THE LARGEST-SELLING
FICTION-FACT
MAGAZINE FOR MEN

ARGOSY 205 EAST 42nd STREET, NEW YORK 17, N.Y. • MURRAY HILL 9-4190

December 2, 1963

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover
Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Hoover:

I would appreciate it if you would see that this letter is passed along to whoever in your bureau is conducting the investigation into the recent and tragic assassination of President Kennedy. It probably contains nothing that you do not know already, but I am writing it in the faint hope that it may be of some help to you in your investigation.

On Saturday afternoon, November 23, I phoned the Dallas Police Department from Chicago and asked to speak to the Chief of Detectives because I wanted to point out to him one aspect of the Kennedy case that I thought he was neglecting. The reports that I had read claimed that Oswald had been eating a bag of fried chicken as he waited for the motorcade to pass beneath his window, and that the bag containing these chicken scraps was found on the floor beside the window. I had heard, however, of no attempt to ascertain whether Oswald himself had been eating chicken on that day. I wished to suggest to the Chief of Detectives in Dallas that he attempt to make such a determination which, if I am not mistaken, can readily be done by a chemical stool analysis. I realized that positive results of such a test would in no way conclusively prove that Oswald was the assassin, but I did feel that if they showed he had not been eating any chicken on that day that there were grounds to suspect that the bag of chicken may quite possibly have belonged to a confederate of his.

When I was connected with the Dallas Chief of Detectives (whose name I do not remember but which is probably on the Telephone Company's records) and when I told him of my idea, he said: "We found that Oswald hadn't been eating anything. That bag of chicken didn't belong to him. I don't know why all the newspapers claim that bag of chicken was his. They all have it wrong. The bag of chicken belonged to some woman who was nearby."

EXP. PROC. REC. 16 25 DEC 9 1963

Several days later I read in the papers that a definite palm print of Oswald's had been found on the paper bag, the same paper bag the Dallas Police told me did not belong to him. I do not think that any firm conclusions can be drawn from these contradictory statements but I do think the questions of whether Oswald's palm print was on the paper bag, of whether he was actually the one who was eating the chicken, and of whether chemical tests show that he had or had not eaten chicken on the day of the assassination do point up an avenue that deserves further investigation, especially if you still suspect that he may have had a partner in his crime.

I hope this letter is of some help to you, although if you have already intensively investigated this aspect of the crime andhave found it to be a blind alley, or have cleared up the discrepancies I seem to find there, I would very much appreciate it if you could let me know so (assuming the information is not confidential) since I have been somewhat distrubed over it.

Sincerely,

Albert N. Podell
Picture Editor

ANP/jw