



WATCHMAN WAKETH BUT IN VAIN

By:

Thomas Katen

Vincent J. Salandria

Gary Schoener

None of the PHYSICAL evidence would lead any serious investigation to the conclusion of a lone assassin, and, indeed, the only bit of such evidence linking Oswald at all to the actual assassination is, in addition to being inconclusive, highly suggestive of a frame up. Bullet 399, the one shot from Oswald's gun, was supposed to have caused a number of wounds in Kennedy and Connally, including the smashing of bones in Connally. Yet there was no blood and no tissue upon it. Nor was there any evidence of any kind of fabric weave impressed in the metal. This bullet was intact and undeformed but for a slight flattening in its front. It was also discovered under the most unusual circumstances--not at the scene of the assassination but under the mat of a stretcher, finally determined by Commission fiat to be Connally's stretcher. This bullet could not have done the damage we are told it in fact did. Not only was it not mangled, as the test bullet shot through a cadaver wrist was, but it was the opinion of Dr. Shaw of Parkland Hospital (IV H 113) and Drs. Humes (II H 376) and Finck (II H 38) of Bethesda Naval Hospital that more fragments were deposited in weight in the wrist of Connally than the bullet could possibly have lost. Mr. Frazier, the small arms expert of the FBI, had apparently tested unfired bullets. C. E. 399 was a fired bullet. A bullet perforce loses some weight in the firing, for in the process of being fired grooves are cut by the rifling of the gun barrel into the metallic surface of the bullet. This cutting process involves the extraction

of metal and therefore weight from the bullet. Frazier said of 399: "There did not necessarily have to be any weight loss to the bullet." (III H 430) The Commission concluded against all the evidence that: "All the evidence indicated that the bullet . . . could have caused all his (Connally's) wounds. (W-95) No official investigation which was honest could have accepted such a lie.

The overwhelming preponderance of the physical evidence just doesn't permit an inference of a lone assassin. When one says there was a conspiracy to kill Kennedy and to HIDE the reasons for the assassination from the public, defenders of the Commission retort "you have a big conspiracy" intending this as a reductio ad absurdum of the conspiracy. Yet, at every level of our federal bureaucracy there was no action where evidence called for it, and there was action to impute sole blame on Oswald where it was uncalled for.

Briefly let us review some of the most sinister of actions by the federal government's police agents respecting the evidence. Governor Connally's bullet-torn coat and shirt were ignored by the federal police for weeks, and when they were finally obtained, had been dry cleaned and pressed. The dry cleaning and pressing served to obliterate vital evidence necessary for the determination of the direction and type of bullet or bullets which struck the Governor. There was the startling and incriminating ACTION of the then Commander James J. Humes, the head of the Bethesda autopsy team, who took and burned the original autopsy notes. In a free society the Commission investigating the President's assassination was not permitted to see

the Xrays and photographs which were taken of the President's body at Bethesda. Can there be any other assumption against this background of suppression that Humes burned the notes because they revealed Kennedy was shot in the front and the back and therefore his wounds were incompatible with an assassination by one man? What happened to Humes as a consequence of his sinister burning of the original autopsy notes? He was promoted from Commander to Captain. Another rational ACTION! After admittedly burning relevant evidence in the crime of the century, a

man receives a promotion from those in power!

In addition to the physical evidence already mentioned, there is photographic material, all of which raises serious questions about a conspiracy. Harold Weisberg has contributed a valuable book on this material. Independent investigator, Richard E. Sprague, has also done a brilliant job of analysis. Montesana 2 and Willis 10 (photos) indicate presence and "discovery" of one and possibly two more rifles besides the one found on the sixth floor. Why was that DISCOVERY not the basis for action? The Mary A. Moorman photo shows a possible total of four men behind a concrete wall (the fence and cupola structure at the west end of the arcade). The Hughes film and the Dillard photo show the sixth floor Depository window from which Oswald allegedly did his shooting within seconds of the assassination, and there is neither Oswald nor anyone else at that window.

What we might call hard physical evidence, that relating to angles of entrance of wounds, of positions from which shots might have been fired, the physical reactions of Kennedy and Connally, the direction of flying skull matter which resulted from the fatal wound in the President's head, the medical testimony of Parkland doctors and photographic evidence all provided impressive evidence for the assumption of a conspiracy. Even if we would now regard such evidence as questionable there was a time at which authorities had such material as their best evidence, and were therefore duty bound to but did not act upon it. If there existed evidence for a conspiracy, and dangerous criminals who assassinated the President of the United States were on the loose, then all of us would be in danger. Surely our government in not REACTING to evidence of conspiracy could not have felt the assassins a threat or a danger. Why not?

There he is, Oswald, the loner! The insignificant being shown preferential treatment from the very highest places prior to the assassination. There he is, Oswald, the loner who defected with an FBI informant number and a listed salary of \$200.00 from that same agency. (V. H 242) On January 22, 1964, General Counsel J. Lee Rankin was informed by Waggoner Carr, the Attorney General of Texas,

that Oswald had been a paid FBI informer. (V P 242) The Warren Commission undertook no independent investigation, no meaningful action to determine the veracity of this report. Is there no action, because they knew it was true? If Oswald was just a lonely nobody, why is it there are fifty-one documents so secret in the National Archives relating to Oswald and Ruby if both of these men are so unimportant? Why should there be ACTION on the part of our government to suppress information about nobodies — unless they are really somebodies?

Why is it George De Mohrenschildt should have any REACTION at all to Oswald? If all things were normal, as they are supposed to have been on the surface, there would be NO TWO PEOPLE less likely to have any kind of relationship than De Mohrenschildt and Oswald. Albert E. Jenner, Jr., Commission Counsel, describes De Mohrenschildt for us as follows:

“ . . . you are a man of very superior education and extremely wide experience and acquaintance here and in Europe, South America, West Indies—you have lived an extremely colorful life . . . ”

De Mohrenschildt simply replies:

“Yes.” (IX H 236)

On the next page of the testimony De Mohrenschildt describes Oswald:

“I never would believe that any government would be stupid enough to trust Lee with anything important.”

Jenner asked:

“Give me the basis of your opinion.”

De Mohrenschildt:

“Well, again, as I said, an unstable individual, mixed-up individual, uneducated individual, without background. What government would give him any confidential work? No government would...” (IX H 237)

(To be continued next week)