

pieces that were being set in type for Cuba. Insabe, and Hurt finally dropped it. Of course the dependable sources are second-hand rumors. *(The U-2s had photograph had all of Cuba.)*

"It seems that Lee Harvey Oswald couldn't avoid crossing paths with the Black Lady of espionage." Nice ^{to us} laugh that. But it would be even nicer if it were true or meaningful. It is neither.

When he repeats that the printing plant did the CIA's photo intelligence for it I wondered what the CIA does? Run the Soil Conservation Service? He sure has a deep understanding of intelligence agency. Real deep.

"...this was programmed," his association with that Black Lady. So the CIA could get its own plane destroyed, which is what happened to the one Powers was flying? no doubt!

149 He finally mentions a name, of a fellow worker, Dennis Offstein. But he makes no reference to Offstein's history and associations, which he would have liked. Ignorance again.

150 Even true to his high standards of scholarship he says that "In Dallas Oswald had a cache (sic) of strange and expensive equipment, especially for a lowly stock boy living on a menial wage. Among the items found by the police after the assassination was a Minox camera (nice added insertion, *generally referred to as a 'spy camera'*")...15-power Wollensak telescope...binoculars...camera filters..slide viewer..ansco flash assembly, lens hood, a 7x18 telescope...." Everything except the one camera Oswald owned. This was all the property of the Faines, which was swept up by the police. Their records and other things too. Boy is he the truly discriminating scholar! He does not demean himself to cite the published official records on this ~~in~~ the Commission volumes he has. He takes this from all people, Jim Garrison. Garrison could see deviousness and plots where even Melanson couldn't.

He concludes this page with what he presents as his own discovery but what he knows I published in 1965, the word "microdots" in Oswald's addressbook.

151 To leave no doubt about his intent he begins this page, "These references have been only partially deciphered by previous research." Apart from what he will, I presume, report deciphering, I did not need his help in *deciphering* the word "microdots." And

54

perhaps at this point, because I have to suspend, this being that painful to me, I also note that he gives no credit to those who before him had the idea that Oswald could have had interesting connections. He read my first book. In assessing Oswald's ^{career} in New Orleans as it was reported by the Commission, I said, having been in intelligence, that it was consistent with what in intelligence is called "establishing a cover." I am not trouble^d that he does not acknowledge this but I regard it as less than honest for him to pretend that what he did not do and did not ~~first~~ conceive first he claims to have done and to have originated.

But that Oswald put "microdots" on the page on which he has the address and phone number of the place he worked does not necessarily connect the two, although it might. Any examination of his addressbook shows that he not infrequently has unrelated items on a single page.

What follows on this page relating to the photography at the printing plant is a deception. Printing by offset requires photographic enlargement and reduction but both at all like what is required to reduce what is photographed to even smaller than "elanson indicates. Making microdots is a sophisticated process and there is nothing at all to indicate that this plant had the need and was able to make microdots and all the indications are that it did not. Perhaps it is with this deception in mind that he fabricated the incredible, that the CIA farmed out its photo-interpretations when it in fact kept them very close and did them in its own center for precisely those things, *at W.P.I.C.*

It is silly for him to suggest that there was anything Oswald knew that he had to send to anyone in the form of a microdot, yet "elanson says his letters should have been examined for them. (He actually has no way of knowing that they were or they were not.) He certainly has not attributed to Oswald any such knowledge.

Microdots are concealed in many ways other than he says they are and were.

He fabricates utter ~~nonsense~~ ^{nonsense} in saying that were a microdot to be located "it might reveal much about Oswald's spy missions (not one of which he has established) and about the identity of those who controlled him" (and no control is established except in his fictions.

This is so ludicrous it is pathetic. If Oswald had in fact been working for ~~CV~~ with any official agency, why in the world would he have sent anything at all like microdot information, even assuming he had any, to the FPCC, the CP or the SWP? He would have sent it to the agency, and in the United States, he would have given it to his presumed ~~but~~ non-existing handler. Domestically, there is no need for the cost and trouble and danger of using microdots.

This is but another of the innumerable reflects ^{IMO} of his amateurish, spy-novel concept of intelligence while he seeks to palm himself off as an expert. *Such ignorance!!!*

I'm taking time on this stypidity because among mature people as well as those who know the book will be ~~alughed~~ ^{laughed} at and because it is not unlikely that there are reviewers *are experts and* who have the knowledge to perceive what I say. Reviewing books like this is sometimes assigned to reporters who have some and in instances considerable knowledge of the subject matter and who know experts in espionage and on the subject. I have heard from them when books have been assigned to them to review and probably other critics have. A *competent* review of this book could become a disaster, a spectacular disaster.

152 His description of the equipment at that plant is of what is normal in such a plant and is not of microdot capability and he is not satisfied with the denials of plant employees that microdoting was foreign to them.

152-3 What he has Offstein attributing to Oswald is what Oswald could have learned from the very spy books charged out to him at the library. Anyone reading spy fictions knows about microdots. The *only* thing surprising about the cited testimony is that Offstein worked for an intelligence agency and knew nothing about microdots.

Melanson misrepresents and exaggerates Oswald's job and knowledge of photography. He was an apprentice and a rank amateur. Had Oswald had any real interest in photography his only camera would not have been a very cheap Russian camera. Perhaps, if not from ignorance, this is why Melanson is so dishonest in telling the reader that all the ~~the~~ Paine's equipment, including the ~~Minox~~ ^{Minox}, was Oswald's.

all of this with Offstein has no meaning at all, except to cast doubt on his maturity.

56
knowledge and credibility. As in his quoting Oswald as saying he never saw jet trails where he saw tank treads. Why should he have? Did he ever see any maneuvers and do armies hold them inside large cities, like Minsk? Of course not!

155 Melanson seeks to make something of Offstein's saying that Oswald told him about the MVD, its being like our FBI (general knowledge in any event) and that he described MVD headquarters in Moscow. He spent time in Moscow, need never have been inside the building to describe it, and what Melanson, either through ignorance or purposefulness has not stated, Oswald was there because he was interviewed by the MVD.

In going into Oswald's being fired for incompetence, which is hardly a manifestation of photographic competence for offset printing, leave alone microdotting, Melanson, with no basis at all, suggests it was "related to his covert activities," not one of which he has yet established. (He manages to avoid what the Commission published, that the plant regarded him as a red and got rid of him for that reason.)

The rest of this printing-plant concoction is the same kind of self-indictment and self-characterization.

156ff He skips back to New Orleans and the Reily Coffee Co. and says it "seems to have been a primary recruiting ground for the aerospace industry." He then lists some of those who left coffee-making for better jobs, without saying what kinds of jobs they left and took or a word about the working conditions at Reily and its pay scale or that of the various plants engaged in aerospace and related work that he manages to avoid identifying or in fact misidentifies. Reily was a lousy employer and the other plants had better conditions and paid much more. They were the most sought-after jobs ^{as much as} a decade and a half later when I was there. But those installations also require many unskilled employees and it is those kinds of jobs that were obtained by the men who left Reily. To suggest that Reily was any kind of "recruiting ground" is as stupid as it is silly. Little or no science or skill is required for grinding and packaging coffee, greasing the machines and ~~packing~~ shipping. So, for there to have been any possibility of any meaning, as there wasn't, it is a training ground that the aerospace and other related industries needed, not recruiting. There was

57.

more than enough unemployment and ^{not enough} poor jobs for an adequate supply of unskilled labor. And the pay at Realy's was really low, ~~and~~ little better than unemployment compensation. 158ff He tries to make a federal case of Oswald's lying and ^{lying} saying he was fired when he quit his welding job. (If Melanson had even done any welding, as I have, he might find that he did not like it and that it can be quite dangerous.) To avoid a wife's complaint this kind of ^{lying} is not at all abnormal. Oswald didn't invent it. Meaningless. So is de Moh-rehschildt's opinion, except that he could not believe that any government would know Oswald and trust him with anything important or confidential, ^{not} not even the government of Ghana. But with a resourceful imagination not exhausted by its overtime work on this manuscript Melanson seeks to explain this ~~way~~ away by de suggesting that de M. "may have been one of the CIA's unofficial operatives in Dallas." ^(Wasn't he the CIA's Oswald baby'sitter a few pages back?) "Unofficial operative?" What kind is that? Does it exist? Any evidence that it does? Of course not! Whatever he may mean by "operatives", and it certainly isn't a title or job-description, for an intelligence agency it cannot be "unofficial." Training, discipline and control are required. The only operative must be that officially or he isn't. (How sick all this inventing, suggesting and imagining really is. The man may have degrees and education but he is enormously ignorant of intelligence agencies and he lack common sense of is unscrupulous and just makes one silly thing up after another.)

Here again he refers to the CIA's Domestic ^{Contact Service} without describing its overt functions. He would rather suggest that the ^{in Dallas,} man in charge, the well-known J. Walton Moore, was really there for espionage or domestic intelligence.

161 "It ~~is~~ has always been a mystery as to how the spooky Baron (sic) and the leftist ideologue became close friends." Close ["] is his fabrication but there never was any mystery. If Melanson knew anything about the White Russian community, he'd have known, as de M said, that they were dull and uninteresting. There is little or nothing, other than the fabrications of the Garriopans, Melansons and the like-minded inventors of fact to indicate any close friendship or uncommonly numerous meetings, but as de M said, Oswald was more interesting because of his past and because he was ~~not~~ as dull as the ~~refugee~~ stolid expatriates.

58

161-2 In the course of building his non-existing case against deM and as Oswald's alleged control he exposes the great extent of his ignorance and the utter superficiality of his knowledge and scholarship with a simple footnote, "104. FBI document DL-105-1966, p. 14." The implication is that this comes from his own research. It didn't. He doesn't even know what it is, what it represents or even how to cite it correctly. He could have gotten it from Mrs. Robohm or from others, like the Assassination Archives and Research Center, to which he did turn for ~~uncredited~~ assistance. *it is uncredited. He is on its board.* He certainly doesn't know what 105 is in the FBI's file classification system. At the time in question it stood for "Internal Security-Nationalist Tendency-Foreign Counterintelligence." Later it was changed to "^{one}Foreign Counter-Intelligence -Russia." It is a "Security-related Classification."

It is a Dallas file. In the FBI's abbreviations, DL. But "DL" does not appear on the document. Within any file the FBI does not identify individual documents as "pages" but as "serials." *He does not give its serial number* *Serials* (There can, of course, be individual documents with 14 and more pages.) This is the internal-security or counterintelligence file on deM's wife, not on him.

It is a monument to his incompetent and falsely-presented scholarship that he devotes so much space to the poor, sick man who finally killed himself and did not refer to himself as ~~W~~ "Baran," which he wasn't, and yet is so entirely ignorant of the large Dallas (and, of course, headquarters and many other field offices') 105 file on De M. Mrs. Robohm did not know of it. She asked me for a copy after I started reading this so she could not tell Melanson or give it to him. So much for the honesty of his footnoting and its scholarship.

In citing a 1978 Dallas Morning News story (he is so well-informed he calls it the "Star") he does not tell the reader that that paper, knowing ^{de M} he had been confined to the psychiatric ward at Parkland Hospital, cautioned the House Assassinations Committee to leave him alone lest what did happen become the reality. Under pressure he could not take any longer, de M killed himself before the committee investigator got to the home in which he was recuperating in Florida. For years before then de M had been under many similar pressures and what he said could not be taken as actual. But the grim truth is that the pressuring conspiracy theorists drove the man to ^u suicide.

59.

"Students of the Kennedy assassination looked forward to his being questioned about his mysterious background and associations with Oswald" by the committee. Not students-nuts and idle theorizers. Those of real scholarship did not share Melanson's fictions and fabrications. And had he been a real scholar in this rather than the pretender he is he'd have known that there was much less unknown about the background because I had compelled the FBI, in FOIA litigation, to disclose its 105 file on him to me *and it's available.*

He does acknowledge the suicide but moderates the reality a bit. It was only minutes before the investigator was due that he killed himself. He also had an appointment he could not avoid with another theorizer used as a dependable source throughout by Melanson, Edward J. Epstein. Epstein had started the interview and was pressing for more.

In this extensive citation of Epstein as a source Melanson, who also cites the House Assassinations Committee extensively, manages not to let the reader know that much of Epstein's Legend was demolished by the CIA's testimony that was not only published, it was telecast and radioed coast-to-coast. I am saying he depends on un dependable sources ~~and~~ and fails to note their un dependability. *(He does not once mention THIS testimony)*

He concludes this chapter by magnifying his own ignorance and lack of ^{of} scholarship in saying that de M was "never thoroughly questioned by investigators." The FBI's 105 files on him are quite informative!

Truly, ignorance is bliss!

The few pictures he has indicated to follow here are among the most often published and with the possible exception of the one he ignores in his text, of Oswald with the rifle, have no significance. He has missed the possible significant of that one picture, which the Commission also published.

Chapter 8

167 The "extremely sensitive source", was the ^{in Hoover's letter} ~~FBI's~~ ^{CIA's} audio and ^{and any/other available} visual surveillance but neither was targeted on Oswald. It photographed all those entering and leaving the Cuban and USSR diplomatic installations in Mexico City and its electronic surveillance that is relevant was of the USSR's.

168 Using "supposedly" suggests he is saying it was not Oswald in Mexico City.

60

"Oswald announced to the passport office that the U.S.S.R was his destination." Passport "office?" Whose? "his is like his leaving most names out, lousy writing at best. It was Cuban.

"...his leftism was a paper-thing veneer." False, the permeating falsity.

"...he must have believed that he had some mission or task to perform." No support for this conjecture, no source cited, of course.

"...he was being impersonated while he was there: someone flitted between the Cuban and Soviet consulates posing as a desparate Oswald." Again, no source. In fact, the first three pages of text in this chapter have no footnote until the bottom of its third page.

Says Oswald was "set up" by his "handlers" is a logical assumption? As logical from what he has produced to here as the moon and green cheese. (And he will not come up with a real Oswald look-alike in Mex Mexico.) (He does not.)

He says that there was at the very same time another Oswald in Dallas. He will not show that because it is not true. There was later evidence of Oswald look-alikes, first brought to light ~~thought to be~~ in my first book, which he'll not credit, I'm sure. Not that I care, but what kind of honesty and scholarship does he reflect in this persisting practise? The one exception is the Sylvia Odio incident and in that the alleged look-alike did not represent himself as Oswald, a man with him did that. (She did not say he looked like Oswald, but that he was referred to as Leon Oswald.)

169 "There is overwhelming circumstantial evidence that the CIA covered up proof of an Oswald imposter at work." That the CIA covered up is without question. He has to give not only "evidence" but "overwhelming evidence" of an Oswald imposter. We'll see!

He gets lost in his own mythologies. To now he has Oswald as CIA. Here he says that some other agency ran the imposter and the CIA may have had leads to him. Oh, well, why not have all-inclusive theories? ^{Self-}Contradictions mean nothing to him any way.

Oswald in his lively imagination has now grown to the statute that had "various intelligence operatives shadowing him "closely."

He identifies William Gaudet as a CIA agent. Then or of the past? His footnote fails to indicate that I brought this to light in a book he has cited.

61.

In common with other conspiracy theorizers he blows Gaudet up enormously and imparts meanings for which there is no evidence and no reason to believe. He even tries to make something of the fact that Gaudet "claimed" he didn't go to "Mexico" by bus. Why in his right mind would he when he could well afford to ~~fly~~ ^{Melanson} fly. He does not say where Gaudet went. It was a long and by bus uncomfortable trip. It was to Yucatan. He also says that Gaudet was "officially listed as the editor of Latin American Traveller." Maybe he knows what I do not, but there is no citation to this nonsense about "official" listing and what Gaudet had published for years was Latin American Reports. (I have no way of knowing what he picked up from the other dreamers but I am confident that he did not do any investigation of Gaudet and his newsletter and that he'll have missed the really provocative connects that, while not relevant in non-fiction on the Kennedy assassination, would have helped build the phony case he has contrived.

170 He makes a big thing of Gaudet's having seen "Oswald handing out FPCC leaflets in front of the International Trade Mart." There is an element of dishonesty, ignorance or both in this. He does not know that Gaudet's office was in that building or he withholds that ~~essential~~ information from the reader. Is there anything abnormal about his seeing what was taking place at his own small building - at lunch time? Of course not! Quite a few people found it impossible not to see Oswald doing that,

He says that ~~somebody discovered~~ Gaudet's "proximity to Oswald was discovered." No source and not that close-on the Mississippi Gulf coast is where he lived- but this was first in Oswald in New Orleans.

Here he finally identifies what he has and here again refers to as "the anti-Castro bastion on Camp Street," and he says, again in ignorance and an apt reflection of both his scholarship and investigations, it "was only a few doors from Guy Banister." In fact it ^{but as single} was in the same building, ^{no door away}

171 In his convoluted and angled reference to Jack Ruby's having been in New Orleans, which was not at all Gaudet's purpose in reporting that to the FBI (Melanson says "the authorities," he didn't even have in front of him what the indications are he picked up from my Oswald In New Orleans and cited the source it cites), Melanson says "the extent

62

of Gaudet's interest in or knowledge of Ruby is not clear." Whether or not true or even relevant - and it is clear that he could identify Jack Ruby - Ruby's purpose was not secret and it had nothing to do with, as Melanson suggests, his going to Cuba. He was there to pick up the contracts of strippers for his Dallas joint. What Gaudet actually ^{do} did Melanson does not like as much as being able to suggest it had to do with Cuba, which it did not. Ruby bought a painting from Larry Borenstein, who I knew. Larry, a wealthy entrepreneur whose wife and children seemed to spend most of their time in Mexico, with him visiting from time to time. ^{and one of} His holdings was a French Quarter art gallery. (It is not relevant, but he also had a good Creole-style restaurant I rather enjoyed when chatting with him.) It was well known in New Orleans that he was Leon Trotsky's nephew. Trotsky ~~port~~ spelled the family name "Bronstein" and Larry's father spelled it ^{using} ~~his~~ used the "o." So, what Gaudet really did was to start a red-hunt about Ruby. A surprising amount of completely wasted FBI effort was invested in checking that out and a couple of wrong "Rubensteins" were investigated, one an authentic Communist. The House Un-Americans had a field day with that and the radical right has never really dropped it.

So, when Melanson actually stumbled over really spooking he doesn't recognize it!

I do, again, note that there are many instances of Melanson's presenting as the result of his own work what he took from the published work of others with which he is familiar. His is the traditional trick in the field, to make a few citations to a book and omit many others. Perhaps a word of explanation is in order.

As the Guth-Wrone bibliography reports, as I recall and as is the fact, it happens that I brought to light most of what is known and is factual, ~~as distinguished from~~ conspiracy theorizing, about this assassination and that of Dr. King. It ~~is~~ thus is inevitable that others will draw upon it and there is nothing unusual about that. How they draw upon it, however, relates to their ^{or} honesty and their scholarship. If they ^{are} pretend that my work is their work they are not honest and not scholarly, at least in the accepted sense.

"Gaudet ran a Costa Rican newsletter." He is nuts. ^{Gaudet} He published ^{from New Orleans -} ~~in~~ the United States, ~~he~~ had a suite of three rooms in the ITM ⁴ building, and if Melanson had done any original

63

work, he'd have learned early on that ^{gawdet} he also had other offices ^{in other place} at other times and that the addresses of those offices were the same as such CIA assets as, of Watergate fame, The ^{Fullen} Agency.

Perhaps it is the need to give meaning to where there is none, ^{that he reports} the presence in Mexico when Oswald was there of "a Costa Rican anti-Castroite named Manuel Porras ^{Melanson} ~~ivera~~." To say that his travel ^{Melanson} paralleled Oswalds, as he quotes Summers as saying, is to say what could be said of ~~th~~ousands of others and in and of itself is meaningless.

✓ The fanstasy about Porras is unfootnoted but it certainly is tragic that all the people in Mexico did not walk around with tapemeasures and measure each and every person they saw ^{so} that Melanson would not have to contend with their later recollections of ~~t~~he heights of those they saw. How inconsiderate Mexican are!

172ff He then goes into the fantasy Fensterwald and others dreamed up about the alleged significance of a man who used the name Bowen and who was on the same bus as Oswald going to Mexico City and who talked with him. ^{outs} This matter was investigated extensively by the FBI ~~not~~ because it attributed any significance to Bowen ⁴ but because it conducted that kind of investigation of the passengers on that bus. I've looked at the two pages of footnates that could include this fairy tale and there is not a single page of FBI records cited. But there are, readily and freely available, the many FBI reports on Bowen. How odd it is that a scholar who boasts of his uses of the FBI and CIA reading rooms, has not a single citation to the existing ^sinvestigative reports and many to the ^{of} conspiracy theorists. Even when he says (173) that "The FBI was perplexed and angered ^{over} over the deception" ⁴ of the use of an alias, ~~the~~ other name Osborne, ⁴ Melanson cites no source. (The FBI is not without prior experience with aliases and in the uncountable thousands of pages of its reports I have seen I have seen not a single expression of perplexity or anger over their use. It regularly lists "akas.")

He gets carried away again as he rambled, ~~here~~ ^{to}, in his digression about ~~the~~ "shadowy figures, ~~to~~ refer to de Mohrenschildt as a man "who claimed to be a geologist." He was and he was a successful one and the published official record is clear and certain. ^{on this}

174 ^{pr} "Lee Harvey Oswald used the alias "Osborne" on two occasions when he ordered the

printing of his FPCC literature." Unless the name "Osborne" was signed he does not know it was not a mistake at the printer's and I as I note above, the only people in the world who knew who ordered that printing said it was not Oswald. Moreover, if Oswald had been any kind of psook and if Osborne/Bowen had been, it is certain that Oswald would not have used any name that could be used as a lead to Bowen. (*Osborne is the name of a fellow Marine.*)

175 The behavior he finds strange in Oswald, based on his incorrect beliefs about him and his allegedly being almost reclusive, is proof that Oswald was not on an intelligence mission. He would never, had he been, have given ^{others} all that information that identified him and his "defection."

176 Contriving to make it appear that he got this from Meagher but not actually so representing, the alternative being that he represents it as his own work, he says that Oswald "got his passport in twenty-four hours" when he was in New Orleans. He got this from my first book. In it I reproduce the State Department cable granting the passport, in facsimile. *Melanson's* It is not his work and he did not get it from Meagher. The rest of what he here says also appeared first in that book, not Meagher

176-7 It is true that the retiring Cuban diplomat, Eusebio Azque, was certain the man he argued with at the Cuban consulate was not Oswald, although this was not the opinion of Sylvia Duran, who spent most time with Oswald. *Melanson* He says of Duran that "the House Committee had not bothered to afford her a fresher look" at a picture of Oswald but he cites no source, does not report what the Committee did say in public, that it had interviewed her at length, that she had agreed to appear as a witness and testify and then did not appear in Washington. I think most writers of non-fiction would wonder why she agree to appear and then, without notice, ^{did} just not appear.

180 "There is no known photograph of the arrest" of Oswald, There were two such arrests. It seems that he is referring to the ^{In Dallas,} New Orleans arrest. While there is no photo taken inside the theater, color photos were taken as the police led Oswald out and again, were taken at police headquarters. ^{N/} In New Orleans two amateur photographers named Doyle and Martin took 8mm movies of the arrest. So, there are known photos of both arrests. Again,

the cheap and unscholarly pretense that what he does not know of does not exist.

He is incorrect in saying that two months before the assassination the CIA told other agencies "that a man named Lee Oswald had contacted the Soviet embassy." It used a middle name, as I now recall, Henry instead of Harvey.

181 "The night of the assassination the Agency forwarded to the Dallas ^{FBI} office a picture of Oswald entering the Soviet consulate." But it wasn't Oswald. Well, the picture was not forwarded, it was not "by the Agency," which is in Langley, and it provided more.

Eldon Rudd, then ^{SA} FBI special agent in the Mexico City "legal attache" FBI office, was give ^{H/} pictures and tape ^{by the CIA} and flown to Dallas in a Navy plane. He was met at Love Field by ^{SA} Wallace Heitman, Dallas FBI subversive expert, and driven to the FBI Dallas office. There special agents who knew Oswald and his voice looked at the pictures and listened to the taped voice. They then sent a cable to DBLHQ and the same night (it was 2 a.m. the day after the assassination when Rudd landed) was instructed to cable or teletype a transcript. (Rudd was later elected to the Congress.)

183 "A former CIA officer who served in Mexico during the period of Oswald's visit..." Again, he omits a name he knows and has in his footnote. It was the late David Atlee Phillips. And here again, deficient scholarship and ignorance of what he could have gotten ~~from me or~~ ^{also} because he sought, and avoids giving thanks for it, from where it is filed, the Fensterwald center, the AARC. Phillips testified on deposition in a libel suit he filed and in the presence of a censoring CIA official testified that the CIA had a live informer inside the Cuban consulate. Not relevant? Melanson next says that "In 1966 a Freedom of Information Act suit ~~was~~ filed against the Agency ~~succeeded~~ succeeded in liberating additional pictures of" the man he ~~called~~ ^{what is} calls "the mystery man," the one in the photograph ~~not~~ of Oswald. His footnote is to Summers' book. This is plain dishonesty. He knows very well that ^{my} Summers had nothing to do with that litigation and that it was Fensterwald's. (Again, ^{the original} he seeks to avoid crediting ^{when he cites, he prefers} any investigators, rather than some authors.)

He is quite wrong in saying that "If the CIA did have pictures of the real Lee Harvey Oswald visiting communist consulates in Mexico City, it would surely have pro-

.66

vided them to the Warren Commission." Not at all if Melanson's theory was true, that Oswald worked for the CIA or another spookery. That then would have been the last thing it would do because it would have linked it to the assassination. He surely has no understanding of the spookeries! I mean the realities, not the silly notions of those who fancy childish novelists' notions. *(And he know that the CIA withheld and withholds much.)*

There is very,very much wrong with the claims of the CIA, some, including those he mentions, having little or no credibility, and there are so many deficiencies in the various investigations, and so much that is really provocative about what the disclosed official records reflect, both the Commissions and the various agencies', but the kind of childish stories and interpretations he and those who think like him and from whom he got these notions go in for merely confuse an already confused situation. This and most of the rest of what he has lacks any real substance. This is true of many of his sources that no real scholar would use. The above ^{is} an example. Were it that the CIA photographed one it could identify as an imposter it had nothing to lose by giving the Commission his picture because there is no credible reason to believe that Oswald was working for it. ^O/_n the other ^{had}/_n, had he been, then indeed the foundations at Langley would have shaken had he been photographed. ^{Or,} because nobody knew what the alleged imposter looked like, really, there was no hazard in giving up his picture, which, had he been working for the CIA, it alone could have identified. Or it ^{could} have given the entire day's take of pictures and merely omitted that one. ⁿobody outside the CIA would have known.

186 He quotes Phillips as saying that after the assassination the tapes were "routinely" destroyed. Phillips did say this. But can that apply to the tape given to the FBI? It cannot apply to the Dallas FBI's teletype or cable summarizing its contents or to the transcript ^{it} made of the tape. These records remain withheld but ^{they} do exist.

"The Hoover memo (quoted at the beginning of this chapter) is the only mention of the tapes in FBI files. " How in the world can any self-respecting scholar make so categorical a statement ^{out} about the vast accumulation of FBI files? In it, as I what I say ^{im} mediately above shows, he is arrogant, ego-ridden, self-important and of abysmal ignorance.

67.

He is not an authentic subject expert. He is an expert on ^{some of} the nutty ^{and irresponsible} literature on which this manuscript is based, and he is familiar with ^{some of the} the responsible writing.

It should be understood that ^y anyone whose time is committed as a college professor's is just does not have the time to get a command of so vast an amount of information. The Commission published about 10,000,000 words and its files, before those of other agencies were added, took up about 300 cubic feet. As I say above, I got about a third of a million ^{mostly the FBI's} pages of records by FOIA litigation. So, absent his claims to omniscience and exhausting scholarship and to originality and to investigating and to use of FOIA, he could not be fairly criticized for not knowing what he does not know. But for such all-inclusive false statements and his many pretenses and his practises he is subject to more than criticism, I think to ^y condemnation.

"The two agents named as listeners (to this tape) were called to testify before the House Assassinations ^(no names?) Committee. They claimed to have no recollection of hearing any tape of Oswald." His footnote at this point refers only to the Special Agent in Charge, not the two agents who, again, he fails to name. Former SAC Gordon Shanklin, now deceased, had no credibility, but not for the reason Melanson gives. The reason is overt perjury. He escaped indictment, which would have devastated the FBI in any trial, on the excuse that to have indicted him so long after the fact ^{w/} would have been ^{u/} what lawyers call "bootstrapping." I don't know the names of the agents but as Melanson should know ^{from} for the Hoover letter he quotes at the beginning of this chapter, it had to be agents who knew Oswald's face and voice. The most likely are the retired case agent, Fain, and his successor case agent, Hosty. Fain knew both the face and the voice and to a ^{u/} lesser degree, Hosty did. Wallace ~~Heitman~~ Heitman was a subversive expert in the Dallas field office and it is he who picked Rudd and the tape and pictures up. Reminds me, these and other Dallas records give the lie to the above quoted sentence that the ^{memo} Hoover letter, which he calls a letter, is the only mention in FBI files. I know of the Rudd messengership, etc., from a Heitman memo I got in FOIA litigation. There are undoubtedly more that are hidden in ^{And I refer to others that I have above.} other files or safes, etc.)

Chapter 9 ("Legend I: Incidents")

189 His definition of the word "legend" as used in spookeries omits that it covers the identification of the person for whom it is created, not his acts. He again makes it up in ignorance of intelligence.

65

The amateur shrinkery with which this chapter begins is not worthy of comment. But in it he says what is not true as it relates to the assassination rather than the professorial fictions, that Oswald "left a trail of self-implicating evidence, ~~for~~...

190 As it relates to the shooting, there is absolutely no evidence that what seemed to link it to Oswald was left by him. although the Commission's ^{Report} does say that he took the rifle to the building from which the official mythology has all the shots being fired, 100%, and this is not an exaggeration, 100% of all the FBI's and Commission's evidence is that he did not and could not have. So, the story-weaving professor ^{again} is un-scholarly in ~~the~~ careless passion into which he works himself in his shrinkery. He again is explicit in stating that Oswald was an assassin, and I emphasize he has yet to say a word about the crime itself or any of the evidence of it, real or imagined.

He is wrong in saying that the first indications of what I called a "false Oswald" and he calls "imposter" was first in Dallas. The FBI's reports in the ^{disclosed} Commission's files reflect that it started earlier, before he left New Orleans. Here he is again careful to omit any citations to the many earlier writings on this, beginning with mine that dates to 1965. Not a single footnote.

195 In every instance to this point all the false Oswalds he has in Dallas come from The False Oswald chapter of my first book. He attributes the Sylvia Odio one, which I went into in great detail and later interviewed the major one of the pair with him, to publication two decades later, and this includes the precise quote he uses.

While it is true that Odio's story was substantiated by her father's response to ^a ~~one~~ ^{letter} from her reporting this visit, it is also true that there is live-witness confirmation in the Commission's published and documentary record and in the FBI's ^{disclosed} files. It is, I think, ^a apparent here that he is pretending to palm all of this off, except for the few citations to two other books, as his own work when it isn't.

196ff ~~196~~ His account of the related investigation of the Odio incident, attributed to some of what I cited, comes directly from my published work and he ^{pretends} it is his. ^{William} Seymour can be said to resemble Oswald but there is no "striking resemblance."

69

Loran Euyens

as Hall had said. Melanson contents himself with the unfootnoted statement that Seymour "denied" that he was then in Dallas. He in fact produced employment records establishing that he then was in Miami, as I recall, working as a welder.

He cites Meagher to Hall's alleged denial that he had ever seen Odio. I'm not checking but I think that I also published it ^{earlier}. Later I spent much time with Hall, who took a liking to me and displayed trust in me. My first interview lasted for three days, when he was hospitalized in Los Angeles. He then told me that he was in fact at the housing development in which Odio then lived, that he was visiting others, and that he did see a woman who was strange to him and could have been Odio. As with what immediately precedes this, the quotation of the Commission's counsel that they were to be closing, not opening doors, had Melanson conducted any kind of real research he could have had enormously more but he avoided those who did the work he was ^{pretending} ^{was} (as his own. The "colleague" was in fact a subordinate. The entire Warren Report was in page proof, the presses were to roll at midnight, and the first of the FBI "Hall" reports had just reached the Commission, only a few hours to press time. The man who had to face the problem, Wesley Liebeler, could not make any change in the number of pages, the footnotes or the pages in the index. This is how the Commission published the non sequitur to which Melanson refers earlier, that it could not have been Oswald because he was en route to Mexico.

Hall, without doubt, is an accomplished and practicing liar who also sometimes tells the truth. Melanson has (197) an account of an unidentified man investigated by Garrison on lead or information provided by Hall. Again, he omits the name. Why? What he has heard ^{re} appears to be confused to me. He asks who this mysterious witness was and then, seeming to describe him, describes Hall and cites my Oswald in New Orleans on Hall on the pages cited. (They are, incidentally, some of what he credited to others in this Odio story.)

202 More mixed ignorance and sloppiness about the basic evidence of the crime. He says that "ammunition that would fit Oswald's ^{rifle} (his emphasis) was uncommon in the United States in 1963." It was quite common. In addition to what Western had made for the Mussolini government, which was itself plentiful, newer Scandinavian ammo, 6.5 cal., was readily available.

203-4 What he here attributes to the New York Times and Anson is his duplication of their error, on the part of the Times innocent because it represents what the Times was told. Anson and those who assisted him had ample time to check. There is again his pontificating from the assassination Olympus in which he visualizes himself enshrined, "none of the Warren Commission lawyers could recall having seen..." the FBI memo referred to. He follows this by saying that ^{who} ~~whatever~~ he may have meant by ^{it} "irrelevant," "nor could relevant FBI or State Department officials." His quotation from the Hoover memorandum, to State, is angled to make it appear that Hoover referred to the assassination era "imposter." Hoover was not. My copies come from the Commission's files. So much for his statement that none of the lawyers- and he and the Times and Anson ^{of} could not possibly have interviewed all of them- had seen it. Some had. Hoover had something else in mind. It had to do with sending his identifications to Oswald. Hoover feared that if the KGB got them they could create a "legend" for an agent who could be sent here. What ^{Melanson} he attributes to the former Commission lawyer, Slawson, who was from Justice, is not relevant.

204 Melanson does interpret this to mean that "an Oswald imposter was lurking about in Russia." ^{There was none.} His ignorance of the records that were available and his longing to create something out of nothing and then contrive support for it account for this error.

He recalls and here presents ^{it} as his own work the "Oswald" who appeared at Bolton Ford, in New Orleans, in this Melanson representation to get a "bid for ten pickup trucks," ~~it~~ (It was for vehicles that could be used as ambulances in Cuba) This was while Oswald was in the USSR, it comes from Oswald in New Orleans, ^{and} it is not in any way related to Hoover's concern that he has misrepresented and which immediately precedes this.

But none of it is what he says it is, "Legend-building for Oswald." (My emphasis)
Chapter 9 ("Legend II: Artifacts and Evidence")

206 He gets off to a blazing beginning for this chapter, another flaunting of his incredible ignorance about the subject matter and some of its best known evidence. First he quotes Robert Oswald as having been told by Lee not to "believe the so-called evidence against me." This could be either what Lee imagined or what little he could have known of what the police were leaking about him. Lee was killed 11/24/63, the assassination was

11
two days earlier and Robert saw him the day before. We don't know whether Oswald had access to a radio but we do know that he had been questioned and knew what he had been questioned about. It cannot be identified as relating to any evidence because Lee did not say so.

Melanson begins writing about "two incriminating photos he also calls "infamous":
"Lee is standing in the Paine's yard dressed in black, holding leftist literature in one hand and a Mannlicher-Carcano rifle in the other, while wearing a holster containing a revolver." It was not in "the Paine's back yard." ~~It was not taken in Dallas~~ ^{They were} taken by Marina, and others like them, in the side yard of their Neely Street address ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ before Oswald went to New Orleans. The two pictures he refers to and fails to identify are Commission Exhibits ~~143A and 143B~~ ^{3/34 and 3/35}. These are the photos I referred to in addressing his allegation that the critics had not done adequate work relating to the SWP, his "linkage" ~~con~~frivance.

While publication of ~~one~~ of the picture ~~did~~ persuade many people of Oswald's guilt, I know of nothing to ~~valid~~ ^{etc} and no reason to believe what Melanson says, that it "established" Oswald's "derangement."

207 The police did report, as Melanson says, that Oswald said his face had been superimposed on someone else's body. And, although Melanson appears not to know about it, a seemingly persuasive case can be built for this. Late production of other pictures, including one autographed to George de ~~Mohrenschildt~~ ^{Mohrenschildt} make it appear unlikely that the pictures were faked.

On the seemingly persuasive evidence of faking he quotes Anson's book, which is much later than the work I had done on copies of those two pictures from the National Archives. Negatives were made of each and superimposed on each other. The faces on both appear to be identical, including in size and all features, and they were not taken from the same distance. with the negatives made so that the heads were identical in size, one body was about four inches shorter than the other. He cites Anson as providing measurement of the head in the two pictures, without saying how the measurements were determined other than by measurement of the photos that were in evidence. This is a ~~lot~~ trickier when hair is a variable. But

12
matter, this demond investigator and dilogent researcher was not aware of all the work that had been done on those pictures and what relates to them an^d has the true scholar's contentment in depending on a pot-boiler. *and it alone.*

He finally does get around, having avoided it where it belonged, in his political dissertations on alleged "linkage," to saying that Oswald in these pictures has both the CP and the SWP publications in the pictures. and he does say the two parties did not agree in political views. This did not fit well with his "linkage" contrivance. And here he admits it is odd. To say the least it is in any effort to make a "link!"

208 In referring to a British expert's ~~opinion~~ ^(from a secondary source) opinion that the picture had been retouched Melanson appears to be ignorant of the known retouching that was so scandalous the Commission had to look into it. The rifle was retouched four different ways by four different publications, each retouching made to coincide with the ~~constant~~ ^{by} changing leaks of alleged evidence. The LIFE picture he refers to earlier without mention of this was one.

209 In referring to the print Oswald had given de Mohrenschildt,, Melanson gives the date on its back, April 5, 1963. From this alone he should have avoided his carelessness and ignorance in saying it was taken in the Paine's back yard. Lee was never there until he returned from Mexico, that October, a half year later. But this kind of error is unavoidable in using the work of others without a personal knowledge of the underlying evidence. and in depending on conspiracy theorists for anything. ⁴ Eash builds his own conspiracy case, regardless of the evidence.

He cites no source for saying that in 1967 de Mohrenschildt surfaced with a new photo and I have no recollection of that and believe it is wrong

210 "If the photos were not a forgery, the autograph certainly was not authentic."

It is not the autograph that the handwriting experts said was not Oswald's, it was the added inscriptions. Whether this is careless error or a deliberate lie, he has the truth on the preceeding page. And what he has ignored in all of this ~~was~~ ^{is} that a negative was also found by the police and was given to the FBI, which gave it to the Commission, after making its own laboratory analysis. (I used, in the work referred to above, a print made from this negative.) Lab examination of that negative identified marks on it that were made uniquely

by the pressure-plate of Oswald's cheap Russian camera. I can't believe that Melanson has no knowledge of this, from the books he'd read if not from the Commission's, which do have the FBI expert's testimony. (Lyndal L. Shaneyfelt.)

He next refers to what he says the Senate Intelligence Committee discovered in examining a picture of Oswald with the rifle but in a different pose but his footnote says it was the House committee he is citing.

He says no more about the picture so we can't know if it is still another print of those taken by the Dallas police. Only a subject-matter ignoramus would not know the history of those pictures. ^{The Dallas police made} Many, many copies ^{They} were made ^{and} were allowed to just lie around. Reporters as well as police, if not also many other kinds of people, had ready access to them because they were not hidden or protected, and many prints are known to have disappeared. The FBI did report this. There is little doubt that some police and reporters helped themselves to copies. Some were also sold to the media.

Hester is just plain wrong and if Melanson knew his material on which he presents himself as an expert - and the only alternative is that he is knowingly dishonest -he'd have known that those pictures were at Dallas police headquarters the afternoon of the assassination. Hester, therefore, could not have seen them there any earlier. If my recollection is wrong on when those pictures were found in the Paine garage, so could Hester's be on when he saw they at police headquarters. There is no doubt that there was a police search of that garage the afternoon of the assassination, by Officers Rose and Stovall. There also is no doubt that Lt. Day made many copies and left them lying around.

212-3 When he goes into the time reconstructions made to see if it⁴ had been possible for Oswald to get from the sixth floor alleged sniper's nest to the second floor, with a coke partly drunk in his hand and behind a door that was closed by an automatic closer that could not be rushed, there is no footnoting. ⁴ This comes straight from my first book.

215 "Following the crime, information targeting Oswald as the suspect (his emphasis) surfaced very quickly -- under suspicious circumstances. ¹ None of this has any source indicated. I know of no representation that Oswald was a, leave alone the suspect² until after

74

he was arrested at the theater and Melanson cites none.

216 It is simply ~~astounding~~ ^{the} astounding how great Melanson's ignorance about ~~er~~ basic and un-
 questioned facts about the assassination and witnesses ^{is} 16, particularly some of those who
 initially received greatest attention. He ~~begins~~ ^{begins} what I refer to by typically, picking up
 from other books, beginning with my first one, the fact that Oswald "was not by any means
 the only employee not accounted for." No source given. Then, again no source, with the
 same comment applicable, ~~"At~~ ^{"At} least a dozen employees besides Oswald were not accounted
 for." True. Then: "Harold Norman and James Jarman were at work that day and were outside
~~the building~~ watching the motorcade when the shooting took place." (The rest of this quote
 is silly.) Well, the ~~simple~~ ^{fact} fact is that they were not outside the building and were in
 one of the ~~many~~ ^{two} photographs that got great attention showing them inside it and looking
 out of ~~the~~ fifth floor windows. They are ^{two} of the three employees used to make it appear
 that the shots came from the floor above. The third was Bonnie Ray Williams. All testified
 to ^{what} that I say here before the Commission. So, in addition to their testimony, which our
 demon investigator/scholar/analyst is supposed to be expert on, at least in his representa-
 tion, he cannot possibly not know about the famous "chicken bone" incident or the quite
 famous news picture of them hanging out the windows with the motorcade underneath them.

(In going over the footnotes I made no check at the point where 20 appears. It is
 three pages long. It begins by crediting ~~several~~ ^{several} accounts of the ~~many~~ ^{flaws} flaws and con-
 troversies about the timing, getting Oswald to where Officer J.D. Tippit was killed in
 time for him to have been the killer. The first and accurate and dependable analysis of
 this ~~fact~~ ^{flaw} flaw, the major matter of ^{of} controversy, appeared in my first book, not mentioned
 and published long before those he does mention. Once he gets into this lengthy note, virtually
 all of ~~which~~ ^{which} that is factual, as distinguished from conjecture, comes from my first book,
 there is no way of knowing what his source is, if any. For example, he says (307) that
 "The cartridge cases were the last items of evidence to be turned over to the FBI by the
 Dallas Police, a full six days after the murder." First of all, it was a ~~state~~ ^{state} state crime,
 not federal, and criminal jurisdiction lay in Dallas, not in Washington. The ~~FBI~~ ^{FBI} had no ~~of~~

25
jurisdiction at all. The evidence that the police gave the FBI is the evidence that the FBI demanded. (The FBI wanted to control as much as it could, particularly of the lab work, much of which is at best quite dubious.) So, there is nothing at all sinister, suspect or wrong in the alleged six-day delay. More, and again his ignorance of the basic facts is so very conspicuous, ~~with the fact that the police had the fourth bullet taken from~~

contrary to what he says, "there is no established link between the murder bullets and Oswald's gun," the Commission had the FBI's work duplicated, as I recall by the State of Illinois, an expert named Nicole, approx., and he claims he could connect the bullets with that pistol. He says all the bullet were removed from Tippit's body. Only three were. The fourth did not enter the body, having struck a bullet first.) *(And for pretty sure there was evidence given to the FBI maybe than a week later.)*

217ff His idle conjectures about the police having Oswald's middle name when he did not use it at the depository has obvious explanations: they knew it as soon as they picked him up, which was a little more than an hour after the crime, and they knew it almost as fast from the FBI, which had a file on him. *FBI (Melanson)* He was an active case. He seeks to build so much on nothing at all! Mixing the sequence of first names that Oswald had was not at all unusual and that the police did it is significant of nothing at all. They had him in custody and had his name before they ever used it, straight or mixed.

221 *"The CIA also seems to have been involved in one post-assassination attempt to (the man, Alvers, appeared at the embassy on his own. The CIA did not dredge him up.)* portray Oswald as a hired gun working for Castro: the story of 'D'." (He cites a variety of sources for this story, of which we first heard from the Commission. Why he does not cite the records themselves is obvious: he boasts about his use of the FBI's and the CIA's reading rooms but he is ignorant of the records and has to depend on secondary sources and some even more remote. In his handling of it he manages to be unfair to almost everyone. The pressure to accredit the man who fabricated the entire thing was from Ambassador Mann. (Melanson omits or did not know his matronymic, Ugarte.) The initial directive to check ~~if~~ this story out vigorously was from CIA headquarters. That investigation was completed before the FBI, which supposedly is not operational in foreign countries, where the CIA is, had any interest in doing so. The FBI was ~~not~~ "frozen out," as he says. The wonder, how-

74
ever, as he does not note, is elsewhere: that any professional intelligence officer would begin to believe some of the alleged details in Alvarado Ugarte's concoction. It collapses of its own weight.

How the sweepings in this chapter can straight-facedly be title "legend" is not clear. There is no legend in it and nothing new in it. it isn't even a good rehash of what had been printed previously and he adds error and imagination to that,

Chapter 10 Cover-Up

225 I don't know how he manages some of his gross mistakes but here he gives the date of the executive session that I published in facsimile as December 5 rather than January 21 and 27, the matter having been discussed at both. December 5, 1963 is the date of the Commission's first executive session and, unusual for it, had a witness, Nicholas Katzenbach, Deputy Attorney General and then also acting Attorney General. Again the indications are not only of his ignorance but of his using other than original sources from which he reproduces error. But here he cites the 12/3/63 executive session, not anything else. Incredibly, he makes the identical mistake in footnote 4! This is what he gets for cribbing my stuff and pretending it is his - and for his subject-matter ignorance, I published the relevant transcript, in facsimile, devoted an entire book of it and he has that book in his bibliography. (White wash IV)

Of course any CIA affidavit attesting that Oswald was not an agent is necessarily suspect on many counts but they provided live testimony. The same is true of the FBI. Does he mention the FBI or the live testimony later? Not to do so is unfair.

227 Here he presents as his own work what he cites to CIA Document 657-831. He in fact is quoting from my ~~White Wash~~ Photographic Whitewash, second edition, in which, having just gotten that record from the CIA, I used it ^{in facsimile} (in space that was available on the very last page, ~~in a facsimile~~).

229 He cribs this again at Footnote 10.

231 He pretends there is hidden significance in the CIA's having on file a picture of Oswald taken by an American tourist in Minsk. It is normal procedure for intelligence agencies to obtain any and all pictures of countries of interest to it. There is no more to this. Standard practice not related to Oswald

77
232 When he earlier discussed U.S. Moscow consular official Richard Snyder he made no reference to the East German book, a fact he hides in his notes, Who's Who In the CIA. As all critics have known for years, it did list Snyder as a CIA agent. But the author(s)- Julius Mader is the only name given in the book - had no way of knowing how long he continued working for the CIA under diplomatic cover and when he left the CIA and worked for State only. Which is what he testified to and has not been contradicted, whether or not it is true.

Chapter 11

240 ff The beginning of this conclusion ^{would} were be very effective if it were not, as only an authentic subject expert can detect, so largely unfactual, exaggerated, imagined, fabricated and distorted. What is lost in all of this, in which he continues to exaggerate his earlier exaggerations, are the legitimate questions that do linger and should never have existed. He is at the end of his book without having given the simple and meaningful explanation of why these troubling question still exist. Because of the dishonesty of his "safe" formula, his assumption of Oswald's guilt, he can hardly say, if in fact he knew it, that the government that came into power only by the assassination never really investigated it and never intended to investigate it.

Where he had earlier inflated the essentially trivial anti-Castro activity, if indeed ~~there then was any~~ ^{meaningful activity there} at all, at the Camp Street building when Oswald was in New Orleans- Only Banister was there, with Ferrie from time to time - what he had magnified into a "bastion" of anti-Castro activity now becomes, his emphasis, "the Grand Central Station of anti-Castroism." Yet for all the exaggerations, falsehoods, distortions and inventions he was not able to show a single anti-Castro act there while Oswald was in New Orleans or later ~~after it~~ and only the inference of small potatoes before Oswald got there. (241)

He begins with the assumption that each and every thing ordinary people do is recorded in some manner for later retrieval by governments and thus what Oswald had for breakfast should have been known to the USSR or US governments. Thus what is true and is not new at all, "unknown routes ~~(XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX)~~ to and from ~~Russia~~ the Soviet Union," is ~~wiped out by what precedes it~~ in the same sentence, "unexplained activities in Mexico, dis-

pearances in Russia and Dallas." (In fact, the only mystery is how Oswald got to Hel-sinki from London when no ~~emere~~ commercial transportation enabled it. There is no ~~searthy~~ reason for even diligent government investigators to be able to account for every minute of every day in the life of ordinary people, and Oswald's employment was menial and he lived in a room in a rooming house. (240)

241 When he conjectures what the USSR could have used ^{Oswald} him for as an agent he gets ridiculous, "Did the KGB really want to spy on the FPCC or CORE?"

When he complains about the media in reporting on the assassination and its aftermath, a legitimate complaint, he is again ignorant of the actualities. It is much worse than he puts it: "the mainstream media remains captive to decades of secrecy and disinformation regarding Oswald: much of it emanating from the CIA." The actuality is that the media did not need and did not depend on disinformation from any agency. It fell in line behind the official mythology was it was being devised and with minor deviations has been there since, without official inspiration. The Times editorial he quotes (242) does not come from any CIA disinformation. It has been Times policy from day one. (Most leaking by the FBI.)

What he missed in his fumbling around with the pictures of Oswald with the rifle about which he knew so little is that in a very brief period of time four major elements of the media altered that picture, each in a different way, to make it appear to be consistent with the current official story. The press is certainly one of the major institutions of our society and it certainly failed us then and since then, but that was not the doing of the CIA. The grim truth is that nothing was required of the CIA for the media to be as dishonest as it was and still is on this subject. It is not easy to be unfair to the CIA but here, as throughout, he is that. Without need. Truth, so often strange to him, is a better weapon. *And makes a valid indictment.*

He has a footnote on page 24³ in which he refers the reader to former CIA director Richard Melms' House Assassinations Committee testimony, "where he asserts that without access to the files of communist intelligence agencies, it will be difficult to finalize conclusively the JFK case." This, of course, assumes ~~that~~ what there is no reason to believe, that they hold information bearing of the crime itself. However, where he could have

done legitimately what he strives so hard to do and could not do, make some real points against the CIA. his ignorance of the disclosed information foreclosed him. He could have gotten this disclosed information from ~~those to whom he, without acknowledging it, he did ask for help~~ ^{a number of others}. He boasts of his access to the CIA's disclosed records in its reading room, ~~but~~ yet remained ignorant. (This is because when he was there he pursued the trivial or the ~~ones~~ ^{non} existing in the futile effort to make his invalid assumptions ^{appear} valid. ~~XXXX~~ The only thing he says he actually got from the CIA is the meaningless number of its "new Orleans employees and then he misused and misrepresented that. All else of CIA origin he had nothing at all to do with in bringing it to light.)

^{one} The truth that he could have used so well in making his case is that the CIA saw to it that our government would not ask the Soviet government for all its information. and this was not because the CIA had any reason to believe that the Soviets were involved in the assassination in any way.

I want to be explicit about what I am saying. As I have indicated throughout ~~xxx~~ he is not the subject-matter expert he pretends to be and in fact he is grossly ignorant of both the established fact of the crime and its investigation and of the hundreds of thousands of page of government records now available. He is so ignorant, his ignorance extending to all area, ^{that} ~~this~~ ~~this~~ ~~manuscript~~ is a monument to his ignorance.

243 He just can't avoid making a spectacle of himself, having persuaded himself that ~~what~~ ^{what} he imagined and was not true is unquestionable fact. After saying that Oswald was "framed to appear leftist" he says, "This occurred while he was still doing intelligence work in Dallas (tinting the Kremlin ~~with~~ red.)" He has not shown that Oswald did any intelligence work in Dallas.

In pretending that there were close Oswald associations with those that by normal standards of proof he has not shown and that they were working for the CIA, as he also has not shown, he is careful to exculpate the CIA from any assassination role. But he suggests at the same time that operations can get out of control, again suggesting that CIA people could have been involved in the crime. But he has given not a shred of evidence to support this. Like all else in his conclusion, this depends on what precedes it being correct and

81

relevant, ~~and~~ not his bad dream. As I could with more effort have shown more than I have, it is neither. It is a bad dream, badly presented.

He has a footnote almost a page in length to page 244, ~~what~~ to what he would have included in his text had it been published earlier, to another self-indictment of his pretended scholarship. He presents as worthy of serious consideration another writer who does not lower himself to deal with reality, Jim Marrs and his book Crossfire. (313-4) ^{Melanson} ~~the~~ has Marrs say for him that the government and allies killed JFK: "So the decision was made at the highest level...Therefore ~~the~~ decision was made to eliminate John ^{K.} Kennedy by means of a public executive (stolen from Jim ^{Melanson} ~~Garrison, this bit~~)...While operational orders probably originated with the CIA, the monsters recruited ^{the} world-class assassin ^{was} from an international crime syndicate who ^{was} then given entree to the conspiracy groups within U.S. intelligence, the anti-Castro ~~Cy~~ Cubans, the right-wing hate groups and the military."

Marrs book is a compendium of all the many nut theories. No self-respecting scholar would use it as a source. ~~The~~ Melanson adds this sick and disgusting nonsense to his own work and would thereby deceive and mislead the nation even more.

The awful truth is the Melanson says pretty much the same thing but ^{2/} limiting it to intelligence agencies when he says (244-5) that "it is possible for someone in control of a network (of spies) to misappropriate it. ...The conspiracy would not have to be massive, institutionally sponsored, or involve only witting participants - not on this turf." 245-6 Oswald was killed, he says, as part of this ^{imagined} monster conspiracy: "One of the ways that criminal and clandestine organizations (my, isn't he expert on everything!) keep secrets is to murder those who might reveal them. Some of the people who knew about Oswald's links to U.S. intelligence...." More (248) : "The morning after the assassination an untold number of ~~the~~ intelligence officers in various agencies or branches must have been panicked about their Oswald file(s) and the problem it could cause them." (Why would they have to wait over night to panic?)

248 "...there is more we can learn about Oswald and the crime...For starters, withheld files should be released..." Wow! This from the man who ignores more than a third of a million pages of ^{of} what has been released and makes not a single reference to the fact of

82

their release or how they came to be released in two books? Sure, more remains withheld but what is wrong with using what is not withheld and is readily available? (And what is right about in effect lying about it because he does know that all this was released and he came to me and got what he wanted of what I got under FOIA on the King assassination - not that this is mentioned in that book, in which he also pretended that he had invented ~~the~~ the wheel and discovered sex.)

He cites no source for this and it reflects how great his ignorance of files and holdings is: "As of this writing, the FBI is still withholding an estimated fifteen percent of its original case file on the assassination."

^{"Case"}
~~There is no single FBI file on the assassination and the "original" file is gibberish.~~
There ~~also~~ are many files on the assassination. ~~Separate large file on Oswald and Ruby.~~

Headquarters and the many field offices each have files on the assassination. (There is a file at each place with that title.)

^{are}
There ~~is~~ are separate files on each of the Oswald ^{S. J.}

There are Jack Ruby files (classified ~~at headquarters~~ as "civil rights"!)

^{are}
There ~~is~~ are acknowledged Warren Commission files and others the existence of ~~which~~ which is known that the FBI merely lies about.

There are many files on many individuals some of whom Melanson mentions. Like the de Mohrenschildts, Banister, Ferrie and even subject-matter authors.

In terms of his mythologies, there are FPCC, CP, SWP, defectors ^{files} and many others that are relevant as well as the irrelevant ones of his mythology.

There also are files that are hidden by means of tricky classification of them, the improper classifications not being searched and are pretended not to be relevant when they are. A convenient illustration is the FBI claim in court not to have any tape recording of the assassination-period broadcasts of the Dallas police. Yet the FBI transcribed those broadcasts and the Warren Commission published the FBI's transcriptions. In fact the FBI dubbed its tapes on a Wallensak ~~tape~~ ^{recorder} recorder and hid the tapes in a metal cabinet, not a file drawer, in Dallas.

What I am saying is that his ignorance is across the entire board. ^{does have} and he has the academic qualifications of a scholar. ^{now} and again seeks to exploit ~~these~~ these credentials.

249 Without citation or any identification of them he says that "researchers have noted that the Bureau is particularly reluctant to disclosing documents relating to Mexico City... the story put forth by the CIA source 'D'...." Then how do I have records on "D," Alvarado Ugarte that are, in fact, in the main assassination files? And in fact, under FOIA, the FBI did disclose ^{to} Mexico City office assassination files.

249 Again, his scholarly ignorance relating to disclosures and withholding: "As for Congress, it should begin by passing ^s long-overdue legislation that would ~~eliminate~~ eliminate its own secrecy cloak. After the House Select Committee on Assassinations disbanded in 1978, it declared its voluminous records to be ^T 'congressional materials', a status that enables them to be withheld until the year 2028." His source for this incorrect formulation is hardly expert on it ^{and} but it is self-puffery. He cites his own book on the King assassination. The fact is that those records ^{are} were withheld not under the ^{any} "declassification" by the committee but under the standing rules of the Congress. While/without question there is much in them that is withheld improperly, it is also true that they are loaded with frightful character assassinations and other ~~be~~ records hurtful of the innocent. One of the reasons for the 50-year rule is protection of ^{the} innocent. (In this area Melanson is safe because most of the characters he assassinates are dead. Their ghosts can't sue.)

Appendix A ~~252-3~~ 252-3 Chronologies can be quite useful but to be useful they must hold significant events. Melanson finds nothing significant in Oswald's military career other than the dates of enlistment and release. ^h This reflects ignorance and unscholarly preconceptions. Nothing in Oswald's earlier life is significant other than his birth and his joining the Civil Air Patrol because there are no other earlier entries. There is no entry after his release by the Marines until he crossed the Finnish border en route to Moscow. ^{when} With the known fact ~~and Melanson's limited use of it,~~ that Oswald could not have gotten to Finland by any commercial carrier ^{is} not worth ^{it} of inclusion in his chronology it is apparent that the chronology is incompetent, unscholarly, undependable and is merely a piece of literary scrimshaw. He regard the dates of the birth of Oswald's children as more

84
important. as a means of evaluating his interest in carefulness, I note that he refers to the half of the original room in the rooming house at 1026 N. Beckley, Dallas - the room was partitioned to make two rooms of it for renting - as an "apartment." If Oswald's rental of a post office box in Dallas is worth of listing, why isn't his rental of the New Orleans post box? When Oswald was charged with each crime also isn't worth mentioning, or when he bought the rifle and pistol?

Bibliography 316-22

He does not draw upon much that he lists and he lists some awful crap, unscholarly work at best. He lists also what he ignores in this text, the work of the Dutch reporter, Willem Oltmans, who helped drive de Mohrenschildt over the brink. He has suppressed all mention of what Oltmans did with de Mohrenschildt here and abroad and what happened to de Mohrenschildt abroad and what he then did. Had Melanson not suppressed this it would not have been easy to pretend that de Mohrenschildt was always rational when he assuredly wasn't. But he had to do this because he builds so much on his de Mohrenschildt fancies. While Kerry "hornley's tiny and slim book retitled to "Oswald" is in his bibliography (it is hardly longer than some magazine articles) he does not list my Post Mortem which does have information relating to Oswald in Russia, Oswald as in intelligence, and an entire area of relevant and disclosed information that he has suppressed. This relates to the defected KGB official Yuri Nosenko. The House Associations Committee also published Nosenko information that Melanson suppressed.

Post Mortem also includes facsimile reproduction of a quite relevant Warren Commission executive session.

Examination of the part of the bibliography on the CIA reflects that it, too, is pseudo-scholarly padding. Such entries Peter Wright's Spy Catcher, which has nothing to do with this subject matter. and Carlos Bringuier's Red Friday, which is junk. But when he does mention Clay Shaw, albeit less than even in his context he should have, he does not include the Kirkwood defense of Shaw, an American roteague.

One of the really fine book on the assassination is Howard Roffman's Presumed Guilty.

By Melanson's scholarly standards and precepts it is unworthy ^{of inclusion} when Bringuier's is ^{of} worthy.

Of the multitude of articles on the assassination, only two of his are listed.

likewise of all the TV documentaries, only two by CBS are listed. One that NBC-TV did on New Orleans and Garrison's response are not listed, nor are the many domestic and foreign ^{documentaries} produced here and abroad in 1988

What I am saying again is that even his bibliography is not scholarly or honest and reflects ignorance, preconceptions, prejudice, ^{and} poor judgement ~~of a combination of these flaws, I believe all of them.~~

If there was a legitimate reason for including Spy Catcher in the bibliography then why not any of the other British books, particularly one devoted ^{entirely} to the British book on the plot to overthrow the British government by its own spookery, barely mentioned in Spy catcher. The CIA was involved in that!

I've done this in haste and under conditions that ought not intrude themselves into this kind of work. I've read the manuscript only once, annotating while reading. I decided to comment and analyze page-by-page because I had read Melanson's The Murkin Conspiracy. It is a remarkably dishonest book and suffers more ~~other~~ serious defects than publishers ordinarily could possibly perceive. It also has contrivances designed to make it appear that Melanson has solved the crime and to stake out his claim to being the ~~top~~ expert on that assassination about which he is ~~also~~ also astoundingly ignorant. In that book he also addressed none of the alleged evidence of the crime itself ^{He} and was in fact ignorant of not only that fact but ^a judicial determination of fact in that crime. In both books he takes the safe and unscholarly course of assuming guilt. If desired, I can expand on this.

Soy Saga is permeated by dishonesty, ignorance, stupidities, factual errors, childish thinking, incompetent and immature pseudo-analyses, fabrications, amateur Shrinkery and it is an ego-trip.

It is trash and the trash stinks!

After reading this and making corrections in haste to be able to get it to you as rapidly as possible I append a bit of trivia that may be of interest and further commentary on Melanson's lack of scholarship and subject-matter ignorance.

Where he writes about Gaudet I referred to what he omitted of what Gaudet did do, ~~trying~~ ^{to} covert the assassination into a "red" plot involving ~~Kortsky's~~ ^{Trotsky's} nephew, Larry Borenstein. If you or others there like New Orleans jazz, Larry, as of my last knowledge, owned Preservation Hall. Aside from playing there, the Preservation Hall bands ~~four~~ ^{four} and have been on TV.

I also refer to Melanson's lack of knowledge of Gaudet's connections and operation and I did mention his sharing of addresses with the Watergate-connected Mullen Agency of the CIA. I forget to include the fact that the CIA's Free Cuba Committee also shared some of those addresses, and that is ²/₄ relevant in this manuscript.