

## **CHAPTER 49**

### **“The Honor of Honorable Men”**

Defending and supporting the Warren Report is as absolute an impossibility as cows flying over the moon. It cannot be done, not with even the thinnest trace of honesty. The only means of pretending requires the grossest ignorance or by a combination of both. Posner and Riebling not only illustrate it — they typify it. They typify also the knowing, the very deliberate dishonesty any such cruel fraud on our history requires — and that for their own self-serving purposes there are those who are capable of the literary whoring, literary prostitution that makes the literal practitioners of it eminently respectable by comparison. The most obvious purposes are fame and fortune, but there are other motives. One is political acceptance and acceptance and help from it.

That pathetic pathological case, David Belin, a moral, ethical and political assassination Judenrat makes those who were Hitler's look justified by comparison, too. Unlike them, Belin did not face the almost certain death of refusing to be Judas goats for themselves and their families. Unlike them he did not and could not hope for delays in their slaughter in doing what if they did not do, others would, anyway, under the same terrible compulsion.

Unlike Posner, who adopted Belin's basic method of prostituting himself and our history for fame and fortune, Belin did it in his effort to justify his dishonesty when he was a Commission counsel. He did it to recapture the reputation he surrendered — I was about to say “integrity” but no man capable of what Belin did can have begun with integrity — in what for a young lawyer means fame and can mean professional fortune.

I dealt with Belin's personal perversions of assassination evidence at length throughout my books,

beginning with the first of them. My exposures of his dishonesties are strong accusations against him, his character, his professionalism as a lawyer and as a man who was capable of anything at all to do his Judenratische duty as he saw that demanded of him. Demanded if he wanted to keep that job and the kudos from it and the benefit from that for his subsequent career. This of course also means for money.

What is true of Belin's prostitution of our history and perversion of his assassination related responsibilities, personal and professional, is true in varying degrees of all the Commission counsels. Belin, however, has written more dishonesty into our history and corrupted it in books to a large, deceived — lied to — audience. His compulsion for self-justification drives him to innumerable newspaper articles and oped pieces that, literary whore that he is, the literary whores of the major media gave him major attention and space when he wanted it.

Most of the other counsels had enough self respect and in some instances fear to keep their mouths closed and to avoid confrontation with those who knew the subject matter and their records in the official Orwellian re writing of our history.

When he was district attorney of Philadelphia Arlen Specter refused to confront me on Philadelphia radio and TV about two dozen times. During his campaign for the Senate in which he is still a Republican Senator from Pennsylvania, a reporter who knew me told me that Specter had begun exploiting his career on the Warren Commission for political benefit. Specter's being the most despicable of all those upwardly-mobile corrupters of that history, I wrote him a letter addressing his remarks. I mailed it to his home rather than his office so he could not pretend that it did not reach him. To be certain that it reached him personally I sent it by certified mail. I still have that letter in the still-sealed envelope because as the postal information added says, he refused to accept it three times. The post office made that many efforts to deliver it before returning it to me.

The country saw the skills he developed as a young Commission counsel when on nationwide TV he took advantage of his Senatorial immunity to label quiet, soft-spoken diminutive law professor Anita Hill a perjurer. Unfortunately, she was so intimidated that her lawyer's mind clogged up on her. If she had merely responded, particularly because it was on nationwide TV, "Mr. Specter, would you please step outside, shed the immunity you have in this hearing that you bare taking advantage of to defame me, and repeat that accusation? Then, sir, I will see you in court."

Had she said that I doubt Specter would have been reelected. And I doubt that the black oreo Thomas would sit in judgment of us all and on all issues that reach him on the Supreme Court to which Specter, personally — and in this appealed to the reactionaries in his constituency and in his party — saw to it he would ascend. To take the side vacated by that excellent lawyer, a principled Justice, ghastly!

If my long-delayed NEVER AGAIN! that I expected to have been published by the middle of 1993 is finally published, as now scheduled, less than four months after I write this, and if it gets attention in Pennsylvania, I doubt that Arlen Specter will ever again stand for election or re-election. Such is his record other than in the official mythology if he was important in making up. In 1987 Wesley Liebler confronted me on TV in Los Angeles. I was then exhausted from extensive travel, appearances and little sleep and I did not do as well as ordinarily I would have, but after that show was over Liebler was publicly mute about the assassination for more than a decade and has said little about it since then.

I made him face part of his Commission record.

Howard Willens whose name I last saw in the papers when he was counsel for Caspar Weinberger — Weinberger escaped conviction when he was pardoned by George Bush — was the Department of Justice's eyes and ears on the Commission. As the man who said he would arrange it, Nicholas Katzenbach says in a Justice Department record I have. Willens had the good sense to keep his mouth closed for years.

But once he did agree to confront me on a Washington TV show on which he knew the moderator was on his side. When I dumped on him a little of his record on the Commission, beginning with his seeing to it that the records would not be indexed, the only response Willens could make is, “Why that is an ad hominem.” Translated from the Latin, that means I was addressing his prejudices or interests. It can also mean that I was attacking his character. I was as he knew addressing only his record on the Commission, and that with official documents. But if it was his character I was addressing, all his reply was, for all the world as though that replied to anything at all, was, “Why, that is an ad hominem.”

And since they Willens also has been publicly silent about the assassination, with one exception.

Those Honorable Men, as I’ve begun to research a book on them that says they so regard themselves. I use them as Marc Antony used those words. They did react to the Oliver Stone movie JFK. All of them, with press conferences from coast to coast. They proclaimed their honor, purity and completely indefensible record on the Commission. The major media gave that major media attention, and they have, save Belin, been silent in public about the assassination since then.

But Belin is like a tugboat that has a large whistle, the equivalent of which he has, and a small boiler. Every time he hears anything about the assassination his whistle blows. It takes so much from that tiny boiler that the boat just stops. It has no power to move.

Belin is a pathetic psychological case but he is not a fool. He knows what he did. He knew what he was doing when he did it. And now he simply cannot bear hearing any question raised about it. He is compulsively driven to justify himself when that is a total impossibility. His method of doing this — well, he never does it and cannot — his method of getting the uncritical major-media attention he knows he will get, it to slacken his jaw and gush with irrelevancies — irrelevancies that do not respond to the criticism and he is capable of doing that, as I’ve seen and heard him do, that at interminable length. The time he takes

alone diminished what else he can expect to have to face and cannot refute. So, he says he knows it all and that he is right because he says he is right. He needs no more — and he has no more.

Whether or not he understands it, whether or not he is even capable of understanding it, each time those words pour out, while he gets the attention for his dishonest efforts at self-justification from the major media, he adds to the record for our history on his part in the officially-intended fraud officially perpetrated on our history by all those Commission counsels who cared more about advancing their careers than they did about the most subversive of crimes in a society like ours, the assassination of the President. Or they cared about their country. That is a crime that inevitably has the effect, whether or not the intended effect, of a coup d'etat.

Compared with Specter and his Commission career, the career in which he was responsible for what lawyers call the corpus delicti or the body or major elements of the crime, Big-Mouth Belin was relatively small potatoes. His areas of responsibility included the murder of Dallas policeman J.D. Tippit.

However, whether or not Oswald killed Tippit, as the Commission said he did, aided and abetted as it was by Belin's stalwart and less than honest efforts, there was a special significance to the Tippit murder that I addressed in my first book (Whitewash, pages 42-52ff). Looking through his special looking-glass, as Alice in her Wonderland did, Belin saw up and as down in as out, and proof? There was none. He did help make it up.

These are the words with which I open the chapter on the Tippit Murder:

If the Tippit murder had not happened, it would have had to have been “invented”. There is reason to believe that, in effect, it was.

The assassination case against Oswald was no case at all. It hung on coincidences, conjectures, speculations, and eyewitness accounts of such dubiousness no sensible lawyer would have taken them to court. Above all, it depended upon a willingness to believe. That willingness was supplied by the murder of Tippit. As the police seized upon this “coincidence” and wholesaled their version to an upset world clamoring for the capture of

the assassin, there seemed to be no question in this murder. Innumerable dependable witnesses saw everything — the shooting, the flight, and the capture.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The so-called evidence in the Tippit case is a tissue so thin the Commission should have seen through it without difficulty. But its myopia in the Kennedy assassination turned into blindness in the Tippit killing.

In rushing that writing, which was completed by the middle of February, 1964, I did not recall that I was drawing on Voltaire. He said that about religion.

Everybody hates a cop killer so, laying that on Oswald made attributing the assassination to him immediately acceptable.

In the 30 years since I wrote that I know of no reason to change a word in what I said about the JFK assassination and in all my subsequently published six books on it based on the official evidence, that demonstrated I was completely correct is overwhelming.

What was butchered out of Case Open when it was published is my taking the Posner contrived, overwritten and flimsy prosecution case of Oswald's guilt and with the official evidence only disproved it as had he been tried, Oswald's lawyer would have acquitted him. It really is this terribly bad.

I do pretty much that in NEVER AGAIN! as written, again with the official evidence.

The big thing those Honorable Men did, the Belins, the Specters, the Willenses and the Liebelers and the others, was to make up a case against Oswald, Specter handling the corpus delicti himself.

To be able to attribute the Tippit murder to Oswald the Commission had to place him at the scene of the crime at the time of the crime. That task fell to Belin. He was up to what it required of him. Here are a few excerpts from what by the middle of February, 1965, were apparent to me as I studied the evidence and wrote about it:

The telepathic powers of the staff did not extend to learning the alleged Oswald's alleged destination. There appears to be no reason why he should have been walking as he was in the reconstruction. The one possible destination indicated by the Report or its

chart is the Texas Theatre. He would have reached this by walking south on Beckley to Jefferson and turning west a short distance. That is where he was subsequently arrested. No suggestion of where Oswald was going or why he would have gone the way the Report says he did is even hinted at. He was seen by no one. He went that way because the Report says he went that way.

There is but one thing that makes sense of this reconstruction. That is an effort to make it conform to the highly suspect testimony of Helen Markham. Mrs. Markham said she saw the man she later identified as Oswald cross Patton at Tenth, going from southwest to northeast. The most direct route in conformity with Mrs. Markham's account was the one the Report used, whether or not it makes sense. By using its new technique of willing the existence of proof, by anybody needed substantiation, it certainly was Mrs. Markham.

The Report allows Oswald less than 13 minutes to walk from his roominghouse to Tenth and Patton. This generosity towards itself was accomplished by simply ignoring Mrs. Roberts' unquestioned testimony [Earlene Roberts was the roominghouse housekeeper]. As it did with its other Oswald movements, the Commission timed this one with a stopwatch on April 8, 1964. It did not bother to take sworn testimony from the staff members who did the timing. Assistant Counsel David W. Belin merely declared while examining Whaley [a cab driver] that he and others had walked by what he described as the "long way around route" (6H434). How long did it take?

Seventeen minutes and forty-five seconds! Tippit was killed five minutes before Oswald could have gotten to the scene of his murder!

It is now clear why this is the only one of the time reconstructions not quoted but "interpreted" by the Report (page 56).

When Belin and I debated at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee in the fall of 1975 he did not dispute this. Instead, as he always did, he made a long and irrelevant speech.

Belin's notion of how to investigate, how a lawyer established fact for a Commission like this one is indicated in his saying of the time, his time "reconstruction" that he took "the long way around" in established Oswald's alleged timing to get him at the scene of the crime. And that when they could not get him there on time!

It makes no sense at all, another Belin speciality.

The Commission's own map of that area and Oswald's alleged route, along with several other maps, is in its Report (page 158). The one and only way in which it was the "long way around" is in

Oswald's going to the theater where he was arrested. For that it is the longest way around. Oswald would have had to circumnavigate the entire earth the way the Commission and its area expert Belin have it. Only a Belin could say that in going to the theater Oswald would not have taken the direct route down Beckley Avenue straight almost to the theater as the map shows, from his rooming house.

Instead, when to get to the theater Oswald would have made a turn to his right on Jefferson, where the movie is, Belin and the Commission have him turning to his left about half way there, onto Davis, from which he almost immediately turned to his right to take Crawford diagonally in the wrong direction and then turn left still again, to get 180 degrees away from the theater to which he was going and in which he was arrested. If he had not turned 180 degrees in the wrong direction onto 10<sup>th</sup> he could not be placed at the scene of the crime. Then, after allegedly killing Tippit, in this hocus-pocus of "evidence" made up by the most dubious witness Belin, Oswald made a turn of 360 degrees to get to the theater.

And thus did Hercule Poirot Belin get Oswald to the scene of the crime.

This also has to mean that Oswald had a purpose in turning away from the theater and more, it has to mean that he knew where Tippit would be so he could kill him when even the police dispatcher, who called Tippit on the radio in vain, did not know.

That none of this does or can make sense is obvious. Also obvious is the fact that although the Commission said there was no conspiracy of any kind, there had to have been one to let Oswald know where he was going to meet his destiny and kill off the cop.

What a mishmash of insane conjectures that would disgrace a child writing a novel.

This is only the beginning of how Belin built his Commission reputation that made him one of those Honorable Men who proclaimed their purity and their correctness in pretended answer to the Oliver Stone movie. There still remained getting Oswald there in time to shoot Tippit.



This, too, Belin and the Commission solved, well not quite, but pretended they solved with a typical meld of conjecture, telepathy and most important of all, need. Getting here to there on time required stark, deliberate dishonesty, but they were all up to that.

Having had Oswald take a cab to go to his roominghouse only to leave the cab quite some distance away from it, the Report “calculated” his arrival there at 1 o’clock. How did it come to that conclusions? It asked Mrs. Earlene Roberts, the housekeeper, when Oswald got there. That timing is based on this testimony. It was elicited by Joe Ball, Belin’s partner:

“Now it must have been around 1 o’clock, or maybe a little after, because it was after President Kennedy had been shot — what time I wouldn’t to say because --”

That was enough for Ball. He interrupted her to ask, “How long did he stay in the room?”

“Oh, maybe not more than 3 or 4 minutes...” Mrs. Roberts answered (6H440) (page 54).

A phony case can be built this way but because those telecasts lasted all that day for three more days it would not be a good idea to cook a chicken that way. Or bake a cake.

If there had been any alternative in the faking of a case against Oswald the Commission would not have used Mrs. Roberts. What I next wrote in Whitewash — about which Belin and Ball and all their cronies on the Commission have been totally silent, is:

The Report acknowledges Mrs. Roberts’ statement that shortly after Oswald left the house she saw he was waiting at a bus stop. She did not use the word “seconds” as the Report does. Nor did this question even come up in her testimony. It was in an affidavit she executed December 5, 1963 (7H439). The Commission, of course, knew of the affidavit and quoted it in her testimony but avoided this part. In it she stated, “I saw Lee Oswald standing on the curb at the bus stop just to the right and on the same side of the street as our house. I just glanced out the window that once. I don’t know how long Lee Oswald stood at the curb nor did I see which direction he went when he left there.”

Understandably, the Report wanted to avoid this as much as possible. The bus stop at which Mrs. Roberts last saw Oswald is for the bus going north on Beckley. The Tippit murder was south of there. The Report preferred not to explain why a man it wanted to be going south without the waste of a fraction of a second was waiting for a

northbound bus. Naturally, the amount of time waiting at a bus stop should have been deducted from the time Oswald had to get to the Tippit killing. The Report did not want to deduct it, and so it did not (page 54).

So the only evidence the Commission had about where Oswald was, leave alone the time, from the only witness it used who knew him had him not rushing to his rendezvous with Tippit's destiny but instead waiting for a bus that went in the opposite direction. As the Commission does not mention, very soon that bus turned and went to that theater.

Although not at this point, the Report also acknowledges Mrs. Roberts' testimony that after Oswald got home and before he left, a police car stopped in front of the house. It signaled with the horn "several times", and drove off (R253).

"Investigation has not produced any evidence that there was a police vehicle in the area," the Report continues. It also pretends to account for all the vehicles with numbers similar to 106 or 107. Mrs. Roberts had made clear she paid no attention to the number and guessed it might have been one of these (6H443). Her vision is so bad — she is blind in one eye — she waived reading her deposition, a courtesy granted by the Commission (6H444).

Dallas police cars bear their numbers in relatively small and thin lettering within the word "Dallas", arranged like an arc above the word "Police", lettered horizontally. In the combination of these numbers the Commission investigated, it avoided one — 10. The first two numbers given by Mrs. Roberts were one and zero, 10. That was the number of Tippit's car.

What kind of investigation the Commission conducted on the assignment of police cars is not indicated, but one thing is certain — it did not include examination of the police radio logs which clearly reveal one police car was assigned to that area — No. 10, Tippit's (pages 54-55).

This additional problem that also reeks of conspiracy was not difficult for the Commission and its Belins and Balls to circumvent. They merely resorted to that SOP of suppression, protected as they were by the omnipresent secrecy. This does account, as so many other things do, for the Commission's decision for all its proceedings to be in secret.

Those police radio logs also reflect that at least this time the dispatcher radioed Tippit and got no answer.

To the Commission's knowledge, and to Belin's that being the area of his responsibility, of all the witnesses to the Tippit killing there was only one who said he looked at his watch to see what the time was and he had a reason to do that. For the Belins and those others on whom our integrity rested and who were entrusted with the solving of both murders, the way around this was simple: they did not call Thomas F. Bowley as a witness. At the same time they did not dare ignore him entirely. This was because the Dallas County Sheriff had taken an affidavit from him. So along with a great number of other police and sheriff's records it was just dumped into the record in Volume 24 and ignored in the report. Many are of poor legibility and were illegible enough to discourage trying to read them. Then, those standard-size sheets, eight and a half inches by eleven were reduced in size by four times when they were published sideways the page, two sheets to each page sheet. The Bowley affidavit, the appropriate width on the page eight and a half inches wide. Thus 6x9 appears as the Commission published it on three and a half inches wide.

What I quote eliminated the affidavit heading, the name of the rotary, the December 2 date and the white space on that sheet. The affidavit was typed single-spaced.

Who, after being duly sworn, on oath deposes and says: On Friday November 22, 1963 I picked up my daughter at the R.L. Thornton School in Singing Hills at about 12:55 pm. I then left the school to pick up my wife who was at work at the Telephone Company at Ninth Street and Zang Street. I was headed north on Marsalis and turned west on 10<sup>th</sup> Street. I traveled about a block and noticed a Dallas police squad car stopped in the traffic lane headed east on 10<sup>th</sup> Street. I saw a police officer lying next to the left front wheel. I stopped my car and got out to go to the scene. I looked at my watch and it said 1:10 pm. Several people were at the scene. When I got there the first thing I did was try to help the officer. He appeared beyond help to me. A man was trying to use the radio in the squad car but stated he didn't know how to operate it. I knew how and took the radio from him. I said, "Hello, operator. A police officer has been shot here." The dispatcher asked for the location. I found out the location and told the dispatcher what it was. A few minutes later an ambulance came to the scene. I helped load the officer onto the stretcher and into the ambulance. As we picked the officer up, I noticed his pistol laying on the ground under him. Someone picked the pistol up and laid it on the hood of the squad car. When the ambulance left, I took the gun and put it inside the squad car. A man took the pistol out and said, "Let's catch him." He opened the cylinder, and I saw that no rounds in it had

been fired. This man then took the pistol with him and got into a cab and drove off. The police arrived and I talked to a police sergeant at the scene. I told him I did not witness the shooting and after questioning me, he said it was all right for me to leave. I then went on the Telephone Company at Ninth and Zangs. T.F. Bowley

Belin cooked the books, so to speak in his time reconstruction and he still could not get Oswald there until some time after Tippit was killed and that was some time before it was on the police radio, the only basis used in the timing. It happens that the same thing happened at the book depository, as I detail in that chapter of Whitewash, the time reconstruction absolutely indispensable in placing Oswald at that sixth-floor window in fact proved he could not have been there.

Belin did read my Post Mortem. He told me so at Vanderbilt, the one time we met. How he got it remains a mystery. I am the publisher. When I sent the book to the printer I was then hospitalized for my first venous thrombosis. I thus was not able to get any copies into the bookstores. Belin did not get his copy from me. The only few copies I had distributed were to a few Members of the Congress. I do not remember the names of those to whom I gave copies but I am confident that none of them had anything in common with Belin politically.

There does remain, of course, the possibility that Belin's friend on the Commission whose Presidential Commission Belin would run, Gerald Ford, got it from one of those to whom sent it. Then, too, from their disclosed records, the FBI and CIA have their own ways of getting copies of manuscripts, proofs and advance copies of books.

In any event, Belin was silent at Vanderbilt and ever since then after he read this footnote on page 493 of Post Mortem, where it is under the facsimile reproduction for the Bowley affidavit:

David Belin claims that Oswald's guilt is demonstrated by taking the Tippit murder and working backwards. Belin should know since he suppressed the evidence proving Oswald could not have killed Tippit. The Report claimed that Tippit was killed at 1:15 because Domingo Benavides reported the killing over Tippit's car radio "at about 1:16

p.m.” (R166). Yet Benevides had told Belin that another man had placed the call (6H449). That man, T.F. Bowley, was never questioned by the Commission and is never mentioned in the Report. This affidavit is published without comment at 24H202. Yet, if Tippit were killed at 1:10, as Bowley swore, Oswald would have had no more than 7 minutes to walk almost a mile to the scene of the crime, an impossibility of which Belin was well aware. What better reason for Belin to ignore Bowley and pretend the killing took place later?

Actually, I stretched this a bit to lean over backward for Belin. When Bowley looked at his watch at 1:10, Tippit had already been killed. Thus Oswald had even less time to get there within Belin’s own impossible and really made-up schedule.

This is not all of the official evidence or said to be of the Tippit killing. Far from it. Some is even hilarious in its ridiculousness, ghastly as that is to say. It is not even all I published on it. But I use what I published because Belin has that and because non-stop as his jaw gets when he hears “assassination” he locked it closed on the evidence that he cooked up a phony deal that is so basic to the Report.

It would not have been easy to get a conviction based on this kind of junk even from a fixed jury with a public trial.

Belin has proclaimed for years that the Tippit killing is the Rosetta Stone of the JFK assassination. Whether or not that is because in his twisted mind on the assassination he believes that attracts more attention to him, in writing this in his book and in saying it so often in public and to the media, he does not have to face the actualities of any translation of his Rosetta Stone with the official evidence he twisted, misrepresented, distorted and ignored in the dictionary of the official evidence that is the dictionary with which I here translate Belin’s Rosetta Stone. The dictionary those to whom he pontificates do not have. With too many of them the dictionary they do not want. They prefer his propaganda to facing the grim reality of the terrible truth of the crime and with a radical change in the meaning of the word, of the official investigations.

Belin personally and in combination with the others resorted to many dirty tricks they would not have dared if their proceedings were in public or if instead of the hearings of a non-judicial body their testimony was in a public trial, with an opposing counsel and a judge to keep them honest. Not that the judges I faced in all those FOIA lawsuits persuades that all our judges are as honest and impartial as in theory they are to be.

Belin's abuses alone are so great that if one were to undertake to make his dishonest first book of the Rosetta Stone honest with the official fact and the office details it would require a series of books its size.

As we have seen above, his Rosetta is a plastic counterfeit to which he gives the false translations and meanings he built into it that are not there. But there is neither time nor space nor need after our look at the truth of what he has the professional indecency to describe as the key to the assassination. The only key it holds is to the corruptions and dishonesties of the official assassination mythology. Well, it also is the key to Belin, his character, his morals, his ethics, his honesty or dishonesty and to the convolutions of truth and reality by which he made his Rosetta Stone up.

Of all the many other illustrations I select but one more. That is because on the one hand he failed to do his duty as a lawyer, failed to meet his responsibilities to the Commission and to the country. It also is because of how he and his partner did it and to whom, besides our history, they did it.

Two of the more important witnesses at the scene of the crime who had important testimony to offer and they, despite Belin's and Specter's diligent effort to prevent it and to destroy their credibility nonetheless got important information into the official record. That where it was not misrepresented it was ignored is still another tribute to the effectiveness of the corruption of our history for which Belin and Specter are personally responsible. I go into this in Chapter 8, "Eyes So Blind," of Whitewash II (pages

71-92). What the Report says of Arnold Lewis Rowland and his wife Barbara appears on pages 250-252.

In the cute way in which those Honorable Men, in their own account at least, made it ever so much more difficult for anyone to get any understanding other than the one they built with careful confusion, Rowland's testimony appears in Volume 2 beginning at page 165. His wife Barbara's, not at the same time and place but on the same matters, is in a different volume. Four volumes separate them. (Volume 6, beginning on page 177).

Rowland's testimony was exceptionally long for the Commission. It does not end until page 190, or for 25 pages. He testified before the Commission in Washington at the session that began at 9:15 the morning of Tuesday, March 10. Specter, then honing the skills he used to defame Anita Hill, and to place the ultra-reactionary Clarence Thomas on the Supreme Court, was the questioner.

Belin handled, and I do not misuse the word, Barbara Rowland's testimony. He took it in the office of the United States Attorney in the Dallas post office building beginning at 4 the afternoon of April 7.

Seeking to discredit their testimony the Report (pages 250-252) begins by saying that Rowland's testimony, "if accurate, would create the impossibility of an accomplice at the window at the time of the assassination." In itself this more than justifies that crack about "if accurate" as applied to the Commission and to its Report. It was not "at the time of assassination" at all. It was prior to the assassination. Putting it the way the Report does is deliberately dishonest. Rowland not only did not say or even hint that it was "at the time of the assassination," he insisted it was earlier. He was in the unusual position of being able to give the Commission a means of timing it with precision.

The Commission, especially not that pair of Judenrats, Specter and Belin, did not do that. I did in Whitewash II.

Following other shady lawyers' trick to discredit Rowland, the Report has to admit, not daring not

to because they could get caught at that, official confirmation of what the Rowlands said. Speaking of both Rowlands. Deputy Roger Craig, only recently the Deputy of the Year, testified,

“And the boy said he saw two men on the sixth floor of the Book Depository Building over there; one of them had a rifle with a telescopic sight on it — but he thought they were Secret Service agents or guards and didn’t report it. This was about — oh, he said, 15 minutes before the motorcade arrived.”

So much for the deliberate dishonest of saying it was “at the time of the assassination.”

Note that Craig refers to Rowland as a “boy.” He was, but do not look for any mention of that in the Report. He and his wife were still school kids who, after they married, were on their own. Life was not easy for them then.

The Report accurately quotes Barbara Rowland as saying, “at times my husband is prone to exaggerate.” The Report gives this no context. Rather than then saying that Rowland exaggerated when as a kid seeking to make out in a man’s world he did what millions of others did, exaggerated their preparation for employment — and built his bruised ego. The Report says he was a liar about such things as “the subjects he studied in school, grades he received whether or not he had graduated from high school and whether or not he had been admitted to college.”

There is other confirmation of part of Rowland’s story , as the Report does not say. Instead, with its omnipresent assumption that Oswald was the assassin, it again uses tricky language in saying of Rowland’s testimony that, it, “if accurate, would create the possibility of an accomplice.”

“Create?” This suggests, as with that Anita Hill technique it is intended to say, that Rowland “created” that. The proper word is, obviously, “reported” or “testified to.” Something like that.

The Report then seeks to wipe this all out, as for the dishonest purposes of the Report and counsel it did, by another tricky formulation in the same Anita Hill spirit:



“Rowland’s failure to report his story despite several [sic] interviews until his appearance before the Commission, the lack of probative corroboration [sic], and the serious doubts about his credibility, have led the Commission to reject the testimony that Rowland saw an elderly, balding Negro in the southeast corner window of the sixth floor of the depository Building several minutes before the assassination.”

The trickiness in this is that while saying nothing to indicate it this is the lawyers’ dirty trick used to “reject” the rest of Rowland’s testimony that is without question not only corroborated by others but is timed by the means to which Rowland testified with simply astounding fidelity.

In order that this intended dishonesty be better understood, Specter was referring to FBI interviews. A bit more on them later. What he does not say is that those interviews were not taped so they would not be transcribed. They are reported on the proper FBI FD201 form and they include only what the FBI agents wanted to include! What they did not include and in innumerable instances witnesses did tell them is what they did not include, not wanting it with the corruption of our history that was long before then clearly what the “solution” would be. Rowland could well have said what the Report says he did not say a dozen or more times to the FBI. Witnesses never saw their reports and were not aware of the censorship they practiced when what they knew was not wanted was reported to them. The FBI saw to it that nobody could ever know if Rowland reported that to them or did not. Specter and Belin were fully aware of this, so, true to their role in the deliberate corrupting of our history, they omit this and pretend that those reports include everything Rowland said, know that to be false.

So, they did what the Commission needed them to do. The Commission could not admit the possibility that there was either an accomplice or a different assassin. Specter and Belin first rigged that and then wrote it in the Report.

If those Commission lawyers had given a damn about seeing to it that what the Commission used as evidence was pristine, pure and entirely unaltered, they would have had what they did not want,

photographic justification, of what Rowland said. They not only did not — they dared not!

The third of the photographs of the motorcade taken by Dallas AP photographer Ike Altgens is used to time the shooting. It is important for this and for other reasons, it is basic evidence, yet those lawyers not only never saw the entire Altgens picture, they had to have recognized that all of the many versions of it given to the Commission by the FBI were altered in a different way. They could — as lawyers they had the obligation to get, study and use a full, uncropped print of the Altgens 35mm negative.

Not having any federal or police authority it took me a year to get the Associated Press to get Altgens' original negative and to make me an 8x10 print of it. I use it in full, entirely unaltered in any way, on two facing pages in Whitewash II to enable the reader to make out all the details possible in it and officially suppressed.

To be confident that there could never be any accusation that I had had anything at all altered, I located a professional photo lab in Washington owned and operated by a former FBI special agent. I pointed out the parts I wanted enlarged for reproduction and I left what he did to accomplish that and even the size of the enlargement up to him. He made negatives from the print of those areas. I have them wrapped and put away with the original of the Altgens picture with all else used in publishing Whitewash II for the value they can have in our history.

My special interest was in identifying a man in the building's doorway that several newspaper professionals in photography believed was Oswald. They had nothing they could use in trying to determine whether that was so or possible. AP cropped the picture for its own purposes, none of which was either conspiratorial or of intended deception.

The other part of this full and clear Altgens picture that grabbed my eye appeared to me to be a severe indictment of the Commission. There were witnesses who had an elevated view of the scene of the

crime, including all the vehicles in the motorcade and the Commission records and Report make no reference to any of them. They should have been interviewed. The FBI also ignored them. With both the FBI and then the Commission beginning with the conclusion that Oswald was a lone assassin, neither wanted either pictures nor evidence to contradict their beginning assumptions. While this is clear in all my published books, particularly in the first chapter of Post Mortem, I go into in considerable details in the manuscript of NEVER AGAIN! long delayed and as of this writing due in April, 1995.

Those witnesses are leaning out of a window of the Dal-Tex Building, which is across Houston street from the TSBD and on the same side of Elm Street.

Above them on the fire escape, is a man, as Rowland testified, but instead of being in the Book Depository easternmost window he is on the fire escape on the west wall of the Dal-Tex building facing the TSBD.

Whether or not this is taken as confirmation as it surely can be, of Rowland said about that man only, the sole basis those Commission shysters used to reject all of Rowland's testimony, it is a much less significant mistake or error on his part than they were guilty of in ignoring all of this, all the information they did not want in that is in the Altgens picture. They suppressed it, really, those sanctimonious shysters did.

One of the many obvious investigations that should have been made is one I made and they did not. At the photo lab of that former FBI special agent, one of the parts of the Altgens picture I asked them to enlarge was of a picture of a man in that doorway. In order to say it was not Oswald, as those several news photo editors had said and believed, the official line was that it was a fellow worker, Billy Nolan Lovelady. Without investigation, the picture can be said to either of them.

Inside the back cover of Whitewash II, I have the enlarged part of the Altgens picture that shows that man and more importantly, it shows his shirt. It also has that print an FBI picture of that shirt, its

imperfections marked with numbers. Those imperfections coincide exactly with those visible on the shirt of the man in the doorway, where the shirt could not be buttoned in particular.

I then examined the actual Oswald shirt in the Archives, under north light and under south light to eliminate any question of light interference with what was so clear in it. Its imperfections and those on the shirt in the Altgens picture are identical and obvious. It was a worn-out shirt, not uncommon for working in.

Also what seems to be a very visible and positive identified is the pattern of the shirt. It was of vertical grass-weave pattern one popular in wallpapers, it is flecked with a gold-like fiber. This pattern is identical with that of the shirt of the man in that doorway.

That is was not her husband was proven beyond question by Billy Lovelady's wife after she saw Whitewash II. Aware as it was of the identical patterns, the FBI photographed Lovelady in a shirt with very loud wide stripes.

All of Photographic Whitewash had been printed except the "signature" or section that would include its index. That had been completed and I was to take it to the printer when I had a surprise call from Mrs. Lovelady. There then being no other space for it I added a note about her call at the end of the index, on page 294. It speaks for itself:

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 cannot 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 30x40 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.

A few minutes after the assassination a Dallasite amateur movie hobbyist, John Martin, changed the exposure as he pointed his standard 8mm camera to that doorway. That footage is over-exposed. Nonetheless, in it, and wearing a shirt precisely as his wife described to me there was Lovelady, his shirt having the largest black and red checks I’d ever seen on a shirt.

Those infected with them official mythology dinned into us from the time of the assassination and then by the Belins and others with their own reputations too weak to protect, may not be willing to believe that there is not a shred of evidence that can withstand examination to place Oswald at that window at the time of the assassination and for some time prior to the arrival of the motorcade. It was five minutes late and thus if he planned to be the assassin he had to have been there at least five minutes before the actual assassination. And then he allegedly had the rifle to reassemble. It took a skilled FBI agent six minutes to do that. Then in the made up official mythology, he had all those sealed book cartons to make into what the Report says were his sniper’s nest — without a single fingerprint where he had to have held them to move and stack them.

Aside from the ignored and misrepresented official evidence that places Oswald elsewhere, a careful examination of the evidence cited in the Report I use at the beginning of Whitewash, the first book,

proves the impossibility of Oswald having been there — from the official evidence alone! I do examine the corpus delicti with care and in detail beginning in the earlier chapters of that first book and I do it in great detail in my later and unpublished ones.

This is not the point to go over all of that, but there are so many infected by the made-up official assassination virus I cite a few points here.

Oswald allegedly brought the rifle to that building the morning of the assassination. In the official mythology that is the reason for his trip to where Marina was staying, with Ruth Paine, in nearby Irving, Texas. Allegedly the rifle was wrapped in a blanket and allegedly Oswald took paper from where he worked and made a paper bag in which allegedly he carried the rifle that morning.

Each and every person the Commission used as a witness on this proved the exact opposite under oath. Buell Wesley Frazier and his sister Linnie May Randle, between them saw Oswald with that paper bag from before he reached the Randle residence, then when he placed the bag on that back seat, when he got out of the car and as he walked toward the building while Frazier revved his motor to put a little charge in its battery.

Their testimony, the only evidence of any kind the Commission even claimed to have, in fine detail proves not only that Oswald did not carry the rifle to work that morning — it proves the impossibility of his having done that.

As with Rowlands, Belin's partner in this area of their work, Joe Ball, tried in every way possible to get them to change their vivid accounts. Ball knew they destroyed the basis of the entire Report and, in fact, proved that Oswald was framed, as he insisted to the police he had been. What a disaster they presented to the corruption of our history the Commission counsels all knew from the start they were part of! As the work of them all shows so clearly and so repeatedly. But try as he did, Ball would not get them

to change their testimony. That might a police polygraph examination proved Rowland's truthfulness.

If Oswald did not take that rifle to that building that morning then someone else did. It had to have been after the end of the previous day's work and before the beginning of that day's work! Not only did Oswald himself not do that — the evidence is that doing it was impossible for him. He was and he remained in Irving. He is the one person for whom proof that he could not have done that was without the possibility of any question at all. He was proven to have been in Irving from the time he got there in Frazier's car until he left in that car the morning of the assassination!

This is one of the areas of the Commission's evidence that it did not want that is overwhelmingly proven by its own evidence — every bit of it!

This only evidence — 100 percent of it — is that Oswald did not take the rifle to that building that morning.

The evidence after his getting to the building, is that he did not take any rifle into that building. Only Jack Dougherty, a building employee, saw Oswald enter the building. He swore that Oswald then was carrying nothing and the more he was questioned about this the firmer his testimony became.

No search was ever made for the curtainrods Oswald said were in the bag he carried until August, and even then there was no search at all. The building manager, Roy Truly, merely told the FBI that if any curtain rods had been found they would have been given to him. This is an absurdity but it is all the Commission got.

Nobody thought of looking in the shed-type building adjoining the main depository building on the west. Reportedly employees left their things other than they wore in it.

It may be closer to the actuality to say that nobody dared search for the curtain rods Oswald said he carried because his room needed curtains.

And, going back to the Altgens picture shysterism of those Honorable Men, if they or if they had asked the FBI to do it for them, had canvassed the photographic agencies they would have gotten what I have, a series of pictures showing the curtains Oswald said his room needed being put up later that day! And they are so thin and transparent he would still have been living in a veritable fishbowl.

I had planned for and expected it to be published in Case Open. The pictures for it is part of the at least three-quarters of it that was just butchered out — and I could do nothing about that.

As of this writing it is with the publisher for inclusion in NEVER AGAIN! The one I recommend using and copies of the other pictures of that series are and long have been there.

The rifle was well-oiled when first seen by the FBI, and these are its words, not mine. The lab also examined that blanket and that paper bag. Both were as magical as the one bullet said to have inflicted all seven non-fatal wounds on the President and on Governor Connally. The FBI Lab's examination of that blanket that was officially alleged to have been wrapped around that rifle -- proved it held not the tiniest smidgeon of the oil. The FBI Lab's examination of the bag likewise proved that it had not even the slightest trace of oil from all the travel and bouncing of that well-oiled rifle allegedly inside it.

It had not a crease or any other mark on it from any rifle. And had not a single Oswald fingerprint at any point where he had to have carried it for so long and in several ways. Even where he allegedly crumpled the top to hold onto it — no trace of it where allegedly made so many, many creases that do not exist in crumpling all that paper up for a hand hold.

The well-known first law of the FBI is “cover the Bureau's ass” as several agents and former agents have told me. The second law is “cover your own ass.” The FBI and its Lab technicians accomplished both with these reports I cite above.

Those reports alone both prove Oswald was not the assassin and that he was framed. They thus



prove there was a conspiracy.

As I say and prove above and repeatedly elsewhere and in all my books, the Commission ignored what was uncongenial to its preconceived “solution,” that was forced upon it by the FBI with its earlier “solution.” And both made up whatever they needed. This alleged rifle transport is only one of innumerable proofs of the most deliberate and premeditated dishonesty with which a case was so shamelessly made up, unembarrassed by all the evidence, as above, and without which the crime was unsolved.

Their part in what amounts to a conspiracy to frame Oswald and exculpate the real assassins is precisely what Belin and Specter were up to with the Rowlands. Beginning with suppressing the truth from the Report so they could distort and write prejudicially in an effort to destroy credible and confirmed evidence of another man at least and another rifle seen in that building just before the assassination.

There is no mention in the Report of what abounds in the testimony, that the Rowland teenage married couple was on their own and struggling to make out, the obvious explanation of Rowland’s exaggeration of his education.

Despite the Commission pretense that Rowland was not credible, any examination of his testimony such as I make at some length in Whitewash II establishes that he was not only credible, he was truthful and he was confirmed.

Those “several” interviews the Report refers to? They were “seven different pairs of FBI agents” (page 80)! Of this one kid! The Report does not tell us who conducted those interviews. Rowland testified, without contradiction, they were by the FBI and in them it sought to pressure him to change his story.

The actuality is that rather than first withholding it and later making it up, the thrust of Specter’s questioning and of the Report, Rowland voluntarily spoke to a “police officer” at the scene of the crime only a few minutes after it (page 79). No effort was made officially to determine whether there was such a

report made. That is how Rowland got to the sheriff's office to begin with. Whatever the normal practice there was, the great and unprecedented volume of witnesses from whom statements were to be taken and used as affidavits was such that after Rowland was there he had to wait for four hours before he was spoken to. Under these conditions it is obvious that the sheriff's department had but little time for each person and evolved affidavits that for the most part are of but a single paragraph, as the Bowley affidavit above was.

There is no need to repeat all the deliberate misrepresentations of what Rowland said here. They are detailed in Whitewash II. However, because the shysterlike misrepresentation of whether the kid-husband/high school dropout was credible, I do repeat part of it (pages 76-78). It shows the precision with which he set the time he saw a rifleman and the means those shysters should have used to determine whether or not he was truthful and credible. The only reason they did not is because they decided they wanted his evidence not to be considered. It shook their coming Report to its foundation!

In reading this it should be remembered that he was no more than a kid, beset with serious personal troubles and had been under tough and undisguised Specter efforts to rattle him and to get him to back down, to admit that what he said he saw he had not seen. The wrongful secrecy made that possible. These pages, by the way, do not include another part of the building where he said, as others also said, he also saw a rifleman he believed was from the Secret Service:

This confusion, which eliminates the location of the Rowlands at the time he said he saw the rifleman and which could have been important had the government not already decided it did not want the evidence, is, unfortunately, characteristic of the Rowland hearing and the Commission's use of photographs.

After two pages of rather specific testimony in which Rowland gave unequivocal answers, such as about the time he returned to Position "V" ("We got back there 14 after, I noticed the time on my watch, and the Hertz time clock (atop the Depository Building) I noticed was about a minute later"), Specter showed him another photograph,

Commission Exhibit 356, and asked, “Will you point to the window where you observed this man?”

“This was very odd,” Rowland replied. “There were — this picture was not taken immediately after that, I don’t think ... “ And he was quite right. Specter did not identify the time the picture was taken, as one might have expected. He ignored Rowland’s statement. From internal evidence, the photograph was taken soon after the assassination. Despite itself, the Commission did have several pictures taken at the moment of and only very shortly after the assassination showing the south face of the Depository building. And there were also countless hundreds of frames available to it from the Dallas TV stations alone that it avoided putting into its evidence or even looking at (Whitewash 43).

There is “Dillard Exhibit B” (19H564), taken by Photographer-Journalist Tom C. Dillard, riding in the first press car, which was the sixth car in the motorcade. And there is the twelfth slide of “Willis Exhibit No. 1” (21H773), taken by amateur photographer and retired Air Force Officer Phillip L. Willis. Close examination of these photographs shows that, in fact, the windows are not exactly as they were at the time of the assassination and shortly before it. It is all Rowland’s way, all against Specter and the Commission. It at least tends to establish Rowland as a sharp observer with an excellent memory and a man willing to speak up, regardless of what it ways of the Commission and its counsel.

Specter was entirely without comment, question or explanation. He kept Rowland testifying on the basis of and marking a photograph that was not an exact representation of the events and observations about which he was questioned.

Only one thoroughly familiar with the Commission’s record can be believe how normal such an event is, how without any interest the Commission and its counsel were about the slipperiest kind of examinations and evidence, witnesses and possibilities.

If these seem strange to those who want to believe the Report, and there is no other basis for believing it, the fact is that using the wrong and sometimes incomprehensible pictures was not at all uncommon. One of the most outrageous of these shyster-like exploits was, as I brought to light with no comment from him, by Wesley Liebler. A TSBD employee, Mrs. Virgie Rachley, testified to seeing the impact of a bullet on Elm Street not far from and in front of the building. That alone, of course, proves the official mythology also to be official mendacity. So, in her testimony, Liebler showed her a picture taken from the triple-underpass. It was taken steeply uphill. As the result, it was impossible for that camera to

have seen the place to which she testified. That same messy picture had been used for other supposed identifications. It was all marked up. Others also reported seeing bullets hit in that general area.

What Liebel, Specter, Belin and the others could and should have done was show each witness not only an unmarked print but also a clear and relevant print. At one point, on facing pages of Whitewash II, I illustrate the clear means by which this could be done with what those shysters had! On page 246 the top half is a view toward the grassy knoll over the President's head. The bottom half is a surveyor's plat. The Commission had a number of those and I reproduce two others elsewhere.

On facing page 247 is a clear aerial photograph of the Dealey Plaza area. It extends from slightly to the west of the entire overpass to past the other side of Houston Street to the east. On the north it includes the TSBD, the shed-like building that is part of it, and the pertinent parts of the Dal-Tex building. On the south it includes all of Main Street and the grassy area on both sides of it, to well past Houston Street and all of Commerce Street to opposite the west end of the TSBD. With such a picture, in which the painted road strips are quite clear and can be used for orientation or on the plat which has the same identifiers in it, all counsel had to do is hand any witness a clear and unused print plus a pen or pencil and ask that the point being testified to be marked.

The problem with that for those shysters, however, is that it reduced the possibility of playing their unseemly games with the evidence to contrive, despite the evidence to the contrary, exactly what the Commission wanted and needed to be able to claim a reason for discounting or "rejecting" testimony uncongenial to the "solution" with which it began. This is obvious its own outlines of its work and Report it (see first chapter, "Conclusions First," in *Post Mortem*).

Rowland's story is consistent, unchanged by the craft of a skilled cross-examiner, unaltered by the prospects of glory and fame, and [it is] exact. What he said he did not know, he would not testify to.

He is steadfast in his insistence he saw this rifleman through the easternmost of the pair of windows at the western end of the sixth floor; that the statements he had signed, typed by others, erred in placing the rifleman 12 to 15 feet inside the window, that it was three to five feet; that he never said the rifle was being held in the “parade rest” position, in which the rifle is not held but rested on the ground; that he could give the proportions of the man’s body but, at that distance, not its dimensions; that he could not say it was Oswald, not having seen him clearly enough (here, of course, was his chance for the front pages); on how the man was dressed; how much of the body and the rifle he could see and what he could not see; when he saw him; what he and his wife, who did not see the man, discussed about him (“must be Secret Service”); how fast the President’s car was moving; what he was wearing; who he spoke to and what was said; what others were doing and where; the finding of potential evidence and how he turned it over to the police; the date on which the FBI interviewed him and where the interviews took place; even a description of the rifle as having a telescopic sight (which he reported before it was public knowledge). In short, for a young and troubled man, under the pressure of great and strange but important events, whether or not his background is beyond reproach, in his testimony about his observations at the assassination scene, resists the temptation to exaggerate and rigidly adheres to the consistent account regardless of the interruptions in his narrative, the jumping around with abrupt changes in the subject of the question, and what seems to be ridicule, from the cold type.

Obviously, Oswald could not have been simultaneously at both ends of that building. So unless the shysters destroyed Rowland as a witness they would not be able to reach their pre-ordained conclusion, reached before there was an investigation at all.

In what follows, and I’ve eliminated nothing in this direct quotation, Fletcher Knebel is a well-known novelist. Without knowledge of the assassination he was a novelist rather than the reporter he once was to attack and criticize Edward J. Epstein’s *Inquest* in an article Knebel did for what was then the second largest weekly picture magazine in the country.

What follows that is what I referred to earlier, the ease with which an honest lawyer could have satisfied himself whether or not the kid Rowland had a clear and accurate recollection. He is confirmed totally by the police radio broadcasts he heard while standing exactly where he said he had stood, where there was a parked police motorcycle with its radio on:

It is a display of probity, the Commission and its apologist Knebel to the contrary notwithstanding, and a display of integrity under stress and pressure unequaled by those witnesses the Commission, in its own poverty, made famous and important.

Throughout it is larded with little touches that are the lawyer's delight because they are so natural and so typical of the kinds of things that linger in the mind and make for credibility. To a remarkable degree his testimony is confirmed by that of his wife, whose recollection is not nearly as clear and whose testimony is more equivocal, and by other evidence.

Rowland testified he saw this man, whom he took to be a Secret Service agent protecting the motorcade, right after 12:15. Immediately he called the presence of this armed man to his wife's attention, but by the time she finished looking at what held her interest and turned, the man had moved. At the time of this conversation with his wife, Rowland explained, they were near a police motorcycle "and the radio was giving the details of the motorcade, where it was positioned...and the dispatcher came on and gave the position of the motorcade as being on Cedar Springs. This would be in the area of Turtle Creek, down in that area. I don't remember the street's name but I know where it is at."

Now it is certain that Rowland had no access to the police radio logs, for the Commission had plenty of trouble getting them and wound up with three untrustworthy, inaccurate and incomplete versions that often contradict each other, incredible as this may seem since they were recorded (*Whitewash* 98-99).

But on this, no matter how gutted, they all agree. "Sawyer Exhibit A," of Police Radio Channel 2, quotes this identification of the motorcade's location shortly after the 12:15 time check — the first item after it: "On Cedar springs off Turtle Creek". In Exhibit 705, the transcript of channel 2, as the first item after the 12:15 station break, Inspector J.H. Sawyer is quoted as giving the motorcade's location as "now turning onto Cedar Springs Road off Turtle Creek". The next item is the 12:16 time check. Exhibit 1974, which is more complete for the periods it covers, just before 12:14 quotes Dispatcher Gerald Henslee and Chief Jesse Curry as reporting the motorcade was "just turning off Turtle Creek", with Henslee adding "onto Lemon". And sure enough, immediately after the 12:15 station break, this log also quotes Inspector Sawyer the same way, "Now turning onto Cedar Springs Road off Turtle Creek; Cedar Springs and Fairmount." The next item, again, is the 12:16 time check.

What, according to Rowland, happened next in that area while he and his wife were discussing the man they thought, following Adlai Stevenson's abuse in Dallas, was a Secret Service agent? A boy had an epileptic seizure across the street from them. Rowland's wife called his attention to it, "and a few moments later" the police "called an ambulance".

Once again the police radio logs confirm Rowland's observation and recollection: "Give us an ambulance 100 N. Houston Street - epileptic seizure", and right before the 12:19 time check.

In detail after detail the Commission's evidence, including even its pictures nobody else had,

Rowland is confirmed with positiveness and in even the smaller details:

How wide open was which of the pair of windows through which he saw the rifleman at the western end of the sixth floor? “To the fullest extent that they could be opened.” Specter asked, “What extent would that be?” and Rowland, unhesitatingly, told him that because these were half-frame windows “that would be halfway the entire length of the window.”

And this is precisely what the contemporaneous photographs show.

What of the window through which the Commission says Oswald fired, the easternmost on the same floor and the window in which Rowland said he saw a Negro man just before 12:15? “How much of that window was open?” Specter demanded.

Rowland showed with his hands, “It was open about that far.”

“Indicating 2½ feet?” This, as Specter knew, was close to half of the less than six-foot overall height of the entire window. Rowland did not take the bait.

“Two feet,” he insisted. From a block away he was less than six inches off, in the direction in which Specter led.

The other window in this pair, with absolute accuracy, Rowland said was “completely closed.”

Knebel is so convinced of the validity of his protest, that the Report of the President’s Commission was not “sloppy”, that he gets careless and, without realizing he is so doing, quotes its sloppiness in the dismal campaign against Rowland. He joins the Commission and its Assistant Counsel Specter in a lusty effort to present Rowland as a modern teen-age Munchausen.

This relates to the pretense that Rowland did not report seeing a Negro in the easternmost window of the sixth floor.

While they, of course, knew the facts, the authors of the Report, as not infrequently happens when writer seek to establish as fact what may not be, got carried away by their own efforts. Uncritically, on the same page of his article, separated by but 17 lines, Knebel quotes the Report as declaring Rowland was interviewed but a single time by the FBI and also as having had “several interviews”. Seven, Rowland’s version, is confirmed.

In twisting Mrs. Rowland’s testimony to make it appear that she “testified that her husband never told her about seeing any other man on the sixth floor,” which is something less than the scrupulously accurate representation one should be able to expect of such a Commission, the Report cites as evidence that “She was also present during Rowland’s interview with representatives of the FBI”. Apparently Knebel sees nothing sloppy in comparison with this quote he also retails from the Report, “...Rowland’s failure to report his story despite several interviews”, cited as a reason that the Commission “rejected this portion of Rowland’s testimony”. Lost in this literary goo is the fact that the Commission rejected all of Rowland’s testimony.

I could continue this with additional quotations from *Whitewash II*’s reporting of the Specter and Belin shenanigans but this is more than enough to prove the matter and for Specter to characterize himself.

Instead I give the unabridged definition of “shyster”:

“1. a lawyer who uses unprofessional or questionable methods; 2. one who gets by with petty sharp practice.”

Barbara Rowland was often looking elsewhere when her husband saw what he reported seeing, as she testified. Women and men do have some different interest. Specter’s misuse of his prosecutorial experiences on her husband did not intimidate young Rowland a bit. He would not change his testimony and from the record he should not have. Because this was supposedly a fact-finding body, not a prosecution of any kind of case in court, with a judge and opposing counsel to keep him honest and within bounds, Specter’s behavior was both bad and in very poor taste. But he and the Commission were not worried about that. They knew all along what they were going to conclude and they knew all along that the evidence not only did not support their preconception — it destroyed it. So, they also knew all along that there would be witnesses like Rowland they had to get rough with. Belin was superficially polite with the young woman but he also tried his best to get incorrect, inaccurate testimony they could use to “reject” her husband. As we saw they had to phony up an excuse.

Belin felt it incumbent on him to apologize to Barbara Rowland several times. Once he actually admitted that he was deliberately trying to embarrass her. As I quote him in *Whitewash II* (page 86), the second time Belin wanted to make himself look not quite as bad as he was and behaved, he said he apologized “for in any way trying to embarrass you.” She had neither accused him of it nor even suggested it.

One thing she did get in that was not asked of her is misrepresented in the Report by its being ignored so the Report could imply that Rowland was a liar in saying that he was inclined to exaggerate. To quote from the same page, “She carefully limited the things about which Rowland exaggerated to what



would ‘boost his ego’ and is not concerned with anything other than himself.” With Belin as with Specter I here use what has been public domain for more than 29 years as of this writing. I use what they know about and have. Without a peep from either of them. And I use what gives their dirty tricks meaning as unexplained quotation from it would not.

They were dirty, they intended to be dirty, and this offense, which might not be an offense in a court of law, was magnified because they were dirty, tried to intimidate and to “embarrass” a couple of teenagers in a non-legal proceeding, in secret, and with no judge to keep them honest. The Rowland’s only defense of any kind was having seen what they saw and telling the truth about what the government was determined not to tell the truth about.

It is not because of the importance of their testimony compared with that of others that I use the Rowlands to illustrate how these Honorable Men conducted themselves and how they devoted themselves and their talents to seeing to it that the truth would not be told about the assassination. I use them because in an honest investigation, theirs would have been important testimony, if not nearly as important as that of many others.

I use it also because it is so obviously dirty and because Specter and Belin have said not a word about it since I published it 30 years ago. This was not and was not intended to be an honest investigation. What Specter and Belin did to them and with what they testified to illustrates one of the means of seeing to it that there was no genuine investigation, that the truth would not be known, and that when their diligent professional efforts failed, how the truth was distorted in the Report they were responsible for.

There was, of course, lengthier testimony than Rowlands and more important than it by far. Yet most of the transcripts, including of the most important testimony, took ever so much less time and as published is ever so much shorter.

It was precisely because Rowland's endangered the "solution" with which the Commission, like the FBI, began, that he was one of the very small percentage of witnesses called to Washington to testify before the Commission itself. That he was and that others who had evidence that was much more important were not reflects the kinds of matters the staff drew to the attention of the Members of the Commission.

As of the time of Rowland's testimony the Commission's internal records I have show that Rankin was sending memos to the staff to get cracking on writing their areas of the Report itself! He wanted the drafts done and in his hands in May and the final text in June. As of that June the Commission and the staff in depositions with no Member present heard the testimony of only a small percentage of the witnesses they were compelled to hear. For example, Abraham Zapruder took the amateur movies now so famous but he was not deposed until the month after the Report had been scheduled to appear. His was important testimony both because of the importance of his film and the need to have testimony relating to and authenticating it and because he was more of a witness because his eye was focused on the President himself through the magnifying lens of his camera. Like the Rowlands, he presented a hazard to the preconceived "solution." When he gave his film to Secret Service Agent John Joe Howlett he told Howlett that he heard and felt a shot come from over his right shoulder. That meant an assassin on the Grassy Knoll and that meant that all the shots were not from behind the President. That, without any question at all proved there was a conspiracy. In a hand-lettered covering memo Howlett reported what Zapruder told him. In the Commission's files these memos are identified as "CD 87 in Folder 1." The file copies are remote generations of the originals and are close to completely illegible. I printed them in *Photographic Whitewash* on pages 138 and 139.

The problem of Zapruder telling the Secret Service what would have ruined the preconceived

solution, apparently the reason his testimony was not taken earlier, was solved by talking Zapruder out of it! As he himself actually testified (*Whitewash*, pages 45-48). The Commission's expert testimony is that "if any shot was fired after Frame 166" of his film "and before Frame 210, it could not have come from that window" (page 46). Zapruder's testimony indicates strongly that a shot had been fired before frame 210 when the Commission said the first shot was fired. His is not the only probative testimony on that (pages 47-48).

James Tague is the third man wounded in the assassination. His slight wound came from a bullet that missed the motorcade entirely. Like Zapruder, he was not called to testimony before the Commission. That missed shot was anathema to it. His testimony, in the same volume as Zapruder's (pages 552-558), is less than a third the length of Rowland's and Rowland testified before the Commission itself. His testimony (7H569-76), Zapruder and that of 50 others is so brief the staff included them all in a single volume, and it is not the largest of the testimony volumes at that!

Another comparison with the length of Rowland's testimony is that of Linda Kay Willis. She was as close an eyewitness to the impact of the bullets on the President as the Commission had. She testified to what she saw, including these impacts. Important testimony? No more important to those Honorable Men than the single printed page length of her testimony reflects! But by its length Rowland's testimony is 25 time more important than hers and he was not a witness to the shooting. By the same measure it was more than twice as important as Zapruder's and Tague's. The greater length of Rowland's represents the effort to discredit him not an effort to get the truth.

The only reason any of the testimony was taken in secret — and it all was — was to keep the media and the people from knowing that the Commission's own evidence, what it could not avoid taking, proved it to be wrong, and to have faked a phony solution to the crime that is inevitable a *coup d'etat*.

This is why Rowland was before the Commission itself and why his testimony is four times longer than Zapruder's or twice as long as Zapruder's and Tague's — with Linda Kay Willis' thrown in for good measure!

But Specter and Belin between them could not break that stalwart couple of teenagers determined to tell the truth. So, they had to distort the Rowland's testimony in the Report.

With this for comparison, with this also for evaluating how honorable those Honorable Men were, while it is not possible to give Belin all the attention he more than deserves, a little more reflects more of his and the counsels' dirtiness and what they were so dirty about, what later they believed justified them in their proclamation that they were all honorable men. Again I use what was public and they had and have, *Whitewash II*:

Assistant Counsel Belin, who questioned Mr. Rowland, also interrogated Deputy Sheriff Craig on April 1, 1964. Although the printed transcript begins on page 260 of Volume 6 and that of Mrs. Rowland on page 177, Craig's testimony was a week before Mrs. Rowland's. Belin knew the contents of Craig's testimony when he took the deposition from Mrs. Rowland.

In detail, Craig's recollection of what Rowland told him about ten minutes after the assassination confirms that of the young man with one exception: Craig recalls that Rowland told him both of the men he saw were white. The general description of the clothing, the kind of rifle, the telescopic sight, the manner in which the man held it, where in the building Rowland saw him — what window — why he did not report it before the shooting, that one man disappeared from Rowland's view before the other, how the Rowlands got to the sheriff's office — the works. In close and intimate detail, almost six months later, Deputy Sheriff Craig corroborated Rowland's story and confirmed that he had not held it back but had volunteered it immediately.

Craig was, therefore, not a welcome witness. He was just as unwelcome for other things he saw and heard (page 81).

On the next page:

There is nothing novel about the treatment of Craig and Rowland in their testimony, or in the Report. It was standard Commission staff practice. So was the misrepresentation and suppression of Craig's confirmation of Rowland's testimony. After a he more words about Knebel and the role in which he cast himself, the role no reporter

ought ever serving in a society like ours,

Mrs. Rowland corroborated almost all of her husband's testimony; a fact the Report avoids. She went into almost as much details as he did on the times and places the FBI came to take statements or interview him, on his reporting to her that he saw the rifleman, and on what he and she did and discussed.

Unlike this representation in the Report, even Dallas Secret Service chief Sorrels concedes (7H350-1) that Rowland may have informed him of seeing a second man. His exact words were not at all those of the Report. He said, "He may have, but I don't recall that."

After a few words about the Commission's and Knebel's effort to demean Barbara Rowland and her testimony, this from the next pages:

The rest of her quoted apparent denial of her husband's testimony, as represented by the Report and Knebel, requires examination. It is not difficult for an experienced lawyer to lead a young girl into the kind of testimony he wants, whether or not it is a precise representation of what is in her mind. But when asked (6H185), "Did he say whether or not there were other people on that same floor looking out the windows," she replied, "I am not certain whether he said that or not." And in response to a general question, not limited to this floor, she was "fairly certain that he said there were other people looking out the windows."

The Report, quoted by Knebel, says, "Mrs. Rowland testified that her husband never told her about seeing any other man on the sixth floor..." , introducing another prejudicial representation of the testimony. It is meaningless in the phony case the Commission staff was building, in any event. The real question was: Had he told the FBI? Of this there is absolutely no contradiction of Rowland's entirely uncontested testimony that he had. Recall, the Commission never even asked the FBI agents if Rowland had.

Recall, also, Rowland had sought out a policeman, and had been sent by him to the sheriff's office. And then there is Deputy Sheriff Craig's confirmation. In this questioning of Mrs. Rowland, Belin is careful to avoid reference to the FBI (6H188):

Mr. Belin. Did he tell the police officer anything that was not on that statement that should be?

Mrs. Rowland. I don't believe so.

Belin was referring to the FBI, even though he said "police officers". It is possible Mrs. Rowland so understood him. Asked, "Was there anything that your husband said that was not on that written statement?" she replied, "I am not positive."

Mr. Belin. Was he asked whether or not he saw any other people in any other window?

Mrs. Rowland. I don't believe he was specifically asked that question.

Mr. Belin. Did he tell any of the police officers that he saw any

people in any other windows?

Mrs. Rowland. I am not certain.

Mr. Belin. Do you know whether or not he told them, the police officers, that there was any other person on the sixth floor that he saw?

Mrs. Rowland. He never said that there was another person on the sixth floor, in my presence, that I can remember.

What now follows is hardly worthy of a Commission so constituted and with such a function.

At the end of her testimony, in which on several occasions this young, partly educated girl had spoken less clearly than she intended (for a proceeding of this sort is impressive, frightening and outside the experience of most adults, more so teen-agers), she was told she would be shown her statement and “you can come down and read it and make any corrections, if you like.” She asked, “Could I, other than making corrections, have it rewritten in better English?”

“No, I’m afraid my English at times isn’t very good, Mrs. Rowland, and we have to let it go the way it is right now.” Belin amplified this, saying only the correction of reporter error would be permitted (6H19).

In plain English, and when we are dealing with arcane concepts of honor and with the nation’s honor and integrity, the English used cannot be too plain — Belin lied, as soon we see.

Resuming from page 84, with the combined Commission-Knebel-Look assault on this teenage girl and her testimony, I draw attention to the unusual means, the extra cost (at 25 cents a page in the 1966 and 1967 values of money) to establish truth and get a real understanding of what the Belins and Specters and the others mean by “honor,”

The Report, as quoted by Knebel, says of Mrs. Rowland’s testimony, “she also said that she did not hear everything that we discussed.”

The language of the printed transcripts, resuming without omission after the quotations about whether or not Rowland had told the police officers of seeing any other persons on the sixth floor, reads:

Mr. Belin. Were you present when he was with the police officer?

Mrs. Rowland. At times.

Mr. Belin. On Sunday morning, November 24?

Mrs. Rowland. Yes.

Mr. Belin. And he, in your presence, never said that he saw anyone on the sixth floor other than the man with the rifle?

Mrs. Rowland. No, he never said in my presence that there was another man with the rifle on the sixth floor.

Mr. Belin. It is a little bit like there has been asked a negative question and you don't know whether to answer yes or no to the question, is that right, Mrs. Rowland?

Mrs. Rowland. Yes, sir.

That Mrs. Rowland did not "know whether to answer yes or no to the question", clear in the transcript, is in no way reflected in the positive interpretation put upon it. But this by no means the worse of it.

The printed transcript has been altered, and less than completely honestly.

There is nothing here to justify the language of the Report quoted above, about her being present, "although she also said that she did not hear everything that was discussed".

Although the testimony has been printed, the stenographic transcripts are locked up, put away with a large red stamp on each reading, "Top Secret". However, entirely without explanation, typescript page 119 covering the testimony of Mrs. Rowland appears in Volume 26 on page 169. The original unaltered transcript reads:

Mr. Belin. Were you personally with him throughout the time that he was with the police officers?

Mrs. Rowland. Yes.

Mr. Belin. And he, in your presence, never said that he saw anyone on the sixth floor other than the man with the rifle?

Mrs. Rowland. No. He never said in my presence that there was another man other than the man with the rifle on the sixth floor.

Mr. Belin. It is a little bit like there has escaped a negative question and you don't know whether to answer yes or no to the question, is that right, Mrs. Rowland?

Mrs. Rowland. Yes, sir.

In this typescript, Belin's word, "escaped", has been stricken through and replaced by "been asked", exactly the way it appears in the printed volume. But Mrs. Rowland here also misspoke herself (if that is what Belin did) and here she also made a correction. Instead of the answer "yes" to the question whether she had been with her husband "throughout the time that he was with the police officers", she crossed out the word "yes" and replaced it with this language: "I was in the same room during the entire interview but I did not hear everything that was said."

When it quoted what Mrs. Rowland said, the Commission staff — whoever drafted this section of the Report — did not dare omit her correction. But it is not in the printed official transcript. The Report engaged in a very tricky representation of this entire testimony.

The records for the future, however, the record those seeking the truth now have access to, clearly misrepresents the truth, clearly says what Mrs. Rowland says is not correct, that she was “personally with him throughout the time that he was with the police officers” and that in her presence he “never said that he saw anyone on the sixth floor other than the man with the rifle.”

And so they cooked the books as part of their phonying up and false “solution” to the assassination of a President, so they could do the phonying up of which this is a relatively minor but typical part. And not without importance.

I published that page of the stenographic transcript in facsimile so that readers could see that Belin lied in saying he could not correct his language and then proceeded to do that — and not here only — while denying Barbara Rowland the opportunity, in the published printed record, of a correcting an accidental error enticed by Belin himself.

Lawyers say, “Let the record speak for itself.” This record. Here the record made by Belin and Specter, does speak for itself as it does for them, their honor, their roles in the investigation and in the Report and how, when a President was assassinated, the honor of these so honorable men disgraced the nation and contributed to the foisting off on the sorrowing people and on our history a hoked-up and knowingly false solution to that crime that turned the nation and the world around.

Int his they wiped out, to the degree they could, one off the proofs that there was a conspiracy to kill the President and give us a different President. With significantly different policies in foreign affairs.

With great changes in our national life and future.

It is for this reason there are *coups d’etat*, to change policies.

With their proclamation of their honor, by all of them, not by Specter and Belin alone, and with this record that does speak for itself, and that also not for Belin and Specter only because in varying degrees they all did as these two did, we see the “honor” of these so honorable men and what they individually and



collectively got started, the JFK Assassination Industry.

We see also what qualified this pair of shysters for their subsequent careers. Specter became the district attorney of the major city of Philadelphia and then a United States Senator from Pennsylvania. After switching from liberal ADA (Democrat to Republican, that is). For Belin it led to his heading the staff of a different Presidential Commission. This was his apprenticeship for that whitewashing role, for his failure to investigate the CIA as he should have, for his suppressing in the CIA's records, as I show above, what in and of itself refutes the whole phonied-up assassination conclusion of the Report each of them wrote part of for which both of them took testimony for misuse in it.

There may be, in the old saying, honor among thieves. That honor did not exist on the Warren Commission staff.

They plunge daggers into our national honor, our integrity and our history. That is no better, if it was not worse than, the daggers of which Shakespear wrote that Marc Antony said, "And so are they all, all honorable men."

These unseen daggers were in their way no less fatal. With a quarter of a billion Americans their victims.