

For Ruffin per Shafiq

Shaneyfelt's June 12 testimony, given in a deposition taken by Assistant Counsel Melvin Eisenberg in the Commission offices in Washington but with no members of the Commission present was to the effect that all the many alterations made in the purloined Oswald picture reportedly sold by unidentified persons after it was seized by the police, the Commission Exhibit 122-A about which he had testified before the Commission were part of the normal photoengraving process. This normality covered just about all the shocking liberties taken by the various media with the picture, ~~xxxx~~ including the disappearance of the telescopic sight that just happened to coincide with the ~~xxx~~ then-current story that Oswald had had the gunsight installed in Irving.

The Commission staff displayed a remarkable indifference to this bold theft of Oswald's property when it was in police custody and when it from the moment of seizure was regarded as prime evidence. Both the Members of the Commission and their staff were no less indifferent to the wide dissemination of doctored pictures. Shaneyfelt's testimony served to placate the record in history and to powder the red faces of the press in the present.

During his testimony, he did not have the originals of the pictures about which he was called upon to testify, a somewhat unusual departure from normal practice, particularly so when the pictures were at best unclear and well below the usual press standards, hence the copies were even less distinct. The reason, on June 12, three and a half months before the Commission made its report, was placed on the record by Eisenberg:

"I am using duplicate originals rather than the actual exhibits, because the actual exhibits are now being printed up by the Government Printing Office."

"Duplicate originals" indeed! In art they are called fakes; in law, copies. There was no need for Shaneyfelt not to have had the originals in his hand, and he should have.