

(1) I have no doubt whatever that CBS conceived and executed its "documentary" in an attempt to rehabilitate the disintegrating Warren Report and to reverse the increasing trend of public opinion to doubt and repudiate the preposterous and discredited findings of the Warren Commission. In my opinion, CBS was determined at all costs to restore confidence in the Report, even if this required unscrupulous methods. The CBS News Inquiry was in no way an impartial fact-finding process; it was a massive, expensive, and deliberate piece of propaganda to promote public acceptance of Government truth. In fact, I have the impression that the whole effort boomeranged, because it was so blatant and transparent a propaganda showpiece.

(3) The blurring of certain frames of the Zapruder film and the possible correlation of the blurred frames with rifle shots was first postulated by researcher Ray Marcus, in 1965, in an unpublished critique; and by Harold Weisberg in his 1966 book Whitewash. CBS was not about to give critics of the Warren Report credit for this discovery but cynically and dishonestly attributed the discovery to Dr. Alvarez and to CBS itself. In other circumstances, one might regard this as one of many examples of parallel discovery by independent researchers; but in this case, it seems a clear instance of usurpation, because CBS was in possession of the book Whitewash for more than a year before its so-called "news inquiry."

As to the significance of the blurred frames, I do not feel competent personally to form any categorical conclusion. I would only point out that while CBS cited three blurred frames, numbers 190, 227, and 318, there are two more frames which are equally blurred which CBS did not mention--numbers 195 and 203. If the correlation between blurred frames and rifle shots is valid, the evidence would then suggest up to five shots, at intervals entirely too brief in some cases to be accounted for by a single bolt-action rifle. The alleged assassination rifle requires 2.3 seconds or 42 frames between shots. By that yardstick, CBS has a problem even with the three frames it cited, excluding the two additional frames I have mentioned. CBS cited frames 190, 227, and 318; but the interval between frames 190 and 227 is only 37 frames, which is less than the required minimum of 42 frames between shots from the alleged assassination rifle.

(2) The CBS theory of an earlier first shot that missed ~~the car~~ is predicated on the single-bullet theory, since CBS agrees with the Warren Commission's conclusion that a total of only three shots were fired. But it is impossible to accept the single-bullet theory. There is a preponderance of conclusive evidence against a single-bullet hypothesis. Therefore, I could accept an earlier first shot, whether it missed or hit, only on the basis of a total of ~~three shots~~ at least four and possibly five shots, fired from at least two different locations. This is exactly what the early hit position taken by various critics postulates--more than three shots, some of which were fired from behind the car but not necessarily from the sixth-floor window of the Depository, and some of which were fired from in front of the car, from the right.

(4) The trouble with Dr. Helper's analysis of the Zapruder film and his conclusion that the first shot could have been fired as early as frame 166, before the car vanished behind the tree foliage, is that he ignores the problem of the trajectory of the so-called bullet that struck the President in the back of the neck and supposedly exited at the Adam's apple, at an angle of declination of about 17°. That trajectory correlates with a shot between frames 210 and 225. If there was an earlier hit, let's say at frame 186, when the Presidential car was closer to the Depository, the trajectory would be 45°, not 17 and a fraction. And if the hit was still earlier, at frame 166, the trajectory would increase to perhaps 65°. At that angle, a bullet striking the back of the neck could not exit at the Adam's apple. We would be left where we were on the day of the assassination--with an entrance wound at the Adam's apple, which is exactly what I believe personally was the case. But this is hardly what Dr. Helper intended to argue. He was trying to salvage the lone assassin theory. But his argument of a hit at or before

frame 166 only raises a whole series of new problems which leave the lone-assassin theory in shambles.

(5) The CBS rifle tests better simulated the conditions at the assassination scene as reconstructed by the Warren Commission but CBS, like the Commission, used expert riflemen instead of marksmen whose skill was comparable with Oswald's poor rifle capability--which is a matter of record. Even so, in 17 out of 37 attempts the CBS riflemen were unable to fire three shots within 7-1/2 seconds, while in those cases where 3 shots were fired within this time-span, there was an average of 1.2 hits in 3 tries. What the CBS tests proved was that even rifle experts had considerable difficulty in achieving the feat attributed to a lackluster rifleman like Oswald and that they failed repeatedly to match his supposed speed and accuracy. In my opinion, the CBS tests merely corroborated and strengthened the conclusion that it was impossible for a marksman like Oswald to fire three shots with two or even three hits in the time-span stipulated in the Warren Report.

(6) I believe that the single-bullet theory originated out of the Warren Commission's desperation to prove that Oswald was the lone assassin even though the evidence it elicited came into conflict with that assumption and ultimately proved it absolutely impossible. The interval between the first shot that hit the President and the shot that hit the Governor was too short for both bullets to have come from the alleged assassination rifle. This posed a prima facie case for separate shots from two separate rifles. If the interval was arbitrarily increased, by an earlier hit on the President or a later hit on the Governor, it would raise a horrible new difficulty--first, that these shots could not have come from the sixth-floor window, because of obstruction of view in the case of an earlier shot at the President and because the Governor was not in position to be hit from that location after frame 240 according to expert testimony; secondly, because it would mean that the maladroit marksman Oswald had achieved three hits in three tries, while even rifle masters qualified to shoot in Olympic competition could not do under much less rigorous conditions.

It was this desperate dilemma, in my opinion, that spurred the contrived single-bullet hypothesis, apparently formulated by the inventive Arlen Specter. All the evidence is against this preposterous theory, but the Warren Report deceitfully and dishonestly pretends that all the evidence indicates that one bullet inflicted all of the Governor's wounds, and that the stretcher bullet specifically would have done all the non-fatal damage inflicted on the President and the Governor by striking both men. Even a Commission lawyer, Wesley Liebeler, admitted during a public discussion at the Theater for Ideas on September 30, 1966, that the assertion in the Warren Report that all the evidence supports the one-bullet theory is "simply not correct--the Report is wrong in that respect, and there is no doubt about it."

CBS presented the single-bullet theory in the most favorable light possible but so far as I am concerned CBS only succeeded in strengthening the case against the single-missile. Its wound penetration tests proved that not one of the test bullets met the requirements; some lodged in the simulated wrist, and none was able to penetrate the simulated thigh. That in itself is devastating to the single-bullet theory. What speaks even more thundrously against the theory is the fact that CBS did not exhibit or describe a single test bullet. From this I infer that CBS did not recover any bullet that resembled the virtually pristine stretcher bullet. I wrote to CBS immediately after its so-called news inquiry requesting photographs or detailed descriptions of the test bullets, and other data. I was so certain that my request would be refused that I said that it had been refused, in the manuscript of a review of the CBS production which I wrote for publication in the September issue of *The Minority of One*, two weeks before the official refusal arrived from a high official of CBS. The net result of the CBS presentation with respect to the stretcher bullet and the wound penetration tests is to convince

me more than ever that the single-bullet theory is a fraud and the stretcher bullet is planted or fabricated evidence. The only "new" information which emerged was that CBS has joined the Warren Commission in a deliberate misrepresentation and deception about the evidence in the assassination and what it really means, in a sinister propoganda ploy which betrays the public interest that the network is supposed to serve, and violates truth and justice in an ugly way indeed.

(7) See (6) above.

(8) I cannot join CBS in the solemn respect with which it heard Dr. Humes' self-vindication. Dr. Humes is under wide suspicion of having falsified the autopsy report, or at least of having blundered incredibly his conduct of the post-mortem examination. His so-called authentication of the autopsy photos and x-rays, in the face of the fact that Congressman Kupferman's request to view these photos and x-rays accompanied by two highly respected experts—Dr. Milton Helpern, medical examiner of NYC, and Dr. Cyril H. Wecht, a forensic pathologist of high reputation—has been denied, merely intensifies the grounds for suspicion. CBS severely criticized the Warren Commission, in a different segment of its "news inquiry," for having permitted the FBI to vindicate itself of suspicion that Oswald was on its payroll. Apparently CBS failed to see the analogy of Dr. Humes' self-exoneration. Moreover, CBS carefully avoided an exposition of all the evidence which is in conflict with the position of the wound as described by Dr. Humes—for example, the holes in the President's coat and shirt, the testimony of federal agents who witnessed and described the wound in a lower position—in one case, specifically six inches below the neck—and the position of the wound chalked on the back of a stand-in for the assassinated President during an FBI reenactment. That body of evidence absolutely convinces me that the wound was well below the neck, approximately in the position shown on the autopsy diagram (allegedly in error, by Dr. Boswell) and corresponding with the bullet holes well below the collar of the coat and shirt.

(9) The interview with Dr. Malcolm Perry was helpful in that it led CBS to correct the record on one important point. The Warren Report falsely asserts that the Parkland Hospital doctors formed no opinion as to whether the anterior neck wound resulted from the exit or the entrance of a bullet, and that press reports that the wound had been described as an entrance hole were inaccurate. CBS, on the other hand, said flatly that Dr. Perry did tell reporters that the neck wound looked like an entry wound and that there was no doubt that Dr. Perry presented this as his firm opinion. That is what the critics have always insisted, and I am personally pleased that CBS has belatedly come over to our position on this explicit question. Perhaps, given enough time, CBS will recognize the merit of other of the arguments which originated with the critics for whom the network has such patronizing disrespect and hostility.

(10) Jackson's explanation of his alleged instructions to Tippit and Nelson at 12:45 p.m. to proceed to central Oak Cliff because that area had been left unmanned when its regular patrols were redeployed to the underpass—that explanation is completely inconsistent with the facts. Central Oak Cliff consists of about ten districts, normally manned by seven officers (some of whom cover two adjoining districts). Before the shooting of the President, one of those men was assigned to Dealey Plaza and another to the Sheraton-Dallas Hotel, leaving five men in position in Central Oak Cliff. Those men were still in position at 12:45 p.m., when Jackson supposedly dispatched Tippit and Nelson there because it was unmanned. The alleged instruction would have left Tippit's district, and Nelson's, unmanned, while increasing manpower in central Oak Cliff—where nothing was happening—from

five to seven. Jackson also tried to explain why he had signaled Tippit immediately upon hearing a citizen report a disturbance on Tenth and Patton, a location within district no. 91 whose assigned officer, W. D. Mentzel, was present and on duty. Jackson said in his CBS interview, "Knowing that J.D. Tippit was the only one that should have been in Oak Cliff, my reaction was to call 78," Tippit's identification number. But Jackson supposedly had assigned two officers simultaneously, 78 (Tippit) and 87 (Nelson). He said this himself, earlier in the CBS interview. His statement that Tippit was the only one who should have been in Oak Cliff contradicts his earlier claim that he sent Nelson there as well as Tippit. It seems to me that Jackson did not think his story through very carefully before his CBS interview. CBS, in its anxiety to dispose of the questions raised by the critics, did not notice Jackson's self-contradiction. This is not fact-finding but a prosecution case no less transparent and untenable than the Warren Report.

(11) Of course not. The CBS series in no way destroyed a single argument made by the critics, nor did it provide the small basis for renewed confidence in the Warren Report. On the contrary, against its own intentions CBS strengthened the arguments made by the critics against the single-bullet nonsense and the marksmanship tests. CBS itself selected and stated what it called the position of the critics, which was not necessarily a complete or accurate reflection of their arguments. CBS arbitrarily presented partial and selected results of the experiments it had commissioned; and refused to provide the fuller information which I personally requested. CBS has also rejected a request by another critic for equal time. In short, CBS has been a mirror-image of the Warren Report--slanting and misrepresenting evidence in order to purvey a thesis of a lone assassin which collides at every point with the evidence. In this way, CBS has merely compounded the shame and scandal of the Warren Report.