

# THE WARREN REPORT: A FIRST

## The Report

The Warren Commission's Report has dispelled many false rumors and has shed light on many inaccuracies which circulated with regard to the assassination of President Kennedy and the investigation of it. It was unavoidable that inquiries by the press and private individuals produce many unsubstantiated rumors and inaccuracies. But while setting the record straight on many minutiae, the Warren Commission's record is much more significant for what it lacks than for what it contains. And what it most obviously lacks is a balanced and impartial consideration of more than one theory of the assassination. In this respect, the Warren Commission's Report is completely soaked in bias, with none of its many pages constituting an exception.

The Warren Commission's Report is cliché, American cliché, that is. It takes more for granted than it attempts to search. It proceeds from the implicit assumption that Americans are the chosen people, that intrigue, conspiracy or any other such ugly phenomenon may be inherently built into every nation and country, but certainly none characterizes near-utopian America.

The Warren Commission's Report is not a document of candor. While it purports to disabuse people of mistaken notions and suspicions, it does so by twisting and misrepresenting some arguments and contentions of its detractors, and on occasion by ignoring arguments and contentions which led so many people the world over to conclusions at variance with those of the Commission. Mark Lane, the New York attorney who, like Emil Zola before him, has dedicated himself to defeating One Big Falsehood, discusses some of these regrettable aspects of the Warren Report in an article included in this issue.

The Warren Commission's Report provides blinders intended to prevent the people of America from taking a searching look at the socio-political machine which controls them.

The Warren Commission's Report is fiction written by adults for children, or by leaders who consider themselves so much above their flock that it does not even occur to them that they might share their knowledge and thoughts with the inferior rabble.

The Warren Commission's Report is a deception against this generation of Americans, an occasion for the healthy skepticism of this generation of non-Americans, and a disowned official document and source of embarrassment to future generations of Americans.

Many U.S. Senators and Representatives would need to be suicidal to let the U.S. Congress thoroughly investigate its intramural corruption. Indeed, the U.S. Congress is the last place where anyone can be expected to get outraged because of graft; our whole "two party" system in fact constituting nothing but a mechanism of institutionalized corruption with the representatives of various businesses arguing for spoils and pretending to constitute a national parliament. It is therefore not surprising that so much Congressional initiative has been going into blocking a full investigation of the business and legislative machinations of Robert G. Baker and his Senatorial benefactors-and-beneficiaries, possibly including the present occupant of the White House. Nor is it surprising, when one bears in mind this character of the U.S. Senate, that even its nominal motions against corruption are in fact a camouflage of corruption. Such was the motion by which the Senate instructed its Rules Committee to reopen the investigation of the business affairs of Mr. Baker. That Committee had so clearly manifested its reluctance to expose all the Congressional thieves and chisellers who participated in Baker's ring that renewed "investigation" by it is the culprits' best insurance against exposure. And it was precisely for the sake of such insurance that Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield masterminded the detour of demands for investigation to the morgue of the Rules Committee.

Lest someone get the erroneous idea that persistent demands for a reopening of the Baker investigation are due to Congressional intolerance of graft, it is important to appreciate that the Baker ball is being played between two electoral teams, both out to embarrass each other and both quite cynical. Even Senator Clifford P. Case's urging that the Justice Department sue Mr. Baker for his "extra-curricular" profits while secretary to the Senate's Democratic majority is primarily a maneuver calculated to put electoral competitors on the defensive. This does not mean, of course, that the Senator's demand is not justified. In fact, elementary consistency would require that not only Mr. Baker be deprived of the fortune he amassed while pretending to serve the nation, but also that his one-time-friend-and-incumbent-President be deprived of a similarly amassed, if much bigger, fortune.

Of course, there is no "danger" of anything of this sort happening. For if every bribed-and-bribing legislator in Washington were to spill the beans, and if from now on only men with clean hands could occupy the nation's highest posts, there would be a massive exodus from Washington and, furthermore, a whole new system of administer-

I. F. Stone, who puts out *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, is Washington's most honest reporter. But I. F. Stone, the reporter, is often at odds with I. F. Stone, the commentator, the latter possessing a distinct dislike of the former. The source of the conflict is the fact that the reporter keeps embarrassing the commentator, frequently digging up facts which no one but leftist dissenters want to hear anything about. That's why the commentator about once a year comes up with something spectacular to restore the reporter's good political graces with a few remaining lunch-time friends in various government offices.

Last year, an opportunity was provided by a New York rally of students who had just returned from a trip to Cuba, unauthorized by the State Department. Mr. Stone promised to address the rally, but when next its organizers heard from him it was through the good offices of the daily press to which he sent a cancellation of engagement plus a renunciation of his would-be hosts as "out-of-this-world leftists."

It is obviously time to place this year's sacrificial lamb on Stone's personal altar of an imaginary shred of respectability. The sacrifice-bearer ostentatiously announces the high cost of this choicest of lambs: Let it be known that I pay my gods dearly, that I put at their feet not just anybody, but "my dear and revered friend, Bertrand Russell." And to impress the anti-Russell veterans who might not think too much of this Johnny-come-lately act, the penitent Mr. Stone offers oozing and cloying derision of the American left, which, in a new application of the Equal Guilt Doctrine, is equated with HUAC, the Eastland Committee and the late Joe from Wisconsin.

Since Stone too sets a limit on thoughts which may be considered about America, anyone who, unlike himself, does not accept the Warren Commission's Report "as conclusive" need not be debated; that man's facts, charges, thoughts, suspicions, considerations are "dishonorable" and he is himself "either unscrupulous or sick." Indeed, the very Mr. Stone who spends half of his professional life on perfectly legitimate conjecture, speculation and deduction, believes any and all conjecture pertaining to The Assassination to be a virtual crime.

Having duly delivered his sacrifice and having also thrown in a few smaller lambs to boot, it is now time to bow to the priests of the temple. Thus, pious Mr. Stone comes to the defense of Senator Russell of Georgia and Congressman Boggs of Louisiana as "highly respected" men, whose racist views have nothing "to do with their probity." Of the other members of the Warren Commission, John J. McCloy is purified through the reliable process of having been Stone's acquaintance, and Allen W. Dulles emerges as a man so remote from the faintest suggestion of intrigue that it is inconceivable

Like many sacrificial rituals, Mr. Stone's too has certain unmentionables. Therefore, his quotes from Lord Russell's "16 Questions on the Assassination" (Sept. TMO) are orphaned as far as source is concerned. Which is understandable, if one considers that Mr. Stone's October 5th newsletter was his annual petition for political acceptability.

No doubt, about one year from now commentator Stone will again try to exculpate reporter Stone by carrying another sacrifice to the gates of Washington's official residences. It is all because commentator Stone is terribly afraid of reporter Stone; he is also very inferior to him in intelligence, integrity and perceptiveness.

A publication cannot stand still; no matter how high the rate of its subscription renewals, a promotional effort must constantly be launched in order to replace the non-renewals. This publication has reached a stage whereby its continuance depends on the enrollment of a significant number of additional subscribers. Accordingly, we have set before ourselves the goal of enrolling 25,000 additional subscribers within the next few months.

To make this possible an expenditure of \$100,000 is called for. The promotional program can be launched, however, with a fraction of the total cost, since increased revenue from its initial stages will hopefully finance the more advanced ones. We have appealed to our readers for \$35,000 to cover our present deficit of close to \$14,000 and to get the promotional drive under way. As of October 1st, we have received \$5,842.00.

We shall venture the immodesty of saying that in the five years of its existence, *The Minority of One* has grown in stature and that by now it is viewed as an important voice for peace and justice by significant segments of the American and international intellectual community. If this voice is to endure, and if it is also to influence general public opinion, a concentrated effort must be made to introduce it to ever more people. The responsibility for the achievement of this goal must be shared by all those who consider it worthwhile. The generous help of each of them is required both in enrolling subscribers from among their acquaintances and in providing the funds on which the success of our Drive for Survival and Expansion depends.

We make this appeal from the pages of the issue which completes our fifth year of publication; and we hope that by the time our specially enlarged anniversary issue of December, 1964 goes to press, the growing response from our readers will have brought us much closer to reaching the goal of this Drive for Survival and Expansion.

TMO - 11/64

*Has the Warren Commission established the facts and responsibility in The Assassination Case, or has it merely labored to make the incredible official theory seem more credible? Some of the key questions have been ignored by the Commission, and some "answers" are no answers. The Report had to reflect the Commission's intentions; this it does.*

Why was the Commission established in the first place, one might ask? Surely, the Justice Department trained for investigations involving Federal crimes was able to cope with all the investigating that was required. Surely, legislative hearings, already contemplated and announced for both the Senate and the House, which hearings were going to permit the witnesses to testify in public, would have provided the American people with the facts in the case. But then a Presidential Commission was established, and public hearings were bypassed. Testimony was classified as "TOP SECRET," including my own, and the American people were presented with a pre-digested version of some carefully selected testimony. Ted Lewis writing in the *New York Daily News* on September 29th offers an answer: "In connection with the Kennedy assassination it was decided that any Congressional investigation, especially in election year, just had to be avoided." In fact, says Mr. Lewis, "One of the reasons President Johnson entrusted the assignment to a blue chip panel headed by Chief Justice Warren was to head off competing Congressional probes." There would have been heat developed, said Mr. Lewis, "primarily in trying to get to the bottom of the rumors concerning a conspiracy." Obviously, since the Gallup poll showed that the majority of the American people believed that there was a conspiracy involved in the assassination of our President, it would have been incorrect, in a democratic society, for such a matter to be openly discussed at public hearings. Mr. Lewis concludes, "Johnson succeeded, of course, in keeping Congress on the sidelines. This was done shrewdly."

*"It's Very Heavy"*

The Report of the Warren Commission has been characterized by the Press as a massive

Mark Lane is a New York attorney and a former New York State Assemblyman.

document and one presenting all of the facts as far as they can be ascertained. The first analysis along those lines came from President Johnson who hefted the document in his hand for the benefit of television cameras, saying, "It's very heavy."

The *New York Times*, as is its way, was somewhat more scientific in discussing the document's attributes. They asserted that it was "the most massive, detailed and convincing piece of detective work ever undertaken," stating as the author for that statement certain unnamed "historians and archivists." (Sept. 28.) The *Times*, in wonderment, indicated that "in sheer shoe leather the investigation is regarded as unmatched in the annals of fact-finding." The Commission and its staff, according to the *Times*, studied "a mass of detail . . . including 25,000 separate interviews and re-interviews by FBI agents."

This all being so, one would expect that the Commission in its investigation, would have come across some answers to the most puzzling questions posed since November 22. However, the Commission seems to lack perspective in its massive assault on the facts. While it devotes several pages to Oswald's sexual and other relationships with his wife, the paraffin test tending to show that Oswald could not have fired a rifle on November 22 is dispensed with as "not reliable" in one sentence. Perhaps the Commission, with an eye toward the reading public, discovered the formula so successfully utilized by contemporary novelists: few facts, a little sex, and quantities of anti-Communism.

#### *Who Dispatched the Description?*

For example, one might inquire how it was possible for the Dallas police to dispatch the description of Lee Harvey Oswald, including his name, at 12:45 p.m. When Oswald was arrested, the Dallas authorities agreed that he was being sought solely for the murder of officer Tippit. A puzzling question arises: why was Oswald sought then—ostensibly for the murder of officer Tippit—while officer Tippit was still alive? The Commission concedes that Oswald's description was dispatched at 12:45 p.m. and that officer Tippit was killed at 1:15 or 1:16 p.m. Certainly one must expect that an investigation which called more than ten times as many witnesses as did the Joint Congressional Committee that investigated the Pearl Harbor attack in 1945 and 1946 would be able to secure that information for us. On what basis did the Dallas police send out Oswald's description, then, is the question presented to the Commission. One would think that if the Commission questioned the Dallas police officer who dispatched the description over the police radio, we might

then know the answer. *The Commission concludes that they do not know how Oswald's description was dispatched.* The historic document, which is filled with speculation and conjecture, does offer a guess: "Brennan saw the man fire the last shot and disappear from the window. Within minutes of the assassination Brennan described the man to the police. This description most probably led to the radio alert. Sent to police cars at approximately 12:45 p.m., it described the suspect as white, slender, weighing about 165 pounds, about 5'10" tall, and in his early thirties." (p. 144) Mr. Brennan, who now claims that he was more than one hundred feet from the Book Depository Building, says that he glanced up into a sixth floor window and saw a man standing while firing a rifle. At this distance, in a glance, Brennan saw enough, the Commission probably concludes, to present an absolutely accurate description of Oswald, including his height. Even those rifle experts who assert that it might be possible, with a vast amount of luck, for a master rifleman to emulate the shooting performance ascribed to Oswald by the Commission, all concede that this could not be done from a standing position. Thus, the Commission concludes, "although Brennan testified that the man in the window was standing when he fired the shots, most probably he was either sitting or kneeling. The half-open window, the arrangement of the boxes, and the angle of the shots virtually preclude a standing position. It is understandable, however, for Brennan to have believed that the man with the rifle was standing." The Commission asserts that from the street one kneeling may appear to be standing, since only a portion of the upper body can be seen. (p. 144) Assuming that this is so, does not the question arise as to how Mr. Brennan might glance up, see a man kneeling or sitting, presume that he was standing, and then give an absolutely accurate description of the man to the police, including his height? The Commission, in one of its many outlandish and speculative conclusions, states that "Brennan could have seen enough of the body of a kneeling or squatting person to estimate his height." (p. 145)



Throughout the Commission Report the impossible is elevated to the possible and the implausible is escalated to the likely.

Two witnesses testified before the Commission that they had seen Jack Ruby at the Parkland Hospital early in the afternoon of November 22nd. The Commission's over-

By Mark Lane

all conclusion that Oswald acted alone in assassinating the President and that Ruby acted alone in killing Oswald may be somewhat muddled by Ruby's presence at the Hospital at about the time of the President's death. In any event, the Commission prefers to believe that Ruby was not at the hospital. They have before them sworn statements of two persons. One, Seth Kantor, a Scripps Howard reporter, trained as an observer, who had known Ruby for years, testified that he is certain that he saw Ruby at the hospital and that, in fact, he had a conversation with Ruby in which he asked him what he was doing at the hospital. Another person testified that she saw Ruby at the hospital. Whether Ruby was actually at the Parkland Hospital may be less relevant than the Commission's approach to the evidence. Without published testimony from a single eye-witness contradicting the testimony placing Ruby at the Hospital, the Commission concludes that Ruby was not at the hospital. The Commission states that Kantor "had previously met Ruby in Dallas," which somewhat understates the situation since Kantor had known Ruby for years. The Commission, in disbelieving the statement of this trained observer and another witness, says: "the only other person besides Kantor who recalled seeing Ruby at the Hospital did not make known her observation until April 1964, had never seen Ruby before, allegedly saw him only briefly then . . ." (p. 336)

Contrast the Commission's attack upon the credibility of two witnesses with its support of Brennan's testimony and this while remembering that Brennan never saw Oswald before, allegedly saw him only briefly then, was unable to identify him in a police lineup, and thought he was standing while he was allegedly sitting or kneeling. The Commission concluded nevertheless—without exploring a single doubt—that Brennan's identification is absolutely valid.

The only eye-witness to the murder of officer Tippit who, the Commission states, can identify Oswald as the assailant, is Helen L. Markham. Mrs. Markham and I spoke on March 2nd in reference to that allegation. At that time she stated to me that the man who shot Tippit was "short, somewhat stocky, and had somewhat bushy hair," contrasting greatly with the police description of Oswald as a man who was "5'10" tall, slender, with thin hair that was receding." I told the Commission what Mrs. Markham had said to me. Mrs. Markham, after having been properly briefed by agents of the FBI, was called before the Commission at which time she denied that she had ever spoken with me. Subsequently, the Chief Justice, who has

indicated from the outset his willingness to believe that which he wishes to believe, stated to me, "I have every reason to doubt the truthfulness of your testimony." This rather temperate remark was based primarily upon his desire to believe that Mrs. Markham was being truthful when she asserted that she had never spoken with me. Shortly thereafter I sent to the Chief Justice a tape recording of my conversation with Mrs. Markham. Mrs. Markham was recalled as a witness and admitted that she had made a false statement to the Commission and that she, in fact, had spoken with me. Mrs. Markham continues to insist that the man who killed Tippit was short and on the heavy side. The Commission concludes that Mrs. Markham's testimony proves that Oswald shot officer Tippit and that, despite the false statement that she made to the Commission under oath, "the Commission considers her testimony reliable." (p. 168)

Mrs. Markham stated to me, and that statement (in the form of a tape recording) is before the Commission, that she was never questioned by any police officer at the scene of the Tippit killing about the physical description of the man who shot officer Tippit. But the Commission concludes, "within minutes of the shooting . . . Mrs. Markham described the man to the police . . ." (p. 168). The Commission then asserts that the description given to the police by Mrs. Markham was part of the basis of the second description of Oswald dispatched that day by the Dallas police. Therefore, to the mystery of how Oswald's description was dispatched by the police with reference to the assassination is added a new mystery: On what basis did the Dallas police dispatch Oswald's description following the Tippit killing if Mrs. Markham, their only eye-witness, never gave any description to them?



### A Prosecutor's Report

Considering the circumstances confronting the Commission, its report is an impressive document. It is not measured in tone. It should be read as it was written—as the prosecutor's case against Lee Harvey Oswald. Of the columnists writing in the major publications in America, thus far only Murray Kempton, writing in *The New York World Telegram*, has accurately assessed its value. "That is the sort of thing prosecutors do," he said. "Impressive as its evidence is, the Warren Report is, in this instance no better than the best presentation of a prosecutor."

### Uncalled Witnesses

Prosecutors, if they are scrupulously fair,

present all of the evidence from their own parochial view. The Commission has neglected to present all of the evidence. With the 25,000 separate interviews and re-interviews by FBI agents referred to above, the Commission failed to call or question or secure a statement from an eye-witness to the murder of officer Tippit. This woman was questioned by the Dallas police and told by them, "you may be killed if you ever tell anyone that you saw Tippit killed." This eye-witness states that the man who shot officer Tippit was short and fat. The Commission never bothered to call the ambulance driver who arrived at the scene within two minutes after Tippit was killed and who could testify as to who was present at that time. The official records reveal the name of the ambulance driver and the funeral home which employs him. Similarly, the Commission neglected to question or to secure a statement from the assistant ambulance driver. They neglected to question or to secure a statement from the woman who called the ambulance, and who, together with her husband, can testify about the murder scene just a moment after Tippit was shot. Our very modest investigation, curtailed by limitations in terms of personnel and finances, and utilizing far less "shoe leather" than utilized by the FBI agents, was able to secure all the "missing" information referred to above. Statements from each of the above persons indicate that the "one prosecution eye-witness to the murder of officer Tippit" was inaccurate in many basic areas of her testimony. Perhaps it is for that reason that the Commission failed to call those witnesses.

In the aftermath of the Commission Report a mass of unanswered questions remains. Those who dare to pose them can expect a simple-minded response from "liberal" publications such as *The New York Post*. The day after the Commission Report was printed, the *Post* concluded: "The conclusions will not please the extremists of right and left who cling to single-minded, conspiratorial views of history. Congressmen like Rep. Pillion (R-N.Y.) will probably continue to insist that Oswald was an agent of Moscow or Havana. On the other side, men like Thomas Buchanan (author of the fanciful thriller, 'Who Killed Kennedy?'), Mark Lane and even Lord Russell will in all likelihood continue to suggest that the assassination was instigated by right-wing oil millionaires or some other diabolical cabal."

Max Lerner, writing in the same publication, said, "Messrs. Thomas Buchanan, Joachim Joesten and Mark Lane, to name the three commanders of the conspiracy-theory battalions, will continue to remain unconvinced . . ." The fact remains that, from the outset, Bertrand Russell and I have each refused to speculate or to present a single theory regarding the assassination of the President. We have both consistently taken the position that the people are entitled to the facts and that the Commission should not have held secret hearings behind closed doors. In that regard, one is reminded of the statement of President John F. Kennedy, "We are not afraid to entrust the American people with unpleasant facts . . . for a nation that is afraid to let its people

judge the truth in an open market is a nation that is afraid of its people."

*The Post* alleges in essence that anyone who wishes to function as a thinking citizen must be an extremist of the Left or of the Right. *The Post* takes, it seems, a rather extreme position although undoubtedly in their hearts they believe they are right. It should not be asserted that *The New York Post* is reluctant to present factual information regarding important events. The very same issue of the *Post* which denounces Lord Russell and myself also carries a story insisting that a man "was found who had been bribed by the War Department to testify" in the assassination inquiry. The reference is, of course, to the Select House Judiciary Committee on the Assassination of the President, which investigated the assassination of President Lincoln. *The Post*, while conceding that that Assassination Commission performed a disservice to the country by presenting "on the witness stand some incredibly unsavory characters," simultaneously alleges that "there are significant differences between the Warren Commission and the Commission investigating the death of Lincoln." For, *The Post* explains, "the Warren group is wholly bi-partisan, its membership drawn from the Congressional elite." One wonders about the accuracy of that assessment since the Congressional members include two Republicans, one of them being a Goldwater spark-plug from Michigan and a leader of the ultra-right in the Congress, while the Democratic Party is represented by two Southern Democrats. If this is the Congressional elite, one shudders to contemplate the Congressional rank and file. *The Post* concludes that the Commission on the Assassination of President Lincoln "has been fully discredited by history." Perhaps one day in the year 2064, should *The New York Post* still be publishing, its editors will just as courageously permit that assessment of the Warren Commission Report.



#### *Speculation and the Commission*

The press is not alone in distorting the facts and attempting to re-write history. The report of the Commission is replete with speculation and conjecture. Whenever the facts contravene its theory, the facts are rejected by the Commission in order that the theory of Oswald as the lone assassin be sustained.

Unlike others who have commented upon the case, we have sought to secure solely factual information and to release that information accurately. We have not claimed to be objective; we assert that we have been accurate and honest. We have consistently refrained, over the objections of some, from entering into the area of speculation and conjecture. Under these circumstances, it is with astonishment that we discover our arguments, distorted and tortured by the Commission, assembled under the heading "Speculations and Rumors." The Commission states that it sets forth "False and Inaccurate Speculations Concerning the Assassi-

nation, together with brief summary statements of what the Commission has found to be true facts." (sic)

#### *The Magic Rifle*

The District Attorney of Dallas stated repeatedly that the weapon which was found on the 6th floor of the Book Depository Building was a German Mauser 7.65 mm. We have presented at public meetings throughout Western Europe and the United States photostatic copies of an original affidavit signed by the officer who found the weapon on the 6th floor. In the affidavit, the officer, Seymour Weitzman, states that the weapon is a Mauser 7.65 mm. I have stated publicly that, at my request, the alleged assassination weapon was displayed to me when I testified before the Commission on July 2, 1964. At that time I read into the record of the Commission the legend clearly and indelibly printed upon the metal portion of the rifle: "Made Italy Cal. 6.5." It is plain that a rifle that has so clearly upon its face that it was made in Italy and that its caliber is 6.5 should not ordinarily be described in a sworn statement by a police officer as a weapon of different nationality and different size. The Commission distorted our argument as follows:

*"Speculation.* The name of the rifle used in the assassination appeared on the rifle. Therefore the searchers who found the rifle on the 6th floor of the Texas Schoolbook Depository should have been able to identify it correctly by name.

*"Commission Finding.* An examination of the rifle does not reveal any manufacturer's name. An inscription on the rifle shows that it was made in Italy." (p. 645)

We, of course, never asserted that the manufacturer's name appeared. One cannot recall anyone ever having stated that the name appeared on the rifle. The Commission, then, presented a total distortion of a valid point which we presented, and one which the Commission understandably preferred to avoid.

*"Speculation.* Mrs. Helen Markham, a witness to the slaying of Tippit put the time at just after 1:06 p.m. This would have made it impossible for Oswald to have committed the killing since he would not have had time to arrive at the shooting scene by that time.

*"Commission Finding.* The shooting of Tippit has been established at approximately 1:15 or 1:16 p.m."

The "Commission Finding" gives the impression that the allegation that Mrs. Markham's timing of the shots was 1:06 p.m. is sheer "speculation," but the fact remains uncontroverted by that "finding" that Mrs. Markham signed an affidavit prepared by the Dallas police on the 22nd day of November 1963 in which she specifically stated that Tippit was shot at 1:06 p.m. We merely asserted that the affidavit exists. It does—the Commission has examined it.

#### *The Missing Witness*

We have asserted that another woman witnessed the slaying of patrolman Tippit. We have secured a statement from this witness indicating that her failure to testify before the Warren Commission was directly

related to a threat against her life relayed to her by a Dallas police officer who questioned her after the killing of Tippit. This witness describes the man who shot officer Tippit as being short and heavy, thus confirming the original testimony of Mrs. Markham in that respect. The Commission presents this allegation as follows:

*"Speculation.* Another witness to the slaying of patrolman Tippit, an unidentified woman, was interviewed by the FBI but was never called as a witness by the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy.

*"Commission Finding.* The only woman among the witnesses to the slaying of Tippit known to the Commission is Helen Markham. The FBI never interviewed any other woman who claimed to have seen the shooting." (p. 652)

The "Commission Finding" uses skillful language in asserting that its members do not "know" the witness to the Tippit killing. In alleging that the FBI never interviewed the witness, they deal with a question never raised while refusing to deal with the question that has been squarely put: the interview conducted by the Dallas police and their threat to the witness.



#### *Bullets Too Fast to be Seen*

The Commission itself concedes that many of the witnesses to the assassination insist that the shots they heard came from the direction of the railroad bridge or a grassy knoll between the bridge and the Book Depository Building. The Commission also concedes that all agree that many witnesses, including Dallas police officers, rushed toward the grassy knoll and the railroad bridge immediately after the shots were fired. Since the original medical statements indicated that the wound in the President's throat was an entrance wound, which might well confirm the witnesses' assertion that the shots came from the bridge or the grassy knoll, one must consider that to be a real possibility. The Commission discussed the matter as follows:

*"Speculation.* There are witnesses who alleged that the shots came from the overpass.

*"Commission Finding.* The Commission does not have knowledge of any witness who saw shots fired from the overpass."

The Commission does concede, however, that "Mrs. Jean L. Hill stated that after the firing stopped, she saw a white man wearing a brown overcoat and a hat" running toward the railroad tracks. Mrs. Hill has stated that the man ran from the grassy knoll area. The Commission concedes also "a motorcycle policeman, Clyde A. Haygood, dismounted in the street and ran up the incline (grassy knoll)."

The Commission announced that, immediately upon presentation of its Report to the President, it disbanded before a single question could be addressed to it regarding the contents of the Report.

History may record that act as the Commission's wisest decision. *FAID*