

XX Holy Water in the Vampire's Face

If the distinct advantages of having no functioning^{ed} conscient^{ed} to interfere with the best Big Brotherly work is not yet apparent, its indispensibility to Posner will be apparent immediately as we examine the corpi delict[?] of the two now interrelated crimes, that of the assassination and that of this book^s that with Orwellian dedication seeks to rewrite our history.

240 fols

There is no personal satisfaction for me in stating that ^{that is not why} ~~some of the time~~ he lies. I use this word to describe what he does. My purpose is to inform those who lack my subject-matter knowledge, so that they and the record for our history will not attribute his lies to simple factual error to which we can all be prone. His book is full of various kinds of mistakes. When I use the unpleasant word that is generally avoided in writing it is to inform and to emphasize the disreputable, really unconscionable means by which he and Random House have created a great evil for ^{them} enrichment, for dirty pieces of silver from besmirching this terribly tragic event in our history; for giving a false account of it that he knows is wrong and Random House would have ^{known} (if it had followed the normal practise, particularly with contrivsial matters in non-fiction and had peer reviews made by those competent to do that; and to use the not inconsiderable publisher's means of getting maximum international attention to a knowingly false account of the in context most tragic and costly event that turned this country and the world around.

^{as they have done,} To ~~th~~ do this cannot be excused or justified and to be able to do it only by what most will not be able to recognize is ^{deliberate} premeditated lies is a true horror.

It is so that the reader will understand this; so that record for history will be clear and unequivocal; so that those who helped this truly nefarious project may ^{better and fully} understand what they have been part of and by any means available to them try to undo what they have done, as an example those who reached even more people with these lies, as the major and the ^{minor} media throughout the world did; and so that I can be as forceful and as explicit and as ~~honest~~ thoroughgoing in condemnations of doing so evil a thing for money and for any other purpose that I am this explicit and that I have taken this time in this ~~for me~~ at my age in the state of my health that I make this clear records without mincing words because it normally is not done or because it is unpleasant.

It is not merely to spit in his face and Random House's.

~~Early on~~ ^{states} Posner repeated the law-school truism, that testimony closest to the event must be given most weight, Having done that he proceeded not to practise it because he had he would not have been able to ~~not~~ write this book. When by dredging the swamps of all the undependable or just plain wrong statements, obviously wrong to anyone with any ^{he could not write what he wanted to} knowledge of the fact, he just ~~made~~ ^{made} it up. In plainest ^{240.A} language, he lied. ^{Not} being satisfied with mere lying - and by the time in his book he ^{gets} ~~got~~ to his "Dealey Plaza" chapter perhaps that was getting monotonous to him ^{enhanced} he ~~used~~ ^{used} his dirtiness with footnotes to appear to cite official sworn testimony to ^{support} his own lies. This is precisely the way he ^{notes} ~~begins~~ his Dealey Plaza fiction to which he gives the title, "I'll Never Forget It As Long as I live." (Pages 224-62) With its very first words!

Lihni~~e~~ Mae Randle, Buell Frazier's sister, was at her kitchen sink when she glanced out the window at 7:15 Friday morning, November 22. She saw Oswald walk across the street toward her house, carrying a long package parallel to his body. He held one end of the brown-paper-wrapped object tucked under his armpit, and the other end did not quite touch the ground. Randle later recalled it appeared to contain something heavy.

Except for the last six words, which came from what Randle told the FBI, the note referring to ~~that~~ ^{them} and to ~~that~~ ^{them} only, the rest is false. This is his permeating Tricky ~~Dickery~~ Dickery with footnotes, using them to lie.

The truth, what the actual Commission evidence is absolutely clear about, which is not what can be said of the Commission's conclusions, is all set forth in chapter three of my first book that, I repeat, dates to mid-February, 1965. Posner has that book. His problem is that he cannot have truth and formula-book fame and fortune at the same time.

This indispensable dishonesty Posner cannot blame on his contrivance of not trusting Sylvia Heagher's index. Nor did he need the index he said he made himself. He did not have to use either, except to misrepresent so he would have the book that without it he would not have. All he had to do was use the ^{official sources I cited} sources ~~carefully~~ ^{carefully} and accurately given to each bit of the same ~~valid~~ ^{valid} evidence. If he intended an honest book, that is.

① But to Posner truth is like holy water ^{is} to vampires.

Without his deliberate lie, that the package Oswald carried extended from his armpit to almost the ground, his false reconstruction is wiped out to begin with, so he does what is necessary for his commercialization of that great tragedy; he makes it ^{up} and with his trickiness tells the reader that ^{what he made up} is what Randle said. The truth, from the Commission's own evidence, and under both oath and ^{under its} lawyers' examination is what Posner had to ignore from Whitewash, where it appears on page 16⁶. What Randle actually swore to and persisted in when the Commission's lawyers tried to get her to describe a longer package than she saw, is that the package Oswald gripped in his hand and with his arm and hand down, did not quite reach the ground, half the length that Posner lies into her statement:

The narrative continues with Mrs. Linnie Mae Randle (2H245ff.), Frazier's sister with whom he lived, noticing Oswald approaching with a "heavy brown bag", in the Commission's words rather than Mrs. Randle's. He "gripped the bag in his right hand, near the top. 'It tapered like this as he hugged it in his hand. It was ... more bulky toward the bottom than toward the top.'" If this seems like a novel or dangerous way to carry a rifle, especially with the metal portion not attached to the stock and more likely to punch a hole in paper, it did not seem so to the Commission. And if Oswald's "gripping" and "hugging" might be expected to leave marks of at least crumpling on the bag, the Commission did not so expect and the bag itself (Exhibit 142, 16H513; Exhibit 1304, R132, etc.) shows no markings of the shape of a rifle, assembled or disassembled. The creases where it was folded in four are still sharp and clear. After untold handling, examination and testing, these creases are strong enough to keep the bag from lying flat when extended to its full length.

"Mrs. Randle estimated that the package was approximately 28 inches long and about 8 inches wide," according to the Report. It was not quite that way. Mrs. Randle first described the manner in which Oswald was carrying his package. In the part the Commission does not quote in the Report, Mrs. Randle said, "... it almost touched the ground" (7H248).

This was not lost upon the Commission, for when Assistant Counsel Joseph A. Ball misinterpreted Mrs. Randle's testimony, asking, "And where was his hand gripping the middle of the package?" Mrs. Randle corrected him, saying, "No, sir; the top ...". Ball reiterated her correction and her description of the package as almost touching the ground.

In NEVER AGAIN! I began the practise I resume here, of using what was published and readily available, what did not require any research in the 10,000,000 published Commission words or the two hundred cubic feet of its records in the Archives, or ^{any} of that quarter of a million pages of records I obtained by those FOIA lawsuits, to underscore the ready availability ^{of it} without all that research, to anyone wanting to write in the field. Posner boasts of how extensive his reading is and makes piddling and usually unfaithful criticisms of it ^{and} as we have seen, of ^{my} ~~the~~ book that I here and later cite, his reading was so close he could spot and misuse four non-continuous words of the six hundred words on a single page. ^{of it} ^{and} ^{did} not see what I quote from it?

Continuing with dishonesty that is total, Posner skips ahead, as the reader has no way of knowing ^{how} he does with the official evidence—he indexed it, remember — to the arrival of Oswald with his ride, Randle's ^{brother,} Buell Wesley Frazier, at the ESBD ~~building~~ building (page ~~224~~ 224)

Unlike Posner, I neither then or since had any interest in fabricating any theory of any phony solution for fame and fortune. I limited myself to the official evidence, evidence, closest to the event, in Posner's own preaching ^(page 235) (that he does not practise because he cannot. And, unlike him as he begins this lengthy false account without which he has no book, I want the reader to ~~begin~~ begin with an understand of the ^{my} importance of this actual evidence and Posner's false representation of it.

In order to be able to pin the ~~assassin rap~~ ^{first} assassin rap on Oswald and for ~~him~~ him to have been in that sixth-floor window it is necessary to prove that Oswald brought the ^{when all the evidence is that he did not.} rifle into the building that morning. Even when making up what is not known and certainly was not proven, that the rifle was disassembled, making any package ^{dit} (thereby shorter, the Commission's failure was total. So, as lawyers do in their opening statements in trial, I ^{do} began ~~that~~ mustering of that evidence with a summary of what it proves (page 15):

The Commission had to prove that Oswald had taken the rifle to the scene. With the possible exception of Oswald's alleged and completely unproved attempt on the life of General Edwin Walker (Marina's tale that even General Walker himself did not believe), no one reported any rifle in Oswald's hands for months. Actually, there is no proof that Oswald ever had the Serial No. C-2766 Mannlicher-Carcano rifle in his possession after getting it at the post office. And that is the rifle the Commission held was the assassination weapon. To try and show that on the morning of the crime Oswald might have taken the rifle to work, the Commission called four witnesses, not counting his wife, who was in bed and had not seen him leave the house.

By means of these witnesses, the Commission attempted to show that Oswald purloined the materials from his place of employment and fabricated a long bag at home, disassembled the rifle, saving but a few inches in its overall length, placed it in the bag and took it to and into the Book Depository. It never attempted to show how or, in fact, that he did take it from the first-floor entrance up to the sixth and through the entire length of that floor, on which a number of people were continuously employed. In questioning those witnesses so employed, the Commission carefully avoided this question.

Without exception, each of these four witnesses either swore that Oswald could not have carried the rifle (2H245FF.; 2H210FF.; 7H-531FF.), did not carry it into the building (6H377), or did not take the materials for manufacturing the bag to the Paine residence in Irving (2H242), and, in fact, could not have (6H356FF.). Each and all of the witnesses proved the impossibility of the Commission's reconstruction. These were the only witnesses the Commission examined on this matter, except for technical experts on unessential aspects. And even their testimony does not support the Commission. Yet the Commission's conclusion is that Oswald did all of these things. Every single and essential aspect is clearly and unequivocally disproved by the witnesses in one of the unfortunately rare instances in which the Commission pressed its witnesses in search of fact. The more the Commission tried to get the witnesses to change or alter their stories, the more positive the witnesses became in their testimonies.

This is the plain and simple truth Posner fabricates and lies his way around because if he does not do that he has nothing at all - no Oswald in that window with that rifle to be his lone assassin, the basic need of his book.

The Commission, which began as Posner does, with a lone- assassin preconception and the preconception that Oswald was that assassin, had the same problem. I therefore treated the ^{evidence} evidence as defense counsel does in a trial, the practise Posner condemned when Sylvia ^W eagher did it, by examining the "prosecution" case, its own evidence. That is what I now do again ~~so~~ so the reader can understand the essentiality of his asserted dishonestise ~~to~~ to what Posner set out to do, regardless of truth, fact or evidence.

Here, as frequently throughout Chapter 3 of Whitewash, the length of the package Oswald carried, the maximum length it could have had- is the first official disproof of the Commission's unsuccessful effort to make it long enough to have ~~carried~~ contained the rifle disassembled:

Knowing Oswald's sleeve length and height, as the Commission did, measuring the length of a package he could have held in his grip without touching the ground was simple and provided an accurate means of approximating the length. Actually, it requires a tall man, which Oswald was not, or a man with abnormally short arms (we don't know his arm length), for a 28-inch package to even barely clear the ground. The Commission had a passion for reconstructions. All of them had unsatisfactory results and at best jeopardized the Commission's findings. Some disproved the Commission's theories. The minimum length of the disassembled rifle was 34.8 inches (R133). The Report does not quote a package reconstruction.

Instead, it worked on its witnesses. Shown Exhibit 364, a replica bag, Mrs. Randle maintained, "Well, it wasn't that long, I mean it was folded down at the top as I told you. It definitely wasn't that long." Asked to stand up and use the bag as a prop, she reiterated it was too long. Then asked, "About how long would you think the package would be, just measure it right here," Mrs. Randle did, saying "... like this." Ball confirmed her markings, saying, "From here to here?" and is given an affirmative reply, concluding, "... with that folded down this much for him to grip in his hand."

The measurement was neither taken nor recorded. Anxious as the Commission was for a specific measurement, one can only speculate about this "oversight". Counsel Ball continued working on his witness, even asking her to guess the length of the entire bag, which she had not seen. Finally, she folded the bag to the length she thought it might have been, while Ball told her he was not sure which was the top and which the bottom of the bag. This time the length was measured, and it would seem the new length suited Mr. Ball better, for he measured it at 28 1/2 inches. Mrs. Randle informed him, "I measured 27 last time." Earlier Ball had described another estimate of the total length of the bag by Mrs. Randle at "about two feet". She had indicated it might have been "a little bit more".

Thus, by both her description of the haphazard manner in which the bag was carried and in her repeated estimates and markings of the length of the bag, Mrs. Randle emerges as a consistent, highly credible witness. She was neither persuaded, cajoled nor deceived into altering her account in the slightest. Certainly the manner in which Oswald was carrying the bag is the kind of image she could clearly have kept in mind. And it fixed the bag's maximum length.

(Whitewash, page 17)

This Posner knew. This Posner could not live with. So, he lied about it.

Frazier's sworn testimony is that when they got to the TSEB building he sat in his old car for a while to run the motor to charge the battery up. He then was looking at Oswald when Oswald ^{forward} walked to the building without him. What Posner knew if not from his alleged reading off all the Commission's evidence and indexing it, he knew from Whitewash, here from pages ~~16, 17~~ 17 and 18:

Her brother, whom the Report next quotes, was completely consistent with her, and his account likewise never varied. The Report says, "Frazier recalled that one end of the package was under Oswald's armpit and the lower part was held in his right hand so that it was carried straight and parallel to his body". On December 1, 1963, he had shown FBI agents the space he recalled the bag occupying on the back seat of his car (and who would have put a knocked-down rifle on the back seat, from which the first sudden stop could have hurled it to the floor, attracting attention and risking the rupture of the bag and revelation of its contents?). By the FBI measurement, 27 inches was the maximum possible length. Frazier's own estimate of the size when he first saw the package, which he assumed contained curtain rods, was two feet. When Frazier was questioned (2H210ff; 7H531ff.), it turned out that he had once worked in a department store and had, in the course of that employment, handled packaged curtain rods.

At the time of the assassination, Frazier was picked up by the police. Before the Commission he was grilled and pushed in an effort to get him to change his description of the length of the package. At one point, when Frazier conceded the package might have been a bit wider than the five or six inches he remembered, Ball tried to interpret this as a concession of greater length un-

til Frazier specified "widthwise not lengthwise".

After Ball declared there were no more questions, he suddenly told Frazier the Commission had the rifle in the bag and asked him to "stand up here and put this under your arm and then take a hold of it at the side". Frazier demurred. Ball ordered him, "Turn around." Frazier continued to demur, with explanations that accomplished nothing. He again insisted Oswald had the package "tucked under his shoulder" when asked by the Chairman, adding again that Oswald "had it cupped in his hand". The Chief Justice said, "I beg your pardon?" and Frazier replied, "I said from where I noticed it he had it cupped in his hands. And I don't see how you could have it anywhere other than under your armpit" without the end being visible. To Ball he insisted the package was not and could not have been carried in any position other than the one he described. After reiterating his observations to Ball, Frazier added that he had followed Oswald to the place they worked for two blocks "and you couldn't tell he had a package from the back". Then, viewing Frazier holding the packaged rifle, Ball conceded the package extended "almost to the level of your ear".

In the course of attempting to get Frazier to modify his testimony, which the Report accurately depicts as two feet "give or take a few inches", the Commission merely established the clarity and positiveness of his recollection. As a by-product, this hearing called attention to the Commission's failure to allude to the third dimension of the package, its thickness. Frazier, however, unintimidated even if nervous, did this in two ways. First, he testified that from the manner in which Oswald carried the package "you couldn't tell he had a package", hardly a description of a bulky military rifle, especially when carried in two pieces (2H243). Earlier, when pressured by Ball about the narrower width of the package than suited the Commission's theory, Frazier gave the lawyer a polite lecture of measurements, saying, "if you were using a yardstick or one of these little -" Ball interrupted to declare, "I was using my hand." Frazier replied, "I know you were, but there are some different means to measure it," and specified the difference between a rigid yardstick and a flexible tape measure, which would follow the contour of the package and, by including some of the thickness, result in a greater width measurement.

Despite immediate police pressures and hassling, the young man refused to tell other than the truth, well aware as he was of how unwelcome the truth was regarded by the police and later by the Commission. Much as a few phrases can be misrepresented and quoted out of context to give them a meaning they do not have, Frazier ~~was~~ remained firm in his testimony. As I write on page 19, and as Posner knew,

Frazier's truthfulness was established, according to Detective R. S. Stovall, by a polygraph examination (7H190, 21H602). Stovall's words were, "The examination showed conclusively that Wesley Frazier was truthful and that the facts stated by Frazier in his affidavit were true."

Posner thus faces the same problem the Commission did, but it did not dare his open dishonesties in an official Report, much as they took liberties with their own evidence, even concluding exactly the opposite of what all its testimony said merely because it had to in order to be able to ^{conclude} that Oswald was the lone assassin. Continuing with what Posner knew, ^{from} ~~fr~~ Page 19:

^{But the}
 but the Commission had to use Frazier to get Oswald to the building with any kind of a package, even though Frazier, as did his sister, proved Oswald could not possibly have been carrying the rifle. With complete and total disregard of the only testimony it had, the Commission concluded exactly the opposite from its only evidence. It said simply, "Frazier and Randle are mistaken" (R134).
 So Frazier put Oswald at the building and was himself about 50 feet behind the presumed about-to-be assassin. This is how the Report gets him into the building: "One employee, Jack Dougherty, believed that he saw Oswald coming to work, but he does not remember Oswald had anything in his hands as he entered the door. No other employee has been found who saw Oswald enter that morning." (R131)
 At this point the Report refers by footnote to that part of Dougherty's testimony (6H373-82) appearing on pages 6H376-7.

Posner is not alone in playing with words to convey what the evidence does not say and mean. This is a different trip around this pitfall, as we shall see,

The excerpt from the Report needs clarification. It was Oswald, not Dougherty, who was then coming to work, and Oswald, not Dougherty, who went through the door. Dougherty was trusted with extra responsibilities by his employer and reported to work an hour earlier than the other employees.
 Asked, "Did you see Oswald come to work that morning?" Dougherty told Ball, unhesitatingly, "Yes - when he first came into the door." "When he came in the door?" the interrogator repeated, and Dougherty said, "Yes." Then Ball wanted to know, "Did you see him come in the door?"
 "Yes; I saw him when he first came in the door - yes," was Dougherty's unqualified reply. So much for the use of the word "believed" to describe Dougherty's testimony.
 Now for the language that says Dougherty "does not remember Oswald had anything in his hands".
 Dougherty had answered the question less positively than satisfied Ball, saying, "I didn't see anything if he did." Ball then asked him additional questions, to which Dougherty replied, "I didn't see anything in his hands ..."
 "In other words, you would say positively he had nothing in his hands?" Ball demanded. (All emphasis added.)
 "I would say that - yes, sir," was Dougherty's equally unqualified response.

Dall made the classic lawyers' mistake, asking one question too many. ~~As a~~ result, the actual evidence is that the only person who saw Oswald enter the building swore "positibely" that he carried nothing. This means that the only existing evidence is ~~that~~ that Oswald did not carry the rifle ~~or~~ anything else ~~into~~ into the building.

In summary, one ^{hundred} percent of the official sworn evidence by witnesses questioned in secret and pressure ^{d/} to say what the Commission wanted them to say; ^{refuted it. they} refuse ^{d/} to change what they said they saw and what they testified to, all of the evidence, is that Oswald not only did not carry the rifle into the building, the package he carried as long as ⁴ Frazier could see him was much too short to have contained even the disassembled rifle.

Posner's approach to the problem posed by Daugherty's testimony, the official proof that Oswald did not carry the rifle into the building, testimony of which he knew

from what he ~~has~~ presents ^{as} his ^{own} diligent study of all that evidence and then ^{his} indexing it, is simple and straightforward dishonesty. He mentioned Daugherty ^{at} three places, pages 226, 227 and 237. But he does not once refer to this testimony. He suppresses entirely the only evidence of how Oswald entered that building to become the official mythology's and Posner's lone assassin - carrying nothing at all!

Putting that rifle in Oswald's possession and getting it into the building with him is essential to ^{al}lging that he was the assassin. Every single word of the official evidence says and means the exact opposite of what the Commission and Posner say. The Commission's solution to ^{getting around} ~~this~~ every word of its own evidence ^{own} was merely to conclude the opposite of what its ^{own} evidence ^{proves}.

Posner is not content with that. His is an even greater dishonesty. He made a non-person in the evidence of Daugherty and makes mention of him where it is not necessary at all, as merely present with other employees on other occasions. In those places Posner contrives criticism of other assassination books but he does not, even mention Whitewash or the repeating of the Commission's own evidence in it.

He has problems with ~~it~~ that evidence too of course.

Not ^{or} wisely Posner depends on his falsifications, like the length of that package, and his omissions to give the impression that Oswald did ^{carry} get the rifle into the building. Having ignored Dougherty's only-witness testimony that could not have been more explicit, Posner then resorts to tricky writing and footnote arguments to make his fabrications appear to be the actuality when they are not.

He does not write what he knew, the reason for Oswald walking to the building without Frazier and, citing no source, he writes that "Frazier watched him enter the Depository, carrying the package next to his body." If Posner had a source for either of the two ~~dear~~ ^{statements} separate statements, first that Frazier watched Oswald to the building's door and into it and that he was "carrying the package next to his body," he would have cited his sources. ^{He does not.} What he says is contrary to Frazier's testimony and ~~was~~ ^{as} we have seen, Frazier's description of how Oswald carried that package is graphic, he refused to change what said when pressed to under oath, and once again it is clear that Posner lies for his purpose of creating a false case.

Pretending that there is none of the sworn testimony repeated above from the book he had and impossible to miss if he really did study ~~the~~ those twenty-six volumes and ~~really~~ really did index them, he argued in his footnote: "Unnamed Critics claim that Linie Mae Randle and Buell Frazier described a package too short to contain Oswald's rifle." (page 224, . . . Unnamed critics says this and only they? Not the Warren Report and its testimony, its only testimony on the length of that package?

As he ~~continues~~ ^{more} to argue in the continuations of this footnote onto the bottom of the next page, after some deceptiveness for which we need here take no time, Posner lies again in saying that "The FBI discovered the bag containing microscopic fibers from the blanket with which Oswald kept his rifle wrapped ~~in~~ in the Paine garage (WC Vol. IV, pp. 57, 76-80)" More ^{dirty} Dickery with footnotes, that Posner standby. Neither of his citations is to the FBI testimony on those fibers. The reason is obvious: it gave no such testimony and no such test results are possible. The most expert examination can show is consistency between the specimens and an enormous number of things ^{are} made from similar

Posner's lying to pretend support from the Paines draw^{he} attention to what ~~he~~, like the Commission, ignored about Oswald and that rifle and getting it, allegedly, into the Paine garage at Irving, Texas.

The Commission elicited ^{misused} testimony from Marina that elsewhere Posner exploits to the effect that Oswald practised with that ~~real~~ rifle on their ^{porch} porch in New Orleans but only after dark. This does place that rifle, at least in Commission and Posner argument, in New Orleans. They never got ~~it~~ ^{it} ~~ever~~ ^{eventual} ~~tried~~ ^{tried} to get it - to Texas and into ^{the} garage.

Oswald, obviously, did not take it to Mexico and back on all those many buses.

Ruth Piane testified that she did not load the rifle into her stationwagon when she loaded the Oswald possessions into it, Marina then being far along in her second pregnancy.

Michael Paine, who unloaded that stationwagon in Texas, testified that he had not unloaded the rifle.

And both, of Quakers, testified that they would not, as a matter of conscience, ~~get~~ have permitted a rifle in their property.

Like the Commission, Posner just assumed or willed it there.

Like the Commission, making reference to the scientific testing of that blanket, neither report any oil on it yet that rifle, as the FBI laboratory report on it states clearly, was well oiled.

In the face of all of the evidence, the Commission and Posner just willed that rifle from New Orleans to Dallas and then, as we have seen, they just willed it, again in contradiction of all of the evidence, into the building because, if they did not, they had no case against Oswald at all.

Returning to

and only that.
 fibers. And that is what the FBI did testify to, Not only did the FBI not give the testimony Posner attributes to it, which I repeat means he lied, and not only does his trickery with footnotes in this writing ^{around his} ~~compared~~ that lie, it is also a lie to cite Paine testimony, which he does, to any statement ^{Oswald} saying they knew he had a rifle in their garage. They knew no such things and testified they would have prohibited any weapon in their property.

248A here The ~~in~~ this same footnote Posner ends with a cutie, "although Oswald claimed to have curtain rods in the bag, ~~none~~ none were found at the Depository."

There is no cited source on this last deliberate deception, which as much as says that once Oswald made that claim there ~~was~~ ^{was} an immediate ea search for those curtain rods. There was not. Not by the building management, not by the police or the Secret Service of the FBI. And from his own diligent examination and indexing of all the Commission published, if ^{Posner} ~~he~~ wrote the truth, never a safe assumption with Posner, and if not, ^{page 22 of} ~~from Whitewash where~~ ^{in which} I note again his examination of it was careful enough to spot four noncontinuous words on a page of ~~600~~ six hundred words, he did know the truth:

On what basis did the Commission prove Oswald had no curtain rods with him that fateful morning? Was there an immediate and thorough search for them (if for anything)? Not at all. The Commission's "evidence" is a long-delayed afterthought. On August 31, 1964, almost as the Report was going to press and more than nine months following the assassination, the Commission wrote the FBI Dallas office asking that Roy S. Truly, manager of the Depository, "be interviewed to ascertain if he knows of any curtain rods having been found in the TSBD building after November 22, 1963."

The FBI reported, "... He stated that it would be customary for any discovery of curtain rods to immediately be called to his attention and that he has received no information to the effect that any curtain rods were found ..." (Exhibit 2640, 25H899).

Aside from the inference that Truly had special regulations about the finding of curtain rods, this means nothing. After more than nine months, who knew what might or might not have been taken from a building into which a rifle was taken without detection? Truly had testified twice, at great length and under oath, without having once been asked about the curtain rods. Nobody cared to ask him. On August 3 he supplied the Commission with an affidavit (7H591) attesting that the door in the vestibule outside the employees' lunchroom was usually closed because it was controlled by an automatic mechanism. It would seem that it was not until the Commission called Oswald a liar in the draft of the Report that, too late for the inclusion of a sworn statement, the staff belatedly asked for a secondhand, unsworn and meaningless opinion.

One possibility remained: Did the "room" Oswald rented need curtain rods? The Report quotes the owner, not the housekeeper (R130), as saying the room "had curtains and curtain rods". It may well have, but the Commission need not have depended upon the word of a landlady who could hardly be expected to say her tenants lived in a fishbowl. This room was so thoroughly searched by the police immediately after the assassination that on a check the following day nothing was found except a single paperclip. Many police and media people were there. The hearings abound with identical pictures repeated numerous times under different exhibit numbers, and both the Report and the Hearings have large areas of blank spaces on countless pages. Why, then, was there no picture showing whether, in fact, Oswald's cubicle had curtains?

With Oswald having claimed that he had ~~of~~ curtain rods for curtains because his cubicle was like a fishbowl, ^{as quoted by the police} not his exact words, but the actuality, no element of public authority dare^d/search to see if there were curtain rods at the Depository.. The reason is obvious: no part of public authority wanted the truth. They had a bird in hand and ~~to~~ ^{they were not about to} ~~beat the bushes.~~ ^{flushes.}

^{chapter 10 of White Wash} After she read this ^{she had read what I missed in the known ~~investigation~~ ^{volumes}} Sylvia Heagher told me that it was common practise for employees carrying parcels to work with them for those parcels to be left in a part of the Depository about which readers cannot ~~see~~ learn from Posner's text or from his incorrect and also incomplete floor-plan diagram in his Appendix B. (Pages (unnumbered) 480^u and 481)

The question I posed in this ~~writing~~ ^{writing} completed early in 1965 was never really addressed by any official body or authority. After discussing this I asked the obvious questions, of all the innumerable pictures ~~taken~~ taken, "Why, then, are there no pictures showing whether ~~or~~ no Oswald needed more privacy. When I learned the answer, this question should really be whether Oswald had the need for any privacy in that cubicle of a room partitioned ^{it} half to be able to rent two rooms from that one.

As ~~With~~ everything else, if Posner had asked me he would have had the proof.

But, still again, had he that proof I here present for the first time, after all these years, he would not have had his book and ~~was~~ all it gave him.

There is the photographic proof, and if I could get it, without leaving home all abdicated public authority, to say nothing of the hotshot investigators like Posner, also could have gotten it, had ~~any~~ ^{any} one wanted it.

My friend Richard Sprague, then of Hartsdale, New York and then a ~~vice~~ ^{vice} president of the prominent accounting firm, Touche, Bailey, asked me how he could help bring facts to light when he travelled, as he did ^{often} ~~much~~ in his work. I urged him to start a search for all available pictures of all kinds. He did ^{that} ~~that~~ and he was able to collect a large number of pictures not sought by ~~any~~ ^{any} official investigators ^{and not had by them.}

Among the pictures Dick located is a sheet of thirty-three contact prints of a roll of thirty-five millimeter pictures taken the day of the ^{on the next day} ~~assassination~~ in Dallas. These pictures are the property of Black Star, a well-known photo agency.

That cubicle did have venetian blinds. But it did not have curtains! Black Star's pictures show the room without curtains, apparent when what is on the outside is seen ~~is~~ between the slats of the blinds, they show the ~~curtains~~ curtains being installa installed and they show the diaphanous curtains after hung over all the windows!

Through those ~~curtains~~ ^{real} curtains Oswald would still have lacked ~~privacy~~.

Here, for the first ^{time} anywhere, is proof that Oswald told the truth and that he did have a need for curtains in his room.

As we have seen, ~~the~~ every word of the testimony the Commission took, which means every word Posner lied about ~~or~~ simply pretended did not exist, proves that Oswald could not possibly have carried even the disassembled rifle that morning.

And now we have the truth, that he did have need for ~~curtain~~ ^{curtain} rods. They ~~are~~ ^{were} required to hang the curtains he did need.

Aside from what this says about all the official investigators and all the literary who exploited whores/on both sides of the controversy, here Posner, ~~some of them~~ ^{like the rest of them, never} really sought truth, the evidence that was available. *It was within easy walking distance of Posner's apartment.*

Only a jury decides such matter, but I think these pictures/alone acquit Oswald and indict all involved officials their sycophants like Posner.

Were this not so, how can there be any honest explanation for the failure of all involved ~~componen~~ ^{nts} to investigate ~~an~~ ^{the} alibi that was offered?

How can those self-righteous of the Commission's ~~staff~~ ^{staff} explain their failure to demand that this be done when not one of them was directed to get the necessary investigation made?

Is Posner really an investigator when he made no effort to learn the truth? ~~or~~ ^{is} his failure, his disinterest, confirmation that he began ~~to~~ self-caste in an entirely different role, the ~~to~~ ^{real} role we are ~~un~~ ^{dis}covering.

#