

"Fact" of assassination.

Opening paragraph: "Marina Oswald awoke at 6:30 on November 22, 1963" False. She and her husband both slept through the alarm. She then awakened at 7:10 and awakened him.

"Her husband stood at the foot of the bed, dressing in a work shirt..." False. The shirt was a dress shirt that once had been a good one. It was fraying slightly at the cuffs, had been darned at the elbow, and was again torn on the shoulder side of that darn. Two of the top buttons were missing, those immediately below the collar.

"For the last time Lee Harvey Oswald said he really wanted her to buy things for clothes for herself, shoes for little Junie. She ignored him. Silently, she went back to bed." False. This distorted version of a real conversation of the previous night (when Manchester falsely averred she had also been silent, this precipitating Oswald's alleged insanity) did not occur then. But she was not silent. She offered to go get his breakfast because he was so late. He said he'd fix his own, but he did not. Use direct quotes from statement to SS, interrogations, testimony.

"Carrying the rifle and telescopic sight in the brown-paper wrapping he had brought from the Texas School Book Depository in Dallas the previous afternoon." He was not, according to the Report, carrying the sight separately. It was attached to the barrel, which had been separated from the wooden stock. Of this there is neither evidence nor the pretense of evidence. There is only supposition. But had the sight, as Manchester says, been separate, it could not have been attached and the weapon fired with accuracy, for the sight would have had to have been adjusted by actual preliminary firing or what is known as "bore sighting". It is also presumption, and here in defiance on the only evidence, that Oswald took that wrapping-paper to Irving that afternoon or any other time. The creases on it reveal it had been folded into a very large square, much too large to fit into any kind of a pocket.

2

And Wesley Buell Frazier, the man who gave him the ride, swore that on neither that nor any of the other occasions on which he had given Oswald a lift from their place of work to Irving, Tex., had Oswald carried any kind of a package of any kind of size or description.

Of that morning's Dallas paper. "...two abrasive stories on the front page..." Like the Commission in its Report, "Manchester neglects to mention the two-column-wide map on the front page. This showed that the motorcade was, in the version of that paper, not scheduled to go under the window at all but to stay on Main Street. Its omission is consistent with an effort to pin the rap on Oswald but not with honest writing.

With reference to the scurrilous newspaper ad insulting the President and printed that morning: "...an organization styling itself as 'The American Fact Finding Committee'- a local coordinator of the John Birch Society and Nelson Bunker Hunt, the son of H. L. Hunt, it later developed were the Committee's most prominent members-..." There was no such committee. It was a fiction devised to give an impressive-sounding name to the ad to make the ad seem responsible and authoritative. It was a front for some cute ultra-conservatives out to milk the right of whatever they could, and in this case they got \$1,462.00 (5H504) through Joseph P. Grinnan, a Dallas Oil operator and local coordinator of the John Birch Society. Hunt's son was one of the four Birchers who put up the money. The others were Edgar R. Crissey and H.R. Bright, "some of whom in turn collected contributions from others" (R296). The singling out of the name "Hunt" here serves an obvious purpose. The fact is that the so-called "committee" was "a name and solely a name", according to the evidence (5H509), that "there was no such organization", that it "was used for convenience on this ad", that the name was never used before or after the ad was placed, and that Bernard Weissman, whose name was placed on the ad because it is a Jewish name, swore that

"As a matter of fact, when I went to place the ad, I could not remember the name. I had it written down on a piece of paper. I had to refer to that piece of paper for the name".

On Oswald's and Frazier's arrival at the Depository and Oswald's entrance into the building: "Then Oswald impatiently (no evidence of this; Frazier merely stayed behind to charge his battery) got out, carrying his package. Frazier's attention was diverted, and he followed slowly. By the time he reached the building, Oswald had climbed the loading platform and vanished inside".

There was nothing unusual or untoward in the way Oswald left the car of the fact that he left before Frazier, who not only remained to put a small charge into the battery of his ancient car but also watched trains switching on the adjacent tracks. For most of the two blocks between the parking space and the rear of the building there was nothing ~~except~~ blocking Frazier's view of Oswald and he gave the most detailed testimony about his observations. Because it is so destructive of the case Manchester is trying to build, he ignores it. The Commission in its Report did exactly the same thing. Frazier saw the package, described how Oswald was carrying it, gave a demonstration of it, corrected the Commission counsel Joseph Ball when Ball erred in describing it (2H 210-45) and was one of the two eyewitnesses - the only people who saw Oswald carrying that package - whose testimony establishes it could not have held a rifle because it was much too small. Frazier's graphic description was "cupped in his (right) hand" ~~and tucked under his armpit~~ (2H239) and tucked under his armpit.

"Oswald's movement in the next few minutes are a matter of conjecture, based solely on circumstantial evidence. Superintendent Roy Eruly later recalled meeting him by a bookbin, saying "'Good morning, Lee, and

receiving the customary reply, 'Good morning, sir'. But Truly was vague and he had no recollection of the package. It is quite possible he was thinking of another morning - that Lee had already ascended to the sixth floor ...to conceal his weapon near the ~~sight~~ site he had selected."

What Manchester here states as fact is false and knowingly false. What he presents as conjecture is both immaterial and a nonsequitur, a conscious diversion, for Manchester's and the Commission's case here fall farthus apart. Oswald was seen to enter the building, by a single man, and by only a single man.

He is Jack Edwin Dougherty, who testified on April 8, 1964, with Bell again questioning. Dougherty swore that "he was alone" and when asked "In other words, you would say positively he had nothing in his hands?" he replied, "I would say that - yes ,sir (6H377).

That Oswald was seen entering the building without a package is a problem for the Commission and for Manchester simply because it was not addressed. There are outer parts of that building in which Oswald's package could have been deposited. It was not looked for. Not until August 31, when the Report was ready to go to press, did the Commission ask the FBI to interview Truly "to ascertain if he knows of any curtain rods having been found in the TSBD building after November 22, 1963." The FBI, reported"...He stated that it would be customary for any discovery of curtain rod rods to immedietely be called to his attention and that he has received no information to the effect that any curtain rods were found..." (Exhibit 2640, 25H899).

If the department for the finding and reporting of curtain rods was not working, Manchester has been at diversions. Whether or not Truly "later recalled" meeting Oswald is entirely immaterial, unless it was that morning and at the time Oswald entered the building or between that entrance and the alleged site of a leged concealment of the weapon. Truly having seen no package, then r or any other time, how could he be other than "vague"?, a color word used for progaganda purpose, to imply what cannot be stated.