

M  
S-B Theory  
JL: How the FBI misleads, from the bottom up; how it works out RW 2/24/79  
and may have relevance in continued withholdings, inc. in 226

Loch's 684 and 685, copies attached, are FBIHQ in 62-109060-298 and 2933 (7), exp.  
The first is of lower level, the second went to Hoover.

In the first the FBI reports the single-bullet theory, in effect, by making no mention of the missed shot. It attributes the absence of mention of the missed shot to the Commission prior to this time whereas it originated with both FBI and Secret Service.

It locates the alleged entry point of the read, non-fatal shot as "high in the right shoulder area, penetrating the torso (my emph) near the base of the neck...not tearing the throat wall." (This attributed to doctors present at meeting.)

On page 2 they report they were asked to use Zapruder's camera in the re-enactment, which is why they didn't, which is why Shaneyfelt had to say it made no difference that with the camera the re-enactment was a third off.

In the addendum they attempt to isolate themselves from any re-enactment by what is classic FBI: they have their substitute that they can control, like mockups, and besides they have no responsibility. They actually concluded that a re-enactment is "without merit" if it uses Z's camera, etc.

On the second record you'll see that when Rosen wrote Belmont he turned back around. Hoover's only comment is on spelling!

Top page 2 he attributed to Huges not a shot in the torso but the "theory" that it "entered...in the rear of the neck region," which they appear to have wanted Hoover to believe.

I don't know what Huges may have said but I'm certain that what they attribute to him to forward the single-bullet theory, that he is certain from the undamaged condition it also entered Connally's body (end p. 2, par. 1) is opposite his and the other medical testimony before the Commission, which was prior to this date.

~~misleadingly~~ Here they have Huges believing a separate shot hit the Connally wrist, as the first record does, also after he testified before the Commission. (On 3/13 and memo is of 4/15) Unless completely inaccurate with Commission holding the session there is no way of explaining this contradiction away.

Nor is there any wonder that the record was withheld for so long and attracted no attention in the mass of records.

I believe this has relevance in explaining the absence of tests we know had to have been made and reported on and perhaps also the disappearance of the spectro plate, which would have made only more problems.

In any event, b7c itself this indicates at least four shots because it ignores the one that missed and still has three hitting - a month after the autopsy testimony.

I believe they also were controlling Hoover.



#1 X

Red by magic pencil Added use of CD1

JL: How the FBI misleads, from the bottom up; how it works out NW 2/20/79 and may have relevance in continued withholdings, inc. in 226

Loch's 684 and 685, copies attached, are FBIHQ in 62-109060-298 and 2933 (?), exp. The first is of lower level, the second went to Hoover.

In the first the FBI reports the single-bullet theory, in effect, by making no mention of the missed shot. It attributes the absence of mention of the missed shot to the Commission prior to this time whereas it originated with both FBI and Secret Service.

It locates the alleged entry point of the read, non-fatal shot as "high in the right shoulder area, penetrating the torso (my emph) near the base of the neck...not tearing the throat wall." (This attributed to doctors present at meeting.)

On page 2 they report they were asked to use Zapruder's camera in the re-enactment, which is why they didn't, which is why Shaneyfelt had to say it made no difference that with the camera the re-enactment was a third off.

In the addendum they attempt to isolate themselves from any re-enactment by what is classic FBI: they have their substitute that they can control, like mockups, and besides they have no responsibility. They actually concluded that a re-enactment is "without merit" if it uses Z's camera, etc.

On the second record you'll see that when Rosen wrote Belmont he turned much around. Hester's only comment is on spelling!

Top page 2 he attributed to Humes not a shot in the torso but the "theory" that it "entered...in the rear of the neck region," which they appear to have wanted Hoover to believe.

I don't know what Humes may have said but I'm certain that what they attribute to him to forward the single-bullet theory, that he is certain from the undamaged condition it also entered Connally's body (end p. 2, par. 1) is opposite his and the other medical testimony before the Commission, which was prior to this date.

~~HOWEVER~~ Here they have Humes believing a separate shot hit the Connally wrist, as the first record does, also after he testified before the Commission. (On 3/13 and memo is of 4/15) Unless completely inaccurate with Commission holding the session there is no way of explaining this contradiction away.

Nor is there any wonder that the record was withheld for so long and attracted no attention in the mass of records.

I believe this has relevance in explaining the absence of tests we know had to have been made and reported on and perhaps also the disappearance of the spectro plate, which would have made only more problems.

In any event, by itself this indicates at least four shots because it ignores the one that missed and still has three hitting - a month after the autopsy testimony.

I believe they also were controlling Hoover.

FBI Record on 11/23 [unclear]

When did Humes say who did the shooting?