entirely contrary. Russell's dissent was more basic than he realized.

Rep.... Ford... wanted the report to state there was "compelling" evidence that the same bullet hit the President and the governors while Sen. Russell wanted it to state there was only "credible" evidence... McCloy... took credit for suggesting use of the adjective "persuasive," which appears in the report.

While Sen. Russell might have suggested "credible" in a spirit of compromise, the evidence was not credible to him. He did not then and does not now believe that one bullet struck both.

The Report and Russell cannot both be right. Russell is. He was conned into accepting the

"compromise."

As it appears in the Report, this "compromise" is what the staff <u>had</u> to know was a complete impossibility. It is, therefore, to staff knowledge, a deliberately false statement. It is so basic that, if it is not true - and it absolutely cannot be true - the entire Report is false. This is the language of the third conclusions from page 19 of the Report:

Although it is not necessary to any essential findings of the Commission to determine just which shot hit Governor Connally, there is very persuasive evidence from the experts to indicate that the same bullet which pierced the President's throat also caused Governor Connally's wounds.

First and, serious as it is, of less consequences there is no evidence, from experts or any other source, that one bullet did all this damage. <u>All</u> the evidence is opposite. There is a tortured conjecture, based on a hypothesis that was contrived not to fulfill the existing conditions, that one bullet <u>might</u> have done it. The Commission never established, for example, that one such bullet <u>could</u> have transited both bodies, smashing bones in three parts of Connally's alone. It did establish that one bullet could not have caused Connally's injuries without considerable deformation, which the bullet alleged to have caused this