troubled by this testimony. He asked Baker, 'Could I ask you a 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 Truly 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.

As with all the official time reconstruction, this one also did not work. It proved the opposite of what the Commission wanted it to prove. Even with the infidelity in the reconstruction it proved that Oswald could not have been in that sixth-floor window and still have had that dramatic encounter with Baker on the second-floor lunchroom.

Note that among the liberties with the fact taken in this time reconstruction Oswald did not have time to scale the barricade of cartoned books to hide the rifle as carefully as it was hidden. There was just a pretense of no more than looking at that barricade as the time reconstructionists went past it.

The hiding of the rifle so carefully that several police looked at it many different times without seeing it (as Weitzman

said, it was covered over more than when covering was removed to take pictures) proved Oswald could not have been the assassin and so does the Commission's time reconstruction.

We have seen confirmation of the fact that Oswald was in fact on the first floor from his telling the police what he could not have known if he had not been there and seen it, those black employees walking past where he was in that first floor, including Junior Jarman, which Jarman's testimony confirmed.

Baker tried to do his part even though he did not always understand it. With a stairway at the end of a hallway that goes to the front, street-level door, with neither the hallway or those stairs of limited or prohibited access, Baker merely said that Oswald had no business there--not on stairways the employees used whenever they had a need, the stairs which they always had free access.

The flimflamming with the rifle part of the supposed time reconstruction is obvious. Belin was the assistant counsel who specialized in time reconstructions that did not work. He did all he could in the effort to make them work when they could not.

This one was not an honest reconstruction. There is no need to get into more of the readily available details.

Belin was also careful not to take testimony before the Members of the Commission that could further undermine this counter-productive time reconstruction that proved Oswald innocent rather than guilty, There were other building employees who used those stairs Truly and Baker were running up, those Oswald is

supposed to have used in descending them when he was not on them at all and not one of those other employees saw Oswald as, had he been on those stairs, they would have.

There are other proofs and reasons to believe that Oswald was in fact on the first floor.

The FBI did its part in an effort to make them invisible. It tried.

Building employee Caroline Arnold was questioned by the FBI, as most of those employees were, as soon as possible after the assassination. SA Richard Harrison questioned her November 26. In his brief report, which she never saw, he says that she saw Oswald as she was leaving the building. He was "standing in the hallway between the front door and the double doors leading to the warehouse." Harrison quotes her as placing the time "a few minutes before 12:15 PM."

But in March the Commission asked the FBI to reinterview all those employees to get answers to five questions none of which was when did you last see Oswald.

The way it worked the FBI agents questioned the people they were to question and then wrote out the statements they wanted those people to sign. They then had those statements typed. Because of an imperfection I noticed in the typed copy I obtained the Caroline Arnold original. That was illuminating!

The slight imperfection was in the sentence in which Arnold is quoted on when she left the building. SAs E.J. Robertson and Thomas T. Trettis questioned her and wrote out what they wanted her to sign.

Those who have my Photographic Whitewash, another of those basic books not used as a source by Hall, will find this and the Harrison statements reproduced in facsimile on facing pages 210-11. (see Exhibit 54). They will see that in the entire and much longer March statement there is only a tiny part that is out of line, as though the result of a correction. It is in the sentence attributed to Arnold on when she left the building. When I got the original, my suspicion was justified. That was one of the changes on which Arnold insisted before she would sign the statement those agents wrote out for her to sign.

As they had prepared the statement for her to sign it had her saying she left the building as "about 12:25 AM on November 22" She did not leave the bulding shortly after midnight! It was shortly after noon.

That is when she saw Oswald on the first floor, about the very moment the motorcade was due, at 12:25 in the afternoon.

It is apparent that in the investigative report Arnold would never see FBI agent Harrison merely said she saw Oswald at about 12:15 P.M. rather than what she actually said, ten minutes later.

However, the truth is that if it had been at 12:15 it would still not have been possible for Oswald to have done all he had to do to be the assssin.

Among others known to have seen Oswald on the first floor at the time of the assassination are Robert MacNeil, then of NBC News and later of the PBS MacNeil-Lehrer Report. He stated this at the time of the assassination and he repeated it on a PBS special; on

the thirtieth anniversary of the assassination.

He saw Oswald immediately after the assassination when Oswald directed him to a phone. Some of those writing sycophantic books have sought to twist this around and toy with it and do all sorts of things to change the time but there is a Secret Service report I used in an unpublished manuscript that pins the time down to immediately after the shooting.

When questioned by the police Oswald said that "immediately after the assassination he spoke to a Secret Service man." When the Secret Service investigated this its report that is in the Commission's files as CD354 (Exhibit 54A) begins with this synopsis:

Pierce Allman (person believed to be the one mentioned by Lee Harvey Oswald as identifying himself as Secret Service Agent at Texas School Book Depository immediately after the assassination) interviewed 1-29-64.

Allman was program director of WFAA-TV. He was at the scene of the crime, Elm and Houston, at the time of the crime. As did MacNeil and others, he rushed for a phone to call his station and inform it of the shooting at the President. He showed his credentials. The language then gets tricky. It says that Allman "could not positively state" it was Oswald who directed him to a phone, as MacNeil had.

This does not say that he said it was not Oswald, which had he said it, the report would have said.

The report also states that he "carried his press pass in a leather case similar to cases carried by Federal agents and police officers."

The report concludes saying that "the facts surrounding" this matter "indicate" that Allman and the man with him "are the men referred to by Oswald in his interview with Captain Fritz."

Or, the Secret Service concluded that with those two men at the corner Elm and Houston when the shots were fired looked for a phone it was Oswald, on the first floor and near that door, who directed them to a phone as he did Robert MacNeil.

The timing seems to eliminate the possibility he had been of the sixth floor, as it did with certainty based on what Arnold said and the FBI tried twice to alter, to corrupt her story.

One of the first major questions once the media learned about the shooting resulted from distribution by the Associated Press of a picture taken by its Dallas photographer, James W. "Ike" Altgens. From the south side of Elm Street, looking toward the TSBD doorway, he photographed the President's limousine at a time that coincided with about Frame 255 of the Zapruder film or about half-way ^h _u through the assassination. When news editors around the country saw the part of the photo AP had on its wire they started asking questions about a man seen not too clearly toward the left side of the picture in the left side of the main TSBD doorway. The FBI announced that it was not Oswald but was Billie Nolan Lovelady, a fellow TSBD worker. To casual observation it could have been either.

As I explored the Commission's files I found a picture the FBI said it took of Lovelady in the shirt he had worn that day. That was a shirt of very broad vertical stripes and clearly could not

have been the shirt on the man in the doorway in that Altgens picture.

Earlier I had sought to get the full picture, with no cropping, from AP. It did take much time and effort but finally, for the first time anywhere, I did get a 8 x 10 print of the full negative, no cropping. By then I had a print of the FBI picture it said was of Lovelady in the stripped shirt he'd worn that day.

To be certain there would be no anti-FBI sentiment in the photographic work I took these pictures to the photo lab of a retired FBI agent. He enlarged that man in the doorway for me and did other work not here important but quite useful. On the back page of Whitewash II and on the inside back cover I printed several of these photos. (see Exhibit 55). They included the enlargement of the man in the western end of that doorway, Lovelady in that stripped shirt, and an FBI picture of Oswald in that shirt he was wearing when he was arrested. FBI photo expert Lyndal L. Shaneyfelt placed identifying numbers at various points on that print of that shirt in which Oswald was arrested to mark flaws that tended to identify that shirt to the exclusion of others.

I also made a personal examination of that shirt at the Archives under varying conditions, under artificial light, with sun on it and under a northern light. That shirt had obvious flaws, some really conspicuous. It was an old shirt with tears with buttons missing, with buttonholes that would not hold buttons and it had a gold fleck in what looked like what was once popular, a vertical grass-weave kind of wall covering.

Where the shirt on the man in the doorway is unbuttoned, the shirt taken from Oswald could not be buttoned.

With the picture taken half-way through the assassination, if that was Oswald in it, he very obviously could not have been simultaneously on the sixth floor firing away.

I regretted that when Whitewash II appeared with this in it nothing happened. There was no media interest. Many people were in touch with me about it but none from any newspaper, radio, or TV station or magazine.

In a few months I had finished Photographic Whitewash, the third of the Whitewash series, all except the index, which my wife was completing. The printer had printed all of the book except the last signature or "sig" or section that would include the index. My wife had no more than finished the typing when the phone rang. Rather than tell the story all over again I reproduce what I added to that book in the one bit of white space that was left in it, the bottom half of the last page of the index:

A partial sequence of Lovelady-Altgens pictures appears in the appendix of whitewash II. The question is: Who is the man in the doorway? Is it Lovelady? Oswald? Someone else? What shirt is he wearing? First is the great enlargement I had made from the Altgens picture. Then there is the photographically decapitated picture of Oswald as he was led from the jail elevator. Unnecessarily removing the top of his head made comparisons difficult, especially of the hairlines and facial characteristics. This is one of five consecutive Shaneyfelt decapitations (21H467). They are not normal and cannot serve any constructive purposes. Next is the FBI-Lovelady picture suppressed from the evidence but in the Commission's files. Whatever can or cannot be said and believed, it cannot be that the man in the doorway is wearing the shirt the FBI says Lovelady wore. It does seem to be Oswald's shirt. From this it would seem that it could not have been Lovelady in the doorway. However, while this book was being printed, I

received a phone call from a woman identifying herself as Mrs. Billy Lovelady. She expressed great apprehension for the family safety and protested the FBI evidence, including this, printed in Whitewash II. She insists it is 'my Billy' in the doorway, that the FBI 'never asked him what shirt he had worn that day, and that he had worn a red-and-black check with a white fleck. The checks, she says, are about two inches. When I said the Altgens picture shows no check, she replied that it is not as clear as the enlargement 'as big as a desk,' about 30 x 40 inches, the FBI showed them the night of Nov. 25, 1963. Demanding money in return, she promised me a picture of Lovelady in the checked shirt she says he wore that day and not since and an affidavit affirming the above. She alleges testimony was edited, FBI reporting was inaccurate and not all in the evidence. I include this at the last minute for what it may be worth or mean.

If I had the five thousand dollars, as I did not, I'd not have given it to her for that shirt.

However, shortly after that phone call Bob Richter, then a producer for CBS-TV, visited me. They were working on a special, he was going to Dallas, and did I have any suggestions for them.

I suggested that he photograph Lovelady in the shirt he had really worn that day and compare that with the shirt on the man in the Altgens picture.

Richter had that picture taken, with himself in it facing Lovelady and Lovelady facing the camera, posed to look like what it might have been, Richter questioned Lovelady. It wasn't taken at that doorway. The shirt is the shirt his wife described, with the larger and black checks in it. (see Exhibit 56).

Although it was unbuttoned at the top, it does not fall open as the shirt in the Altgens picture does. In any event, those large red and black squares cannot be the Altgens picture.

That CBS "special" did not use this.

To remove this from depending on Lovelady's wife's word I

sought what I believed might exist, a contemporaneous picture of Lovelady at the time of the assassination.

Earlier, after I had been on a New York City popular radio talk show I had a letter from Richard Sprague. He was then a vice president of the prominent accounting firm, Touche, Bailey. He told me that in his work he travelled much and that sometimes it took him to Dallas. Did I have any suggestions of what he might look into that might be useful when he was there and had free time?

I told him immediately about the Dallas Cinema Associates, of whom I had learned in Commission files. They had gotten together, collected much of the amateur footage of the motorcade, and had produced a schmaltzy film that avoided any evidence of the crime. I told Sprague of the people at the head of the Dallas Cinema Associates, suggested he look them up and try to get the outtakes from Mrs. Irving (Anita) Gewirtz who headed their organization, and from Rudiolf Viktor Brenk, who had put their show together, and from individual amateur photographers whose film was used. Sprague did a fine job of collecting quite a few outtakes.

That the shirt on the man in the doorway had the same imperfections visible on the shirt at the Archives taken from Oswald, was impressive.

That Lovelady had a shirt as described by his wife could be questioned because she asked for money for it.

There was one of those amateur films I believed might provide the proof that could be proof positive. It was overexposed footage of the doorway taken shortly after the shooting by a man named John Martin.

When I was able to get it examined and enlargements made from it, lo! there was the shirt Lovelady's wife described. (see Exhibit 56).

Eight millimeter film is quite small. Enlargements from it to a size close to five by seven inches, which is the size I have, is a very considerable enlargement of that tiny 8 mm film. But there is that shirt in the TSBD doorway on a man who has the Lovelady build and a bald spot as Lovelady does.

This seems to be pretty conclusive proof that it was Oswald in that Altgens picture and not Lovelady, as the FBI claimed. By itself it is probative evidence that Oswald was on the first floor at the time of the assassination and not on the sixth floor shooting away.

Taken with the other evidence of this only some of which is recounted above, it is what would have been of extraordinary effectiveness if Oswald had lived and this had been presented to a jury. It would have acquitted him!

Whitewash II was, of course, one of Hall's claimed sources.

He found in it what he could misrepresent, what he could write dishonestly about as we have seen, but with what is described above on the inside cover, he had nothing to say about that.

What comes close to exculpating Oswald by itself, if in fact by itself it is not enough, was of no interest to this dean of humanities, this professor of history and law who teaches; this man who is to see^T_a the disclosure of all possible assassination information--and who has not learned a blessed thing about the

assassination--who writes about it as an official propagandist might be ashamed to, who, when give a prestigious speech to deliver and a law review in which to publish and he has not a single word of fact about the assassination or assassination evidence in more than twenty thousand words; and he instead spent his time defaming people, mocking them and their work, doing this from a base of the most solid ignorance and prejudice, and doing it in the pretense that it is others who had what he says is the "virulence of the national appetite for bogus revelation."

How shameful it is that this subject-matter ignoramus has so little self-respect he does all of this with ignorance and prejudice as his sole basis while trading on his position at the Ohio State University and on that board.

He does it all dishonestly.

And without learning about throwing stones from glass houses!

In this we have addressed what Hall said about my alleged "propagating theories of conspiracy" and my "stating that the Warren Commission did not consider any alternative to Oswald as the sole assassin." We have shown, albeit to a much less degree than is possible but enough to make the point, that in this, despite his academic credentials, Hall is ignorant and he is a liar with regard to his first criticism and with regard to the second, he is no less ignorant because his reflection of what I said is the actual truth. Again, were he not so determinedly ignorant he would have known that fact because among other proofs the Commission itself recorded that as fact.

He is critical of me for undertaking to "show that the job assigned to and expected of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy has not been done." What he omits in this is that I also wrote that but it must be and that it should be done entirely in public.

When he can criticize this what can he not criticize? When he writes this what does he teach of the humanities, history, of the law and of a citizen's responsibilities?

He does not show, does not make even a pretense of showing, what is wrong with what I did write. He merely treats it as a great sin, a wrong, rather than what a dean of the humanities and a professor of history and the law he should have recognized as the duty of an American writer.

On this Hall condemns himself and his objectives as no enemy could.

The seriousness of these offenses for a scholar cannot be exaggerated.

In this Hall also reflects what can be expected of him in his responsibilities on the board that is to see to the disclosure of all possible assassination information.

Hall casts himself as one who, regardless of fact--of which he is ignorant-- he is a government protagonist, not a scholar, and not an informed man, not one who believes that what is wrong must be corrected and as one who is opposed to all of this and to more like it.