Comments on "The First Shot"

At the outset, the author should make it clear that the single-bullet theory is indispensable to the lone-assassin claim, so as to create the context for what follows.

Page 4, paragraph 2, line 1:   Helpern contradicts the claim that the tracheotomy incision obliterated evidence of the bullet wound. See Where Death Delights by Marshall Houts.

Page 4, paragraph 4:   It should be indicated that the photographs were taken away by Secret Service agents and were not developed at that time and apparently not for more than a year afterward.   It is not clear that the X rays were all developed and examined at the time. The testimony is contradictory on this point.   I think the most that can be said is that at least some X rays were developed and examined.

Page 13, paragraph 2, line 9: This phrase should be rewritten for greater clarity, and to make the point that Dr. Humes was unduly and improperly influenced by the alleged location of the presumed assassin. I had to re-read the sentence a number of times before the intent became clear.

Finally, I would agree that the author has made a very cogent and persuasive argument for a first shot from about street level and possibly from the triangular shed roof at the west facade of the Book Depository. I believe that at least some of the movie and/or still photogrphs taken by by-standers include that area, but do not show a man at that location. This counter-argument should be foreseen and provided for, by ascertaining what the available photographic evidence reveals and, if it turns out that the area in question is included in films but without a man present, then greater weight should be given to the lower west windows as the possible location of a rifleman.

This is a very fine piece of reasoning and very well written.   I was not persuaded by the tears and punctures in the cloth samples, and perhaps an effort should be made to perform an experiment using actual rifle shots on clothing on a cadaver.

Tolbert Goodall
6/17/68 ē
MS by Forman