

George Lardner, newsroom
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

8/26/93

Dear George,

If you have to get your review in by Monday this will reach you after your return and after you have turned your review in. I write for ^{the} purpose, to explain why for the first time in what is it now, more than 25 years, I was angry with you; and to tell you why I said that the time will come when you will be ashamed of the review you very clearly indicated you intended writing.

I think we have shown how men can disagree and get along. We have had strongly different views on the JFK assassination but we neither lacked trust in each other. I believe that if you think back over all those years you will not recall a time when I was not honest with you and that you will not recall a time I misinformed you.

I lost patience with you and was angry when you were not the man I ^{was} known all these years in that you absolutely refused to think. You reflected a determinedly unthinking partisan. That may be acceptable in a review but I prefer not to think so. I was so disappointed in you, so upset that when, from the convoluted hours I live, as you know I do, I was eating supper when you phoned and when we finished talking I could not finish it. And it was our first fresh corn of the season!

One example of this is one aspect of that fifth of Willis' pictures. Of the several evidential ^{points} and by this I mean factual points it represents you just would not face the fact that it is a physical impossibility for it to have been taken at any time other than before Zapruder Frame 202. While there is no question from the evidence that he took it in ^{the} fraction to hearing the shot, and it was the first one, my point was separate from that. It was that it was a physical impossibility for him to have taken it later.

I have no objection to your trying ^{to} thought/out on me or a number of them. That is the right way. What I objected to is your unthinking determination to agree with all Posner wrote, regardless. But everything I told you is factually correct. And I think that before long I realized that you were being suckered and then I think I believe you wanted that. ~~Now~~ You really abandoned all your critical faculties. I've not known you to do that before. I intend no insult, but you came across to me like a Blakey.

Lest you misunderstand what my attitude toward Posner was until I learned from you what he says (as I told you I did not get the UN News because when I read the book that would turn out to be a waste of time), I enclose what I wrote him three weeks ago. That he has not responded means nothing. He had no occasion to. As you will see, it is not unfriendly. I wrote it months after knowing in general what his publisher said the book says and how it says it. After I had written, as I can show you, for my own purposes, that it is impossible to do with an enhancement of the Zapruder film what his publisher, as

it turns out accurately, says he did. We did not discuss it but the most obvious thing is that the film cannot reflect any other shooting. This is but one aspect of the fact that enhancement cannot put into the film what is not there. Another is that the film is not the only evidence on anything at all. That is one reason why I tried to illustrate with the Fifth Willis picture. You will recall that after you told me he places the first shot at Frame 162 I kept asking you when he placed the second one.

Another illustration of why I said he was not being honest is his misuse of Willis' ^{miss name all} daughter. Those were not good sources at all. I asked you if he cited her Commission testimony. You were not in a position to check it so after we spoke I checked it. He could not use it because it refutes what he misused her for. He did not recognize the first shot as a shot. She thought it was a firecracker. So she did not turn to the TSED thinking a shot came from it. He had to know that. So he lied by registering to second-hand or remote sources of years later. Even then his rubbish is based on an earlier shot than what she, too, told the Commission was possible.

As you should remember, I have never taken the position that everything the Commission, FBI, Secret Service or any other agency said is wrong. You know my books come entirely from what they said and their dependable evidence shows. And that is all I used in talking to you yesterday. Posner has become part of the new wave of commercializing sycophants who say that while everything the commission did was wrong they lucked into the right answer anyway.

You told me Posner reflected an impressive knowledge of the 26 volumes. You did not say a word about any use he made of the information available later. I have no reason to believe that of the 724 pages his wife noted she copied here he drew on any of that. Her receipt, by the way, reflects their copying for three days when here.

I was offended by his imposing on my trust. That accounted for part of my anger. As you also know, I have always made all I have available to those I know I'll disagree with. That is not what angered me. His false colors is what did as you made them clear to me. You will see that before I knew more than his publisher said I regretted that he had not tested anything, that he lacked devil's advocacy. When it is available and is not used that represents an intent to say what he was determined to say regardless of fact or ~~truth~~ truth. And your attitude was similar. That was a real disappointment to me. I do not remember your ever reflecting that before.

What you reflected is a determination to be a propagandist rather than a reviewer who has a reporter's experience and traditional attitude. Which is what he is, ~~no~~ no more than a commercializing, exploiting propagandist. Why else, for example, would he not ^{check} ~~ask~~ a single thing? Or ask if any of the ^{records} available after the Commission's life-ended disputed anything he was going to say?

There is an ego that typifies all those guys. They do not need fact. They know it

because they are that omniscient or they just make it up. All of them, and he is no exception. Both sides. They can, they do, and Posner does ignore what they know that proves them wrong. With him the Willis girl's testimony is ~~but~~ ^{the} example. What he says about what he says she did, which is in itself not true, is not relevant to the actual timing of the shots in her testimony or where she was when. She is quite specific on that and nothing her father said or did not say figures in it at all. It is in Volume VII and she is pretty explicit, repeatedly, on where she was when the shots were fired and where she was when she saw she head explode, right opposite the Stemmons Freeway sign. Do you think she ran more than 11 miles per hour?

As you gave it to me, which is how Wrono also did after reading the magazine, what he said about this missed shot in a physical impossibility or close to it. That is why I said he had another magic bullet and adds a magic tree.

Also addressing his honesty is the unquestionable fact that he knew the hole made in the curbstone was ~~not~~ patched before Shaneyfelt went through the charade of having it dug up. He knew it from Post Mortem, which has the before and after pictures and from the Gemberling synopsis that is quite explicit in stating that there had been than mark and ~~it~~ ^{was} not there when they dug it up. That is in a folder on my desk I show everyone.

I am not certain but I may also have shown him the technicians' report that confirms what is so visible, that the ~~the~~ curbstone had been patched. For your information, that was when Oswald could not have done it, and by May of 1963. Liebeler knew it, too, and he had knowledge that Taguz had taken pictures, thought he had prints from it, when there is no Commission or FBI record reflecting that it had any way of having any such knowledge. So, there was a magical patch the curbstone grew? Another proof that there was no conspiracy? And it was just by accident that the one spectrographic film that is missing is the one of the testing of that patch? The test that showed only two of the seven elements of the hullet's core? Do I have reason to question his honesty, or wonder about your abandonment of your ~~and~~ ordinarily excellent critical faculties? Or do you use them and not use them when you want to or do not want to?

I am sorry to say it, sorrier to believe it, but I do believe that in time, and it may not be much time, you will be ashamed of not only this review but that you were capable of it.

Not knowing that you would be asked to do the review and not knowing what if you were asked your review would say, ~~if~~ I had thought of it, I would have thought that you were the one reporter who would see through this scam, that your beliefs would not blind you to the indecency, the ugliness of it. It is really an outrageous thing that most reviewers or reporters would have trouble examining critically. But not you. Only you did not want to. And that is not the you I've known for so long. It is disappointing.

At this point I left for my early-morning walking. I then thought of this more. I do not want you to misunderstand. I have not from the time I knew that Posner deceived me on

what his book was to be, and I knew that from his publisher as quoted in PW, had the illusion that I could do anything about it. There is other reflection that I was not even angry in other letters I wrote him, asking if he had returned only-copies of pictures I had loaned him. You also know that because of my age and illnesses I long ago decided that the most useful thing I can do is perfect the record for history. This means including all the whoring with our history. From what you told me Posner is a ~~mark~~ mark. (I regret you have made a mark of yourself, but ~~not~~ that I will not write about.) Posner and Random house provide a magnificent example of the abject and determined book-publisher failures on this subject. (I am reminded that when RH read my ms in 1965 they ~~rejected~~ rejected it on the sole basis that they do not publish new authors!)

Wrone met me for ~~lunch~~ ^{breakfast}. He worked in DC yesterday and returns to Wisconsin today. (He was here along with other professorial friends for the awarding of honorary doctorates to Ldl and to me by Hood Sunday and he remained to make copies of records for his own work.) He bought copies of Posner's book for both of us and I have an idea of some ^{from} ~~one~~ what he ~~read~~. From that I assure you that I understated when I said he was merely dishonest. But that can now wait for when I can document it, as I will.

I wanted to say this before taking a peek at his book. Wrone had told me of some of his nasty cracks about me. I checked the index and then checked the notes to page 150, where he lies about what I wrote and is careful not to cite where I wrote it. I also did that without any Garrison connection. The Camp Street address was that of the back door to Ronnie Caire's office. I juggled no numbers at all and we all knew very well where Bringulf's and Pena's places of business were. He is a determined liar in saying that "11032 Canal was at the corner of Canal and Ramparts." It was not at the corner at all. I remember all this so well I checked Oswald in New Orleans. I ~~enclose~~ ^{enclose} pages ~~78 and 79~~ ⁷⁹ and 80. I remember quite clearly that the empty lot was not the corner lot, as he says, and because I was there, as you'll see on 80, I recorded the number of the next highest numbered property on that side of the street. I did that without any help to ^{or from} Garrison, as he says on 150, but to add to my book then written. I wrote it before ever going to New Orleans, to be independent.

What Wrone had called to my attention as an intendedly dishonest^a reference to me is in the note of 433. Whether ~~he~~ lies or just makes a mistake, the latter being no endorsement of the rest of his book. you know very well what I did not wait until Garrison's "investigation ended ignominiously" and what I then did is considerably understated as "backed away from him." I do not recall that letter to Playboy and do not recall thus that it was published. If he copied it from my files I have no objection. But how can he honestly cite that and ignore all else I did later and even pretend to the slightest smidgeon of honesty.

I've gone no farther now and won't for a while. I made a list of citations to me

So you can, if you'd like, check them for yourself. You might wonder what kind of man it is who would come here, take my time for at least three days, get unsupervised access to all I have, including all that the government said about ^{me}, and then can contrive this kind of fiction to defame me. From what Wrone told me there are innumerable deliberate dishonesties throughout the book. Those he mentioned from the two chapters he had read by

- 11 n
- 13 n
- 18 n
- 20 n
- 150 n
- 414 n
- 415 n
- 420
- 433
- 448
- 453
- 454

6 a.m. when we met for breakfast, are not and cannot be accidental errors. This is true on 20-1. I copied the notes to what I wanted to quote from what I have told me. Thus as he goes out of his way to defame and deprecate others I am confident that he lies in saying that I wrote of the 15 year old Oswald what in a different place I said about the older Oswald. (page 18) Thus you will find no source cited, page of notes also enclosed.

Then (11) I am somehow derelict in not going for this crap in my book not about Oswald but about the Commission, in

"not telling the reader that Marguerite and Lee Lived with the Pigs.

(I did, too) can you think of any damned reason why I should have? Or do you agree that we should all corrupt our thinking to conform with his? I am not bothering to check what I actually said where he

quotes me because it has no significance at all but I also attach

the notes for that page so you can see he makes no references to what he says he quotes.

I am sorry for you George, and for your vesting your personal and professional integrity is a man as devoid of honor, integrity or ordinary, everyday morals and ethics.

If you read just these notes you should have had some question at the very least about how faithful he is and detected the obvious signs of ulterior purposes. I'm so sorry you delayed so long in phoning me because when you have to give your review in Monday you now lack the time for the independent checking that with Wrone here I could have suggested to you because he got and read US News and then read two chapters last night.

I hope you can begin to see what I said above that the George you reflected last night is not the one I've known all these years. That George would have wanted to do serious checking and would not have argued against what he did not want to believe.

In laughing with Wrone about that silly contrivance to criticize me about that Canal Street stuff Wrone told me the only person he knows who went with that nonsense in Bringuier, who told it to Wrone or has it in his silly book. Posner has no source but Wrone remembered his thanks to Bringuier for his

With sincere regrets,

Harold

"clarifications." (page 502) What a source!

8/4/93

Gerald Posner
300 E 54 St., #28C
New York, NY 10022-5026

Dear Gerald,

Thanks for the copy of your 4/22/92 letter covering the return of the pictures.

This time I'll be careful to not misfile it.

I'll be glad to get the clippings. I have already established a file, meaning that mostly I have a labelled file folder, for each of the coming books. Aside from the Dahlin 5/3 piece I've seen almost nothing save on McGinniss.

I'm sorry you did not want some devil's advocacy, from that story, because I believe it describes what is impossible in your book. And I am not talking about any "interpretations of evidence." Time will tell. If you had indicated you were doing that kind of book I'd have offered it.

And I could have helped you on Lifton. Came a time when I decided to reconstitute the memo that Livingstone's cop stole for Lifton. If you have any further interest on him Roger Feinman, a lawyer formerly with CBS News, did a short book I believe is fine. Only xerox copies now available. I think he has found no publisher. Has no agent.

Minor correction & I know in advance I'll disagree with virtually all who use my records. Thanks for what you say about it, though.

When you are promoting the book, if you have any good confrontations you'd like to have in the file I'll be making for history I'll be glad to add them without any comment on them. I'll probably annotate the copy of your book for that purpose, too.

If and when we can reschedule that dinner, fine. Be interest^{ed} in your experiences with the book then, too.

Lil joins me in best wishes to you both.

Sincerely,

Harold

Convinced his work for Cuba was gaining the attention of national leftist leaders, Oswald was encouraged to embark on a new gambit. Having read only a week earlier about anti-Castro militants and their armed training camp, raided by federal agents across the river from New Orleans, Oswald was ready to infiltrate the "enemy." On Monday, August 5, he walked into a Cuban-owned general goods store, Casa Roca.* Behind the counter was the co-manager, Carlos Bringuier, a twenty-nine-year-old Cuban lawyer who also was the New Orleans delegate for the anti-Castro Cuban Student Directorate. Casa Roca served as the Student Directorate's unofficial headquarters, as well as a general clearinghouse for Cuban activities in New Orleans. Bringuier was explaining the Cuban fight against Castro to two fifteen-year-old Americans, Philip Geraci and Vance Blalock, when Oswald walked up to them. Geraci recalled that Oswald asked, "Is this the Cuban exiles' headquarters?"^{6**}

"He started to agree with my point of view and he showed real interest in the fight against Castro," recalled Bringuier. "He told me that he was against Castro and that he was against Communism."⁶ Then Oswald requested some literature, which Bringuier

*Also on August 5, the Soviet embassy notified Marina that her request to enter the USSR had been forwarded to Moscow for processing. And unknown to the Oswalds, that same day, the FBI interviewed his landlady, Jesse Garner. She confirmed he was in the city. At that point, the New Orleans FBI office became chiefly responsible for Oswald. Special agent Milton Kaack was assigned to the matter.

**In his address book, Oswald had three addresses listed on the same page with Carlos Bringuier's name: 117 Camp, 107 Decatur, and 1032 Canal. Harold Weisberg claimed the first address was a formal-dress shop and the second did not exist. He then juggled the numbers and determined that if Oswald had meant 107 Camp and 117 Decatur, that would lead to two anti-Castro militants. It shows the extent to which some will speculate. In fact, Weisberg searched the addresses when he helped Jim Garrison in his 1967 investigation. Instead, a review of 1963 records reveals there is no mystery or mixup. 117 Camp was the Hispanic-American Discount House, owned by two prominent Cubans (it was only a dress shop when Weisberg saw it years later). 107 Decatur was Bringuier's Casa Roca. 1032 Canal was at the corner of Canal and Ramparts, the New Orleans Discount Center, owned by a Jewish Cuban. The addresses were part of Oswald's efforts to discover the headquarters of the Cuban exiles.

gave him. "After that, I joined the Marine Corps and that was the last that he was willing to talk to me," Bringuier said. "Even more, I would have liked to see Oswald himself to fight against Castro."

Bringuier rejected the idea of training operations, and the party had just been raided a few days earlier. His reaction was this guy could be just Castro just trying to fit in. Oswald walked away from the city and never came back. Bringuier was explaining to Oswald. When the train, blow up a bridge of powder.⁹

The next day Oswald was in the Marine Corps training manual. "But Bringuier refused not try to contact him." On August 9, one of his Cuban friends said "He was upset and angry off the bus at Canal Street that said 'Viva Fidel!' He cursed the Americans." Bringuier grabbed a knife in the back of the demonstrator. On the bus and picked up another of us went to Canal Street says. "We went down the streetcar, even with the direction for that Communist." Bringuier returned

⁹Bringuier still has the letter scribbled in pen on the inside

tion, and that said search discloses that Lee Harvey Oswald was never an informant of the FBI, was never assigned a symbol number in that capacity, and was never paid any amount of money by the FBI in any regard. (17H815)

What he does not say is that he can guarantee this was not done under any name other than "Oswald" or under any other bookkeeping arrangement such as having to do with "expenses."

I am willing to believe that Oswald was never in the FBI pay. But neither Hoover nor the Commission proved he was not.

In his own private, commercially sponsored Warren Report *Portrait of the Assassin*, Congressman Ford, in the very first chapter, quotes Henry Wade, then Dallas District Attorney and formerly a long-time FBI agent. Wade told Commission General Counsel J. Lee Rankin that he had dispensed \$2,000 a month to informants, with no official record. The denials are not persuasive. Wade also told Rankin, apropos of Oswald's use of post office boxes, that they were "an ideal way to handle such transactions and was a way he had used at various times in the past, too."

Suspicion in this matter is not diminished by the absence from the Report of the name "Ronnie Dugger" though Dugger had pertinent information. (His name is mentioned but once in all fifteen volumes of testimony (2H42), and then as having seen activity on what is known in Dallas as "the grassy knoll," west of the Texas School Book Depository Building. He was told the same story as Hudkins.) He is editor of the weekly *Texas Observer*. He had written a well-known book and for major magazines. At the time of the assassination, he was also corresponding for the *Washington Post*. Writing in the February 1967 issue of a Texas magazine, *Latitudes*, he said of his own reporting of the assassination, "... an official told me that Oswald had been an employee of the FBI and had a certain pay number, which my source gave me. He

would not give me his source but said it was solid."

The Commission failed, too, to call Dugger as a witness—or Hudkins, or Sweatt. The Report lists those regarded as "witnesses," if only an unsworn statement was used. Not one of these men was called (R487,490,498). This is one way of "wiping out" a "dirty rumor," but not a persuasive one.

A number of other provocative items scattered throughout the evidence raise questions for which there is no satisfactory answer. For example, in Oswald's pocket address book there are these notations on a page (16H67) that faces a blank page:

Cuban Student
Directorate (sic)
107 Decatur St
New Orleans, La
Carlos Bringuier

N.O. City Editor "Cowan"
David Crawford
reporter

117 Camp
107 Decatur
1031 Canal

After the middle of these three addresses but extending upward from it is "cuban exile store." This is the address of Bringuier's store. Why is it listed twice? What do the other two addresses represent? The Camp street address is across from the International Trade Mart, which since then has moved. It is the address of a clothing store where formal attire is rented. Oswald had no such interests. Why should he have noted it in association with Bringuier?

Or did he make a mistake, or have his own special code? In the building at 107 Camp Street, the Cigali Building, advertising man Ronnie Caire, who was connected with the anti-Castro Cuban groups, then had an office. It was on the Canal Street side, opposite the

Camp Street entrance. Caire says Oswald applied for a job with him, claiming public relations experience. It should by now not surprise the reader to learn that Caire is one of the multitude who were not called as witnesses by the Commission and should have been. His New Orleans reputation is excellent. He is considered a generous man, easily touched. He says he lost about \$10,000 on his effort to help the "Crusade," that about \$4,000 was raised, and that some of it was "pocketed" by another.

That he was not called as a witness is not because the FBI was unaware of these things. Caire complains that their questionings "cost me about 100 hours" of time.

The Canal Street address is not where Oswald was arrested, which was in the 700 block, and it is not a "good" address but was then and is now a blank one. The numbers go from 1030 to 1034. In the covered-over passageway on that side of 1030 is a small fruitstand. Its number is 1030½.

If Oswald made a mistake and meant 117 Decatur, that is the address of Orest Pena's Habana Bar and Lounge, where there were other interesting developments in the story of Oswald in New Orleans, and at about this time, notably the spectacular and conspicuous drunk staged there by Oswald or his counterfeiter. And why should Oswald have noted the names of the city editor and reporter in the middle of these entries.

We do not know whether he made these notes before or after he got himself arrested in this handbill operation, which makes sense only as part of a scheme to establish a "cover." But there is reason to believe it was not after the arrest, because there is what seems to be such an item in his notebook (16H62), also facing a blank page. It is the listing of WDSU-TV, over which he broadcast *after* his arrest. This listing has the names of several of its staff and their phone numbers

but no address. It logically would have been entered after his arrest.

When this manner of establishing a "cover" is considered in conjunction with the strange business of his notebook copyings and his possession at the time of his arrest of a list of entries that could serve only to show he had been a defector to the Soviet Union, along with the equally perplexing plea of guilty he entered when he was not guilty, it is apparent the whole affair requires explanation the government has not made. The least likely preparation of a sincere Castro sympathizer sallying forth on a propaganda venture that could lead to his arrest is evidence of Communist or Russian connections. This handbill operation seems to have been designed for an arrest and a police record. As soon as Oswald harvested the "pro-Castro" press he thus made, he took it to Mexico with him and used it in an unsuccessful effort to get a Cuban visa. After this failed, he still kept reminders of the affair. One was found when the Dallas police searched his property in the garage of the Paine residence, in Irving, Texas, after his arrest on November 22, 1963. In the inventory of what was seized there is Item #231 (24H335), a "slip of paper containing names Carlos J. Bringuier, Miguel M. Cruz and Lt. William Gaillot." Cruz was with Bringuier when he broke up Oswald's handbill operation; Gaillot, the police officer in charge.

Such items and entries in the notebook would be less troubling if there were any serious official explanation of their purpose and if so many questions did not remain, so many indications of Oswald's intelligence involvement.

When the FBI prepared an "analysis" of this notebook, of what J. Edgar Hoover described (5H112) as "those items in Oswald's notebook requiring investigative attention," the presence in it of the telephone and license numbers of the car of James P. Hosty, Jr., the FBI's Oswald "expert," was not included. Hoover's

TESTIMONY OF LINDA KAY WILLIS

The testimony of Linda Kay Willis was taken at 3:15 p.m., on July 22, 1964, in the office of the U.S. attorney, 301 Post Office Building, Bryan and Ervay Streets, Dallas, Tex., by Mr. Wesley J. Liebeler, assistant counsel of the President's Commission.

Mr. LIEBERER. Would you rise and raise your right hand and I will swear you as a witness. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss WILLIS. I do.

Mr. LIEBERER. As I told your father, I am an attorney for the President's Commission on the assassination of President Kennedy, and he has told me that you were with him in the vicinity of the School Book Depository Building at the time of the assassination, and I wanted to ask you two or three questions about that. First of all, would you state your name for the reporter, please?

Miss WILLIS. Linda Kay Willis.

Mr. LIEBERER. How old are you?

Miss WILLIS. I will be 15, July 29.

Mr. LIEBERER. Your father has told us that you were out in front of the School Book Depository Building along with your sister on the day of the assassination, and your mother and father were also there, is that correct?

Miss WILLIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIEBERER. Did you hear any shots, or what you later learned to be shots, as the motorcade came past you there?

Miss WILLIS. Yes; I heard one. Then there was a little bit of time, and then there were two real fast bullets together. When the first one hit, well, the President turned from waving to the people, and he grabbed his throat, and he kind of slumped forward, and then I couldn't tell where the second shot went.

Mr. LIEBERER. Now, you were standing right along the curb on Elm Street, is that right, when the motorcade came by across the street from the School Book Depository Building?

Miss WILLIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIEBERER. Did you follow the motorcade down Elm Street at all, or did you stand on the corner up toward Houston Street and watch from there?

Miss WILLIS. I was right across from the sign that points to where Stemmons Expressway is. I was directly across when the first shot hit him.

Mr. LIEBERER. Directly across from the sign that says, "Stemmons Freeway"?
Miss WILLIS. I was right in line with the sign and the car, and I wasn't very far away from him, but I couldn't tell from where the shot came.

Mr. LIEBERER. Did you just stay right there, or did you go on down Elm Street?

Miss WILLIS. I stayed there. I was on the corner across from the courthouse when the motorcade first came down Main Street, and when it turned the corner on Houston, well, I followed along the street with the car, and then he turned the corner on Elm and I stood there where the Stemmons sign is.

Mr. LIEBERER. Did you see the President get hit in the head?

Miss WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBERER. You actually saw the President get hit that way?

Miss WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. LIEBERER. How far away would you say that you were when you saw that?
Miss WILLIS. Oh, about twice as far as I am from here to this door. Maybe not quite that far.

Mr. LIEBERER. About 25 feet or so?

Miss WILLIS. About that.

Mr. LIEBERER. Now when you saw the President get hit in the head, did you hear any more shots after that?

Miss WILLIS. Yes; the first one, I heard the first shot come and then he slumped forward, and then I couldn't tell where the second shot went, and then the third one, and that was the last one that hit him in the head.

Mr. LIEBERER. You only heard three shots altogether?

Miss WILLIS. Yes; that was it.
Mr. LIEBERER. So you don't think there were any more shots after he got hit in the head?

Miss WILLIS. No.

Mr. LIEBERER. Did you recognize the noises that you heard as shots right away?

Miss WILLIS. No; when the first shot rang out, I thought, well, it's probably fireworks, because everybody is glad the President is in town. Then I realized it was too loud and too close to be fireworks, and then when I saw, when I realized that the President was falling over, I knew he had been hit. But I didn't know how badly.

Mr. LIEBERER. Okay, I just wanted to ask you about whether you heard any shots after the President got hit in the head, and if you didn't hear any more shots, that is really all I wanted to ask you about. Thank you very much.

Miss WILLIS. All right.

TESTIMONY OF HELEN MARKHAM

The testimony of Helen Markham was taken at 10 a.m., on July 23, 1964, in the office of the U.S. attorney, 301 Post Office Building, Bryan and Ervay Streets, Dallas, Tex., by Mr. Wesley J. Liebeler, assistant counsel of the President's Commission.

Mr. LIEBERER. Will you stand and take the oath, please? Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. MARKHAM. I do.

Mr. LIEBERER. My name is Wesley J. Liebeler [spelling] L-i-e-b-e-l-e-r. I am an attorney on the staff of the President's Commission investigating the assassination of President Kennedy. I have been authorized to take your testimony for the Commission pursuant to authority granted to me by the President in Executive Order No. 11180, dated November 29, 1963, and joint resolution of Congress No. 197. I think you are somewhat familiar with the proceedings of the Commission because you have already testified before the Commission in Washington; is that right?

Mrs. MARKHAM. Yes; but you know, I don't know nothing about the Kennedy—President Kennedy.

Mr. LIEBERER. I understand you were there when Oswald shot Officer Tippit?

Mrs. MARKHAM. Yes; that's right.

Mr. LIEBERER. Since you are familiar with the Commission's procedure, I'll just go right into your testimony. I wanted to ask you some questions about some of the things you told the Commission when you appeared before it on March 26, 1964, when Mr. Ball took your testimony before the Commission.

Mrs. MARKHAM. Yes.

Mr. LIEBERER. Do you remember at that time that Mr. Ball asked you the question, "Did you ever talk to a New York lawyer who said he was from New York?" And that you answered, "No, sir." Mr. Ball then asked you, "Did you ever talk to a lawyer who was investigating the case on behalf of the deceased man, Lee Oswald?" Your answer was, "No, sir." Mr. Ball asked, "Did you ever talk to a man who said he was representing the mother of Lee Oswald?" And you answered, "No, sir." And then Mr. Ball asked you, "You don't remember ever talking to a man named Mark Lane?" And then you answered, "No, sir."

Mrs. MARKHAM. Right.

Mr. LIEBERER. Do you remember giving that testimony at that time?

Mrs. MARKHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIEBERER. Have you ever talked to Mark Lane?

Mrs. MARKHAM. Yes; I never seen the man in my life.

Mr. LIEBERER. Have you ever talk to Mark Lane on the telephone?

Mrs. MARKHAM. No.