

10/5/71

re Perry/ Carrico Affidavits

Dear Harold:

A very quick note, hopefully to reach you in time to revise the drafts before you send them off.

On Perry: Paragraph 7 should come after 3, to keep info about his gunshot wound/hunting experience together,

¶8: Don't say they showed me a copy of "the autopsy"-be more specific: typed autopsy report or autopsy protocol. Notes?

¶11: Get him to specify that this fragment was in addition to the fragment embedded in the left femur. Also, did he observe it with the naked eye or by X-ray? Also, did he ever tell any federal agents about it? In ¶9 he says the WC didn't question him about it, but relevant to your suit is whether any feds asked him about it.

(I see now at the bottom of p. 2 the continuation of "autopsy" from ¶8--O.K.)

¶13: I would be a little more precise than "conjectural." Why not say ~~xxxx~~ "When I was questioned before the WC about whether the wound in the front of Pres K's neck was of entrance or exit, my responses were based on questions by Counsel A.S. which were hypothetical in nature, soliciting my evaluation of the wound based on a detailed set of facts the truth of which I had no way of verifying."

¶14, 3rd sentence, beginning "However..." Change to "However, the WC counsel did not ask me to testify as to what specific characteristics of the wound indicated to me that it was most likely one of entrance."

¶16: This is important, but I think it is a mistake to speak in terms of "bruising," which is too generic and not specifically indicative of entrance. The real indicator is a ring of abrasion, which is distinct from bruising. Get precise here, perhaps ask Perry to give details: how dark was the ring, was it thicker on one side than another, how wide was the ring?

¶19: Why not include direct quotes from press conf?

OK on Carrico. Hope this is of some help.

Best



HR