

Mr. Dulles. Do you know whether any fingerprints were taken after Lee Harvey Oswald returned from the Soviet Union?

Mr. Latona. Those after he was arrested in connection with this particular offense.

Mr. Dulles. Apart from the fingerprints obtained in connection with the assassination.

Mr. Latona. I do not.

Mr. Dulles. Do you have a right to go to anybody and demand their fingerprint?

Mr. Latona. No.

Mr. Dulles. Under law?

Mr. Latona. No, sir -- only persons taken into custody for Federal violations as such. Now, the FBI has actually no authority at all, except in cases of making an arrest.

Mr. Dulles. There is nothing done in connection with the census or anything of that kind?

Mr. Latona. No, sir. Some persons are ordered, by virtue of being aliens, to be fingerprinted -- those that are domiciled here in the United States must register under the Alien Registration Act.

Mr. Dulles. And fingerprints then are taken of aliens in connection with their registration?

Mr. Latona. That's right.

Mr. Dulles. Otherwise there is no general procedure for the taking of anybody that you may happen to want to take?

Mr. Latona. The services, of course, require it. Applicants for certain positions are required by law. For example, all Civil Service, Federal Civil Service applicants must be fingerprinted. Locally, there are certain local cases. For example, a man may in some localities, if he even applies for a chauffeur's license, have to be fingerprinted. If he desires a gun permit, he has to be fingerprinted. In some places, if he applies for certain jobs he must be fingerprinted.

Mr. Dulles. As I recall, I gave a fingerprint when I got my automobile license. Is that general throughout the United States?

Mr. Latona. What State was that?

Mr. Dulles. Here in the District. Didn't I give that?

Mr. Latona. No, sir. To my knowledge, there are none that require it. Fingerprinting -- for an automobile license. In California I believe it is voluntary -- to place the finger, if you desire to, on your card.

Mr. Dulles. Thank you very much.

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Latona, Exhibit 630, which is one of the known ten-print cards submitted by the Dallas Office, is marked "Refused to sign" in the box with the printed caption "Signature of person fingerprinted." Do you recall whether Lee Harvey Oswald signed the Marine Corps card?

Mr. Latona. Off hand, I do not.

Mr. Eisenberg. I think it would be interesting for the record to see if that is signed, and, of course, as we read the

record and get the card, we will be able to note that information.

We were discussing whether you had made a chart of the known and latent right palmprint of Lee Harvey Oswald found on Exhibit 142, as I will refer to it from now on.

Mr. Latona. I believe I have already furnished you smaller photographs.

Mr. Eisenberg. Yes, you have. Those have been marked into evidence.

Mr. Latona. This is the inked -- the right inked palmprint, a photograph of the right inked palmprint of Lee Harvey Oswald.

Mr. Eisenberg. And you say "this". Can you identify that exhibit? It is 631.

I am handing you Exhibit 632.

Mr. Latona. Exhibit 632 is approximately a time and a half enlargement of the latent palmprint which was developed on the brown wrapper.

Mr. Eisenberg. That is Exhibit 142.

Mr. Latona. Exhibit 142 -- which is indicated by the red arrow A.

Mr. Eisenberg. Did you prepare this chart, Mr. Latona?

Mr. Latona. Not personally, no. This was made under my personal direction and supervision.

Mr. Eisenberg. And is it an accurate reproduction of the known and latent prints which were earlier introduced into evidence?

Mr. Latona. It is. It is a true and faithful reproduction of



these areas enlarged to approximately eight times the originals..

Mr. Eisenberg. May I have this introduced into evidence as 636, Mr. Chairman.

Rep. Ford. It will be introduced.

(The item referred to was marked Commission Exhibit 636 for identification and received in evidence.)

Mr. Dulles. May I ask whether this was discovered immediately after the assassination -- at what time did you discover this particular palmprint?

Mr. Latona. I was on the 23rd of November, the day after.

Mr. Eisenberg. Using this chart, 636, Mr. Latona, could you demonstrate to us some of the points which led you to the conclusion that the latent palmprint on 142 was the palmprint of Lee Harvey Oswald?

Mr. Latona. The procedure in making this comparison was exactly the same as the procedure followed in connection with making the prior examination of the fingerprint. Now, the area which shows in approximately an eight-time enlargement, and is marked "Latent Palmprint Developed on Brown Homemade Paper Container", which is Exhibit 636, is roughly outlined on Commission Exhibit 631 in red, which is a photograph of the inked right palmprint of Lee Harvey Oswald.

This area below the little finger, or what we referred to as the ulnar portion of the palm -- now, in making the examination or comparison, here again -- first of all I would like to point out

~~TOP SECRET~~

that there is a black line that goes right through -- in an upward fashion -- through the enlargement of the latent palmprint. That line is caused by virtue of the fact that the palmprint which is developed is partially on a piece of tape as well as the wrapper itself. In other words, a part of the print is on a piece of tape and the other part is on the paper itself.

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Latona, could you show how the palm lay on the paper to produce that impression?

Mr. Latona. The palm lay in this fashion here.

Mr. Eisenberg. You are putting your right hand on the paper so that the fingers are pointing in the same direction as the arrow A?

Mr. Latona. That's right.

Mr. Eisenberg. And it is at approximately right angles to the paper bag?

Mr. Latona. That's right.

Here again, in making the comparison, a check is made for the location of certain points.

Now, we notice here that the points appear to be much closer than they were in the fingerprint, and that is probably because of the pressure which was exercised possibly in holding the object which was in this paper container.

Now, you notice this point number 1 here, which we term the ending ridge. Point number 2 is also an ending ridge. And you notice in between these points there is a ridge. Point number 2

is to the left ( point number 1.

Then we find there is a point number 3 which is a point which is similar in character to point number 2 and is almost directly below, but there are two intervening ridges. Then there is a point number 4 which is below point number 3, and going in a direction opposite from point number 3.

If we bear those four points in mind -- and if the latent palmprint was made by the same palm that made the inked palmprint, then we should find these four points in that position over there.

Now, in order to first of all find the particular area where we would look to see if these points ~~are~~ existing <sup>we</sup> it would be bearing in mind the general formation of the print itself. We notice the so-called looping formation in the inked print. We see that there is a looping formation here. Definitely it is not as pronounced in the latent print as it is in the inked print. But to the experienced eye, it is right here.

Accordingly, bearing in mind where these points would occur, we would generalize in the area to the extreme right of the enlargements, and find that there is a point which is somewhat similar to the point which appears in the inked impression, which momentarily we would say appears to be the same point as number 1.

Now, bearing in mind how number 2 is related to point number 1, does such a point appear in the latent print? And making the check, exactly in the same fashion as in relationship that occurred

~~TOP SECRET~~



in the inked print, we find that there is such a point.

Does a third point appear in in the same relationship to point number 2 as it appears in the inked print?

Counting down 1, 2, and then the 3 point being the point itself. And in the same general flowing direction we count here, 1, 2, 3 -- there it is.

Being in mind again that we found point number 4 is what we refer to as a bifurcation going in the opposite direction from number 3, which was directly below and to the left, do we find such a point here? Sure enough, there it is.

Now, an additional test would be this: At this point here we notice there is an abrupt ending of a ridge at this point here. It was not even charted. The fact is, it also occurs here. You see this point here, through which there is no line drawn, here it is right here --

Mr. Eisenberg. You are pointing above 4?

Mr. Latona. Directly above 4 to a ridge going -- what we term flowing to the right. Now, at this point here, to a fingerprint examiner of any experience at all, he would start saying these prints were probably made by the same fellow. To satisfy himself, he would continue to point number 5 -- 1, 2, 3, 4 -- there is point number 5. Then there is number 6, and there is number 6 here, having exactly the same relationship to each other.

On the basis of those six points alone, I would venture the opinion that these palmprints were made by the same person. But

for purposes of carrying it out further, here is point number 7. Point number 7 is obliterated to a certain degree to the inexperienced eye by virtue of the fact that it almost coincides with that line there. You probably do not see that.

And here is point number 8, which is related to point number 7 by the separation of those ridges in the same way. 1, 2, 3, 4 -- 1, 2, 3, 4. In its relationship to number 9 here -- just above and to the left, flowing in the same general direction. Here it is here.

Then your point number 10, which is tied into point number 11 in this fashion here, and 12 and 13. All of them have the same relationship insofar as the intervention of ridges is concerned, the same general area, plus the fact that they all flow in the same general direction.

Picking up number 14, which is going upward to point number 15, which stands out rather easily -- 15 here. To throw in just one point extra -- see this little point here, that ends here?

Mr. Eisenberg. That is to the upper right of 15?

Mr. Latona. To the right and upward of 15.

Mr. Dulles. So you really have 16 points there?

Mr. Latona. Actually, there are more than that in here, which I have not even bothered to chart. The opinion here, without any question at all, this latent print, which was developed on the brown bag marked A -- 142 -- was made by the right palm of Lee Harvey Oswald. And in my opinion, this identification is

~~TOP SECRET~~



absolute. There is no question at all that only the right palm of Lee Harvey Oswald made this print, or could have made it.

Mr. Eisenberg. Are there any further questions on the prints appearing on this bag?

Rep. Ford. Murray?

Mr. Murray. May I suggest this, Mr. Chairman? Since the print on the bag may become obliterated, and since members of the Commission have already seen it, it might be advisable to put on the record that they have seen it, because in time to come it may not be visible to anybody.

Rep. Ford. Well, I for one would be willing to state that I have personally seen that fingerprint through a glass on the bag-- both the finger and the palm.

Mr. Dulles. I would be glad to concur that I also have seen the fingerprint and the palmprint to which Congressman Ford refers.

Mr. Eisenberg. In that general connection, Mr. Latona, do you commonly make your fingerprint identifications on the basis of the object -- on which the latent print appears -- or on the basis of a photograph of that object?

Mr. Latona. Normally it is made on the basis of photographs. We work more or less like an assembly-line basis, and we do not have the time or the opportunity to work from the originals, as was done in this case -- this being quite an exceptional case. So the usual identification would be made -- or was made on the basis of the bag itself, rather than to wait and get finished photographs

from our photographic laboratory.

If I recall correctly, this was on a Saturday, the 23rd.

Mr. Eisenberg. Yes, it was.

Mr. Latona. We did not have our full staff there. We were called in to handle this case <sup>s</sup>pecially. There were no photographers available at that time for that particular purpose. Frankly, under the circumstances it would not have made any difference whether they were available or not. This had a priority over everything we were working on and naturally we had to proceed as fast as we could in a sense to render conclusions and opinions at that time.

Accordingly, the original comparisons were made directly from the wrapper, rather than a photograph, which was prepared subsequently to this.

Rep. Ford. The suggestion has been made, Mr. Murray, that perhaps you would like to look at the palmprint and the fingerprint on the wrapping, and you might make a statement the same as Mr. Dulles and I have made.

Mr. Eisenberg. Could you point out to Mr. Murray, Mr. Latona, the two prints?

Mr. Latona. Yes, sir. A is the fingerprint.

Mr. Dulles. And the witness certifies that these are true photographs of the fingerprint and the palmprint that you have exhibited.

Mr. Latona. Yes, sir.

Mr. Murray. May I say for the record, Mr. Chairman, that I definitely and clearly saw what appeared to me to be a palmprint in the part of Exhibit 142 which was designated with a B, and less clearly, but nevertheless I did see the fingerprint on the other portion of the bag.

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Latona --

Mr. Latona. B is the finger, and A is the palm.

Mr. Murray. Yes, that's correct. And the palm A -- there I definitely saw what appeared to be a palmprint, and more faintly I saw a fingerprint in the portion marked B.

Mr. Dulles. And these are exhibits --

Mr. Eisenberg. This is Exhibit 142.

(At this point Representative Boggs entered the hearing room.)

Mr. Dulles. Both the palmprint and the fingerprint are on Exhibit 142.

Mr. Eisenberg. Yes -- marked A and B respectively.

Mr. Latona, one further question on this subject.

When you testify in court, you frequently testify on the basis of the photographs rather than the original object?

Mr. Latona. If the originals are available, I would prefer that they be brought into court. If they are not, then photographs are used -- plus the original negative of the latent prints which were photographed.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, Mr. Latona, I hand you Commission Exhibit 139 which, for the record, consists of the rifle found on the sixth



floor of the TSBD building, and which was identified yesterday as the rifle -- and the day before yesterday -- as the rifle which fired the fatal bullets, and I ask you whether you are familiar with this weapon?

Mr. Latona. Yes, I am.

Mr. Eisenberg. And did you examine this weapon to test -- did you examine this weapon to determine whether there were any identifiable latent fingerprints on it?

Mr. Latona. I examined the weapon to determine whether there were any identifiable latent prints on the weapon.

Mr. Eisenberg. When did you receive the weapon?

Mr. Latona. On the morning of November 23, 1963.

Mr. Eisenberg. And when did you proceed to make your examination?

Mr. Latona. I proceeded to make my examination that same day that I received it.

Mr. Eisenberg. Can you tell us what techniques you used?

Mr. Latona. Well, the technique that I used first was simply to examine it visually under a magnifying glass, a hand magnifying glass, primarily for the purpose of seeing, first of all, whether there were any visible prints. I might point out that my attention had been directed to the area which we refer to as the trigger guard on the left side of the weapon, Commission Exhibit 139.

Mr. Eisenberg. The trigger guard area.

Mr. Latona. The trigger guard area.

~~TOP SECRET~~

Mr. Eisenberg. Which actually, in the case of this particular weapon, is the area in which the magazine is inserted at the top; is that correct? You are looking at the weapon now, and the magazine comes out the bottom of what is called the trigger guard area, and would be a trigger guard on another weapon.

Mr. Latona. That's correct. There had been placed over that area a piece of cellophane material. My attention had been directed to it, to the effect that a prior examination had been made of that area, and that there were apparently certain latent prints available -- visible under that area.

I first examine most prints to see --

Mr. Dulles. Who placed the cellophane material there, in your opinion?

Mr. Latona. Well, I was told -- my information was simply that the Dallas Police Department had done so. I have no personal knowledge as to who did it, other than information that the Dallas Police had examined the weapon and they had found these visible marks on there, that they had developed the prints.

Now, by what means they did it, I do not know, but I would assume they used a gray powder.

Mr. Dulles. What was the purpose of putting the cellophane there?

Mr. Latona. To protect the prints while the rifle was in-transit to the FBI.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, when you received it with the

cellaphane cover, what portion did it cover?

Mr. Latona. Closest to the trigger area.

Mr. Eisenberg. On the trigger guard, closest to the trigger area?

Mr. Latona. That's right.

Mr. Eisenberg. Was that on the right or left side of the weapon?

Mr. Latona. Left side.

Mr. Eisenberg. And was there a print visible to you underneath the cellaphane?

Mr. Latona. I could see faintly ridge formations there. However, examination disclosed to me that the formations, the ridge formations and characteristics were insufficient for purposes of either effecting identification or a determination that the print was not identical with the prints of people. Accordingly, my opinion simply was that the latent prints which were there were of no value.

Now, I did not stop there.

Mr. Eisenberg. Before we leave those prints, Mr. Latona, had those been developed by the powder method?

Mr. Latona. Yes, they had.

Mr. Eisenberg. Was that a gray powder?

Mr. Latona. I assumed that they used gray powder in order to give them what little contrast could be seen. And it took some highlighting and sidelighting with the use of a spotlight to



actually make those things discernible at all.

Rep. Ford. As far as you are concerned.

Mr. Latona. That's right.

Mr. Dulles. Is it likely or possible that those fingerprints could have been ~~damaged~~ or eroded in the passage from Texas to your hands?

Mr. Latona. No, sir, I don't think so. In fact, I think we got the prints just like they were. They had, in addition to this rifle and that paper bag, which I received on the 23rd -- there had also been submitted to me some photographs which had been taken by the Dallas Police Department, at least alleged to have been taken by them, of these prints on this trigger guard which they developed. I examined the photographs very closely and I still could not determine any latent value in the photograph.

So then I took the rifle personally over to our photo laboratory. In the meantime, I had made arrangements to bring a photographer in especially for the purpose of photographing these latent prints for me, and an experienced photographer -- I called him in. I received this material in the Justice Building. My office of operations is in the Identification Division Building, which is at 2nd and D Street, SW. So I made arrangements to immediately have a photographer come in and see if he could improve on the photographs that were taken by the Dallas Police Department.

Well, we spent, between the two of us, setting up the camera,

looking at prints, highlighting, sidelight, every type of lighting that we could conceivably think of, checking back and forth in the darkroom -- we could not improve the condition of these latent prints.

So, accordingly, the final conclusion was simply that the latent print on this gun was of no value, the fragments that were there.

After that had been determined, I then proceeded to completely process the entire rifle, to see if there were any other prints of any significance or value -- any prints of value -- I would not know what the significance would be, but to see if there were any other prints. I completely covered the rifle. I also had a firearms man --

Rep. Boggs. What do you cover it with?

Mr. Latona. Gray fingerprint powder.

Rep. Boggs. What is that powder?

Mr. Latona. It is usually a combination of chalk and mercury, or possibly white lead and a little bit of resin material to give it some weight.

Mr. Eisenberg. And you testified earlier that that adheres--

Mr. Latona. To the moisture that was left by the finger, the fingers or the hands, when it came in contact with the surface.

Rep. Boggs. How long will that condition remain?

Mr. Latona. Going from one extreme to the other, it may remain for years; under other circumstances, it may not even last

for fifteen or twenty minutes.

Rep. Boggs. Why the difference?

Mr. Latona. Because of the amount of material which was left and the condition of the material which was left.

Basically, the material may be made up of protein material and salt and water -- primarily water. If it is totally water, with very little salt or oily material, when the evaporation is effective, then it is complete -- there will be nothing left.

Rep. Boggs. You mean that it is gone.

Mr. Latona. Right. On the other hand, if there is an oily matter there, we know that latent prints will last literally for years on certain objects.

Rep. Boggs. Well, just for purposes of information, if I make fingerprints there on the table, how long would they normally last?

Mr. Latona. I don't know.

Rep. Boggs. Well, would there be any way to know?

Mr. Latona. No, sir.

Mr. Dulles. It depends on temperature, on the amount of moisture involved? What does it depend on?

Mr. Latona. First of all, I saw him touch it, but I am not even sure he left a print there.

Rep. Boggs. Well, I can see it.

Mr. Latona. As to the quality of the print, there again it is simply a matter of what material you have in your hands that made that print, as to how long it will last, how long it will take for



it to evaporate.

Actually, when it dries out, it may, in itself, leave a print with such clarity that it would not -- even, though it would not accept the powder, still by highlighting it, the way way you did to see that the print was there, we could photograph it so it would come out just as clear as though it were black on white.

Rep. Boggs. Does the material that one touches have any effect?

Mr. Latona. Very definitely. It depends on how hard or smooth the material is.

Rep. Boggs. Now, does a weapon lend itself to retaining fingerprints?

Mr. Latona. This particular weapon here, first of all, in my opinion, the metal is very poorly finished. It is absorbent. Believe it or not, there is a certain amount of absorption into this metal itself. It is not finished in the sense that it is highly polished.

Rep. Boggs. So this would be conducive to getting a good print, or would it?

Mr. Latona. It would not.

Rep. Boggs. I see -- because it would absorb the moisture.

Mr. Latona. That's right. Now, there are other guns -- for example, Smith and Wesson, which have exceptionally nice finishes, the blue metal finishes are better surfaces for latent

prints. Where you have a nickel-plated or silver-plated revolvers, where it is smooth -- they are much more conducive to latent prints than some of these other things, say like the army type, the weapons used in wartime, that are dull, to avoid reflection -- things of that type -- they are not as good.

Mr. Dulles. I wonder if you would like to look at the fingerprints we have gone over. They are quite apparent there with the glass.

Rep. Boggs. I would like to look at them. That is all I want to ask right at the moment.

Mr. Dulles. I would like to ask a general question.

Mr. Latona. This is one of the fingerprints developed on the brown wrapper. It is this print here.

Mr. Dulles. You can see these prints quite clearly, and the palmprint.

Rep. Boggs. This is a photograph of that?

Mr. Latona. This is approximately a time and a half enlargement. This is the left index finger. Here is the palmprint that was developed.

Rep. Ford. Mr. Boggs -- each of us here, Mr. Dulles, Mr. Murray and myself, have said on the record that we have seen the prints on the wrapping. We did this because, as Mr. Latona has indicated, such prints may disappear over a period of time. We thought it might be well for the record to indicate that we saw them. If you wish to do the same --

Rep. Boggs. I would like to do the same, having just seen it.

Mr. Dulles. The witness has certified to the fact that these are true photographs of the prints that we have seen.

Rep. Boggs. And the witness has also certified that those are Oswald's prints?

Mr. Latona. No, I cannot certify to that.

Mr. Eisenberg. Do you want to explain that?

Mr. Latona. As I am not the one that fingerprinted Oswald, I cannot tell from my own personal knowledge that those are actually the fingerprints of Lee Harvey Oswald.

Mr. Eisenberg. But you can certify that those prints are identical with the prints on the card which bears the name of Lee Harvey Oswald which was furnished to you?

Mr. Latona. That is right.

Mr. Eisenberg. We will get other evidence in the record at a subsequent time to show those were the prints of Oswald.

Mr. Latona, you were saying that you had worked over that rifle by applying a gray powder to it. Did you develop any fingerprints?

Mr. Latona. I was not successful in developing any prints at all on the weapon. I also had one of the firearms examiners dismantle the weapon and I processed the complete weapon, all parts, everything else. And no latent prints of value were developed.



Mr. Eisenberg. Does that include the clip?

Mr. Latona. That included the clip, that included the bolt, it included the underside of the barrel which is covered by the stock.

Mr. Eisenberg. Were cartridge cases furnished to you at that time?

Mr. Latona. They were, which I processed, and from which I got no prints.

Mr. Eisenberg. Therefore, the net result of your work on Exhibit 139 was that you could not produce an identifiable print?

Mr. Latona. That's correct.

Mr. Dulles. May I ask one question? Does the Secret Service do fingerprinting work, or do they turn it over to you -- turn to you for all of that?

Mr. Latona. I think they do some of their own, and on occasion we will do some for them, too. Primarily I think they do their own. I am not too familiar with the Secret Service as to how elaborate their laboratory is.

Mr. Eisenberg. So as of November 23rd, you had not found an identifiable print on Exhibit 139?

Mr. Latona. That is right.

fol

Mr. Eisenberg. I now hand you a small white card marked with certain initials and with a date 11-22-63. There is a cellophane wrapping, cellophane tape across this card with what appears to be a fingerprint underneath it, and the handwriting underneath that tape is "off underside of gun barrel near end of fore-grip, C 2776" which I might remark parenthetically is the serial number of Exhibit 139.

I ask you whether you are familiar with this item which I hand you, this card?

Mr. Latona. Yes, I am familiar with this particular exhibit

Mr. Eisenberg. Can you describe to us what that exhibit consists of, that item rather?

Mr. Latona. This exhibit or this item is a lift of a latent palm print which was evidently developed with black powder.

Mr. Eisenberg. And when did you receive this item?

Mr. Latona. I received this item November 29, 1963.

Mr. Eisenberg. Before we go any further may I have this admitted into evidence?

Rep. Ford. It will be. What is the number?

Mr. Eisenberg. That will be Number 637.

(The document referred to, was marked Commission's Exhibit No. 637 and received in evidence.)

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Latona, could you describe to us what a lift is?

Mr. Latona. A lift is merely a piece of adhesive material which is used for purposes of removing a print that has been previously developed on an object onto the adhesive material. Then the adhesive material is placed on a backing, in this case which happens to be the card. The adhesive material utilize here is similar to scotch tape. There are different types of lifting material. Some of them are known as opaque lifters, which are made of rubber, like a black rubber and white rubber which has an adhesive material affixed to it and this material is simply laid on a print which has been previously developed on an object and the full print is merely removed from the object.

Mr. Eisenberg. When you say the print is removed actually the powder<sup>d</sup>?

Mr. Latona. The powder that adhered to the original latent print is picked off of the object.

Mr. Eisenberg. So that the impression actually is removed?

Mr. Latona. That is right.

Rep. Ford. Is that a recognized technique?

Mr. Latona. Yes, it is.

Rep. Ford. In the fingerprinting business?

Mr. Latona. It is very common, one of the most common methods of recording latent prints.

Mr. Eisenberg. Who did you get this exhibit, this lift from?

Mr. Latona. This lift was referred to us by the FBI Dallas office.



Mr. Eisenberg. And were you told anything about its origin?

Mr. Latona. We were advised that this print had been developed by the Dallas Police Department, and as the lift itself indicates from the underside of the gun barrel near the end of the foregrip.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, may I say for the record that at a subsequent point we will have the testimony of the police officer of the Dallas police who developed this print, and made the lift, and I believe that the print was taken from underneath the portion of the barrel which is covered by the stock.

Now, did you attempt to identify this print which shows on the lift Exhibit 637?

Mr. Latona. Yes, I did.

Mr. Eisenberg. Did you succeed in making identification?

Mr. Latona. On the basis of my comparison, I did effect an identification.

Mr. Eisenberg. And whose print was that, Mr. Latona,

Mr. Latona. The palm print which appears on the lift was identified by me as the right palm print of Lee Harvey Oswald.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, Mr. Latona, as I understand it, on November 23, therefore, the FBI had not succeeded in making an identification of a fingerprint or palm print on the rifle, but several days later by virtue of the receipt of this lift, which did not come with the weapon originally, the FBI did succeed in identifying a print on Exhibit 139?

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

Mr. Latona. That is right.

Mr. Eisenberg. Which may explain any inconsistent or apparently inconsistent statements, I believe, which appeared in the press as to an identification?

Mr. Latona. We had no personal knowledge of any palm print having been developed on the rifle. The only prints that we knew of were the fragmentary prints which I previously pointed out had been indicated by the cellophane on the trigger guard. There was no indication on this rifle as to the existence of any other prints. This print which indicates <sup>it</sup> came from the underside of the gun barrel, evidently the lifting had been so complete that there was nothing left to show any marking on the gun itself as to the existence of such -- even an attempt on the part of anyone else to process the rifle.

Mr. Dulles. Do I understand then that if there is a lifting of this kind, that it may obliterate.

Mr. Latona. Completely.

Mr. Dulles. The original print?

Mr. Latona. That is right.

Mr. Eisenberg. So that you personally, Mr. Latona, did not know anything about a print being on the rifle which was identifiable until you received, actually received the lift, Exhibit 637.

Mr. Latona. On the 29th of November.

Mr. Eisenberg. Seven days after the assassination.

~~TOP SECRET~~

And in the intervening period correspondingly the FBI had no such knowledge.

Mr. Latona. As far as I know.

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Latona, could you tell us what portion of the palm of Lee Harvey Oswald you identified that print as being?

Mr. Latona. Yes. Here again I have a photograph that will show the approximate area involved which is on the ulna<sup>N</sup> side of the lower portion of the palm.

Mr. Eisenberg. The ulna<sup>N</sup> being?

Mr. Latona. Down near the base of the palm towards the wrist.

Mr. Eisenberg. This is <sup>S</sup> the right palm?

Mr. Latona. The right palm.

Mr. Eisenberg. As it was in the case of the paper, Exhibits 142?

Mr. Latona. Yes, sir.

Mr. Eisenberg. Could you display that photograph please? This is a photograph which you took of the inked print which was furnished to you by the Dallas office.

Mr. Latona. I didn't personally prepare the photographs. They were prepared at my personal direction.

Mr. Eisenberg. Was it prepared under your supervision?

Mr. Latona. Yes, sir.

Mr. Eisenberg. Is it an accurate reproduction?

~~TOP SECRET~~



Mr. Latona. It is.

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Chairman, may I have this admitted as 638?

Rep. Ford. It shall be admitted.

(The photograph referred to was marked for identification as Commission's Exhibit No. 638 and received in evidence.)

Mr. Latona. I might point out that you have the original of this which has been previously admitted.

Mr. Eisenberg. Yes, but this photograph shows a red circle around the portion which you identified.

Mr. Latona. That is right.

Mr. Eisenberg. As being the latent found on the lift, is that right?

(Discussion off the record.)

(The reporter read the last question.)

Mr. Latona. Yes.

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Latona, now you are showing me another photograph which appears to be a photograph of the lift itself, Exhibit 637, but an enlargement thereof.

Mr. Latona. Slightly enlarged, yes, sir.

Mr. Eisenberg. Was this prepared by you or under your supervision?

Mr. Latona. It was.

Mr. Eisenberg. And there is a red circle around this, on this photograph, that is around the print, the latent print?

Mr. Latona. That is right.

~~TOP SECRET~~

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Chairman, may I have this photograph admitted as 639?

Rep. Ford. It shall be admitted.

(The photograph referred to was marked Commission Exhibit No. 639 and received in evidence.)

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Latona, did you also prepare a chart showing an enlarged portion of the inked and latent fingerprint?

Mr. Latona. Yes, sir, I did.

Mr. Eisenberg. Illustrating some of the points which you used in making your identification?

Mr. Latona. Yes, sir, I did.

Mr. Eisenberg. Was this chart prepared by you or under your supervision?

Mr. Latona. This was prepared under my direct supervision.

Mr. Eisenberg. May I have this admitted as 640?

Rep. Ford. It shall be admitted.

(The chart referred to was marked Commission Exhibit No. 640 for identification and received in evidence.)

Mr. Eisenberg. What is the enlargement of this chart?

Mr. Latona. Approximately an eight time enlargement of the latent print which appears on the left, Commission Exhibit --

Mr. Eisenberg. 637?

Mr. Latona. -- 637. And the inked right palm print enlargement is approximately eight times an enlargement of the Exhibit 638.

Mr. Eisenberg. The inked print?

Mr. Latona. Which is encircled in red, a portion of that area.

Mr. Eisenberg. I wonder whether you could put that up on this easel here so that we can all see it, and explain to us some of the points which led you to your conclusion.

Mr. Latona. Here again the approach insofar as making a comparison is concerned is exactly the same. That never changes. In making a comparison of fingerprints or palm prints, the mechanics <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ exactly the same.

First to look for what might be considered as points which are easy to see to the fingerprint man.

Rep. Ford. May I ask first was the lift a good print for technical purposes?

Mr. Latona. Yes, to the extent that the identification was made. There is no question as to the identity.

Now, insofar as quality is concerned, I believe that is what you have in mind, we don't, <sup>i</sup>/<sub>n</sub> fingerprint circles, don't say that this is a good latent as compared to a bad latent. If it is valuable for purposes of identification so far as we are concerned it is good.

Now, that may not appear to the inexperienced eye possibly as being as clear as some of those others which you have already seen but for the purpose of identification the points are here. That is the main thing.



Now, in making the comparison here it is easy to see the ink print. There is very little question here. This print was made on purpose for purposes of recording the ridges. This was made more or less incidental or possibly accidental.

Mr. Dulles. How does the left one differ? I thought you told us before it was ten times.

Mr. Latona. No. Those were the others.

Mr. Dulles. That was the fingerprint that was ten times?


Mr. Latona. That is right.

Mr. Dulles. And the palm has always been eight times?

Mr. Latona. That is right, because of the fact to make it ten times it would have been enlarged to the extent that maybe you wouldn't be able to see the significance as to what it purports to be.

If you enlarge fingerprints too much, it loses its identity. I have seen them where they were enlarged so big that you couldn't tell what they were, and if somebody would tell you it is a fingerprint you would say, if you say so it is, but it doesn't look like it to me.

Now, in some other sciences, for example, like handwriting and things of that kind you can enlarge them pretty good size, typewriting and things of that type, but a fingerprint because of the pooriness in contrast plus the fact that in themselves these black marks have no particular significance, they might lose their identity, you won't reconcile a palm print with a palm print.



So, actually for purposes of making comparisons we never make a comparison from an enlargement. The best way to make a comparison, the more complete, is to make it from the actual size utilizing a regular fingerprint glass which enlarges approximately four diameters.

We would never think of enlarging the prints for purposes of making our initial comparison. We make them on the basis of the actual size, just like you see it here, utilizing a fingerprint, which gives you a better picture.

Mr. Eisenberg. Fingerprint glass, you mean?

Mr. Latona. Fingerprint glass, because you get a much better view of the impression than you do where it is enlarged because in enlarging you have a tendency to distort, the dissimilarities, to exaggerate what may be considered as dissimilarities.

Now, looking at these marks here again, which are very apparent here in the ink print, this number one which is a black line which flows over to the right, then one ridge directly below it and off to the left is this point number two. Then by counting down one, two, three, four we come to this portion, a shortened ink ridge which was similar to this shortened ink ridge in the illustration drawn on the board is Number 3.

Now, here again the fingerprint man simply mentally says to himself, "If these palm prints were made by the same palm I should be able to find three such points in approximately the

same area of this palm print as was found here."

The manner of isolating the area is by virtue of the fact that you see this looping formation, the looping formation is right in here, rather vague, but it is there.

Looking in that approximate area, you notice faintly this black line that comes over to this area and stops at that point there. Now, is this point number one the same as this point number one? If it is, then there should be a point number 2 in the latent print which is in the same relative position as point number 2 occurs in the ink print. By looking in such a position by this one ridge removed and to the left, there is this point number 2.

Then looking down to point number 3, we notice one, two, three four, there is this so-called shortened ink ridge which to me shows up very clearly here in the enlargement of the latent print.

Point number 4 is this black line which is coming towards point number 3, and right within the same area, line. There is point number 4.

Point number 5 is picked up in this position over here, which is another one of these shortened ink ridges. It is removed by one ridge or rather to the left of point number 6 as is seen here.

Then we pick up point number 7, which is this point showing a cluster of ridge formation here.



Point number 8 is tied in. You can tie in point number 8 to point number 4, point number 5, to point number 7, and that coincides with point number 8 here. In that way we pick up point number 9, showing the relationship of one, two, three and over here one, two, three, always the same formation, the same general area, the same relationship to each other. In that way we pick up point number 10, point number 11 and point number 12, which have exactly the same formation.

Here is point number 10 coming this way, point number 11 going that way, these two ridges are in between. It checks perfectly. The same way with point number 12 which is just below point number 11, and having the same relationship to point number 10, the same general areas, identically the same type of characteristics, and exactly the same relationship to each other.

On the basis of those points, the obvious conclusion to an experienced fingerprint man is simply that the same palm made both of these prints. Only one palm could have made, it, and that palm is the one who is alledged to be of Lee Harvey Oswald, his right palm.

Rep. Boggs. Is it true that every fingerprint of each individual on earth is different?

Mr. Latona. Yes, sir. That is my sincere belief. I say that not only on earth but all those that have died before and all those to come. There will never be duplication.

Mr. Dulles. The same is true of palm prints, isn't it?

Mr. Latona. Absolutely, yes, sir, fingerprints and palm prints and foot prints.

Rep. Boggs. Can they be distorted, destroyed?

Mr. Latona. They can be destroyed in the sense that --

Rep. Boggs. Cut your finger off, that is right?

Mr. Latona. Sure, you can cut your finger off. You can resort to what is known as -- they can be transferred. You can slice off a pattern from one finger and place it on another but you will see the scar. They can have what is known as surgical planing.

Rep. Boggs. That is what I was thinking about.

Mr. Latona. That can be done, too.

Rep. Boggs. What happens then?

Mr. Latona. What happens is that you lose the ridge area and you will simply have a scar. There will be no more pattern. Now, the pattern is formed by what are known as dermal papilla which is below the epidermis or outer layer of skin. As long as you only injure the outer surface the ridge formation will grow back exactly the same as it was before. If you get down to the dermal papilla, which lay like this --

- Mr. Eisenberg. You are drawing an illustration on the board which shows short broad downward strokes.

Mr. Latona. You destroy or injure these to the extent that there is actual bleeding you will get a permanent scar.

Fingerprints can be destroyed or scarred in such a fashion that we would not be able to successfully classify them.

Mr. Dulles. Do criminals do that?

Mr. Latona. Yes, they do. We have had one case probably the most successful was known as the so-called Roscoe Pitts case. This was a fugitive who in order to avoid identification ~~he~~ went to <sup>an unscrupulous</sup> ~~a notorious~~ doctor who performed an operation and he did so by ~~virtue of~~ first cutting five slits on one side of his chest. Then he removed the pattern areas, what we call the pattern areas which would consist of removal of the whole core area down to the delta area, sliced that off.

Rep. Boggs. How much would that be?

Mr. Latona. He would literally have to draw blood. He would have to get down and just slice that off completely. He did that with five fingers. Then he taped the five fingers to the side of his chest and he kept them there for about two weeks. The same procedure was gone through with the other hand, and at the end of that time they were taken down and bound up individually. When they finally healed, all he has now is scar tissue for his pattern areas; but all we did in order to identify him was to drop down to the second joint. We make <sup>d</sup> the identification from the second joint.

Now, at that particular time --

Rep. Boggs. After all that business.

Mr. Latona. It didn't do him any good. Literally, the easiest



person in our files to identify is Roscoe Pitts. He is the only one that has scar patterns like that. As soon as they see anything like that everybody that knows anything about our files knows Roscoe Pitts.

Rep. Boggs. Develop, if you will, please, that point that no two human beings ever have similar prints. Why is that, in your opinion?

Mr. Latona. Well, earlier we went through a case in which we have in the FBI, in which we literally have compared millions, millions of single prints with a fragmentary latent ~~palm~~<sup>(delete)</sup> print which we developed on a demand note in a kidnapping case, one of our major kidnapping cases which occurred back in 1937, and we have compared this fragmentary print.

Now, ordinarily <sup>in</sup> fingerprints, there are four basic pattern types. You have an arch, tented arch, a loop and a whorl.

Now in making a comparison naturally if you can tell the type of pattern you are going to restrict your comparison to the particular type.

In this instance we cannot tell what type of pattern this fragment that we developed is. We know that it is from a finger. And in attempting to identify the subject of this kidnapping case, we have compared it literally with millions of cards.

Now, existing in this fragmentary print there are only about seven to eight points that can be found, it is so fragmentary. We cannot determine the pattern. Accordingly then when you com-

pare it, you have to compare it with a person's ten fingers .  
regardless as to the pattern types. Bearing in mind that the  
average fingerprint has from 85 to 125 points identifying charac-  
teristics, we have literally made millions of comparisons with  
only a portion of a finger, and we have failed to identify these  
8 points in all types of patterns.

Isn't it sufficient to say then that people simply  
will not have the same fingerprints? Yet you have authorities,  
so-called authorities, who say that it is possible to find all  
ten prints duplicated in one chance out of one followed by 60  
zeros, if you can figure out what that figure is.

Rep. Boggs. Who are these authorities?

Mr. Latona. They are really in my opinion mathematicians  
who on the basis of the so-called characteristic points have said  
five points times 125 times 125 times 125 to about the tenth  
power and wind up something like one followed by 60 zeros.  
They are mathematicians but they are not fingerprint people.

Mr. Dulles. What is your card system like? If this is  
too confidential I don't want to get anything in the record  
here that is too secret.

We can take it off the record.

Mr. Latona. Nothing is secret about our files.

Mr. Dulles. How many characteristics do you file on a card  
so that when you find these characteristics you can go to the  
right cabinet and the right filing drawer and then pull out the

right card in time?

Mr. Latona. Literally they can breakdown into hundreds of thousands of groups.

Rep. Boggs. How many do you have on file?

Mr. Latona. We have the fingerprints of 47 and a half million people.

Rep. Boggs. That includes all of those who were in the Army, Navy --

Mr. Latona. 15 million criminals and about 62.5 million what we call civil. I explained earlier that our files consist of two main files, it is criminal files and the civil files. In the civil files are the fingerprints of individuals, those prints that we have retained who have been fingerprinted in connection with some civil affair like the services, for example, security sensitive jobs, all types of applicants, alien registrations. Then we also will accept the fingerprints of just a private citizen who would like to have his prints on record for simply identification purposes.

They are in the category of 62.5 million. Criminal prints 15 million.

(Discussion off therecord.)

Rep. Ford. I have to leave, Mr. Dulles, will you take over as Chairman for the rest of the time that you can be here?

Mr. Dulles. I will do so.

Rep. Boggs. May I ask a question which is not particularly



pertinent to this particular witness, but how many prints on various things like these boxes and other paraphernalia that the Commission may now have in its possession have been identified as those of Oswald?

Mr. Latona. Six all told.

Rep. Boggs. Six altogether?

Mr. Latona. Six.

Rep. Boggs. That includes these?

Mr. Latona. That is right.

Rep. Boggs. How many, three?

Mr. Latona. Three so far.

Mr. Dulles. You have dealt with three so far?

Mr. Eisenberg. Three so far. We should modify this. We are only introducing this morning evidence associated with the crime, directly with the crime.

Now, there were many papers submitted to the Identification Division. I believe you did identify --

Mr. Latona. Personal effects, wallet, pictures, papers and things of that kind which in themselves bear Oswald's prints, which they should because they belong to him.

Rep. Boggs. May I ask another question in this connection. A weapon of this type, in your examination do you find a lot of other prints on it as well? You do not?

Mr. Latona. No. First of all the weapon itself is a cheap one as you can see. It is ~~an~~ one that --

Rep. Boggs. Is what?

Mr. Latona. A cheap old weapon. The wood is to the point where it won't take a good print to begin with hardly. The metal isn't of the best, and not readily susceptible to a latent print.

Rep. Boggs. Was this weapon picked up first by the police?

Mr. Eisenberg. Yes, sir.

Rep. Boggs. Did anyone touch it as far as you know?

Mr. Eisenberg. No, no. It was picked up by a police officer attached to the Dallas police force first.

Mr. Dulles. It came to you directly then from the Dallas police and not through the Secret Service?

Mr. Latona. No, the FBI turned it over to me, the Dallas office of the FBI flew it up here.

Rep. Boggs. What I am trying to determine is the average police officer when he would pick up a weapon of that kind would take steps to secure whatever prints might be on that and also prevent the addition of prints, is that right?

Mr. Latona. I would assume so.

Rep. Boggs. I mean this is part of his training, isn't it?

Mr. Latona. Yes, sir, especially if he is -- yes, I would say so. That is almost elementary today. There are so many schools today going that an officer that doesn't give some thought to latent fingerprints, he hasn't been to school.

Rep. Boggs. Of course not. But do you have that problem

in your normal examination?

Mr. Latona. Well, a lot of times that all depends. Sometimes they don't realize the significance of a latent examination, and it is unavoidable that an object has been contaminated. And then a lot of times it is simply because of the circumstances. Sometimes possibly in an instance of this kind because of the crime itself, which was involved, I dare say there must have been a lot of panic there at that time. That is just pure conjecture on my part. I don't know whether they were thinking in details as to the examination. I don't think they sat down and just figured very calmly what they were going to do.

Rep. Boggs. Of course not.

Mr. Latona. I imagine everybody just poured into that room where they found the thing, somebody would say was this the gun and he handed it to someone else and then he would look at it. Lord knows what went on down there.

By the time the gun got there -- on the other hand, if the right officer was there he would have protected it from the beginning and that is unquestionably what happened here.

Mr. Dulles. I have to make a telephone call. I will be right back.

Mr. Eisenberg. I believe that the print showing in the lift was taken from an area which had been covered by the <sup>wooden</sup> ~~woven~~ stock so that it was protected even against --

Mr. Latona. Promiscuous handling, yes. If that were on the



underside, if that was covered by the wood then very obviously those people there never did touch that.

Mr. Eisenberg. At any rate we are going to find out exactly what they did.

Rep. Boggs. Yes. Go ahead.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, just to elaborate on some questions which Mr. Boggs was asking earlier, Mr. Latona, referring specifically to this weapon, do you believe that a determination could have been made as to the age of the print found on the weapon which you have identified as being Oswald's print and a lift of which is Exhibit No. 626?

Mr. Latona. No, I don't.

Mr. Eisenberg. You don't?

Mr. Latona. No, I don't.

Mr. Eisenberg. Are experts unanimous in this opinion?

Mr. Latona. No, they are not. There are some experts who contend that they can determine from the way the print develops, and they will use the term "fresh".

Now, on the other hand, so far as the definition of fresh, then it resolves itself into an hour, a day, a week, a month.

What is fresh as aside from an old one? And my opinion simply is this. That on the basis of the print itself, on the basis of the print itself I cannot determine how old it is.

Mr. Eisenberg. At least specifically on this type, or in particular focussing on this type of weapon?

Mr. Latona. Particularly on that weapon.

Mr. Eisenberg. That is 139?

Mr. Latona. That is right.

Mr. Eisenberg. If there are no further questions on Exhibit 139 Commissioner Boggs, I will move on to another exhibit.

Mr. Latona, I hand you now a small cardboard carton which has written on it "Box A" in red pencil and has various other marks which I won't go into, and I ask you whether you are familiar with this box, this carton?

Mr. Latona. Yes, I am.

Mr. Eisenberg. And did you examine this carton, Mr. Latona, to determine whether there were any identifiable latent fingerprints present?

Mr. Latona. I did not personally process this box, but I was present at the time that the box was and I had occasion to examine that during the course of its being processed while it was being done.

Mr. Eisenberg. It was processed in your presence?

Mr. Latona. In my presence and under my direction.

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Chairman, I would like this admitted as a Commission exhibit with your permission.

Rep. Boggs. It will be admitted.

Mr. Eisenberg. That will be 641.

(The box referred to was marked Commission's Exhibit No. 641 for identification and received in evidence.)

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Latona, when you received this box which is now 641, did it bear any evidence that it had been dusted or otherwise tested for fingerprints?

Mr. Latona. No, it had not, just a plain cardboard box.

Mr. Eisenberg. So far as you could tell then it had not been?

Mr. Latona. That is right, it had not been processed.

Mr. Eisenberg. How was it processed in the FBI laboratory?

Mr. Latona. First by the iodine fume and subsequently by chemical means.

Mr. Eisenberg. Did the iodine fume develop any identifiable prints?

Mr. Latona. It did not.

Mr. Eisenberg. Did the chemical means?

Mr. Latona. The silver nitrate did develop a latent fingerprint.

Mr. Eisenberg. Just one?

Mr. Latona. A latent fingerprint, yes.

Mr. Eisenberg. Just one identifiable print?

Mr. Latona. One identifiable print, yes.

Mr. Eisenberg. Do you want to check your notes on that, Mr. Latona?

Mr. Latona. There was another print identified on that. There were two fingerprints, one palm print. There was developed on Box A, Exhibit No. 641, one palm print and one fingerprint.



Mr. Eisenberg. Were those the only identifiable prints  
Mr. Latona?

Mr. Latona. No, there were other fingerprints developed  
on this box.

Mr. Eisenberg. Do you recall how many there were?

Mr. Latona. On Box A in addition to these two prints  
there were developed eight fingerprints and three palm prints.

Mr. Eisenberg. That is a total of 13.

Mr. Latona. Nine fingerprints and four palm prints.

Mr. Eisenberg. 13 identifiable prints?

Mr. Latona. That is right.

Mr. Dulles. Could I just get caught up. What is this  
box we have here?

Mr. Eisenberg. This is a box which was found <sup>n</sup> near the window  
in the TSED from which the assassin apparently fired,  
that is the easternmost window in the south face of the  
SED. Yesterday cartridge cases and the day before cartridge  
cases we discussed were also found near that window. This box  
is labeled on there, I believe --

Mr. Latona. "A".

Mr. Eisenberg. Yes, and I think it also says top box.  
Yes, it says "Top Box".

Mr. Dulles. This is the Rolling Reader?

Mr. Eisenberg. That is right.

Mr. Dulles. The Rolling Reader has played quite a role in

our testimony.

Mr. Eisenberg. Yes.

Now, this particular box is labeled top box, and I believe this particular box was on the top of the three boxes two of which were Rolling Reader boxes which were found near the window and which may have been used as a rest by the assassin for his rifle.

Mr. Dulles. As I recall previous testimony indicates that the Rolling Reader box had been moved from its normal place.

Mr. Eisenberg. Apparently so.

Mr. Dulles. With the other Rolling Reader boxes and put in a position near the window from which it was alleged the shot was fired.

Mr. Eisenberg. Apparently so, and apart from the two boxes, the two Rolling Reader boxes which were found near the regular storage area for the Rolling Reader boxes were a distance away from the sixth floor window.

Mr. Dulles. Yes, I recall that testimony.

Mr. Eisenberg. So you found 13 identifiable prints, Mr. Latona. Were you able to identify any of those prints as belonging to a specific individual?

Mr. Latona. We were able to identify one fingerprint and one palm print.

Mr. Eisenberg. And whose prints were they?

Mr. Latona. The fingerprint was identified as Harvey Lee Oswald.

Mr. Eisenberg. That is Lee Harvey Oswald.

Mr. Latona. That is right.

Mr. Eisenberg. And the palm?

Mr. Latona. The palm print was identified also as Harvey Lee Oswald.

Mr. Eisenberg. Again Lee Harvey Oswald.

Mr. Latona. That is right.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, again you used, did you, the known print which was marked into evidence earlier?

Mr. Latona. Yes.

Mr. Eisenberg. And you used those in all your identification I believe?

Mr. Latona. That is right.

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Latona, can you tell us what portion of the palm of Lee Harvey Oswald is reproduced on this box, this carton 641 as a latent print?

Mr. Latona. I have here a photograph of the palm print which has an area indicated by a rough red circle showing the approximate area which is the ulnar<sup>ru</sup> area of the left palm.

Mr. Eisenberg. That is the area closest to the little finger?

Mr. Latona. On that side, yes, sir.

Mr. Eisenberg. This is a true photograph which was prepared by you or under your supervision?

Mr. Latona. A true reproduction of the original which you already have.

~~TOP SECRET~~



Mr. Eisenberg. May I have this admitted as 642, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Dulles. May I ask a question. Apparently the red mark on this exhibit on the palm is in a different place, isn't it, a slightly different place?

Mr. Latona, It is a different palm. This is the left palm.

Mr. Eisenberg. This is the left palm. The other two are ~~left~~ <sup>right</sup> palms.

Mr. Dulles. Good, that straightens me out.

Mr. Eisenberg. Actually they were both on the ulna <sup>N</sup> side of the palm.

Mr. Latona. That is correct.

Mr. Eisenberg. That is they were both taken on what is commonly called the heel of the palm.

Mr. Dulles. This is a different hand. This is the left hand and what we have had so far is the right hand on the palm prints.

Mr. Eisenberg. Yes, sir.

Mr. Latona. Previously we had two palm prints on the right hand. This third one is from the left.

Mr. Eisenberg. May this photograph be admitted as 642, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Dulles. This will be admitted.

(The photograph referred to was marked Commission's Exhibit No. 642 for identification and received in evidence.)

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Latona, do you have another photograph in

your hand there?

Mr. Latona. Here I have another photograph a slight enlargement time and a half which is a latent palm print found on the cardboard box marked "A" which is the Commission's Exhibit 641. This is indicated by a red arrow.

Mr. Eisenberg. Let's hold that just a second and get the photograph admitted.

Rep. Boggs. Where did these boxes come from?

Mr. Eisenberg. These boxes were located in front of the window from which the assassin apparently fired. There were three boxes stacked immediately in front of the window of which this Exhibit No. 641 was the topmost box, and these were apparently used as a rest by the assassin for positioning his rifle.

As you can see, there are several other boxes in the room which will be introduced shortly.

Mr. Dulles. I may say that there was testimony, I don't recall <sup>e</sup> whether you were here at the time, about some boxes called Rolling Reader, Hale.

Do you recall the testimony on the Rolling Reader?

Rep. Boggs. No.

Mr. Dulles. These boxes were moved from a place on the 6th floor room where a great many Rolling Reader boxes were placed, and they were put near the window, and a Rolling Reader apparently, these are cubes, and they are for small children and they roll

them out on the floor and they learn how to read the letters of the alphabet and other things from these Rolling Readers.

These boxes, because of their nature, -- do you know what the blocks are made of?

Mr. Eisenberg. No, I don't.

Mr. Dulles. They weren't solid wood but they were light cubes and therefore presumably these boxes were moved because they were a good deal lighter and easier to handle than other boxes.

In that consistent with the testimony as you recall it?

Mr. Eisenberg. Yes.

Rep. Boggs. Were they full when you got them?

Mr. Eisenberg. You will have to ask Mr. Latona.

Mr. Latona. They were empty. They had been opened and the books removed or the contents, whatever it was.

Mr. Dulles. The contents were apparently these cubes as we were told, and small children used them and roll them on the floor and then they got the As and the Bs and the Cs.

Rep. Boggs. In the opening process this would not have any effect on the fingerprints or the palm prints?

Mr. Latona. It could. I mean in the sense that somebody else's prints, the people opening them if they didn't take the time and effort to protect themselves, they could have left their prints there. I don't know how that was done.

Mr. Dulles. Do you recall whether the testimony shows whether the boxes were presumably filled when they were originally moved