

Acknowledgements

As in his The Murkin Conspiracy Melanson fails to acknowledge the many long and costly suits under the Freedom of Information Act which brought to light more than a third of a million pages of previously-withheld government records, mostly the FBI's but including the CIA's records to which he had access in its reading room. As he well knows, without this litigation the records would not be available to ^{him} anyone.

It became clear that he ^{nded} intended to take credit for the work of others, pretending that their work does not exist and that this manuscript is based on his original work. (The only originality is in some of this theory.)

This also is apparent in his bibliography.

With regard to his acknowledgements, I have more in my letter sent earlier.

He cites as the result of his own "investigation" what he got from others and what he just took from others.

Introduction

10 Lines 6ff: Whether this refers to the preceding sentence or to the quotation of Oswald, "(n)ow everyone will know who I am," is ^{it} both unclear and inaccurate.

What most researchers hypothesized is that Oswald was not a lone assassin, that he was not guilty, that the Warren investigation was angled, incomplete and undependable, and I know of no researchers, assuming he means published, who believed that Oswald believed ^{that} ~~and of~~ his alleged ~~W~~ "political postures" were "about to be stripped away by the legal processes as he sought to defend himself against charges of murder."

There is nothing in Oswald's behavior after he was arrested that even suggests that he feared the legal processes. He assured his wife and mother that he would be OK.

If he does not refer to the Oswald quotation, perhaps this is because there are researchers who long before him believed that Oswald could have had some intelligence connections. Aside from several articles and newspaper stories, this first ^{appeared} in Whitewash, first published in 1965.

11-12 There were more than three official investigations.

If Oswald "spent nearly all his adult life working for U.S. intelligence," then he had to have begun when he became a Marine, at aged 17. This would be ^{only} partly true if Melanson says he was working for intelligence, "most likely ^{for} the CIA," as a civilian~~s~~, after he returned to the U.S. That then was illegal for the CIA.

12 He does not cite his source for Dulles' telling his colleagues that proving Oswald had had no connection with the CIA (and that was not in the sense of having been an "operative") because that would involve crediting what he was careful not to credit. It ^{is} already, after I've skimmed his notes and read the Introduction, ^{that} because he is going to pretend that his work is original where it is not. There is no "option" that Oswald was a "mafia soldier" (emphasis added) but if he had been, there is no "mutual exclusivity" with any intelligence connection. The OSS and the CIA at the last ^{among} such agencies did use the mafia.

13 It is not true to say that Oswald "maintained a facade of leftism." There is no reason to believe this was not genuine. Apparently Melanson is not familiar with

Oswald's extensive writings or ^{with} the portion of them published by the Commission.

15 Oswald did not "pose" as a defector. Rather is it that the U.S. embassy did not accept his defection. Apparently Melanson does not know what the word "agent" means to intelligence services. As they use the word an agent is an employee, not an informer or one who may render some services.

16 Oswald became a Marine at 17, not 18.

To say that Oswald could "easily" have given the USSR the information they needed to shoot down the Powers U-2 flight is not true in any sense and it is not true that Oswald "caused a loss of military-intelligence which was unparalleled in the previous decade." Aside from whether or not Oswald possessed such information, and he certainly did not, the KGB refused to have anything to do with him and did not bother even to interview him. Moreover, Oswald did not "have access to the U-2." If this is merely sloppy writing and reference is to his operating radar during U-2 flights, that meant virtually nothing at all. The USSR had monitored them and was quite familiar with them and their characteristics. All of this is enormously over-written and exaggerated. He does not say what military secrets Oswald had to give away or that the USSR had any interest in them. The secrets Oswald had, the codes used in communication, were changed as soon as the Navy knew he'd gone to the Moscow embassy.

He does not provide any source for the destruction of CIA and military files on Oswald. This again serves to make it appear that this is his original work and it isn't.

And he was not "of interest" to the KGB. They ignored him entirely

17 I believe his "legal definition" of conspiracy is wrong: it requires an overt step.

Chapter 1

19 Oswald did NOT found a New Orleans chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

There was none.

Saying that Oswald attempted to return to the USSR is over-writing again. He did apply for a visa to go to Cuba, which was one of the most difficult ^{it} starting-points for going to the USSR. (No source cited)

The "dirty rumor" the Commission had was of Oswald's connection with the FBI, not "U.S.intelligence."

20 He misuses "agent" again.

22 I know of no "assertion" that Oswald "had contact with Castro's spies" and no source is given. Straw man?

23 I know of no evidence that Oswald was not ^{really} ~~really~~ pro-Castro and no source is given. Another straw man?

He says that the CIA did not have exclusive ^{"turf"} rights to the various places Oswald appeared. Yet he says Oswald served it inside the US, and it had no rights to that "turf" at all. It was prohibited from any domestic activity involving spying.

He cites no source for any linking to any intelligence agency of either George De Mohrenschildt or David Ferrie and he cites no source for saying that Oswald was Ferrie's "associate." If he builds on this later he builds on a cloud.

24 Footnote 6 is a citation to the Commission's 1/22/64 executive session but as he is again careful not to acknowledge, as he did with footnote 3, it was a published source. An entire book is devoted to it, including facsimile reproduction of the transcript. He may be unwilling to cite that author and he is again making it appear that he did work ^{he} and did not do because all those transcripts had been classified "top secret" and it required FOIA litigation ^{in me} ~~he~~ apparently will never mention for them to be available to him. The book is ^{my} Whitewash IV, in his biblio.

25 There is an unjustified presumption that Oswald did work for the CIA in the sentence that as says "(d)irect proof that Oswald worked for the CIA is impossible to come by

without Agency cooperation." I think it is not unfair to say that this is just plain dishonest.

26 ^{Again} Agee uses the word "agent" as the CIA does not. Is the emphasis in the original or added?

27 Again, Ferrie is Oswald's "associate" and again no source. This is because there can be no source, not a dependable one in any event. No source also on Ferrie as a "pilot and as a soldier in the CIA's war against Castro" and again, none is possible.

No source is given on "two CIA contract killers" and this says that they killed for the CIA, of which there is no evidence. Only sloppy writing or is he again suggesting support for his theory? The CIA contracted with two men who were known as killers but he does not say this.

Footnote 9 again hides his actual, published source, Whitewash IV.

28 To say as he does that Oswald was "in the grip of U.S. intelligence" is overwriting at the least, as it is to say, as he does, that beginning when Oswald went to Russia he was in this alleged "grip" until he was killed by Ruby.

Comment: aside from what is not so, what is conjectured and what I believe is just made up, all without any source given, this represents amateurishness and will be laughable to those with any knowledge of or experience in intelligence agencies. It is really kid stuff blown up.

Chapter 2

29 He knows nothing at all about Oswald's ^{specialized} training if he describes it as ^{only} "techniques" and it was much more specialized than radar operation, which is how the basic training and function are described.

He is playing ~~spook~~ or spook expert again in saying that "(1)n clandestine parlance, black means secret." It has much more meaning than just secret,

30 "High-flying cameras" or the CIA's cameras now fly on their own?

No source for ("i)t is easy to understand why the black lady was the KGB's highest priority target" and I doubt it is true. He continues to over-write and I now expect it throughout the entire manuscript.

He is just making it up, as in a novel, as he goes. It simply is not true that "nothing could find" the U-2 or that the US assumed this. It may have assumed that the USSR could not shoot it down but again, no source.

The radar "bubble" is not its control room! Whether or not this was so at Atsugi, that control room later was in a trailer.

"All data" on the U-2 was not ultra secret, except to civilians who had no need to know. It was not so secret to foreign agencies with a need to know and this includes what Melanson does ~~not~~ mention, its ~~range~~ height capabilities.

31 "...frustrated Soviets in their frenzied attempts to catch the black lady." No source for "fr^{en}zied" and no source possible for ["]catch." Again, over-writing and kid stuff. Same for what follows, that the Soviets couldn't even track the U-2.

It is becoming clear why he has avoided saying what is well known, that the KGB would not even talk to Oswald. He keeps on implying a) that Oswald had secrets the KGB wanted and b) gave them to the KGB. It just isn't true.

Meanwhile, with all the pointless identifications he provides, apparently intending to convey authoritativeness, he hasn't even identified Oswald's unit by name.

32 Carelessness and sloppiness permeate. ^{all} Bissell did not "develop" the U-2. He was in charge of the project but not the development, which was by Lockheed. But here, where [^] what he says about Bissell ^S has no relationship to the book or Oswald as a CIA agent, he

~~but~~ has quite a few footnotes.

Sloppy, sloppy, sloppy again: the Russians did not "stop surveillance" when they shot the Powers U-2 down. He has no source on what the Russians learned from the downed U-2, ~~expected~~ "spectacular advances" in "technology."

33 Sloppy, sloppy, sloppy and grossly careless, the man he cites here, then a lieutenant, was not ^{John B. ~~John B. ~~John B.~~~~} "(t) commander of Oswald's El Toro unit." He was not Oswald's ~~commander~~ ^{John B. ~~John B. ~~John B.~~~~} Donovan, not yet named by Melanson, why I don't know, was in charge of the radar shift and on the very page Melanson cites he gives precise details of what Oswald did and what was not known. But Melanson preferred his fancies earlier and did not use this testimony.

34 Sloppy, sloppy, careless again. Oswald's duties most assuredly changed at El Toro, from working radar to working in the post security office. It was not then, as Melanson says in crafting what is becoming more and more of a novel, that Oswald "became a conspicuous leftist." (Oswald was in touch with both the Communist and Socialist parties before he enlisted.) And what Melanson says next Oswald did before he was assigned to El Toro, from which he was discharged.

Report's

The portrayal of Oswald ~~as~~ as "pro-Soviet" is the Warren Commission's ^{Report's} but it also is contradicted by what the ~~the~~ Commission published and omitted from its Report, Oswald's dislike of both the USSR and the ^{U.S.} Communist Party. Melanson knows this if he read what is in his bibliography because with direct quotations it is quoted in Whietwash I. He called the Russians "fat, stinking politicians" and said the US Communists had "betrayed the working class" in his writings that are included in the Commission's 26 volumes. At the very least one pretending a scholarly approach and intending honesty would have cited the writings along with the Commission's self-serving description of them and of Oswald. In context this is consistent with building a case regardless of the evidence.

The handling of Oswald's security clearance (33-4) is worse than sloppy and careless. Avoiding names other than Kerry ⁴hornley's Melanson has unnamed Donovan saying that Oswald had secret clearance, which ⁴hornley also testified, and an unnamed ^{Marine} who is Nelson Belgado and notoriously undependable, saying, ³ quoted by Melanson, ^{that}

saying he "believed" they all had access to what was classified secret. The quotation is incomplete. Delgado then added, immediately, "(w)e all had secret clearances." This is false and if Melanson is at all familiar with the unquesti^{s/a}onable evidence it is that only five men in that unit had security clearances higher than confidential. Oswald was ^{one} of the five.

If Melanson knew this, as he certainly should have with only a reading rather than a scholarly knowledge of the literature as well as the evidence, theⁿ why he quotes Delgado incompletely and unfaithfully is a question.

Now these were far from the only Marines who testified about security clearances. Why does Melanson limit himself to these if he really knows the material, published and in disclosed records? Perhaps the answer lies in his citing the Warren Commission testimony for these few instead of the published source on which he draws. This could be my first (1965) book or Oswald In New Orleans (1967). Neither uses the other relevant testimony of which I was aware and used for other reasons ^{only} (later).

Whether or not earlier publication was his source, when he fails to cite the earlier publication of ^h which he does know and instead cites the sources they cite it raises question of personal and professional integrity and suggests he is puffing himself and his work up without any legitimate basis.

What is even more curious, with his listing of Oswald In New Orleans in his bibliography, is his failure to ~~not~~ cite it on Oswald's security clearance. It is at least as dependable a source as some he cites and it - albeit uniquely - states that Oswald had Top Secret and ^{Crypto} ~~Crypto~~ clearances. What makes this even stranger is that it ^{would} ~~does~~ support and advance Melanson's theory thus far presented largely as fact. And if he is not familiar with Oswald In New Orleans, what is his bibliography other than pseudo-scholarship and another self-promotional effort?

The other relevant and much better, including for his purposes, testimony I refer to above is in the very volume he cites for the three ^{Marines} he uses. This again suggests lack of familiarity with that volume of testimony and his dependance upon

the published earlier studies in his bibliography.

Delgado was an under-educated, unsophisticated young man with a wild imagination. If Melanson were the scholar he pretends to be he'd know that Delgado tried to lead the Commission to believe that Oswald murdered a fellow who killed himself. If he were at all familiar with Delgado's post-Marines career he know that Delgado continued to make wild, unsupported and irrational allegations.

The other Marines who are clearly more dependable are all in the same volume, ~~xxx~~ where what they did before and after the Marines is testified to.

35 Melanson says Oswald "served at one of his nation's most sensitive foreign bases." ^(Asugi) This reflects either carelessness or ignorance because Oswald served at more than one. For example, Cubi Point in the Philippines, which is one of the most important of all foreign bases, along with Cubic Bay, where it is.

36 Without any qualification he says that in the "Marines Oswald prepared or was prepared "for his forthcoming espionage mission to the U.S.S.R." There is no basis for this as a bald statement and he does not present it as his opinion.

In citing authorities for Oswald's proficiency in Russian ^{here} he and on the next page Melanson omits what he should know from the published evidence, that when ~~met~~ his wife, Mariaa, first met him she thought he was Russian, from a different area, from his accent.

37 There is conspicuous^y dishonesty and abandonment of any pretense of reputable scholarship as well as a disclosure of personal animosity in: "In 1974 a transcript of ~~the~~ an executive session of the Warren Commission was released after a prolonged legal battle by a private researcher." The footnote reads, "Summers, Conspiracy, p 155." ~~Summers~~ Citing Summers is additionally crooked because the actual source, Summers' source, is in Melanson's bibliography. It is, uniquely, my Whitewash ~~III~~ ^{IV}. I am the only one who sued for the transcripts, of which that is only one, and Melanson, the professor who teaches the subject, knows it very well. (Parenthetically, it was the least prolonged of all my FOIA litigation.)

What is truly amazing about this petty business is what it reflects, either that

no publisher would get any ^{expert} authority to read the manuscript or that all authorities, all of whom have to know the truth about it, would either ignore it or remain silent as a favor to him, without regard to their own integrity. (I refer to it as petty because Melanson and I never had any arguments or disagreements and he felt free to write and ask for documents from me and to ask my opinions and he visited here and got copies of any of the records I got under FOIA that he wanted, including for his The Murkin Conspiracy, where he credits these documents to the FBI reading room and makes no reference to my getting them via extensive FOIA litigation. This reminds me, he knows from personal observation the extent of my archive, about 60 file cabinets plus innumerable boxes of records. I can't begin to remember all the FOIA suits I filed but they are well known in the field, certainly to anyone pretending to be a scholar, and the result is an archive of about a third of a million pages of previously-withheld records.)

Critics knew of the possibility of Oswald's having attended the Monterey school long before I got and published this transcript. The problem with the conjecture and one Melanson does not mention is that Oswald's service record almost certainly precludes the possibility of his having gone there long enough to attain any proficiency at all in Russian. ~~Unless, of course,~~

38 Here and on the next page he gives as his sources in his footnotes Commission publications but without exception all appeared in books he does not credit, with the single exception of Sylvia Meagher's, and she alone is dead of those authors. His account of Oswald's finances comes straight from Whitewash I, for example.

39 Unless he expands on this latter, he here reflects incredible ignorance of what is readily available on what he discusses on this page, as in the sentence where he says the Soviets "must have debated whether Oswald was for real or a spy." I expect to have occasion to expand on this later.

40 Where he discusses what Oswald told our Moscow embassy what he says is childish silly, the stuff of cheap novels, and at the same time ignorant of the publicly available data. What "extraordinary means" short of murder could the embassy employ "to stop the ~~journalists from spinning secrets.~~"

young Marine² from spilling secrets." Scholarly^{Um} scholarly ignorance is in the next sentence, "If the U.S. E³mbassy did not previously know of Oswald's access to secret materials, ~~he~~ if did now."

Immediately on Oswald's⁴ deflection" the FBI consulted his records at ~~NAVY HQ~~ Navy HQ. The FBI reported no security clearance of any kind. Also immediately the Navy cabled the embassy and also said his records reflected no security clearance of any kind but added the opinion that he could have had confidential clearance, the lowest of all clearances. So, the embassy knew what the official records show and had no reason to place any credence in any threat by Oswald to disclose big secrets - even if he had had any. The KGB believed he did not and did not question him at all.

Oswald presented no "risk to the U-2" to be "eliminated" by "some cold-war caper to silence Oswald." This is really juvenile! Can it be imagined what the consequences would have been had anything at all have happened to Oswald after he asked for Russian citizenship?

Oswald had no significant "U-2 data" to give the USSR that it did not have, He had no secrets at all "concerning radio-communications codes." This concoction again raises questions about Melanson's uses of uncited books because if he really did know the Dobovan testimony (the man in charge of Oswald's radar work whose name Melanson has always omitted up to this point), Melanson would know that as soon as Oswald "defected" the Navy changed all those codes he knew because it had to.

What Melanson says about alleged secrets relating to "radar installations" and "aircraft deployment in the western United States" reflects gross ignorance of the actualities of intelligence. ~~It~~ It is the stuff of cheap novels. There are no secrets about where there are radar installations. They disclose themselves when they operate. Oswald had no knowledge of aircraft deployment from his work in the El Toro security office, even if that were secret from the USSR and it gave a damn.

Melanson give ~~no~~ source for his reference to the USSR's "bugging of our embassy." That he does not again reflects consummate ignorance of the public material, published

in sources he does credit elsewhere and he should know very well. I expect to be returning
to this also. More, the conjectures at this point are childish. *(He ignores Yuri Nosenko, KGB,
who located 50 bugs for U.S.)*

41 "The Russians took him in and, presumably, his radar secrets along with him."
Rubbish! The KGB had ordered that he not be permitted to stay and his attempted suicide
(earlier referred to by Melanson as "allegedly") prompted the Russian Red Cross to get
him permission to remain in the USSR as a non-citizen. That Oswald was not paid for any
intelligence services to the USSR is reflected by the fact that he had to borrow money
from our embassy to return home by the cheapest means.

His notes for this page refer to Richard E. Snyder as a "diplomat" in our embassy
who dealt with Oswald, Snyder had a title. Perhaps Melanson goes into it later but he
does not here report that Snyder had been CIA. This would seem to advance Melanson's
theory that Oswald was CIA. So, is he a real scholar? Does he really know the available
material? Even in sources he cites, like Snyder's own writing? *If later, why not here?*

He again refers to those alleged secrets in "Oswald's radar knowledge." Radar
was not secret to the USSR or other countries, all of whom have and operate it. The
one area that Melanson could claim to be secret - but wasn't having been published more than
a year earlier - was Oswald's knowledge that we had height-seeking radar. But this is in
Lieutenant Donovan's testimony on the very page Melanson cites so Melanson does not
mention it at all!

Unlike most writers of non-fiction and at least many scholars, Melanson has a
phobia about giving names. Thus he refers only to "a New Orleans radio host," without
saying anything more about him or the station he was on - a station used by the CIA
to propagandize in Cuba, WWL. There are reports I cannot authenticate that this host
also had CIA connections.

42 He does get around to Snyder's CIA connection at the bottom of this page, saying
he was "alleged by some Warren Commission critics to have been working for the CIA under
diplomatic cover." On checking his note "some" turns out to be Jim Marrs' Crossfire, a
nutty and inaccurate compilation of all the nut theories Marrs could get. It is not even

a dependable source and no honest scholar, after ~~reading~~^{reading} it, would consider citing it as a dependable source.

He finally gets around to Snyder's admission of having worked for the CIA briefly at an earlier time in citing the House Assassination Committee. Snyder had written this years earlier in the Washington Post article Melanson cites without quoting this from it.

As with the executive session transcript, there can be a motive in delaying identifying Snyder as having worked for the CIA and not reporting it until after saying that Snyder was still working for the CIA when Oswald was there - it tends to credit the false version. This is supported by what follows, his argument that as of the time Oswald went to Moscow the CIA did have people under diplomatic cover. There is no point in this unless he is trying to persuade the reader that Snyder, despite denials, was then CIA.

He gets so carried away with his baseless argument about Oswald and secrets to spill that he here refers to "the magnitude of secrets Oswald might spill." Yet the one possible secret that is in the testimony he ignored on the page he cited several times, that of the authentic expert, Donovan, he did not mention. Some "scholarship"!

He next quotes the same page of testimony, again, still not naming Donovan, referring to him as what he testified he wasn't, "Oswald's former commanding officer," reels off, without direct quotation, the "wholesale changes" the "defections" required, and still excludes the height-seeking radar, the only possible secret that in any event was not secret!

Underscoring his abysmal ignorance of the very thing he touts here and did in The Murkin Conspiracy, the records disclosed in FOIA litigation and those of the Warren Commission available in the Archives, he concludes that "At the highest levels of the military bureaucracy in Washington, however, there was scarcely a ripple." As I note above, there was immediate reaction, the records were searched and the report on the search was aabled to the Moscow embassy. If he was not so utterly incompetent he could have used this to advance his argument because Oswald did have a high security clearance and it is not in his Navy records. The records are not honest and it can reasonably be inferred they were fixed to obscure intelligence connection.

It is "standard operating procedure to conduct a 'net damage assessment' for defectors,
44 But "There was none for Oswald." He cites no source. Yet it is apparent that there
had been such an assessment from the very testimony he has used, the changes that were made
immediately in the codes, etc.

What he could have used to make the point he is striving to make he apparently
does not know about. There was an investigation by ONI but its results were not given to
the Commission and have not been disclosed by the Navy and it is known that all of Oswald's
mates who should have been interviewed were not. He has cited Epstein's Legend, which goes
into this, and he has my Oswald in New Orleans in his bibliography, and it even includes
what one avowed mate told me and could have told ONI. If he read the book, he knew this
and if he did not read the books he cites them to inflate credentials he does not have.

The argument that follows is silly. As he gets carried away with it he blows the
Oswald defection up into "one of the most damaging defections in history." *It did no real harm!*

An account of the shooting down of the Powers U-2 flight follows. He then argues
46 that "the plane must have been flying at an abnormally low altitude when it was
shot down" and follows this with "Another qualified source, U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers,
opined that technical data ~~provided~~ supplied to the Russians by Lee Harvey Oswald may have
been the U-2's downfall." ("Downfall"?) Powers did not say that. His ghost-writer, Curt
Gentry did. It was Gentry's idea to have this in to help sell the book, not Powers', and
Gentry phoned me from San Francisco to discuss it with me. He knew there was no basis for it,
led me to believe he was not going to use it, and then did. Had Melanson used other
available literature or been a scholar and learned whether or not the Soviet's had the
capability, he'd have known that they did and that Powers had also said his plane was
downed when it was flying at the prescribed and presumably safe height.

He then quotes the book again on what is worse than merely silly ~~is~~ what is
stupid, having Powers say Oswald knew "how long we stayed out on any mission, and in
which direction we went." Oswald knew this from Japan, Atsugi, of California, El Toro?
Powers was shot down in the western USSR.

47 He argues that the CIA should have debriefed Oswald on this U-2 incident and says the CIA was "simple-minded" if it saw no connection. It is just plain silliness and ignorance to argue this, as it is not to argue that Oswald should have been debriefed, as was the CIA's standard practise with travellers, on what he saw and heard in the USSR. And on this very point he is conspicuously ignorant of the literature in his bibliography or has other motive in not citing it because I pointed out in my first book that what Oswald wrote about the factory in which he worked was precisely the kind of information all intelligence agencies want and seek.

He ends this page with what is incredible, that Oswald, who'd been in the USSR for a long time before the Powers flight, knew the "altitude" at which Powers would fly, and his "actual flight path." Aside from the obvious impossibility of this, if Melanson was at all familiar with what is public, including official testimony he has cited, he'd have known that they were last-minute determinations and are always variables.

There is no case to begin with and he makes it even worse by using undependable sources and adding his own ignorance to them. He lacks basic understanding of what he is writing about.

48 In this silliness of this page of baseless argument and conclusions he again is carried away by his concoctions to the point where he says that Oswald had "first-hand knowledge of the spy plane and its base." Its base was in TURKEY!

49- He goes into Captain Alexis Davison giving Oswald his mother's address in Georgia
50 so Oswald may visit here and has an understated version of Davison's expulsion from the USSR over his involvement in the Penkovsky case and cites the official claims that this was Davison's only involvement in espionage. But his deficient scholarship again denies him the ability to really question what Davison and officialdom said. Davison's mother had been a nurse in the White army at the time of the Russian revolution when she met his father, a doctor in the US invasion force in Siberia. She was as anti-Soviet as was possible. There is little more unlikely than that Davison would have sent a man he believed was pro-Soviet to annoy and aggravate his mother by his politics.

51ff As he continues what is more of an amateurish spy novel than a work of non-fiction

and gets the Oswalds out of the USSR and back in the US he is ignorant of facts ~~rather~~
~~than conjectures~~ that could advance his argument and he twists facts a bit and fails to
report what was well known, as that Otto Otepka had the Oswald file in his possession
as I recall after the assassination. In writing about Marina and the ~~K~~ Komsomol, he
omits the fact that she had been expelled from it.

54ff When he gets to the fact that the Oswald's had an apartment in Holland (he does
not say why but it was while waiting for the ship on which they sailed) he cites "some
researchers" without any source in his notes as believing this was a CIA safehouse or
for the Oswalds' debriefing. There is no way of knowing even whether there is anything
to either belief, but the point he misses is that the Oswalds were broke and had to borrow
from the embassy to pay their transportation costs. Who got those accommodations for the
Oswalds and how were they paid for?

If he had cited the available FBI reports on Spas Raikin he'd have learned more
about him and what Oswald said that he could use. ~~Instead he cites.~~ Instead he cites
secondary sources.

He is correct in noting how unusual it was for the CIA not to have debriefed
Oswald but his discussion is amateurish, incomplete and even unfair to the FBI. Rather
than make a scholarly assessment he seeks to advance his argument and again has a really
nonsensical and ignorant flight of fancy (56): "Oswald was a walking data bank regarding
Soviet techniques of debriefing and handling defectors."

How did Oswald acquire such information about KGB debriefing when ~~he~~ not only was
not debriefed - it never spoke to him at all! And what is there to the actualities with
Oswald to justify calling him a data bank on ~~the~~ "handling defectors" when he wasn't
~~handled~~ at all but was given a place to stay and a job by the USSR Red Cross

It is true that the CIA says it did not believe that the KGB was not interested
in Oswald but he is either ignorant or dishonest in stopping with this CIA claim and
saying no more about it. The KGB got all it needed to know about Oswald from the In-
tourist and hotel employees and it regarded him as unstable and undependable and merely
directed that he leave the USSR when his visa expired. Oswald was, ~~however~~ however,

interviewed by the other USSR spookery, the MVD. ^{He} is either ignorant or dishonest in not including this well-known fact.

^{Office} Oswald was back in the US, aside from any ^{country} CIA/debriefing, counterintelligence jurisdiction was with the FBI, ^{not the CIA.}

62 Oswald did not in Dallas "settle under the wing of George ~~de~~ Mohrenschildt, who, citing no sources, Melanson describes as "right-wing and with CIA ties." What is a "tie" to Melanson? Why no source? The White Russian community there was right-wing but what make ~~de~~ ^{he} ~~it~~, who was openly contemptuous of some of them, right-wing? This is scholarship?

63 Oswald's "new status as a traitor." Not true and no basis for saying it.

"...why he was not punished as a traitor for revealing secrets to the Soviets." Oswald was not a traitor and not only had he no secrets to give the Soviets, not only is there no evidence that he gave them anything, what kind of scholar does not know that there must be evidence and testimony and there was no evidence and no possible testimony on any aspect of this. It is irresponsible, immature, unreasonable and baseless.

Refers to Oswald's "observations about the deployment patterns of the Soviet military" based on something someone allegedly said that Oswald said and nothing else. Does he mean comments by observation, or what Oswald saw? Assuming that Oswald actually said it, there is nothing in what he has before on this to indicate that it was not something that Oswald had read. He was never in a position to see such deployments throughout the USSR. Which was pretty well known in any event by other means, including U-2 photography.

Then there is what is really wild and was never ^{suggested} by anyone, "The CIA would not have sacrificed its prized U-2 just to provide a cover for a fake defector."

Assuming on the basis of nothing but the smoke he has blown that Oswald served in an intelligence function in the USSR Melanson says what he has not addressed and cannot prove, that Oswald "continued in a domestic/spying role for the CIA" (which was prohibited the CIA by law and it is absolutely irrational to even suggest that he could have done for it what could justify the great risk involved in using him in domestic operations). "Nor would he continue to have CIA contacts." I am confident he'll not come up with anything substantial in what follows and he has yet to show that Oswald had any CIA contacts at any

time in his life to this point in Melanson's uninformed, inaccurate and distorted account of his life.

The penultimate sentence in this chapter is wildly irrational and were it not is without justification in the chapter: "The only way Oswald could be accepted as not (his emph.) being the traitor who downed the spy plane is if the Agency had precise control over the substance and number of 'secrets' he delivered to the KGB."

This is a complete and shocking departure from any rational concept of scholarship and honesty. *Why would it destroy its own valuable plane and pilot?*

It is even worse if he believes he has established these statement in this chapter because if he does he is nuts.

Chapter 3

65 He uses "links" as he used "ties," with no definition of either or any similar word. These words have little meaning except what he seeks to impart by suggestion rather than proof. It is the same in "CIA-related activities." What is "CIA-related" is what the reader takes from it. Moreover, there can be a relationship that has no meaning at all, like a bookstore from which it or its people get books or magazines. A newsstand, etc.

Oswald "founded a chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee." False. There was no New Orleans chapter.

66 With regard to Oswald's picketing of the carrier Wasp, he reflects his ignorance of basic and established fact with what he does not say. Here he is trying to make a case of Oswald not being alone and being involved with the CIA and he does not know or worse, does not see the significance in the fact that someone else was involved in this with Oswald.

Melanson, convinced that he knows all there is to know, again flaunts his ignorance in saying that when Oswald picketed the old (which he does not say) International Trade Mart that was the third time he picketed. This is false. Oswald was quite active in such picketing but the Commission did not report all of them. Again his ignorance, he says that when Oswald did this "the local TV news cameras were there." Not all, only two, and Oswald himself arranged for that. This is in the Commission's materials and he should know it.

He says Oswald "founded the chapter" of the FPCC. Again, absolutely false. There was no chapter. There was only Oswald's phony business and it was not related to the FPCC. He just made it up, as Melanson should know. And if he does know, there is no excuse for his persisting misrepresentation of it.

67 Melanson says that it was only three days ~~later~~ after Oswald appeared unannounced at Carlos Bringuier's store that Oswald picketed the Trade Mart. He cites Tony Summers' book as his source. I've noticed that quite often he cites books for what those books took from the Commission's publication instead of citing the original, Commission source. This is an old trick of the rip-off artists who have been so active in this field. By seeming to be generous in crediting other and earlier publication they obscure the fact that they do not credit the sources where they want to give the idea that what is not credited is

their own original work. There are a number of instances of this at this point. *And why not cite The First or at least early book? Summers was a late book.*

There are two versions of this time lapse in the Commission's evidence and both *by Carlos Bringuier, published* are wrong. That they are wrong is established by a Secret Service record of which he knows ~~nothing~~ nothing, apparently, although I published it in a book in his bibliography. The leads were there for following, Melanson didn't follow them and I did. Bringuier's story is just plain false, as the Secret Service record I refer to establishes and I have additional documentary proof in Bringuier's handwriting and dated by him. My point here is that despite his pretense to be an authentic expert Melanson simply is not and oblivious of it flaunts his ignorance as he tries to build a phony case in his book and a phony reputation for himself. There is much, much more of this than I've indicated. He avoids dependable sources, whatever his reason, ignores the vast amount of documentation now available, draws upon the undependable, particularly conspiracy theorists whose work just stinks, and puffs himself up with the manner in which he handles this stuff.

Sloppy, sloppy, ignorant still again when he pontificates, "It would be interesting to know the ultimate source of the 'tip' that brought Bringuier into a confrontation with Oswald," inferring that it was part of the nonexistent CIA plot of which Oswald was part. The truth is that this is in the Warren books, in part, the part that identifies the Cuban friend of Bringuier's who ran and told him. The name slips my mind at the moment. *Celso Hernandez.* The

actuality is that Oswald himself set out to do this, what it would have helped Melanson's contrived case had he but known it. But despite his pretenses (that are just as false in The Murkin Conspiracy) he has done no real investigation of his own and depends ^{o/n} undependable secondary sources, as will soon be seen. Oswald spent quite a bit of time and effort conspicuously picketing close to Bringuier's store - and was ignored. ~~He~~ was seen doing this regularly on Canal Street, the main street very close to Bringuier's store. Only most sensible Cubans stayed away from Bringuier. He was known in that community as "El Estupid-es." This means "The Stupidity." Those level-headed Cubans took their complaints to the Catholic Cuban Relief and Mrs. Elise Cerniglia, who ran it. Had Melanson followed the leads in the Warren material he'd have interviewed her, as I did. (And not only her, others.)

Melanson replaced "source" with "friend" in quotes, ^{m/}plying that it was not a friend who told Bringuier where Oswald was. (And Bringuier did not have to "search," as Melanson says, to find Oswald.) Then he does correctly provide the name, Celso Hernandez, and asks where he got the information. This is in the Warren testimony: he saw it!

"Bringuier and his associates were extensively involved with the CIA." False. This, Melanson seems to say, is because Bringuier was the "New Orleans head of the Directario Revolucionario Estudantil," which he proceeds to exaggerate and misrepresent. There was but a single New Orleans member of the DRE: Bringuier. So, he "headed" himself!

There were organizations that had been financed by the CIA, like the Cuban Revolutionary Council, but that ^{f/}unding has ceased, as had any relationship with the CIA through it.

"Bringuier was the publisher of a right-wing New Orleans Newsletter. It was funded by the Crusade to Free Cuba." Source: Tony Summers' book. The actuality is that the then defunct Crusada, as it was known, was started by two Cubans, with one of whom, were he not so ignorant of the facts, Melanson could have used to forward his argument because he could alleged an Oswaldⁿ connectionsⁿ with him, the late "onnie Caire. (Who was also a registered foreign agent! Wow! What Melanson could have embellished that into!!!) It was ^{a/}rip-off, the Crusada. The other guy had been the last New Orleans head of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. The CIA broke its ties with the CRC- and again, what Melanson could

have done were he not so ignorant of what is well-known, in this instance by Warren Commission publication - the very month Oswald appeared in New Orleans. That guy, whose name also escapes me at this moment, had to flee New Orleans, to escape a Logan Act charge. The name is Sergio Arcacha *S m Th*.

Citing Summers as the source, Melanson says that the Crusada was "yet another CIA-funded anti-Castro organization." False. Never any CIA connection and the "organization" consisted of those two characters. *And amounted to nothing. It was Teacher's Scam*

68 Asking why Oswald, after being arrested, asked to be interviewed by the FBI and then lying to that agent, Melanson says, "One explanation is that he was sifting the Bureau's files as part of establishing his pro-Castro cover, a cover he needed in order to pursue certain intelligence activities (which will be discussed on the next chapter)."

The one thing Oswald would have done, had that been the purpose Melanson mind-reads into existence, was to have seen to it that he would not have had such a cover.

Throughout this manuscript, as is true throughout The Murkin Conspiracy, Melanson displays a childish concept of the FBI and CIA and intelligence in general. He gives a story-book account that even for such an account is childish and immature. The FBI has and keeps extensive files and checks information out. They knew there was nothing to Oswald's story and came close to ignoring it entirely. *Had* he not "defected" they'd have ignored it entirely. They also knew that there was no pro-Castro activity in New Orleans. They had and they checked sources, so if Oswald had in mind what Melanson puts there, he failed, as anyone acting with an intelligence agency would have known and as any intelligence agency would have prevented.

Melanson says that Oswald went to the unemployment office "looking for demonstrators." He in fact went there to hire someone to help him with his picketing. One young man, Charles Hall Steele, *Dr* took the short-lived job. Melanson again avoids names, as he does more than not, a strange form of scholarship and of writing. Melanson says also that Oswald had only one helper. Now if Melanson had done any investigating, as he didn't and I did, he'd have known from two obvious sources, the man who reported Oswald's ITM picketing to the FBI, Jesse Core, a public relations man who had his office in the ITM building and who also had that

function for the ITM, and Steele. Both told me that Oswald had at least one other assistant, unknown to Steele. Other anti-Castro sources say he had more than these two and worked out of an automobile, which he did not have.

Citing ~~now~~ Commission sources, testimony, ~~exhibits~~^{or} and documents, Melanson ends this page saying that Oswald "and his lone helper passed out leaflets just long enough to be photographed by a mobile unit (sic) from a(sic) local TV station."

Well! This does establish his ignorance of the very records ^{has} he ~~cites~~¹ and of the well-known information and the reputable and even some of the disreputable literature.

That "mobile unit" did not exist and it ~~was~~^{was} two, not one, TV stations, WDSU and WWL, and the Commission published frames from both films and used them extensively in questioning witnesses and seeking identifications of people. In each instance there was only a single cameraman with a shoulder-bag. WDSU's photographer, Johann Rush, did not even go the few blocks to his studio after filming Oswald. ~~He~~^{He} took a woman who worked in the ITM building to lunch.

~~66~~ 70 "Behind Oswald's pro-Castro facade lay numerous linkages to the Byzantine world of the anti-Castro movement." No source is given and no real source can be. He clearly is referring to what precedes in this chapter and that is worse than worthless- it is misleading and/or false and fabricated.

Again, ~~was~~^{was}lessness, sloppiness or ignorance where he refers to Oswald's distribution of copies of a pamphlet by Corliss Lamont, "The Crime Against Cuba," with "the address ~~at~~ stamped inside the back cover: FPCC, 544 Camp St., New Orleans, La." What he does not say is that only a few had this address stamped in them. Most didn't. The Commission had some trouble getting the copy with this address from the FBI, as he fails to report.

71 In referring to the office of Guy Banister being in the 544 Camp Street building Melanson ^{Sources! For the location of a building?} gives a very large lily by giving seven. For the first time he cites one of my books and he is careful to obscure the fact that it was the first and the other^{rs} followed and copied from it. He does not list it first. He cites to more than the office being in that building and mixes the undependable with the dependable, leaving the reader no way of knowing which is dependable, if he actually knows, and which isn't. Some that might be assumed to be dependable, like Jim Garrison's books, are least dependable.

The footnote typography, without spacing or paragraphing, is confusing. I see now that he gives but three sources on the building and Banister in it but what I say above with regard to it is true as is the next footnote in which he mixes undependable sources for what he says about Banister

72 By putting "detective agency" in quotes he pretends that Banister did not have one. He did, and he was also engaged in various extreme-right activities. He also fails to note that a source he depends on elsewhere, Jim Garrison, ^{is books} places Banister's office on the second floor when it was in the first, the street floor with a private entrance.

He says that Banister "helped" to establish the CIA-backed Cuban Revolutionary Front, giving Summers as his source. In fact the Frente, as ~~it~~ was called, was organized before Banister had any involvement with it, if he had any. Summers uses sources who have no credibility at all.

For the fact that men one of whom used the name "Oswald" asked for a ~~contract~~ ^{bid on the} sale on 10 vehicles to be used as ambulances in Cuba (Melanson says "trucks,") he avoids giving a source but has an irrelevant source indicated at the end of the next sentence. This information appeared in my Oswald In New Orleans, from which Summers picked it up and used it, with my assent, although he did not credit it.

He gives no ~~source~~ source for what there is absolutely no reason to believe, that Banister "knew" or "knew of" Oswald before he returned from the USSR.

If what follows is true, as some isn't, it has no real point except in an amateurish fiction. When he gets to address ^{the} Oswald had noted in his addressbook he cites Summers as the source. ^{He} well knows that this originated in Oswald In New Orleans, from which Summers and others adopted it. And when he gets to the non-existing addresses there, I am the one who checked them out and later gave them significance, and that originates in the same book. Others who used it added nothing to it, as he also knows.

He says this strange matter of those notations by Oswald "is easily explained by his working for the Agency." He doesn't say how and it isn't true. Another bit of fiction-writing rather than non-fiction: he makes it up as he goes and probably believes it.

HE SAYS THAT Oswald, the "potential left-wing spy (a new kind of "spy") walked

20 64
into the nerve center of anti-Castroism in New Orleans and tried to palm himself off as an anti-Castro activist." There was no such thing as a nerve center for that activity there, whatever he may mean by "anti-Castroism," and ~~only~~ only once, in the store of The Stupidity, did Oswald pretend being anti-Castro ^{Castro} and then not ^{as} an "activist." He had done nothing anti-Castro.

He continues to blow smoke and call it links of a chain, He has the CIA administering anti-Castro groups from New Orleans, when there was no such need ~~at~~ and he has no evidence.

He cites an undependable source for saying the CIA had an operation there but he could,

if he knew the material, ~~have~~ ^C cited a dependable source, the Church committee of the U.S. Senate. But that does not mean it was supervising anti-Castro work and there is no evidence that it did there. He does cite this committee (on 78) for the mail-opening

work the CIA did there, but that does not relate to what he is talking about in any way.

He says he learned under FOIA, big deal, and the only such personal claim he's been able

to make to this point ^{N/}, despite his puffery, that in 1967 the CIA had 22 employees there. But

he does not say what they were doing, when ~~at~~ he could and should have, instead deliberately

misleading the reader. The CIA's domestic-contact service has an open office, listed in the

phone book, and that has employees ^{The CIA station and had a} ~~it~~ also had a station chief. He makes a big deal about

a station chief's name that is a big secret, with an undependable source. At the time of

those 22 employees - in all - the CIA had in New Orleans the station chief's name was well

known. It was Leake. *How many of these 22 were clerical? He suggest all 22 were clerical.*

He concludes ^{pro-} ~~anti-~~ this chapter saying that "Oswald's ostensible ~~anti-~~ Castro activities were firmly ~~en-~~meshed in the city's anti-Castro subculture." This is wordswordswordswords.

He has established nothing at all, certainly not what he claims in this sentence. It is an incompetent, over-written ^t, exaggerated, fabricated, imaginary "mesh" that he just has not established.

The one thing he continues to establish is his own ignorance and his systematic departures from authentic scholarship. No real scholar - not even the National Enquirer - would even think of using ~~the writer~~ Delphine Roberts, Danister's former secretary, as an only and a dependable source, as he does.

In addition to what I say about Melanson's FOIA request to learn the number of CIA employees in New Orleans, in and of itself a useless inquiry, reflecting a lack of understanding of what is and is not important and significant and an amateurish and immature approach, Melanson is unfair to the CIA in his use of the information.

Both the FBI and CIA do have responsibilities, proper and necessary responsibilities.

New Orleans is a large and important port and base of commerce, particularly with Latin America. One of the proper functions of its International Trade Mart was to promote business. This business was in part with dictatorships, like those of Samozza and Trujillo in Central America and Pinochet and others in South America. They had many enemies and when they or those representing them went to New Orleans there was, as there should have been, governmental concern over untoward events, including efforts to assassinate them. Thus the CIA and the FBI had to be prepared to frustrate any such efforts and that required them to be informed, to keep up with what exile groups might be up to. With the FBI, as an example, in those days SA Warren de Brueys covered the ITM as a reporter or policeman covered a beat. ^{situation} This required extra personnel be assigned by both agencies.

Because New Orleans is a large port for sea and air transportation, there were more returning travellers to be interviewed by the CIA's domestic contact service than say IN Dallas or St. Louis.

Melanson infers that all those CIA people, including clerical personnel of whom he makes no mention and who swelled the number to 22, were engaged in spooking. This is not true and in the way he uses it it is not honest.

Chapter 4

80 To refer to David Ferrie as a homosexual does not satisfy the need of this amateur novelist pretending non-fiction. He ~~was~~ says he was fired by Eastern Airlines because of "his on-the-job homosexual activities." No source gives ^{it}. In fact it was as he should have known a New Orleans police case and it involved juveniles. He says Ferrie "was hairless from head to toe" but cites no source. ^{It} was alopecia totalis (approx. spelling) and the only original source is Oswald in New Orleans. Much of this trash is without source citation, but ^{when} he does cite sources and as usual uses secondary sources

81 ^{He} makes needless mistakes that do reflect his personal ignorance of the subject/matter: "Ferrie was in a federal courtroom in New Orleans watching as ^G Carlos Marcello was being cleared of charges that had resulted in his temporary deportation." There is no such things as a "temporary deportation." He was cleared of immigration charges. Ferrie was not in the courtroom. That is prohibited for witnesses, which ^F Ferrie was. And as I report accurately in Oswald in New Orleans, with a cited and ~~repeated~~ quoted FBI report as evidence, he was in the witness room, where witnesses are until they testify. He was with FBI SA Regis Kennedy, who filed the report. ^{Kennedy} He also was a scheduled witness.

"Ferrie's precise relationship with Marcello is not known." It is not known only to fakers pretending to be experts. He had only one relationship with Marcello, and it was not a direct relationship. Ferrie was a friend of and was used as an investigator by one of Marcello's New Orleans lawyers, G. Wray Gill. (As the ^{so} pretendedly omniscient Melanson failed to note in the preceding chapter, Ferrie also worked with and hung out with Guy Banister.) Gill recommended to the late Jack Wasserman, a Washington immigration specialist with a fine reputation, that they use Ferrie as an investigator. Wasserman was the lawyer in charge of that immigration case defense. ^{and Bill hired Ferrie.} He agreed. ^{It} is Ferrie who went to Guatemala and came back with the evidence that got Marcello acquitted. (I see he does have Ferrie working with Banister lower on this page. This is characteristic of the endless jumping ~~as~~ around I've observed up to this point. He didn't take time to organize his writing.)

82 ~~He has~~ ^{They} Ferrie working for the CIA. His citations lack credibility and report ~~them~~

^{as fact}
unconfirmed rumors. There is ~~no~~ real evidence of any kind and no real reason to believe that Ferrie flew CIA missions to Cuba, bombed it in raids or rescued anti-Castroites. If I remember correctly, internal CIA records state that he did not work for it. Melanson boasts of his time in their reading room so he should be able to put it one way or the other from the CIA's disclosed records.

He refers to "the Cuban~~e~~xile training camp outside ⁿNew Orleans." In fact there were at least three, all of no significance in training, and they were not "outside New Orleans." They were all on the far side of Lake Pontchartrain, which is 30 miles wide, as I recall. They were in St. Tammany's Parish and at least one was a scam.

He says this camp was raided "by federal agents seeking to enforce President Kennedy's order forbidding anti-Castro military activities on U.S. soil." I know of no Presidential "order" of this description, which is minor ^{my} compared to the rest of what happens when primary sources are not used. His one citation is to the House Assassinations Committee and to a new story.

From the top, the one he refers to was not a "camp" or any kind of "training camp." I was there; he wasn't. It was a bungalow loaned to some Cubans by the Moloney who had been involved in mafia ^{b/}gambling in Cuba. His brother was a tennis star. ^{Cubans} They used it to store an strange assortment of explosives that with their concept of secrecy and security they brought in on an open U-Haul trailer. Then, in cleaning up the accumulation of leaves and other trash on the grounds and setting fire to it, they almost set the house with all those explosives in it on fire. A neighbor phoned to complain to the local Sheriff and he notified the FBI and the FBI raided them and saved that part of that Parish, off Ponchartrain Boulevard from devastation. JFK had nothing to do with it.

83 In blowing all of this so far out of reason he says of those he says are Ferrie's CIA-linked associates, like ^{ink} Danister, who really had no such leak, that Sergio Arcacha Smith of the CRC "had an office at 544 Camp Street at the same time Oswald used this address on his pamphlets." No source and there can't be any because it is fictitious. The CRC had not been in that building for a year or more and Arcacha had fled New Orleans long before then.

At the bottom of the page he does admit that the CIA told the Justice Department that it had had no relationship with Ferrie and had no file on him. That he has not cited anything that reasonable people can regard as refuting this did not deter Melanson from wandering about in his fictions he regards as fact.

84 In going ~~in~~ into Ferrie becoming suspect he again avoids the original source and cites one using it. It was first in Whitewash II (1966) and then in Oswald In New Orleans (1967). and he can't even ^{crib/ m/} get simple things like this straight: "He was taken in for questioning by the FBI but was released." He was arrested, not just "taken in," by Jim Garrison's office ^{not the FBI} and it dragooned both the Secret Service and the very unwilling FBI into questioning Ferrie. After they placed no charges, Garrison, not the FBI, released him.

He refers to what Ferrie did after the Marcello trail was over, which was the day JFK was assassinated, and says his "movements" are "unexplained." This is false. They were explained, by at least three people in the Warren Commission materials and more in the disclosed FBI records to which he has yet to make a single citation, such is his scholarship. He may not believe the explanations ^{ions}, and the whole business - that I brought to light, not other sources he cites - is at least strange. But not unexplained.

As usual his scholarship requires that as many names as he can be omitted so he does not mention those of Ferrie's companions. He refers to the phone calls that were made but he had no real knowledge or understanding because he'd never have ignored the fact that one ^{call} was to Marcello's motel. However, it was by unnamed Alvin Beauboeuf, whose mother worked there and he phoned her.

86 He ~~repeats~~ says, "By far the most significant of Ferrie's activities and associations are those involving Lee Harvey Oswald." He then says that Ferrie led the New Orleans unit of the Civil Air Patrol." He gives no dates for Ferrie's leadership and there were two such CAP units, not one. How well informed he is!!

"In 1955, while Ferrie led the New Orleans CAP, Lee Harvey Oswald joined." There is no source indicated here ^{it} but the one at the end of the next sentence cannot apply. The truth is that when Oswald was in that CAP unit Ferrie was and had been inactive and not on the CAP roster. Some connection!!!! And "association."!!! He is just ignorant of the

readily available data or doesn't give a damn or both. *And it is easy to call from there who just make it up.*

87 He begins this page by assuming what he has not shown, a ^{Ferris}Ferris-Oswald relationship. "One might assume this (Oswald in the Marines) would be an end ~~to~~ of any relationship between Ferris and Oswald....(b)ut Oswald was again in Ferris's company after returning from Russia." (The is no footnote to this entire paragraph so we are to divine the source, unless he did that, which is probable.)

In what follows his lone source is the completely undependable Delphine Roberts, second-hand from Symmers, for whom she had been conditions by Garrison's people and others. Aside from those personal qualities which make it ^{im}possible to credit her, particularly as a lone source, and the fact that she radically changed what she was saying after her initial refusal to be interviewed and speak at all, she was then engaged ~~in~~ a feud with Banister's heirs over possession of some of his papers. Using her as a witness to Oswald and Ferris being seen together reflects adversely on Melanson's knowledge, judgement and professional and literary standards. It is anything but the conclusive proof represented.

It is not unfair, ^qhowever, to refer to the Clinton, La. witnesses as "solid evidence." Unlike Melanson I met and spoke with those people. They were impressive and none appeared to have any reason for not being truthful.

I believe but am not certain that Melanson is wrong in saying their existence was not known to the Commission and I am certain it was known to the FBI and that I have or have seen its reports on them.

The real question is of identification: did they see the people they say they saw or did they see others who looked like those they said they saw. Impressive as they were, the New Orleans jury in the Shaw case was not moved by their appearance and testimony. It deliberated only an hour in acquitting Clay Shaw.

88ff ^{ly}Clinton is more than "a hundred miles north of New Orleans."

He has about ten pages on the CIA's domestic-intelligence adventures. These can be relevant only if a firm link to the CIA is established. He does not do it and he cannot. He returns ^{briefly} to Clinton and its witnesses at the bottom of page 96. But before ^{getting} getting

he seeks to build his phony case of an Oswald-Ferrie association by referring to Ferrie as Oswald's "old CIA buddy," ^(on 91) which is at least an exaggeration and I believe is not in any sense established. Had Melanson consulted the FBI's records originally withheld that I obtained he would have known that for the period of time Oswald could have been in the CAP Ferrie was out of it. The FBI depended not on the recollections of people ^{Melanson has no idea Ferrie-Oswald "connection"} mostly then boys but on the CAP's records. He also displays the smattering of ignorance he palms off as expertise in saying, on page 92, that "COINTELPRO was a massive counter-intelligence effort conducted by the Bureau against radical and left-wing groups in America." It was not in any sense a "counterintelligence" operation. It was an operational function by means of which the FBI created tensions, disturbances and disunity within the targeted groups. It was a mesh by which it sought to harm them and people in them by an assortment of dirty tricks that included character assassination, suspicions of marital infidelity and in general a bad public image of them and people in them. It was in an effort to make these wrongful activities appear to be legitimate that the FBI resorted to Orwell and called them ~~KKK~~ "Counterintelligence." The CIA's CHAOS was a similar operation with similar objectives.

Without the firm connection to the CIA that is missing this amounts to padding and is irrelevant.

But with all of this space devoted to what he has not made relevant he avoids two basic tests for the Clinton story: is it reasonable and if it is, is it possible? Whether or not the young man seen there was Oswald, was it reasonable that a man like Ferrie would be with a man like Clay Shaw has to be addressed. All that is known about Shaw says he would not have had any association with a man like Ferrie. But were this not true, or had it been true that it had been Banister rather than Shaw ^(which is from the Shaw defense, as Melanson does not say), what ^{or could} purpose did either man serve? There is nothing in the story from the Clinton witnesses that says that either made any effort at all to help Oswald get ^{m/} what was not an important job. From the stories they just stood around and served no function at all, other than providing transportation, and for that neither was necessary. Nor was Ferrie, in any conjectured role. Had Clay Shaw

wanted to get Oswald a job, first of all, it would not have been in Clinton but in New Orleans, where without any difficulty at all he could have gotten Oswald employment. He could have given him a job at the ITM, where he was the boss. And he had multitudinous connections, business, professional, social and political. While to a lesser degree this is true of Panister, there are many places he could have located ~~Oswald~~ Oswald and it would have been much less trouble that taking a day to go to Clinton. It is probable that either could have been of more help to Oswald at Clinton ^{And not only at the hospital.} merely by using the phone.

So, although the Clinton witnesses are impressive and appear not to have any ulterior purposes, their story does not answer the basic questions of reasonableness and probability that any investigator, writer or scholar should ask.

99 On returning to the alleged Ferrie connection Melanson says without question that Oswald was always under some agency's control, "What may have prevented further surveillance activities relating to Clinton ^{or} ~~of~~ CORE (and he has not established that there were any at all in the Clinton story) was that Oswald was suddenly being moved back to Dallas via Mexico." This is nonsense and from a scholar, it is worse ^{se} than nonsense.

The young man did not qualify for employment at that hospital. Period. So leaving there had nothing to do with some mysterious force "moving" him. And none of this is in any way related to "any further surveillance ~~of~~ . . . of CORE."

Melanson always pretends to be an expert on the spookeries but he displays less actual knowledge of them than a reasonably intelligent person would get from reading well-done novels about them. (This is starkly ~~apparent~~ apparent in the last part of The MURKIN CONSPIRACY.) If any agency had "moved" Oswald to Mexico and thence back to Dallas it would not have had him travel the way he travelled and he would not have been permitted to be as conspicuous as he made himself. While they all use some strange types, they all also observe the demands of tradecraft and they avoid, except for possibly special purposes, those who attract attention to themselves. In transit and in Mexico City Oswald violated all that is taught and is essential, as he had repeatedly before then, and thus he became a liability and a danger to any spookery that used him. This is just greasy kid-stuff, not scholarship or responsible writing.

More sloppiness, ignorance, carelessness and irresponsible writing: "Ferrie was

taken into custody by the Secret Service shortly after his skating trip." It was not by

(A few pages earlier he says it was The FBI.)

the Secret Service! How can he be so grossly ignorant of what is so very well know and,

if he had not examined the official records, is fully and accurately reported in some of

the books he presumeably read, like Oswald In New Orleans? It was by Jim Garrison. And

Ferrie was not "taken into custody." He gave himself up. In going for the irresponsible

theorizing and conjecturing of the exploiters and other uninformed and undependable

authors and in lacking the ability to investigate and ~~analyze~~^{analyze} on his own Melanson misses

what he could have used responsibly and reasonably of that strange trip Ferrie took. He

quite obviously expected something to happen. Learning whether or not it had is what

accounts for the phone calls he made back to New Orleans. This is not conjecture. The

fact is that he expected some kind of word from his lawyer/friend G. Wray Gill and he

kept checking to learn if he had that word. He did get ~~whatever~~^{would to come in and let him.} he expected from Gill,

He spent the last night of that three-day trip with a friend (who I interviewed and

all this is in FBI records I got. Melanson didn't) and then, the next morning, turned himself in to Garrison's office.

That Melanson could make this kind of mistake repeatedly ~~and repeatedly~~ says that he not only does not have the expert knowledge he pretends, he also lack the understanding required for this kind of writing. But factual errors like this permeate this book and the previous one. To a degree they are careless, but they virtually all reflect ignorance of the basic material all of which ^{was} readily available to him.

"The reason for the question has never been explained," the question being had Oswald borrowed Ferrie's library card. Ignorance again. It had been reported, by a very undependable source who immediate undertook to get ~~Ferrie~~^{Ferrie} in trouble, that He had loaned his card to Oswald. Who, it happens, did not need any, having his own.

He then says that "Ferrie was under heavy surveillance" by Garrison. He doesn't have the remotest notion of what "heavy surveillance" is - and he cites no source. In fact the only surveillance was on Ferrie's apartment, and that was not by any police or Garrison employee. It was by a young man one of Garrison's detectives used.

A minor but typical exaggeration is his statement that "a large bomb" was found in Ferrie's apartment after he died. What he fails to say is that it was disarmed and thus could cause no damage.

102 Any unsupported inference that the ~~D. D. P.~~ del Valle murder in Miami was connected with Ferrie's death, an apparent suicide, ignores the high incidence of brutal murders among anti-Castro Cubans in the Miami area. There was a high incidence of murder, often seeming to be from political disputes and most often by the far right. That the two men knew each other is meaningless. *Melanson makes no real connection between these deaths.*

103 He concludes this chapter with a gross error and a misrepresentation of the meaning of his quotation of the HSCA's conclusion: "Since Oswald consistently demonstrated a left-wing Marxist ideology, he would not have supported the anti-Castro movement. ..." (102) Of this Melanson says, ~~the~~ "The assumption that Oswald's left-wing involvements were real rather than a charade has forced all official inquiries into weak explanations like the one above." The HSCA is explicit in saying that Oswald was of the left and there is nothing at all weak about this statement, which is not any kind of "explanation." All official inquiries were convinced and ~~are~~ stated their convictions straightforwardly, Oswald was of the left. There is nothing weak about any of them. If Melanson were familiar with the five-volume reports ~~of~~ LBJ ordered of the FBI before he appointed the Commission he would know that it could not have been any more explicit. Indeed, it exaggerated and magnified Oswald's leftism. *Melanson* (The alternative is that ~~he~~ ^{he} is familiar with this document, known as Commission Document 1, and ignores it because it is so diametrically opposite what he here states.) As a result of the official effort to establish that Oswald was of the left even his writings when he was 16 years old were published. Oswald was consistent: he was always of the left and never of the right.

Chapter 5

105 More of the sloppiness and/or carelessness that never ends. In the footnote he says that Oswald took apartments in ^D Dallas after he returned from Mexico. Never once. He had cheap and crummy rooms in rooming ^a houses and a private home. ^{is} This can be deliberate,

34
however, to lead the reader to believe that Oswald had more money than his known income represented.

Here he is explicit in assuming Oswald's guilt, without any assessment of the evidence and in contradiction to the books he cites when citing them serves his preconceptions of Oswald's intelligence involvement.

He also contradicts his argument that Oswald was a functionary of a domestic-intelligence operation because he describes Oswald's one "street brawl" in New Orleans, in which Oswald did not begin ~~the~~ fracas with Bringuier, as "street brawl^s" which are, in his words, "evidence of mental turmoil that would induce him to commit murder the very next month." He then says maybe this behavior was rational, "as a covert ~~action~~ frame of Reference." But he had included Oswald's attempted suicide in Moscow, in which he almost succeeded in killing himself, as part of his alleged instability, "mental turmoil." Now he says that maybe it was rational. He wants everything both ways and to be able to select which suits his arguing of his ~~pre~~ preconceptions.

Although he bases very much on Oswald's political views he has not at any point made any effort to define this. They are definable from a clear record. Oswald was an anti-Soviet and anti-American Communist Party young man who claimed to be a Marxist. The FBI and the Commission never once referred to him as a Communist. So what was he? He said he was a Trotskyite and this is consistent with his hatred of the USSR and US Communists. There is nothing at all inconsistent with a very abundant record Oswald left on this and if Melanson does not know this he is much too ignorant to have presumed to write such a book. If he does know it, then he is verily dishonest.

He begins this chapter with an account of Oswald going to a Dallas ACLU meeting with Michael Paine and he depends on Michael Paine's opinions. But he has not at any point had a word to say about this or about Paine or about Paine's separation from his wife Ruth or the fact that whatever Ruth's politics were, she had Trotskyite close relatives. This was established in the FBI's investigation of them, all available to Melanson and all ignored by him - if he ~~was~~ even aware of them. All indications in both books ~~are~~ ^{are} that

35
except in pursuit of his preconceptions in his "safe" formulation, of assuming guilt in both crimes and thus supporting the official mythologies, he made no effort to examine these disclosed records. Which, I emphasize, he excludes from his credits and acknowledgements and his bibliographies in both books.

It is apparent that both Paines did not like Oswald.

107 He says that after this ACLU meeting and after joining the ACLU Oswald wrote the American Communist Party. He implies for the first time, but it wasn't. He wrote it when he was 16. As I perceive how Melanson is going to argue I note that his argument could be advanced with reference to Oswald's writing similar letters to both the Communists and Socialists when he was 16 and he could not have been honest in both letters. If he does not go into this then his knowledge of the known fact is scanty. Both letters were published by the Commission. They were, in fact, the basis of a pointed statement by the Academy of Forensic Sciences, of which only the ignorant would not know.

There is no question about the fact that from his youth on Oswald's record is that of a provocateur. Why or whether on behalf of other interests is a question but not the fact. If Melanson omits this earlier history and knows it then he is deliberately dishonest. Unless he wants to argue that the spookeries recruit children.

He argues (107ff) that Oswald's purpose was to link the ACLU and the Communist party. Maybe he'll say why. He says this was the purpose of Oswald's attendance at the ACLU meeting. His first step in this alleged linkage was to write the Communist Party and ask, "Could you advise me as to the general view we had on the American Civil Liberties Union and to what degree, if any, I should attempt to heighten its progressive tendencies." (emphasis added) Yet this professor/ subject-matter expert makes no effort to describe the reaction of the Communist Party to such a letter. This was a red-flag letter. Anyone not a Party member who wrote it and identified himself with it, the "we", is immediately suspect and the Communists were with more reason than most always suspicious. It is, obviously, a self-serving letter that virtually advertises its provocateur's intent. Nobody working for any spookery would write anything like this and continue with any spookery connection be-

30
cause as Melanson does not say, although it is well-known and in the disclosed records, the ~~the~~ FBI had informers working inside many headquarters of the left, including the Communist Party and the FPCC. They thus got ^{at least} the return-addresses from all letters.

What Melanson then argues ^{is} childish, like Oswald was inviting the CP to commit itself on paper in response to his inquiry, in pursuit of his domestic-intelligence role. He says also that ^{at} "This letter, by itself, established a linkage between the two organizations. (108) This is the maturity of a college professor? *It established nothing!*

Oswald did have a postal box for which he authorized receipt of mail to the ACLU and non-existing Dallas FPCC. ^{Melanson} He says, childishly, ^{at} this also established a "link"- and "another pro-Communist link for the ACLU." ^{It} It did not establish any link and the only way in which this could be conjectured is to prove that the box was under surveillance, as it was not and as there was no reason to believe. But more, how would ^{it} be a "pro-Communist link" for the ACLU? Was the FPCC Communist? It was not! The anti-Communist Trotskyites were most prominent in it and at that time the Cuban Communist Party was actively opposing ^{Castro} Castro. (What a knowledge of modern history and political science ^{is} this college professor displays!!)

109 Oswald's "FPCC activities were finished." They never began. ^{He} He never engaged in any activities for the FPCC, he was never authorized to and he was told by it not to. ^{His} His continues the construction of The phony case fabrication of which began in the prior chapter in which Melanson says what was never true, that Oswald's was the FPCC's New Orleans chapter. ^{It} It never had any there. *Not did Oswald.*

Melanson never wonders whether there could be any other explanation for Oswald's putting both the ACLU and FPCC in his box rental. One is could he be living ~~off~~ fantasy of some kind, or could he have had some unperceived purpose not indicated in what is known about him. Instead he just assumes that Oswald had linked the CP and ACLU and, with all the wisdom and knowledge of a college professor/subject-matter expert, wants the reader to assume a) that some useful spook purpose would be served thereby and b) that it would be unique, never having ^{it} happened before.

Can Melanson possibly be this ignorant? Can there be any innocent explanation?

The next ~~approximate~~ links two thoughts; the strange description of a tiny room Oswald rented, half of a room that had been divided into two, "Whatever transpired with (sic) Lee's leftist cubbyhole hole (sic) in Dallas," with "the federal bureaucracy may well have known about it." The second part of this fantasy is even stranger than the first, whatever he may have meant by "leftist cubbyhole," because he has been saying all along that Oswald was part of a federal intelligence agency's domestic-intelligence operation. So, how in the world could he have been ^{there} without the federals knowing it?

He then flaunts his ignorance and in doing so depends on the date ^d/Sylvia Meagher book.

(Of all the assassination books, he singles out her truly magnificent book for praise in his acknowledgement, her book only. It happens that she is the only author on whom he depends, without more often than with credit, who is no longer ⁿ alive. In this he appears to be generous in ^d creating others when he isn't where their work is basic, indispensable to his. He describes it as "early," which it wasn't. I alone had published at least three and possibly four books before her ^s appeared and there were quite a few others. Consistent with this he avoids crediting the other substantial works wherever possible and not uncommonly credits instead later works that ~~draw~~ ^{draw} upon these earlier and dependable works. Those he favors in his citations are, when he can cite them, those that like his fabricate solutions of one kind of another and, in general, theorize conspiracies rather than establishing the fact of a ^c conspiracy. He also draws on the work of others without crediting it. This is the common practise of those who seek to make reputations out of nothing for themselves. Here his citation of her work represents ignorance and underscores at the same time that it is dated and that, lacking the knowledge of a real subject expert, he is ignorant of that and of the publicly-available fact.)

110 The FBI did give the Commission a copy of the letter Oswald wrote the FPCC from Dallas, saying it got the copy from "T-2." This professor, this subject-matter expert, does not say a word about T-2 or what it represents. ¹¹ Instead ~~he~~ he contrives a self-serving question that is stupid, ignorant and reflects a childish, story-book concept of how the

police and intelligence agencies work and what is important to them:

"Did T-2 intercept only one Oswald letter, or was the government privy to all the leftist missives sent by Oswald and was it also monitoring his new FPCC/ACLU box?"

First T-2. There is no such person. There may have been and undoubtedly were many thousands, if not many hundreds of thousands, of T-2s in the many millions of FBI records.

In New York, In Dallas, in every FBI office, where there is a need to protect any source, be it just a source of information of an official informer, never referred to by the FBI this way - they insist on "informant" - identify is protected by substituting arbitrary "T" numbers on each record. It is not impossible for a single FBI SA to have a half-dozen or more different "T-2s" in a single day's output of reports. And the next time he cites these same sources, they may have entirely different T numbers. The method of numbering is in accord with citation within any report, first is 1, next is 2, etc. Who is T-2 today may be T-100 tomorrow.

So, there was no one person, T-2, to intercept earlier or later Oswald letters.

How he can regard himself as a subject-expert and still not know what the FBI has disclosed cannot be explained. He is just ignorant of anything he does not take from books or other people except for the scanty and preconceived and obvious nit numerous reading-room records he has read. The story of this particular T-2 was disclosed by the FBI in its general releases (to forestall suits that I and probably others had indicated would be filed under FOIA) of December, 1977 and January, 1978, close to 100,000 pages. This T-2 was the FBI's, or one of the FBI's, informers inside the FPCC national headquarters.

Sublime in his ignorance, and to continue his fabrication of a non-existing case, he wonders whether T-2 was the "monitoring" of Oswald's box. This is also really stupid! Who ever heard of placing outgoing mail inside a postal box and how in the world was Oswald going to get inside the post office to put it there and why would he? Assuming, of course, that he never used ^{the} mailboxes throughout Dallas!

He next refers to the fact that the post office does not have the required receipt for Oswald's rifle mailed to him at this box. He gives no source. He thus pretends that

that it is his own work, derring-do investigator that he is. In fact it is cribbing. Which he does more often than I've indicated. Here it is flagrant.

He next displays his scholarship by referring to a Senate subcommittee without giving its title of that of the committee of which it is part and instead refers only to "the Dodd Committee." It is in this connection that he has another stupid conjecture,

"Perhaps Oswald or his handlers wanted to create some data on the threat of subversive firepower." *(I am not certain but I think he cribbed this silly notion, too.)* First of all, absent Oswald's alleged assassination, who in the world would

ever have known that he bought a rifle by mail? What did any such "handling" create that did not already exist in innumerable magazine and other ads? Can this ^{professor,} ~~professor,~~ this subject-matter expert, be so ignorant he is not aware of the countless publications proving so much material on how to kill. and with what and how and where to get it? Even a man who is in the Commission's and the FBI's records as having been propositioned to begin wholesale assassinations by killing JFK published such magazines and manuals and sold them by advertising. (He is Robert K. Brown, currently publisher of "Soldier of

Fortune Magazine and one to whom Oliver North sent his agent, Robert Owen, to see and consult with in his anti-Sandahista adventures.)

This is ^{or} ~~worse~~ than stupid and ignorant. It is senseless, but he stops to anything in his fabrication of his non-existing case.

and what he is really saying is that Oswald's alleged handlers knew many months before it happened, before Oswald left ~~the~~ ^{from} the Dallas area for ^{then} "ew Orleans and went to Mexico and returned to Dallas that he would assassinate the president. How else could the alleged handlers have been creating something the Dodd subcommittee could use?

111 The stupidity and the irrationality are endless. He says that if "Oswald was a leftist ideologus, the forging links among these various groups would make sense in terms of his political world view. " Even were this true, those links did not already exist? Of course they did! And this assumes that Oswald did forge links, which he did not in any way.

To carry this notion forward he describes the ACLU dishonestly, as an "ultra-liberal defender of political freedoms, including those of far-left political action groups like the FPCC." Perhaps it did defend the FPCC. He does not give a single specific and + do

40

not have an independent recollection. But it also defend^{de} Nazis and ~~did and~~ racists and the KKK. (Earlier, ag^{ay}in dishonestly to adavce^{DUHLE} his fabrication, he described the ACLU as composed of liberals only. This is not true of either its membership of the lawyers it used in multitudinous court cases.)

He next returns to what has been disclosed about the CIA's improper domestic-intelligence operations under~~the~~ the code-name CHAOS, the conjecture that this ~~included~~ "surely included the ACLU." Surely included is a new forth/of fact or evidence for him. Those records are public and he boasts of his use of the CIA's reading room. And of his use of FOIA. Why didn't he ask the CIA for such records?

He follows this with general comment and conjectural interpretation of what the CIA was up to with the conjecture that Oswald "was creating a paper trail" for the CIA to follow to the CP and the ACLU/ This is a ~~story~~ fairy tale, not a paper trail!(113)

Having said earlier, ⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ when it suited his contrivances, that Oswald had no FPCC activity after he left New Orleans, he here quites Oswald's alleged paper-trail/CIA activity, his letter to the ^{FPLC} ~~ACLU~~ in which he reported to the FPCC on April 15 ¹⁹⁶² that he had picketed in Dalls for the FPCC the day before. ~~In Oswald's activity in New Orleans he was ordered to give out 40-50 more FPCC pamphlets to give out in Dallas. Consistency is indeed the hobgoblin of small minds.~~ (114)

He then says that although a policeman reported such an incident as Oswald reported in his letter to the FPCC, "there is no evidence that this ~~incident~~ incident ever occurred." Reality is whatever suits his purpose. To the point where he actually says that April is not "late Spring." So it could not have been Oswald because he left Dallas by April 25. And he has April 15 was "within a week of" April 25. He has even simple arithmetic problems.

Having gone through his Clinton hokus-pokus of perhaps Banister trying to get Oswald a job there, he here says that Banister "hired young men to infiltrate college campuses in New Orleans and search out pro-Castro sympathizers and activists." Was not Oswald, from Melanson's own description of him, ideally suited for this employment by Banister? Why the Clinton deal, then? (In fact, if Melanson knew anything at all about Banister, he also hired young men for other duties. I know some who worked for him when they went to college.)

including one seriously crippled, who found motion awkward, difficult and slow.)

115 He says that the CIA "announced its intention to conduct covert (domestic) activities," citing the House Assassinations Committee as his source. This meant public announcement and that not only never happened, it would have been to proclaim law violation. What he is really talking about is the CIA's telling the FBI that it was only thinking about a Cointelpro operation against the FPCC by "planting deceptive information which might embarrass the " FPCC.

116 He says that in New Orleans "had to print his own literature (3,000 copies)..." He ~~must~~ ^{mean} have printed, but if he had done any investigating, instead of assuming the official account he'd have had what would have given him some substance for his contrivance. I interviewed the only two people in the world ^{Oswald} who know ~~he~~ who had that printing done, the late ^{of} Douglas Jones, who had the Jones Printing Co. around the corner, no less, from where Oswald worked, the ~~Jones~~ ^{Jones} Reilly Coffee Co., and down the street a block or so from Danister's office, and his assistant, Myra Silver, and Jones twice, separated by a year and ~~Silver~~ ^{Silver} Silver once, in Jones's presence, both insisted it was not Oswald who got that single-sheet throw-away Melanson describes as "literature." More, the person they ^{both} did identify as having gotten it would have helped in a serious, legitimate inquiry into any connections Oswald may have had.

Well! For once he understates, whether ^{it} be more of his carelessness, more of his sloppiness or both, saying "There is no evidence" that Oswald "attempted to broaden his ~~own~~ chapter's (sic) membership..." He actually refused Carlos Quiroga, who is an anti-Castro Cuban, who tried to join up. And in talking about Oswald's picketing of the carrier Wasp again, he again fails to report that fingerprints other than Oswald's were on one of the Jones sheets he gave out and the N.O. police got. (The cop's name is Austin and this is well known and is included in the Commission's and the FBI's disclosed records.)

Assuming without question the Ferrie-Oswald relationship for all the world as though it was established fact he next conjectures a reason for some of ^{Oswald's} his activity that can account for his failure to report that Oswald was known to have refused membership in

phony and non-existing FPCC which Melanson always refers to as a chapter of the national organization. It is that he "found the right-wing ~~in~~ New Orleans too tough a place to make a go of a chapter. Aside from the fact that obviously Oswald wanted no members, New Orleans was not monolithically right-wing. There was an abundance of Democrats and quite a large liberal population. If he had been at all serious in organizing a legitimate chapter Oswald could have done this in the colleges alone and easily. What Melanson says is neither reasonable nor factual.

As not infrequently, he gets carried away with his own mythology and here refers to "the heart of the anti-Castro bastion at Camp Street." Bastion? The sick-in-the-head Banister and the organizations he was in that were meaningless and ineffectual when they tried to do anything? Contrary to what Melanson has said, the Cuban Revolutionary Council had left that building a year earlier and if this had not been the fact, it is the fact that the CIA had ended its support of the CRC and there was nothing left of it. It was done.

Bastion? Ferrie? Aside from the fact that an FBI report of years earlier had him ^{suspected of} ferrying arms to Cuba, there is no anti-Castro act attributable to him.

What else is there for this imagined "bastion?"

Melanson never did locate Bringuier's store. When Camp crosses Canal it becomes Chartres in the old French Quarter, and Bringuier's store was on the next ^{street} block, Decatur, so he can't be including Bringuier in his "Bastion" that never, ever existed there, although there was much anti-Castro feeling, particularly among the many Cubans there. But even the actual rather than his imagined anti-Castro organizations never amount to much and all went broke for lack of support.

117 That Oswald read spy novels he interprets as his learning that craft^{ed} or "learning how to be a spy." His other reading was on communism.

Because he knows nothing about what Oswald was doing some of the time he was in New Orleans he says that "Oswald went underground for two months. ^{By} this reasoning most of the world's people live in the underground perpetually because there is no reason for what they do to be of any interest to anyone and it thus is not reported.

But before Oswald went "underground" he wrote an unsolicited letter to the Communist paper, the Worker. This Melanson describes as "important" because, as he dreams it, "The Letter established a linkage between the FPCC and the Communist Party. Even if there had been an FPCC in New Orleans, as there was not, an unsolicited letter does not establish any kind of "linkage." Nor can a letter from a non-existing New Orleans FPCC. Calling this merely a dream is to praise it. It is sick.

118-9 "To strengthen ~~this~~ the linkage, Oswald sent along some honorary FPCC membership cards." Unsolicited honorary membership cards in a non-existing organization establishes a linkage?

That Oswald was rebuffed merely strengthens this linkage as it would any other kind like it. It was rebuffed, although Melanson does not say this in referring to what the CP replied to Oswald. Instead Melanson, flaunting his political ignorance, interprets this as meaning that the CP was afraid of being connected with anything and everything to the right of center by the right and by the spooks. The fact that he continues to ignore that the world communist movement then was opposed to Castro, although this later changed. But Melanson does not entirely ignore. The CP had written Oswald that it had no organizational ties with the FPCC. The CP "was wrong in a very important sense," Melanson intones from whatever cloud he is on, because "it did now. Oswald ~~had created that~~ on paper." His writing an unsolicited letter to the CP with honorary memberships in what did not exist tied the CP to anything at all? Of course not! Even assuming that the CIA or FBI knew what Oswald did, how could they possibly use anything that utterly meaningless? They'd have been laughed at.

119 He says that, in August Oswald's FPCC activity, which never existed, his being a phony, one-man "organization," became "feverish." This refers to his ITM picketing of a few moments and to the wrong date for his appearance at Bringuier's store, albeit the wrong two different dates that Bringuier testified to falsely to cover himself, and the scrap that Bringuier, not Oswald started. "Feverish"?

He next displays his maturity, wisdom and scholarship by treating an unsolicited

44
and self-serving letter Oswald wrote ^{as} the real thing, as factual and as establishing that, in advance of the fact, Oswald was reporting Bringuier's assault on him. He makes this even more confusing by omitting dates, except for that of Oswald's letter.

120 Oswald again sent the CP an unsolicited letter, enclosing a clipping of a news account of this scrap and again enclosed an honorary membership in his non-existing organization.

121 Although Melanson says that most of what Oswald told the FBI agent he had asked to interview him after the police arrested him is false, he nonetheless says that this was "all part of his job of discrediting the FPCC by tying it to Communist subversions." This is done by giving the FBI lies? The FBI is that ignorant? Or that desperate for whatever uses Melanson imagines it may have had?

122 In the course of this nonsense he cites what Oswald told the New Orleans police to its FBI file number, 89-69, and enormous file, but scholar that he is, he omits its unique serial number. More, having omitted any reference to FOIA litigation, mostly mine, he here pretends this is his work. It isn't. It is mine and mine alone. His omission of the serial number indicates that his actual source may be secondary, with the serial number omitted in it.

Displaying his ignorance again, and in this case the ignorance includes Oswald's entries in his pocket addressbook, published in facsimile by the Commission, he refers again to TV Station WDSU having sent a mobile unit, an imaginative description of Johann Rush with a shoulder-bag on his way to lunch. Then he says, "It would be interesting to know what brought WDSU to the scene (of his ITM picketing) so promptly." It was Oswald's on call to Vern ^R Kottman, as I remember the name, in the WDSU newsroom.

122-3 He then, again without his phobia about names, perhaps safe for him with his lack of knowledge, refers to the radio interview of Oswald. The interviewer was Bill Stuckey, who reported connections a less ignorant scholar might have found provocative, along with his writings.

(How would Melanson as a college professor, or most college professors, grade a paper in which there was so determined and permeating ^e refusal to give names, addresses and significant dates?)

45

123 He refers to Ed Butler of the Information Council of the Americas without reference to any of Butler's connections, which were those Melanson attributes to Oswald. Persisting in his myth that the FPCC was in New Orleans Melanson says that when Butler identified Oswald as having defected ^{to} ~~the USSR~~ the USSR, that was a ~~to~~ "bombshell" and especially against the FPCC.

124 With his tricky footnoting in which when he makes something up he concludes that paragraph with what he can provide with a footnote ^{he} says that "Bringuiet's DRE published a newsletter," which is false and would have been ludicrous if with his limited command of English Bringuiet had tried (it is also false if he had in mind that Bringuiet published in Spanish because he published no newsletter at all); that this nonexistent newsletter "was also backed by the CIA-funded Crusade to Free Cuba," which is also false, and with consistent falsity he says the Crusada "was the fund-raising arm of the Cuban Revolutionary Council", and not to relieve his falsities in this paragraph he says it was "headquartered at Camp Street above Guy Banister." To all of this his note cites page 67 of the Commission's Volume 16 and my Oswald in New Orleans, p. 79.

Citing the Commission's volume is padding and meaningless but the more footnotes generally the more impressive, including to publishers and editors. The only thing relevant on that page is the address of Bringuiet's store and this serves no legitimate purpose because that is what he cites in Oswald In New Orleans. However, in my book he did pick up the ~~fact~~ Ronnie Caire connection with the Crusada. Only it says, if he'd turned the page, nothing at all about being funded by the CIA, which it never was, having been Sergio Arcacaha Smith's scam, that Caire lost about \$19,000 in ~~it~~, and that, without giving Arcacaha's name, "about \$4,000 was raised and some of that was 'pocketed' by another."

This is to say that not a thing Melanson ^{says} has here bears any relationship to the sources he cites. This includes the fact that Ronnie Caire was not head of Crusada, as Melanson just made up. *It is 100% false, fabricated.*

It is too bad that while he was helping himself to my published work he did not help himself a little more. That was not because the occupation was at all strange to him.

It is by now quite ^{ob}vious that his concept of scholarship is to make something up and then see what he can ~~street~~ stretch to justify or seem to support it or contort into a semblance of support. But he would have helped himself and ~~not~~ ^{his} avoided ~~the~~ frequent displays of subject-matter ignorance if he'd used the FBI report I printed saying that the CRC had not been in that building for a year when Oswald returned to New Orleans, or if he wanted to be really precise, he could have lifted from page 346 the exact date on which the CRC left 544 Camp Street, February, 1962, a little more than a year earlier. The source was the man who still had records, having had those CRC connections, and he also reported more on scamming and that Arcacha had been fired and had had to leave the area.

^{Melanson} If ~~he~~ wanted a bit more, it is on the next page - that although the cover for Arcacha's scam was that his ~~Cross~~ Crusada was going to raise money for the CRC, it never did, that it was a failure, and that it had folded soon after being announced. He can't even copy it straight!

He next, agains without a name, says that Butler's INCA "had as its manager a man who was a member of the ~~CRC~~ CRC. Big deal, being a member. Automatically connects with some spookery? Well, the man he does not name is Manny Gil, he was not the manager but a flunky, Butler running the operation himself, and Gil did get tapes for INCA to use without having to pay for them.

His phobia for names ~~lingering~~ temporarily, he says that Pringuier said he'd sent a friend to Oswald's home to pose as a spy. This was Carlos Quiroga, whose name I provided ^{when} he omitted it earlier. What kind of scholarship - or writing - it is to leave out all the names he has omitted and why does he do it?

125 He finally does use William Studkey's name, ^{having} omitted it when he should have used it, on first mention. He has no question that a Washington source ^{Stuckey} would not identify informed Stuckey before the broadcast that Oswald had defected.

Melanson, expert on the intelligence agencies that he says he is, here writes, "It is unclear how the Washington source divined (sic) that Oswald was about to appear on a New Orleans radio show." But that source, supposedly a reported, ^{gave} Stuckey the dates on which Oswald's defection was reported in the Washington papers. How many reporters does

41

one suppose walk around with such clippings in their pockets and have such marvelous powers of divining what is going to happen so far away? (Melanson does say that it is known that the CIA had such clippings. "e does not say that the FBI did, but it also did.)

127-8 Melanson says still again that in sending an unsolicited letter to the Communist Party Oswald was again establishing a link to it for the FPCC via his non-existing chapter.

He also says that because Oswald had said the CIA was "defunct," that was "an odd comment for a leftist ideologue but not for an Agency spook." Fortunately, he does not undertake to explain this absurdity.

Nor does he find it strange that the two other characters seem to have avoided bringing up Oswald's defection but primed Bringuier to do it. Impartial moderator, "tuckey was, and shrinking violet Butler was.

129 He says all of this was " a major ~~xxxx~~ and propaganda coup for Bringuier and the anti-Castroites" but he spares our stomachs and minds but not bothering to tell us how it did the utterly meaningless Bringuier any good or could have or how it did either for those unnamed anti-Castroites. It was of no consequence.

Oswald wrote another unsolicited letter to the CP and that, ~~to~~ to Melanson, is an "addition" to the "paper trail." It meant nothing and it did nothing and it could have meant nothing and it could not have done anything that would be of any use at all to any spookery. And after repeating this letter in full Melanson gets on his Sargantua-sized pogo stick and snakes a big jump: he describes Oswald as the comrade "comrade" of the CP leadership. This for a man who was not a member and was, actually opposed to them. (131)

132 ~~White~~ ~~White~~ Whether it is ignorance of his obvious lust to establish himself as the subject-matter expert he isn't and as a derring-doer of original research, he says that "There is also evidence, neglected by most researchers, of Oswald's efforts to lump the leftist groups together and link them to domestic and foreign communism ...extended to the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) as well."

There are ways Oswald's approach to the SWP could be and was addressed other than he has. One is through a picture Oswald had taken of himself in 1962 in which he has

48
along with his rifle, copies of the publications of the CP and the SWP. Now anyone with a grain of political savvy in his head knows that the two were blood enemies and that there was nothing that Oswald could have done that could "link" the two enemy parties.

What can be said for the researchers he seeks to put down is that they ~~did~~ did not invent any such nonsense as he contrived of the sending of unsolicited letters ^{forging} ~~forges~~ a link. And some of ^{of} these he lumps together as researchers are pretty huffy and wild in what they've imagined.

It is not at all exceptional for Melanson to be careless but I do note that at the bottom of this page he refers to the SWP as "the socialists." That is a different party. 134 After saying that there is no evidence that Oswald ever sought out communists in New Orleans or Dallas he says the FBI said he was unknown to Dallas Communists and was not a member. He also says, correctly, that the FBI had two informers inside the Dallas Communist Party. What he does not say is that it had only six members and all or all but one of them was somebody's informer.

Melanson's conclusion is that Oswald was "incapable of seeking out and contacting his supposed ideological brethren." They were not his brethren. He despised the CP, as is clear in his secret writing that the Commission did publish and I quoted in my first book, which is in his bibliography. He then continues to cite the evidence that Oswald had no left-wing connections in either city but he says Oswald did have contacts with the ^{right.} ~~write~~ His scrap with Bringuier is some kind of connection! But he enlarges Oswald's right-wing connections to include the dubious Clinton matter.(135)

With a bit more mumbo-jumbo he says that what Oswald did, or at least his version of it, "fits the Agency's expressed intention of 'planting deceptive information'" to embarrass the FPCC. Except that he uses this to suggest to the reader that Oswald was CIA, it for once is not unfair. Maybe what Oswald did did embarrass the FPCC. But if so it meant little because it was soon out of business anyway. He adds that Oswald was helping to "legitimate domestic spying by the CIA." He says it so we gotta believe it.

136 His last sentence in this paragraph is, "Oswald's pro-Castro involvements(sic) would be a central element in the purposely crafted image of Oswald-the-assassin."

49

There is a typical reflection of his arrogance and ego in this reference to the alleged lack of research on the actually non-existing Ossald- SWP connection. If Melanson does not know about it, it therefore does not exist.

I do not know of anyone other than Jim Garrison who actually believed that if someone writes someone else an unsolicited letter they are linked by it in any way. Even if the FBI, CIA or any other agency obtained copies. Melanson is not well informed, or he'd had known and said that the mail to those organizations, like the CP, FPCC and SWP was obtained for the FBI from its informants. There was a major and successful SWP lawsuit against the FBI for its many intrusions into their activities and that of members. The Warren Commission records reflect that FPCC and CP mail was given to the FBI and its disclosed records say how this was done. But while making unjustified slighting references to others he is ignorant of this. Yet awareness of the unsolicited Ossald letters is essential for ^{re} their to have been any kind of link, even if an unsolicited letter were to be so considered, unreasonable as that it.

Oswald also sent the SWP a print of a picture of himself in the Neely Street back yard, holding his rifle and with its publication and that of the CP in the picture. That The Worker is in the picture would turn the SWP off because the parties disliked each other intensely.

A great amount of work was done on the picture Oswald sent the SWP. So much attention to it was generated that the House Assassinations Committee had to make some kind of investigation. It was not at all as Melanson represents, only that others did not go for his amateurishness in his firm belief that an unsolicited letter makes a bond.

It is also interesting that he omits all the many and not infrequently deperable reports that Oswald's political beliefs were closest to those of the SWP and he did tell others that he was a Trotskyite. If Melanson did not know this then he reflects still again his ignorance of the subject matter. If he did know this and suppressed it, then it is still another reflection of his dishonesty.

Perhaps he will yet explain this; he doesn't here. So I merely note that there is no evidence at all and he has cited no evidence at all that reasonable people not chasing wildly after a contrived conspiracy can consider "pro-Castro." Melanson himself as said that what Oswald did did not help the FPCC, as close as he can get to anything he can contort into being Castro. There is no "link" between Oswald and Castro so this point and there can't be later because it did not exist.

This is quite a scholarly tour-de-force. Unusual scholarship, to say the least!
A truly amazing historian/political scientist.

Chapter 6

137 From its title, this has to be hot stuff: "Dallas: The Long Arm of Langley."

After a quotation of what is well-known, that the CIA engaged in domestic intelligence, this: "The unseen hand was there (Dallas), moving events toward the climax of the President's assassination." If he does not mean the CIA or some other intelligence agency of our government, I do not see what he means. Or can mean. Pretty awful, with no more than the scrambled assortment of gibberish up to this point. In spades: "The events of Oswald's life in Dallas are often obscured by mistaken assumptions -- that Oswald was not an intelligence agent, that the CIA has no clandestine involvements."

If there is a mistaken assumption that Oswald was not an intelligence agent (and agent he could not have been if he'd had any association), ^{Melanson} he has yet to present a single, tangible fact to make it credible that in any capacity Oswald served an intelligence agency. Must talk, much inference, innumerable factual and logical errors and an abundance of suspicion but not a single thing else. That the CIA was engaged in domestic intelligence, which is without question, means nothing at all here without something correct and tangible, proven with reasonable certainty, that it was involved in the assassination. It isn't here.

138 He faults the Commission and HSCA because "they interpreted the events of ~~the~~ Dallas through the prism of Oswald-the-leftist-ideologist." But he had a kaleidoscope^{le} we can approach these events with a much different perspective." This begins with a remarkable bit of absolute rubbish; "CIA linkages to Oswald, so clearly manifest in New Orleans..." He has made no connection of the CIA in New Orleans of any rational kind, none factually.

resumed

(Nothing omitted in quotation) begin to emerge in Dallas immediately upon ~~his~~ his return in "une 1962" from the USSR. How? Because George De Mohrenschildt became his ~~ex~~ closest friend and became a, if not the (his emphasis) primary influence in the young man's life." Yet, this man ~~W~~ provided some of the most damaging testimony about Oswald to the Warren Commission." Quite a feat, de M having been in Haiti for many months before and at the time of the assassination. He knew nothing at all about the assassination, testified to nothing at all about it, and did no harm to Oswald. Describing him as ill-tempered and violence-prone described an appreciable percentage of the people of the world and means nothing about the assassination. (Perhaps we are getting to one of the reasons

Melanson merely assumes Oswald's guilt and never addresses a single fact about the crime.

Another is that he doesn't know enough about the crime, having spent his time chasing theories that have no substance.) He quotes deM as saying Oswald was jealous of JFK. *(Actually, he resented and hated JFK)* That is real evidence! Melanson says Oswald had no money. Doesn't his spookery pay anything? CIA agents are well paid and he says Oswald was an agent. But reason and logic, as we have seen, deter Melanson as little as fact.

139 Melanson runs off a bit about their alleged "close relationship." He does not even estimate how many times they were together. The fact is that it was far from an every-day event and they were together not many times at all. An appreciable number of those times were when the deMs were befriending Marina, taking clothing to her, things like that. (I wonder if he ever gets around to reporting the time De M spent in the ~~park~~ psycho ward of Parkland hospital or that he killed himself after being emotionally ill for some time.)

The history he gives de M is meaningless absent some direct connection with something real, of which there is no sign. ⁴his suggested that I skip ahead in looking at his notes to this chapter, 107 of them. He has some of the most exalted sources, like Cladestine America, the sina qua non of scholarship, but he has not a single one to the subversive files the FBI has on him. Which he could have gotten here had he asked. But he did not even know about them, his scholarship and subject-matter knowledge being what they are.

52
145 As I skim his many pages of his version of de M's history and see that it is angled and both undependable and not having the meanings he attributes, I see an outright lie that he has to know is a lie: "Michael Paine moved out of ~~his~~ his home when the Oswald family moved in." He has^{ed} already said that Oswald ~~didn't~~ didn't live there but visited weekends so Oswald did not move ^{in there} in. Also, Michael and Ruth had a broken marriage and Michael had left before Ruth drove to New Orleans to pick Marina up and bring her to Dallas.

Marina and her two children did not move out and find other quarters after the assassination. She was ^{forcibly} ^(Secret Service) in protective custody until she appeared before the Warren Commission and by then she'd been given enough money by sympathetic people and had gotten some through literary rights so she had enough money for her own home. And the CIA had nothing to do with it. (I have a file drawer of letters caring Americans wrote her, some with gifts. The FBI intercepted and copied them all and I got them from the FBI.)

146 By now Melanson has de M Oswald's "CIA baby-sitter," a silly notion invented by Jim Garrison, to whom Melanson gives no credit.

And having made this big deal about the close relationship between the two, Melanson now finds something sinister in Oswald having de M's phone number on a scrap of paper - a phone number he could not get from information because it was unlisted.

I note also that he does not say how long a period of time at the outside the two could have associated. It was only a few months, not much time for the Svengali bit.

147 His comment that Oswald has just paid his brother \$200 that he owed him reminds me that his spooking pay must have been in scrip because it took him a long time just to get out of debt, to his brother and to the State Department, the two not much more than \$600.

148 Melanson is now to where Oswald was working for the Dallas printing company, Jagers, Chiles, Stovall. Here his scholarship draws heavily on Tony Summers' theoretical popularization, Conspiracy, as he does less concentratedly throughout this chapter. Tony's book is his source for saying that this plant "processed and analyzed photos taken by the U-2 plane." In a pig's eye the CIA let them out to anyone! It was a printing plant, not the CIA's phot-intelligence center. (This is like Henry Hurt's theory, and he draws on Hurt extensively, too, that Oswald was sent by the Russians to spy out the names of