

Copy to =
H. WILBERG

DALLAS



'63

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Did a Secret service Agent accidentally kill Kennedy? <i>Michael T Griffith</i> | 1 |
| Marina Oswald Porter, letters to the ARRB | 5 |
| The Similas Affair <i>Rick Nelson</i> | 11 |
| Dr Charles A. Crenshaw at the Liverpool Conference <i>Pat Kelly</i> | 16 |
| The Physics of Dealey Plaza <i>Carl J. Eiriksson</i> | 22 |
| Judith Campell Exner aborted JFKs child | 29 |
| Those were the Days <i>Peter Dawnay</i> | 30 |
| Cubans reveal JFK secrets <i>Dick Russell</i> | 33 |
| Reflections on the Dallas '63 Conference <i>John Rudd</i> | 38 |

Journal Number 8 November 1996

DID A SECRET SERVICE AGENT ACCIDENTALLY KILL KENNEDY?

A REVIEW OF HOWARD DONAHUE'S RESEARCH

Michael T. Griffith

1996 Second Edition (Revised and Expanded on 5/31/96)

Ballistics expert Howard Donahue believes that one of the Secret Service (SS) agents in the follow-up car accidentally shot President Kennedy. Donahue's theory and his supporting arguments are the subject of Bonar Menninger's book *MORTAL ERROR* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992). The book includes an excellent publisher's note that summarizes the findings of a St. Martin's Press research team regarding the flawed trajectory analysis done for the House Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA) by NASA scientist Thomas Canning.

According to Donahue, Oswald did indeed fire at Kennedy, but only got off two shots. Oswald's first shot, says Donahue, hit the road near the limousine and showered the car with fragments, some of which lightly injured Kennedy in the head. Oswald's second shot, according to Donahue, struck the President in the back of the neck, and then went on to cause all of Governor John Connally's wounds. (Donahue accepts the single-bullet theory.) Moments later, claims Donahue, the fatal shot was fired, accidentally, from the follow-up car by SS agent George Hickey.

Donahue makes the following arguments in favor of his theory:

-- The trajectory given for the alleged rear entrance head wound is incompatible with a shot from the alleged sniper's nest, i.e., from the location from which Oswald supposedly fired, the southeast corner window on the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository Building.

-- The bullet that mortally wounded Kennedy in the head behaved like a high-velocity, frangible missile, whereas Oswald supposedly used low-velocity, non-frangible ammunition. In connection with this, Donahue notes that SSA Hickey was seen with an AR-15 rifle at around the same time the head shot was fired, and that the AR-15 fires high-velocity, frangible ammo.

-- The reported width of the rear entry wound on the head was 6.0 mm, but Oswald allegedly used 6.5 mm Carcano bullets.

-- The damage to the limousine's windshield was too high to have been caused by a bullet coming down into the car from the sixth-floor sniper's nest. Even Canning told the HSCA that this seemed to be the case.

-- Several witnesses in Dealey Plaza said two of the shots came in very rapid succession, nearly simultaneously, much too quickly to have been fired from the bolt-action Italian rifle that Oswald supposedly used.

-- Connally's wife and one of the SS agents in the limo both heard Kennedy cry out that he

had been hit well BEFORE Gov. Connally was wounded.

-- There do not appear to have been any traces of blood or human tissue on the bullet fragments that were found in the limousine, yet the WC said these fragments came from the bullet that plowed through the President's head.

These arguments are all perfectly valid and relevant. However, they also lend themselves to more than one conclusion. Each of them could be viewed, quite logically and plausibly, as strong evidence of conspiracy.

There are three major problems with Donahue's theory, in my opinion. For one thing, it fails to explain the many indications that President Kennedy was killed by a conspiracy. For instance, it does not account for the phony SS agents who were encountered in Dealey Plaza, the disturbing and suspicious Oswald impersonations (which occurred BEFORE the assassination), the phony backyard rifle photos (in fact, Donahue accepts the photos as genuine), or the Joseph Milteer case (in which a wealthy, militant right-wing leader connected to the anti-Castro movement was recorded on tape by a Miami police informant, weeks BEFORE the shooting, saying that a hit on Kennedy was already "in the working").

Second, Donahue relies heavily on the single-bullet theory (SBT). The only way Donahue can explain Connally's wounds is to accept the SBT. However, physicist and radiologist Dr. David Mantik, when he was recently permitted to examine the original autopsy materials at the National Archives, discovered that the theory is very probably a physical impossibility. Dr. Mantik, by making a simple but crucial measurement that should have been made years ago, found that no bullet could have gone from the back wound to the throat wound without smashing straight through the spine. Dr. Mantik's historic discovery is discussed in detail in my file "Why The SBT Is Impossible" (file name: nosbt.txt), which is available for down loading from the JFK Debate library in CompuServe's Politics Forum. The discovery is also discussed in Harrison Livingstone's recent book **KILLING KENNEDY AND THE HOAX OF THE CENTURY** (New York: Carroll and Graf Publishers, 1995), pp. 93-94.

In attempting to salvage the SBT from the results of the Warren Commission's own ballistics tests, in which the exit wounds in simulated human necks were torn-out wounds that were at least 10 mm in diameter, Donahue cites Dr. John Lattimer's specious theory that Kennedy's collar band "restrained" the neck and thus prevented the alleged exiting bullet from markedly pushing out the skin and from breaking through in a tearing fashion (**MORTAL ERROR**, p. 35). This theory, according to Donahue, could explain why Kennedy's neck wound was small (about 4-5 mm in diameter), neat, and circular, even though it was supposedly the exit point for a 6.5 mm missile. But, as Donahue should have realized, the slits in the front of JFK's shirt are visibly BELOW the collar band. According to the SBT, the "magic bullet" made those slits as it supposedly exited the throat. However, if those slits were made by a bullet, there would have been nothing to restrain the skin of the neck from stretching, since the slits are undeniably below the collar band (Harold Weisberg, **NEVER AGAIN**, New York: Carroll and Graf, 1995, pp. 244-245), and thus there would have been nothing to prevent the bullet from breaking through the skin in a tearing fashion.

Again, in the Commission's own ballistics tests, every single bullet fired into the simulated human necks created a torn-out, gaping exit wound of at least 10 mm in diameter, whereas Kennedy's throat wound was small, neat, and not punched out.

What's more, according to Dr. Charles Carrico, who was the only doctor to see the throat

wound before the shirt was removed. the throat wound was ABOVE the collar (specifically, he said it was ABOVE the knot of the tie).

The third problem I see with Donahue's theory is that it is foundationally dependent on the assumption that the alleged autopsy photos and x-rays are genuine and that the interpretations of them given by the Clark Panel and by the HSCA's medical panel are accurate. Thus, Donahue accepts the placement of Kennedy's back wound near the base of the neck, yet evidence from the released files make it clearer than ever that the wound was actually farther down on the back, about five to six inches below the neck.

Similarly, Donahue accepts the claim that there was only one head shot and that it came from behind. Donahue rejects the massive eyewitness testimony that there was a large, exit-type defect in the right rear part of Kennedy's head, primarily because the x-rays reportedly do not show such a defect and because the photos of the back of the head show the region to be intact. Two private experts, however, who have examined the x-rays at the National Archives, have found that one of the radiographs does in fact indicate a sizeable defect in that area of the skull. Furthermore, several private experts have concluded the skull x-rays show clear, undeniable evidence that TWO bullets struck the President in the head. As for the photos of the back of the head, these pictures have been labelled as fraudulent by medical technicians who attended the autopsy, as well as by medical personnel who saw the President's body at Parkland Hospital in Dallas right after the shooting. Additionally, we now know from released files that one of the autopsy pathologists, Dr. Pierre Finck, in one of his HSCA interviews, went so far as to question how one of the photos of the head been established as having been taken at the autopsy! We also have the previously sealed testimony of the mortician who reassembled Kennedy's skull after the autopsy, Tom Robinson. Robinson reported that there was still a visible defect in the back of the head **EVEN AFTER THE INCLUSION OF THE SKULL FRAGMENTS THAT ARRIVED LATE THAT NIGHT FROM DALLAS.** And Dr. J. Boswell, another one of the autopsists, told the HSCA that half of the rear entry wound in the back of the head was contained in a piece of **MISSING** skull fragment, and that this fragment did not arrive to Bethesda Naval Hospital until very late that night, whereas the alleged autopsy photos were supposedly taken hours earlier.

Since he accepts the findings of the Clark Panel and the HSCA medical panel, he believes there was a large, 6.5 mm bullet fragment in the outer table of Kennedy's skull, just beneath the "revised" rear entrance wound in the back of the head. (More will be said about the revised wound in a moment.) However, it is highly doubtful that this fragment was present at the autopsy; and if there was a fragment in that location, it almost certainly did not look the way it now appears in the skull x-rays, according to Dr. Mantik. Not one of the doctors or med-techs at the autopsy mentioned seeing any such fragment, neither on the skull nor in the skull x-rays that were developed that evening. Nor is any such fragment mentioned in the autopsy report. Many researchers believe the fragment's appearance in the skull x-rays is another indication of fraud in these materials.

Somewhat surprisingly, Donahue accepts the "revised" location for the rear head entry wound put forth by the Clark Panel and by the HSCA medical panel, which is a staggering **FOUR INCHES** higher than were the autopsy doctors located it. Donahue speculates that the autopsy pathologists simply mislocated the wound. But this would require us to believe that all three of the autopsists "erred" by a whopping four inches in describing and diagramming the wound's location. This seems extremely unlikely and hard to believe,

especially since they carefully measured the wound's location, and since Dr. Boswell prepared a medical diagram in which he, in effect, triangulated the wound to the external occipital protuberance. (Why was the wound "moved"? Because the entry wound described by the autopsy doctors could not have been caused by a bullet fired from the alleged sniper's nest. Actually, the revised location doesn't fit all that well either, but it lines much better than the location described in the autopsy report.)

There are other problems with Donahue's theory. Donahue allows for no more than three shots, but credible reports of additional bullets striking in Dealey Plaza and a substantial

amount of eyewitness testimony indicate there were at least four shots were fired, and quite possibly as many as six or eight. Donahue assumes that Oswald fired two shots from the alleged sniper's nest, but there is good evidence that Oswald was on the second floor at the time of the shooting. I discuss this evidence in detail in my file "Proof That Oswald Did Not Shoot JFK" (file name: proof.txt), which can be downloaded from the JFK Debate library in CompuServe's Politics Forum.

Donahue cites journalist Jim Bishop's claim that SSA Clint Hill phoned Robert Kennedy from Parkland Hospital and told him there had been an "accident." (MORTAL ERROR, p. 110). But Hill did not say "accident"; he said there had been an "incident," and then went on to explain that the President and Gov. Connally had been shot.

In order to explain the violent rearward movement of Kennedy's head and upper body in response to the head shot, Donahue accepts the neuro-spasm and jet-effect theories. Both theories, however, are of doubtful credibility. Ballistics expert and physicist Dr. Larry Sturdivan implicitly rejected the jet-effect theory when he testified before the HSCA. The theory is based on disputed, improbable, assumptions anyway. As for the neuro-spasm theory, the neuromuscular reaction posited in this hypothesis seems to be much too fast given the speed of the backward snap and the mass involved, as Josiah Thompson observed years ago (SIX SECONDS IN DALLAS, New York: Bernard Geis Associates, 1967, pp. 93-95; see also Livingstone, KILLING THE TRUTH, New York: Carroll and Graf, 1993, pp. 151-152).

I am certain that Howard Donahue is a decent, honorable man, and he has done a great deal of valuable, credible research. Nor do I doubt that he genuinely believes his theory. Unfortunately, his theory rests on a number of untenable arguments and is incompatible with, or simply fails to explain, much of the evidence.

About the Author: Michael T. Griffith is a two-time graduate of the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, California, and the author of three books on Mormonism and ancient texts. His articles on the assassination have appeared in THE ASSASSINATION CHRONICLES, in DALLAS '63, and in DATELINE: DALLAS. He is also the author of the book COMPELLING EVIDENCE: A NEW LOOK AT THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY (Grand Prairie, TX: JFK Lancer Productions and Publications, 1996)

"Only a virtuous people are capable of freedom. As nations become corrupt and vicious, they have more need of masters." -- Benjamin Franklin

"Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." -- John Adams

Marina Oswald Porter

Gave Dallas '63 her kind permission to print the following letters which were sent to the ARRB.

Marina said..... "The Review Board is going to be closing soon. The time is very limited. They should concentrate their priority on things that can shed some light rather than on things that create more controversy, more stupid books, leading away from the answers instead of giving the answers, it seems to me. My priority should be considered, not because I'm important, but because I'm the one who has to live with this. It's a very personal agenda in my life."

"Now I have to defend not just my honor but my life as well. It is impossible for me to put my time where it belongs, to be a normal wife and mother"

In my view they sum up all that is so wrong in the way this courageous Lady has been treated...
God Bless you Marina, never lose your resolve. Tony Saunders

April 19, 1996

Mr. John Tunheim, Chairman
JFK Assassination Records Review Board
600 E Street N.W., Second Floor
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Tunheim:

I am writing to you regarding the release of still classified documents related to the assassination of President Kennedy and to my former husband, Lee Harvey Oswald.

Specifically, I am writing to ask about documents I have learned of from a recent book and from a story in the Washington Post by the authors of the same book (as well as other documents they have described to me). The book reviews Dallas police, FBI, and CIA files released since 1992, and places them in the context of previously known information. I would like to know what the Review Board is doing to obtain the following:

1. The Dallas field office and headquarters FBI reports on the arrests of Donnell D. Whitter and Lawrence R. Miller in Dallas on November 18, 1963 with a carload of stolen U.S. army weapons. I believe that Lee Oswald was the FBI informant who made these arrests possible. I would also like to know what your board has done to obtain the reports of the U.S. Marshal and the U.S. Army on the same arrests, and the burglary these men were suspected of.
2. The records of the FBI interrogations of John Franklin Elrod, John Forrester Gedney and Harold Doyle (the latter men were previously known as two of the "three tramps") in the Dallas jail November 22-24, 1963. All of these men have stated that they were

interrogated during that time by the FBI.

3. The official explanation of why the arrest records for Mr. Elrod, Mr. Gedney and Mr. Doyle, as well as for Daniel Wayne Douglas and Gus Abrams were placed "under federal seal" in the Dallas Police Records Division for 26 years as described by Dallas City Archives supervisor Laura McGhee to the FBI in 1992.
4. The FULL records of the interrogation of Lee Harvey Oswald, including his interrogation in the presence of John Franklin Elrod as described by Elrod in an FBI report dated August 11, 1964.
5. The reports of army intelligence agent Ed J. Coyle on his investigation of Captain George Nonte, John Thomas Masen, Donnell D. Whitter, Lawrence R. Miller, and/or Jack Ruby. I am also requesting that you obtain agent Coyle's reports as army liaison for presidential protection on November 22, 1963 (as described by Coyle's commanding officer Col. Robert Jones in sworn testimony to the House Select Committee on Assassinations). If the army does not immediately produce these documents, they should be required to produce agent Coyle to explain what happened to his reports.
6. Secret Service reports and tapes of that agency's investigation of Father Walter Machann and Silvia Odio in 1963-64.
7. Reports of the FBI investigation of Cuban exiles in Dallas, to include known but still classified documents on Fermin de Goicochea Sanchez, Father Walter Machann and the Dallas Diocese Catholic Cuban Relocation Committee. These would include informant files for Father Machann and/or reports of interviews of Father Machann by Dallas FBI agent W. Heitman.
8. The full particulars and original of the teletype received by Mr. William Walter in the New Orleans FBI office on the morning of November 17, 1963, warning of a possible assassination attempt on President Kennedy in Dallas. I now believe that my former husband met with the Dallas FBI on November 16, 1963, and provided informant information on which this teletype was based.
9. A full report of Lee Harvey Oswald's visit to the Dallas FBI office on November 16
10. A full account of FBI agent James P. Hosty's claim (in his recent book, ASSIGNMENT: OSWALD) that Lee Harvey Oswald knew of a planned "paramilitary invasion of Cuba" by "a group of right wing Cuban exiles in outlying areas of New Orleans." We now know that such an invasion was indeed planned by a Cuban group operating on CIA payroll in Miami, New Orleans, and Dallas--the same group infiltrated by Lee Oswald. We know this information ONLY from documents released since 1992, as described in the book I have mentioned. On what basis did agent Hosty believe Lee "had learned" of these plans, unless Lee himself told him this? I am therefore specifically requesting the release of the informant report that Lee Oswald provided to agent Hosty and/or other FBI personnel on this intelligence information.

The time for the Review Board to obtain and release the most important documents related to the assassination of President Kennedy is running out. At the time of the assassination of this great president whom I loved, I was misled by the "evidence" presented to me by government authorities and I assisted in the conviction of Lee Harvey Oswald as the assassin. From the new information now available, I am now convinced that he was an FBI informant and believe that he did not kill President Kennedy. It is time for Americans to know their full history. On this day when I and all Americans are grieving for the victims of Oklahoma City, I am also thinking of my children and grandchildren, and of all American children, when I insist that your board give the highest priority to the release of the documents I have listed. This is the duty you were charged with by law. Anything else is unacceptable -- not just to me, but to all patriotic Americans.

Please be advised that this is an open letter, and I intend to make it available to anyone who wishes to see it. The time for secrecy in government is over. I ask that you respond to me in writing within two weeks, and will take no further action until then. Thank you for your attention to my requests. Sincerely,

Marina Porter (signed)

cc: Rep. John Conyers Jr., Rep. Newt Gingrich, Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez, Rep. Lee H. Hamilton, Rep. Joseph P. Kennedy, Sen. William S. Cohen, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, Sen. Bob Kerrey, Sen. John Kerry, Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Sen. Arlen Specter

A Statement to the Assassination Records Review Board from Marina Oswald Porter, September 17, 1996

On April 19, 1996, I sent a letter to Mr. John Tunheim, chairman of the Assassination Records Review Board. I requested certain documents listed in the letter. I received a letter from Mr. Thomas Samoluk, public relations director, in which he more or less politely brushes me off. He describes the opinion of the FBI, how they stand on the matter, which is nothing new to me. I took it as a refusal. The letter did not indicate who they talked to at the FBI, the reasons for the refusal, if the documents exist or never existed, if they are destroyed and if so, why. I want to know the answer.

On May 15, 1996, the ARRB sent me a description of what powers they have under the law. My assumption is that taxpayers are paying them, that they have power of subpoena for any record related to the assassination of President Kennedy. In my opinion, the records I requested from them are assassination related. They imply Lee Oswald's involvement with the FBI. Until we see these records, we can only speculate. Beyond the release of these documents, the ARRB should subpoena FBI employees who have seen records on Lee Oswald and of a specific warning of an assassination attempt against President Kennedy in Dallas, and grant these FBI employees immunity from confidentiality agreements that we now know they signed. These persons should be allowed and encouraged to tell everything they know.

When I came to this country I came as a friend. I was then and am now. When the assassination happened I believed it was my obligation--anybody's obligation--to abide by the law of this land. I testified to the Warren Commission and I obliged any request the

government made of me. I agreed with the findings of the Warren Commission not because I really understood everything about it, but because I had enough trust that they investigated honestly and that the conclusions they came to were based on the highest form of investigation. So, with my blind faith, I accepted their conclusions.

Of course, at that time lots of people in this country who knew more about what was going on questioned the findings of the commission. And I defended the commission against those people, and I wanted all those so-called conspiracy people to just go away. Then there was a second investigation because the people demanded it. This was the investigation of the U.S. House Select Committee. And I testified for them. And their conclusion was possible conspiracy, meaning that the assassination involved more than one person, and they stopped it at that. Even then, I wasn't very pleased. I wasn't very pleased because when I was testifying for them and I thought they were honest--after so many years, and because the people demanded it--I asked them questions that would be answered just for me, and I was told that I was there only to answer questions, not to ask them. So I knew that that investigation was doomed.

And how can I respect the conclusions of the House Select Committee when they locked up their records? I gave the two investigations everything I had. Then later I found out that the FBI knew more about me than I knew about myself. Literally, even my underwear was investigated. And I have no problem--they didn't have to trust me, why should they? I don't hold anything against that. But my private matters were investigated--even when they had all the proof that I was nobody's "spy"--and I feel that this was FOR BLACKMAIL--my house was bugged, and I saw pictures of me which I knew nobody but the FBI could have done. I've seen with my own eyes that any kind of gossip from people even remotely related to me by name in Russia--any kind of nonsense--is in the record. You cannot be more thorough than that. And even so, I don't object. But now I think, it's my turn to ask the questions and for the FBI to clean their own laundry. I don't want to know everything about the FBI, but since they claim that I am wife of the assassin, and I have to defend myself, only in that regard am I sticking my nose in their business. And I'm not begging for answers. I think I've earned them, and I think they should give them to me.

After the cold reply to my letter from the Review Board, a woman who said she is with the ARRB left her number for me to call, which I never did. They want the tax records of Lee Harvey Oswald. (The Assassination Records Review Board does not have authority over IRS law). I did not sign the IRS release form the Review Board sent for one simple reason. Because I thought the priority should be the release of the records which I had requested. In my opinion, I think the tax records are irrelevant to the assassination. Mr. Jeremy Gunn of the Review Board called me a week ago and said, "I'm so and so, How come you didn't sign those papers?" And I said, "I have no problem with signing those forms, but I told you, I requested those documents, and this is my priority. So you do this job right now; put your energy over there." And Mr. Gunn said, yes, they did approach the FBI and the FBI is stonewalling, and so we're approaching you and you're not helping us. And I said, "How is that related to what I'm asking?" I have no problem releasing my tax records, and I will agree to have them released to journalists who will publish them. This will eliminate the problem of having them public. But this is not related to my request. There will be no enlightenment there for me. I will not find anything there at all. Then Mr. Gunn said, "Would you be more comfortable if Mr. John Newman talked to you about this?" And I said, "I'm familiar with Mr. Newman, and I have talked with him, but I don't want to talk to him anymore."

The Review Board is going to be closing soon. The time is very limited. They should concentrate their priority on things that can shed some light rather than on things that create more controversy, more stupid books, leading away from the answers instead of giving the answers, it seems to me. My priority should be considered, not because I'm important, but because I'm the one who has to live with this. It's a very personal agenda in my life.

If the records reveal an FBI informant in the assassination, I want to know the name of that informant. And I don't want to have one dead man's name substituted for another. I absolutely believe that Lee Oswald was the informant on the arrest of Lawrence Miller and Donnell Whitter on November 18, 1963. After the assassination, the puzzle of Lee Oswald did not fit for me. But for Lee to be an informant makes everything logical to me. Specifically, the behavior of Lee Oswald--all that strangeness didn't come from a crazy lunatic. That was his mission, a secretive mission. I would like to be wrong. But if I'm right, I want an apology to me and to the American people.

After twenty-seven years, I consciously made the choice to become an American citizen. Of course, my heritage was never betrayed when I took alliance to the American constitution and tried to pronounce this country as my home, only to find out that thirty-three years later I have nothing but the address. I lived in two systems which were labeled differently. Slowly and surely, the names are different but I feel oppressed, when I have to struggle for every piece of paper. Everytime I have asked for documents, I have been intimidated

And who gave the media the power to throw insults at me and my children, when they don't have the facts? Lee Oswald's face is on a dart board, comedians make jokes so freely without knowing the facts, that it is embedded in the people's psyches now. And we have the ex-president of the country, Gerald Ford, in front of millions of people calling a man never convicted of the crime, "that looney, that lunatic" with no facts to back it up. I'm listening, and I KNOW. But who's going to believe me? They're going to believe the authorities. So many careers, including media careers, have been made hiding behind dead Lee Harvey Oswald. If those people came forward and told the truth, they would never have those positions for one day. That's my bitter opinion.

It's my turn. Whatever few years are left in my life, I want to live it. I'm tired of bare existence. I want also to say I'm not anti-government, I'm not revolutionary, I'm not communist. I want to believe in the government. That entity should exist to help people but not to abuse them. Someone can try to restore the confidence of the people in the government. It has to start somewhere. The government are servants of the people, and they should be honorably served. The public trust should not be discarded that easily.

The Review Board has been empowered by the people, and I thought that was the government. Apparently it's not. So we don't have a leadership, we just have a ruling. Why bother with the constitution? We should have stayed a colony of England. I cannot empower that Review Board. I cannot make them not to act dishonestly or cowardly. This is up to their conscience. I want to quote something that I hope will give them a little bit of strength and bravery. It is from the Declaration of Independence:

And for the support of this declaration, with the firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our life, our fortune, and our sacred honor.

I am sure that most Americans feel that way. I think the same thing is expected from the government. Patriotism should not be used for the gains of only a few. That is when dishonorable things happen.

I definitely think that Lee Oswald did not kill President Kennedy. I think he was given up to pacify people as a patsy. I don't think he was the first one--only the first one we know about. And he wasn't crazy. If he was crazy, how come I have normal intelligent children? With very good convictions? The thing that bothers me the most. You teach your children the difference between right and wrong, give to the best of your abilities, how wonderful the country is, how honorable it is to live right here, and yet I no longer believe this myself; I'd be lying to you if I say that. And if I don't believe it I cannot tell it to my children or grandchildren. I cannot disappoint them. I have to believe first I look at my grandchildren, I look at those eyes and say to myself, what do I have to leave for you? You can leave money, which I don't have, you can leave fortune, but most of all, you can leave to your children a decent society. And I'm not one who thinks that everything should be perfect tomorrow. There will be stupid people, crazy people, lazy people, crime will be there. But the government and ruling bodies are supposed not only to set up the standards for us, but to set an example as well. And then, maybe we'll have some kind of balance in society so goodness can survive.

All documents which can expose that a man was accused wrongly should be opened. I believe that the documents I have requested will be eye-openers. After that, if time is still left, I think a law should be put on the books that if a man is accused of murder, and is dead before a trial is held, that crime should never be closed, and the family should be able to defend itself from accusations. This case has never been OPENED. The twenty-six volumes of the Warren Commission do not support its conclusions. My final conclusion is that the man--Lee--was not on the sixth floor. We're not even sure about the rifle. According to the local police chief, we never could put the rifle and the person (Oswald) together. Lee was charged with the crime. They showed him a picture, said this is a rifle, this is you; he denied it. But they never showed him the weapon for identification. I'm the one who was supposed to identify the rifle, and I did, believing in the authorities' good intentions.

But I was the worst of all. I knew nothing of weapons or guns; I knew nothing. Now I have to defend not just my honor but my life as well. It is impossible for me to put my time where it belongs, to be a normal wife and mother.

But I finally know the documentary evidence and I have to demand, not beg, that this information be released. This evidence was itemized in my letter to Mr. Tunheim and the ARRB. Why has this evidence been ignored?

Thank you, and please forgive my English.

Very sincerely,

Marina Oswald Porter

Reprinted with permission of Marina Oswald Porter

The Similas Affair

Where is the "Smoking Photo"
Did a Canadian's photograph reveal two men on the TSBD's 6th Floor ?

by Rick Nelson

Partially declassified Government files on the JFK assassination reveal that a joint FBI/RCMP investigation was sceptical of the existence of a photograph allegedly showing two men positioned at the window where the Warren Commission concluded a "sniper" fired at President Kennedy.

Since witnessing the 1963 assassination, Toronto resident Norman Similas has maintained that he took a picture of the Texas School Book Depository at the very moment shots were being fired at the Presidential motorcade. Similas claimed he was lined up with the sixth floor window and snapped a picture of two men sharing the same location from which he said a rifle barrel was protruding. However, Similas could not produce the photo for the authorities; in 1964, the Warren Commission concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald, acting alone, killed President Kennedy.

Recently, the Canadian National Archives in Ottawa released an FBI/RCMP file on Norman Similas. They indicate that a joint US/Canadian investigation came to the conclusion that Similas made up the whole story for financial gain and notoriety. Unless the actual picture showing two men at the window surfaces (which would be the biggest bombshell since the Zapruder film was first shown on national television) the findings of the FBI/RCMP investigation will no doubt stand unchallenged.

In the absence of this photograph, a review of the following documents is needed in order to decide whether Similas's account is a fraud. Perhaps the best way to proceed with this study is to follow the events before, during and after Similas's visit to Dallas in November 1963 in chronological order:

November 17-21st 1963: Norman Similas of Toronto attends a bottlers' convention at the Dallas Trade Mart, reporting for a Canadian Beverage Industry publication.

November 22nd 1963: Similas witnesses the assassination of President Kennedy and promptly leaves town.

These are the known facts up to this point. The information which follows is based on statements made to both the press and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP). Also included are internal memos and correspondence between the FBI & the RCMP.

July 15, 1964: *Liberty Magazine*, a Toronto publication, prints an interview with Similas. The title of the story is called "The DALLAS PUZZLE". The reporter who conducted the interview, Kenneth Gamble Armstrong, claims Similas approved its contents. The following excerpts are the words of Norman Similas:

"While I attended a national convention of the carbonated beverage bottlers, the following events occurred...Nov.21 - I interviewed Vice President Lyndon Johnson and photographed him in several informal poses. I spent more than an hour chatting with Jack Ruby in his

nightclub. November 22 - I witnessed from a distance of less than seven feet the assassination of President Kennedy, and unwittingly photographed his assassin or assassins as a rifle was levelled at him from a nearby building. I am convinced that if Oswald was the assassin - and this has never been definitely proven - he was not alone when he aimed from the sixth floor window of the depository. One of the pictures I took as the presidential car passed, showed two figures beside the gun barrel in the window. A reporter for the Dallas Times also saw two figures. His newspaper published that story too. (The FBI determined that Similas was referring to photographer Robert H. Jackson of the Dallas Times.

More than seven months have passed since the horrors of Dallas. Never a day passes but what the projector has not flipped in my mind, and the scenes tumble out in sequence after sequence. I can see Lyndon Johnson smiling as he pushed his hand into his coat and says, "Shall I pose like Napoleon?"

In the semi-darkness of the entrance of his night club, Jack Ruby throws a bear-like arm around my shoulders and ushers me to a table. He is saying, "Save your film. Why shoot the entertainers when you can photograph the President tomorrow. He'll be passing by, just down the street."

There is a fade-out and I'm next standing on the curb across from the Texas School Book Depository. I have selected a spot not far from the underpass where the crowd has thinned out. As the crowds cheer and wave the limousine slowly passes the Book Depository".

Part One of The DALLAS PUZZLE ends here. Part Two of the interview with Norman Similas was to be printed in the August 1964 issue of *Liberty Magazine*, but the publication folded before that could happen. However, I have obtained a copy and it will be presented later in this article.

September 8th, 1964 - (Telex from J. Edgar Hoover to RCMP): *URGENT.. appreciate knowing if you have on record any reference to one NORMAN SIMILAS of Toronto Canada being an eye witness within ten feet to the assassination of President Kennedy on Nov. 22/63. Urgent wire reply collect.*

September 10th, 1964 - (Memo to RCMP from FBI Liaison Officer): *The President's Commission has requested that the author of this article (from Liberty Magazine) be contacted and the photograph referred to be obtained, if possible. The Commission has also requested that the name of the presumably Dallas Times reporter referred to in the article be determined in order to ascertain whether such a picture ever existed.*

September 11th, 1964 - (Memo to Commanding Officer of the RCMP branch in Toronto from the RCMP Commissioner in Ottawa): *FBI advise article appearing in July issue of Liberty Magazine by Norman Similas (address unknown) suggests Similas took photo which shows two persons at window from which fatal shots fired at late President Kennedy. Article also indicated reporter from Dallas Newspaper present when photo taken. Ascertain (a) whether such photo exists (b) identity of Dallas reporter.*

September 14th, 1964 - (Memo to RCMP from FBI Liaison Officer): *One Robert H. Jackson, a photographer for the Dallas Times was interviewed in this matter last year and stated that upon hearing the shots, he looked up at the Texas School Book Depository window in time to see the barrel of a rifle being pulled inside the window, but could not see*

the person holding the rifle. He also recalled seeing two Negro individuals looking out of the windows immediately below the window in which he saw the rifle.

September 15th, 1964 - (Internal RCMP memo from Criminal Investigation Branch to Operations Division): *Kindly endeavour to obtain a copy of the August, 1964 issue of Liberty Magazine. The FBI have requested that this matter be treated as urgent.*

The following is a portion of the never-before-published second part of "THE DALLAS PUZZLE." The words are those of Norman Similas...

At the corner of three streets intersecting Main, I could see that large crowds had already gathered. So I walked on to a park near an overpass where the crowd thinned somewhat. I checked my setting of my 120 Japanese camera, glanced upward to verify the position of the sun and stepped off the curb to catch an early view of the presidential procession. Time seemed to stand still as we heard the first shot. The president's car was now less than ten feet from me. Another agonizing second passed, and with the exception of this one grotesque incident, everything around me seemed so normally parade like. By this time I was close enough to the car to have kicked the side of it. A second and third shot were fired. Still no-one seemed to have any idea as to where the shots were coming from. My camera had methodically returned to my cheek and I flipped the shutter. The Presidential limousine had passed me and slowed down slightly. My camera was directly angled toward the Texas School Book Depository in the background. The picture that I took on the curb of Elm Street was trained momentarily on an open sixth storey window. The camera lens recorded what I could not possibly have seen at that moment—a rifle barrel extended over the window sill. When the film was developed later, it showed two figures hovering over.

I returned to my hotel room, packed and boarded a bus for Chicago. The trip was uneventful but when I reached Chicago I was interviewed by dozens of reporters & photographers who had learned I was en route. Upon my return to Toronto, I submitted my developed negatives to a daily newspaper. When they were not used on Monday, November 25, I phoned and asked that they be returned. Later I received a fat cheque in the mail, but the one negative which clearly showed what I believe to be two figures in the window of the assassin's nest was missing. When I pressed for it, I was told that this negative had somehow become lost. It has never since been returned to me.

September 16th 1964: Two RCMP officers pay a visit to the home of Norman Similas. They take down the following statement. Compare this statement with the article he provided for *Liberty Magazine*..

"The position I finally took (for picture taking) was approximately 250 or 300 yards west of the Texas School Book Depository building. Approximately five minutes later the autocade appeared at the corner of Main and Houston. I took my first picture as the lead motorcycle passed in front of me. At the same time as I took the first picture I heard the first shot fired. I didn't take any more pictures until a bus carrying the Presidential Press Party came into view.

I took a bus from Dallas to Chicago as I was unable to make airline reservations. En route I picked up a newspaper in St. Louis and noticed a story which was published on the day of the assassination and which was written by a Dallas reporter. His account of the

assassination indicated that he observed two people and the rifle barrel being withdrawn from the window in the building. At Chicago I contacted T.C.A. Reservations where I received a message to call a local Chicago number. I called and a Ray Jefferies answered. It was the Associated Press Office. They sent a car for me and I gave him the rolls of film less one of which I did not know the locale. They developed the film there and advised me that they had coverage of most of the pictures that I had.

I arrived in Toronto at about 10pm on November 23rd. Almost immediately on my arrival at home, I was contacted by a reporter from the Toronto Telegram who advised they received word from the AP in Chicago that I had negatives that they might be interested in. He arrived in my home in five or ten minutes. He then examined the negatives, and while examining them he exclaimed, "there looks like two people at this window." I then went over and looked at the negative and I agreed that there were two objects in the window on the 6th floor south-east corner of the building. This window differed from the others in that it had an alcove above the window as opposed to the others on the 5th and other floors, which were square frame. The two objects appeared to be people and the Telegram reporter thought he saw what appeared to be a rifle barrel between them. I did not make any comment on this upon looking at it as it blended into the shadow of the object to the left. This negative was one of a strip of three and this strip plus another of three was handed over to this reporter.

The following Wednesday, my wife telephoned me at work and told me a letter had arrived from the Telegram. This letter apologetically explained that they had lost the negatives. In a matter of a few days I received a cheque for \$50.00 from the Telegram. Since that time I have heard nothing further from the Telegram.

September 17th, 1964: One of the two investigating officers files a report on Similas. This is his statement:

"During the course of this interview SIMILAS struck me as being a cocky, brash, individual who was quite anxious to create the impression of the "big-shot". When we began to question him on specifics he lost some of his composure and became extremely nervous and unsure of himself. It was not until Nov. 23rd, 1963 when he and a Toronto Telegram reporter were examining the negatives of photos he took, that the idea that two persons may have been in the window came up. SIMILAS went on to say that it was this reporter who drew it to his attention, and SIMILAS is very careful to point out that the reporter said "two people".

I have attempted to verify the loss of the negatives by the Toronto Telegram newspaper as alleged by SIMILAS and enquires at the Photo Department have failed to produce them. The photographer who took this picture is one Colin Davis however, I have been unable to contact him to date, as he is on assignment and only reports in to the office when he has something for publication. [signed] C.A. Beacock RCMP Sgt.

September 19th, 1964: RCMP Sgt. Beacock interviews the Toronto Telegram reporter...

"Further to previous report in this regard I interviewed Mr. Colin Davies, reporter and photographer of the Toronto Telegram. Davies stated that Similas was very excited at the time of this interview. While viewing the negatives Similas was said to have pointed out the window and asked Davies if he didn't think there were two people there. Similas drew his attention to the article written by a Dallas reporter in which two people were mentioned as being in the window. Davies said he felt that it was the power of suggestion and that Similas wanted to see two people in the negative so badly that he actually believed that he did. It was Davies opinion that the negatives were worthless from a news standpoint, but due to Similas'

state of excitement he didn't have the heart to disappoint him. Davies decided to take the negatives and let the Photo Editor decide what should be done. During the next day or so, the negatives somehow became lost and the Telegram, feeling responsible, sent Similas a cheque to pay for them. I questioned Davies as to his impression of Similas and his story and he replied that he had no doubt that Similas has witnessed the assassination, but "he was sure going to get a lot of mileage out of the story". There appears to be a complete reversal of the roles played by SIMILAS and DAVIES depending on whose story you hear.

September 21st, 1964: RCMP Statement by Kenneth G. Armstrong, editor of *Liberty Magazine*

"On our first meeting (with Similas) we discussed his visit to Dallas and the events leading up to the assassination. There were two subsequent meetings at which I got the remainder of the information that I wanted for my story. Similas offered to supply me with pictures which were taken prior to and during the assassination. These were to be used to illustrate the story. It was my understanding that one of these pictures was the one in which two persons and the gun barrel could be seen, and these were to be forthcoming when developed. I phoned Similas a day or so later and he said they had been mailed to me from a Post Office on Yonge St. After a week had gone by Albert Plock, Art Director of Liberty, and I went through the entire amount of mail received during the previous week but we found nothing. I mention this because it was so important to the story to have that picture which contained the two faces at the window. We still held out hope that they might arrive in time for the second installment, however, they never did arrive."

September 22nd, 1964: Conclusion of report submitted by RCMP Stg. C.A. Beacock
"The foregoing statement indicates that SIMILAS knowingly deceived ARMSTRONG into buying the story by promising him pictures which he knew to be non-existent. The paragraph of the July issue which states "a picture I took showed two figures beside a gun barrel" was actually the main point of interest of this story. From all the enquires here I doubt that such a picture ever existed and it is a certainty that it does not now exist. It was pointed out to me that had SIMILAS taken the picture showing the assassin or assassins, it would have been an exclusive and every medium in the world would be after it. SIMILAS told ARMSTRONG that he mailed this photograph along with others to the Liberty Magazine fully three months after he had been paid for the pictures lost by the Toronto Telegram and which supposedly contained this picture."

SIMILAS' story to me, and to both Davis and Armstrong contains too many inconsistencies and outright lies to be taken seriously. I feel he was an opportunist who saw a chance to cash in on the fact that he had witnessed the assassination and in order to do so he had to make the story as convincing as possible. It is unfortunate that by a coincidence the negatives which would prove the lie have been lost."

The RCMP sent their report down to the FBI and closed the books on Norman Similas. The last statement by RCMP Stg. Beacock leaves the door open for reasonable doubt as to whether Similas' was lying. However, based on the statements of other witnesses, I believe it is reasonable to conclude that a picture of two men in the 6th Floor window never existed...at least not in a picture taken by Norman Similas.

SOURCE: Canadian National Archives/RCMP file no. 63-HQ-1180-1-Q-112

Rick Nelson is a broadcaster living in Sudbury Ontario. In 1993 he organized the first ever Canadian Symposium on the JFK assassination. Following the death of JFK-AIC director Larry Howard, Nelson moved to Dallas to help open a new center called the Howard Archives & Research Museum. The museum was to be located at the historical Texas Theatre, however the fire that nearly destroyed the theatre has delayed the opening indefinitely and Nelson has since moved back to Canada.

Dr Charles A. Crenshaw,
At Liverpool 1996,

By Pat Kelly

Over a period of two days, Dr Charles Crenshaw told the story of the most harrowing weekend of his life. His story began at 12:38 p.m. on Friday 22nd November 1963, at the Parkland hospital, Dallas. Dr Crenshaw was one of the first doctors in Parkland to attempt to save the life of the 35th President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

The doctor was also one of the first witnesses to see the wounds to the President's head. The first thing he heard was the public address system calling for Dr Tom Shires. Dr Crenshaw knew that Shires was out of town, so he took the call. What he heard was devastating. The President of the United States had been assassinated, and he was heading for Parkland. Dr Crenshaw then met up with Dr McClelland, and broke the news to him. Then two Secret Service agents burst into the hospital and they made their way to the Emergency Room. The agents then informed the staff that two gurneys were required one for the President, and one for Governor John Connally who was also hit during the shooting. There was absolute bedlam in Trauma Room one when they wheeled the President in. Dr Crenshaw told of the emotion that he felt when he saw Mrs Kennedy standing there, she was quiet, composed, and clutching her bag. Her clothes were saturated in her husband's blood. It was then that Dr Crenshaw realised that the story of the President having been shot in Dallas was true. He also found it hard to believe that someone was crazy enough to shoot him.

When he first answered the call, he had hoped it was all just a big hoax. Then when he saw Mrs Kennedy, he knew that it was for real. In Trauma Room One the process of trying to save the President's life had commenced. An endotracheal tube had been inserted down the President's throat. The doctor looked directly at the President and made a quick inspection. He noted that his face was unmarked and his eyes were open and divergent, there was no movement in his eyes, and they were deficient. Doctor Crenshaw also noticed that there was substantial damage caused to the President's head. He noted that the entire right hemisphere of the brain was missing. This began at his hairline and extended all the way behind his right ear. Part of the cerebellum was hanging from the back of his head. Blood and brain tissue were sticking to his hair, it was such a dreadful sight. Then Dr Crenshaw saw a small opening in the throat, it was about the size of the diameter of a pencil. It was an entrance wound, there was no doubting in his mind. At this point in time, he, like all the other doctors in Trauma Room

one knew that the President was dead.

Dr's McClelland and Jones were positioned at his left arm and chest. Dr's Peters and Baxter were at the right hand side of the President. Mrs Kennedy was now in the room. Dr Baxter said "Mrs Kennedy, I think you should step outside," which she did. Then Dr Crenshaw noticed a Secret Service agent Clint Hill waving a .38 calibre pistol, no one was sure what he intended to do with it. Agent Hill then left the room after he was persuaded by nurse Doris Nelson that the President was okay. After this, Dr Crenshaw began to remove the President's shoes, and his right socks. Then he began to cut off his trousers. The doctor noted that the President's right leg was three quarters of an inch longer than his left leg. His back brace was then removed and thrown to the floor. No one removed the President's briefs, this was purely out of respect for him. Then Dr Crenshaw pointed out that his fellow doctors did not know the President's blood group, or his personal medical history, they were working on him in the dark. They were later informed that his blood type was O. RH Positive. The doctors were now performing the ABC of trauma care. Airway, Breathing, and Circulation. Dr Crenshaw then placed his hand on the femoral artery and said, "he may have a pulse," a nurse then said "no blood pressure." Then someone else said "I think I've got a heartbeat here." We realised that the President was barely breathing. It was noted that a bullet that had entered his neck had pierced his windpipe. There was now an endotracheal tube down his throat. There were now three cut-downs (the insertion of a plastic tube in the vein to give a rapid infusion of fluid intravenously.) There was also a massive amount of lost blood, (hemorrhagic shock) and the President was receiving massive amounts of blood. We began to see the blood bubbling up from the neck wound. We knew that the endtracheal tube had failed to increase the air volume to his lungs. A decision was made by Dr Perry that a tracheotomy was required. This was where Dr Perry had cut through the bullet entrance hole in the President's throat. Various incisions were made to the President's body and tubes were then placed throughout. Twenty minutes had passed, and the doctors were still battling on.

Dr Crenshaw then walked up to the President's head, and again looked at the wound, he noted that the entire right cerebral hemisphere appeared to have been blown away. When he looked at the President, he then knew that all the work that they had carried out on him had been for nothing. Dr Perry refused to give up, but bravely he had to admit that he had did everything in his power to save him, but the life of the President was gone. There was dead silence in the room, all you could hear was the muffled sound of people crying. The battle to save the President was over. Dr Crenshaw looked at his watch, the time read 12:52 p.m.

The President's body was covered with a white sheet. Mrs Kennedy then came into the room, and kissed her husband on the big toe. At the head of the cart was a Catholic priest, Father Huber, who began giving the President the last rites. Father Huber absolved the President of all his earthly sins, and anointed him with the holy oils. The First Lady then took of her wedding ring, and placed it on her husband's little finger. She then said farewell to him with a kiss to his cheek.

Then some nurses arrived and began the process of preparing the body for removal. The President's body was washed and all the tubes were removed from his lifeless body. President Kennedy was wrapped in two white sheets. A large casket had arrived, and a plastic mattress was then placed in the casket to prevent any blood stains from staining the casket interior.

The President's clothes were also placed inside the casket, they were folded and placed at his feet. Then came a major problem for the Parkland doctors. A group of agents appeared on the scene and surrounded the coffin, they were all armed and if required they were going to blast their way out of the hospital. Dr Earl Rose was the Chief of Forensic Pathology at the

hospital was then confronted by the agents. Secret agent Roy Kellerman told Dr Rose, "my friend, this is the body of the President of the United States, and we are going to take it back to Washington." Dr Rose told him "no, that's not the way things are when there is a homicide, we must have an autopsy here." Kellerman refused to listen to the doctor's plea, he then brought his firearm to a ready position, and the other agents soon followed. But still the argument continued. Agent Kellerman then snapped, he said "Goddammit, get your ass out of the way before you get hurt." Rose had no choice, he just had to get out of the way or they would have shot him. That was how desperate the Secret Service were to get the President's body.

At 2:08 p.m. they loaded the President's body into a waiting hearse, with Jackie riding alongside her husband in the backseat of the hearse. This was only the beginning of one of the longest, yet saddest weekends of Dr Crenshaw's distinguished career.

Sunday 24th November 1963.

Dr Crenshaw was having a coffee with Dr Shires. They had just completed a medical condition check on Governor John Connally who was still in a serious but stable condition. The Doctors were conversing on how Lee Oswald had been able to shoot both men from the rear, and yet all the medical signs had showed them that the wounds to the President had come from the front of him. As they were drinking, and contemplating the mystery the phone rang in the doctors lounge. Dr Crenshaw picked up the phone, it was the hospital administrator Jack Price who was demanding three medical operating teams to go directly to the Emergency Room. Both operating teams were working that day, so three resident doctors including Dr Crenshaw, made their way downstairs.

Waiting there at Trauma Room one was Jack Price, he then proceeded to tell them that he had just seen the shooting of Lee Harvey Oswald on television. Dr Crenshaw told Dr Price that they could not put Oswald into Trauma Room One as this was the place in which they had tried to save the life of the President. Out of respect it was felt that Lee Oswald would be better placed in Trauma Room Two. They were all in agreement. Suddenly, the door burst open, and a gurney came flying in, on it was Lee Oswald. The patient was white as a sheet, a ghastly colour, and was rushed into Trauma Room Two. On arrival there he was immediately checked for blood pressure, and felt for a pulse. His abdomen was expanding and it was obvious that he was suffering from internal bleeding. There was an entrance wound on his left side, and he did have a heartbeat. So in seven and a half minutes he had cut down from both extremities. The upper left extremity was where we put the trachea tubes in place. We also inserted a tube to prevent his lung from collapsing. A tube was placed over the left area of the chest where the bullet had entered so that could evacuate blood and air.

The patient had a Hemo Numo Thorax. We then raised his head, and placed him on an anaesthesia machine and was placed on 30% oxygen. Oswald was then removed from the Emergency room, and taken to the second floor where an operating room was ready. When we got there we realised that we did not have the time to remove him onto the operating table, so we just had to administer the treatment while he was still on the cart. We were giving him O' Negative blood, we later discovered that he was A' Negative, which was a rare blood group, and was given massive amounts of blood. Still the patient did not respond to this. Dr Perry, who had performed the tracheotomy on President Kennedy, made an incision straight

mid-line, and about 2.5 to 3,000 CC's of blood came pouring out of his body. This bullet had gone into his left, through the lung, hitting the spleen, and then hit a major artery going into his abdomen. The bullet had also damaged the artery leading to the intestine, then through part of his stomach, and then hit a part of his duodenum, pancreas, went right through the liver, and stopped just under the skin. You could actually feel the bullet with your fingers. It was later named by the doctors as the "Parkland shish kebab," it got everything from left to right.

Then Dr Crenshaw noticed a strange looking man in the room. He resembled Oliver Hardy, and he was wearing a scrub suit, and he was also armed. Dr Crenshaw later recalled the commotion around Oswald when he was first brought into the hospital. Some were shouting at him "did you do it. ?" Then a nurse informed Dr Crenshaw that a doctor had been requested to take a very important phone call.

Dr Crenshaw picked up the telephone and said "this is Dr Crenshaw, may I help you.?"

The voice said "This is Lyndon B. Johnson, how is the accused assassin. ?"

Dr Crenshaw: " Mr President, he's holding his own at the moment."

President Johnson: "Would you mind taking a message to the operating surgeon? ?"

Dr Crenshaw: "Dr Shires is very busy right now, but I will convey your message."

President Johnson: "Dr Crenshaw, I want a deathbed confession from the accused assassin. There's a man in the operating room who will take that statement. I will expect your full cooperation in this matter."

Dr Crenshaw: "Yes Sir."

[The telephone conversation with President Johnson was fully corroborated by the switchboard operator at Parkland who originally took the call, and subsequently listened into the conversation]

After the call Dr Crenshaw returned to the operating room and conveyed the telephone message to Dr Shires. He looked totally bewildered and said something like, "President Johnson want's us to let him over there to take a statement," and then Dr Shires shook his head in disgust.

There was no deathbed confession because Lee Harvey Oswald was dead. All the doctors assembled did everything in their power to save him, but he was too far gone when they wheeled him into Parkland. The time of death was 1:07 p.m. The bullet was removed, and was duly handed over to the authorities. And so ended the worst weekend in the life of Doctor Charles A. Crenshaw.

Questions to Dr Crenshaw.....

Question:

"As someone who knows the geography of the Dallas highway, Why did it take the Dallas police and the ambulance team 14 to 15 minutes to get to Parkland, and if it had arrived earlier, could Oswald have been saved. ?"

Dr Crenshaw:

"Well, actually, it took about two minutes to get Oswald into the cart, people were so much around Oswald when he was shot. There were TV cameras, the ambulance they used was like an old hearse and they had to drive back into the entrance there. They then had to get Oswald through the doors, and then they they had to drive out slowly from the police station. I don't know if you know where the Dallas police department is, it's a little bit north of the Adolphus Hotel, and you just keep on going. So it was damn near 14 minutes, and then all the

things we did in Trauma Room Two should have been done, with the exception of the chest tube in the ambulance. All Trachea tubes, oxygen tubes, all these things would have given him a good shot. As I have said, all these wounds, horrendous as they were, were amenable to surgery at that time."

Question:

"Doctor, you have assured us that the Parkland doctors remember the wounds to the back of the head, yet the Zapruder film and other photographs show the back of the head in tact. How then do you reconcile the memories of the Parkland doctors with the photographic evidence?"

Dr Crenshaw:

"Well, all I can say is they were ignored because they put in their statements that were filed and were read by the Warren Commission and they were printed in Volume Six of the medical part of it. All I can say is all of the said "Yes" to the wound being an exit wound in Arlen Specter's offices, but no one ever rocked the boat after that. No one had seen these pictures. Three of them saw the pictures in Nova in 1977 and 1978, but the first time any of these pictures was shown just recently, and one of the books here by Bob Groden, it will show all of us sitting at different chairs holding the back of our heads. They all remember, I don't know how they can all live with themselves."

Question:

"That seems to be in relation to the autopsy photographs, but I'm talking about the slides that came out in the early sixties where the Zapruder film still shows the back of the head in tact. So what we have is a It's difficult to reconcile all the doctors when they say the back of the head came off, but the photographs have been in existence for a long time showing part of the back of the head."

Dr Crenshaw:

"That's the whole point, I have concluded a medical cover up. Trying to prove this was not a hole in the back of the head and as exit wound."

Question:

"I am interested in the wounds to Oswald, you mention the amount of damage that was done by the bullet going through his body. Your experience with gunshot wounds is that a normal amount of damage to have been done by the shots to the abdomen, or, what's the survival rate for a wound like that.?"

Dr Crenshaw:

"I would say it was rather an abnormal wound, usually they bounce around, As I talked to you recently about the size of the bullet, this was a larger bullet, it did not have a muzzle velocity of less than a thousand feet per second. But, when this one went in, it tumbled. The heavier bullets tumble, where as the high velocities go straight through, and it got the spleen and what have you. I think it's an abnormal one, obviously I've seen wounds like this."

Question:

"The point I was trying to make is, if one was attempting to kill someone it is not the best place to shoot someone in the abdomen. The head or the chest would have been better."

Dr Crenshaw:

"Oh no, usually you would go for the head if you really are going to kill someone."

Question:

"Should LBJ be indicted??"

Dr Crenshaw:

"I believe that LBJ was behind the cover-up. As for J. Edgar Hoover, I think with

Johnson's personality, and he did not want to be faced fighting Cubans, Russians, or the Mafia because he didn't want any additional problems of being President, and there were some people who had felt that he was going all out with the Vietnam War, and that's another point. But as far as pull the trigger, I really couldn't say about that. But I do feel that he was ultimately responsible for the medical cover-up because they wanted one lone mad assassin that they could tie this up with."

Question:

"You did say that there were two fragments of metal that were left in Connally's wrist, and I believe that Dr Cyril Wecht contacted the Connally family after the death of the Governor, which was not very long ago, and asked if the wrist could be examined and the remains removed because they wanted to test whether it was the same bullet, the so-called magic bullet, apparently the Connally family refused. Can you comment on that. ?"

Dr Crenshaw:

"Yes, when John Connally died, not only were the people interested in the research, they asked the Connally family if they could remove the fragments from the wrist, and from the thigh. But, the FBI requested this too. Apparently, the FBI stationed in Dallas drove all the way out to the cemetery, they were trying to get a court order to cut out the bullet wound to the thigh, and at least two fragments that could be found in the wrist. The FBI was just as interested as we were, and then the Connally family refused."

Dr Charles A. Crenshaw was never called to testify before the Warren Commission. The reason given was that he did not make out a medical report in Parkland Hospital on the day of the assassination. It does become apparent that with such an important witness to the head wound of the President just ignored, we can only conclude that the Warren Commission had no interest in finding out whom shot President John F. Kennedy in 1963.

For a fuller account of Dr Crenshaw's story, you may wish to read his book "**JFK Conspiracy of Silence.**" By Charles A. Crenshaw MD, published by Penguin Books 1992.

THE PHYSICS OF DEALEY PLAZA.

Carl J. Eiriksson

After the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963 there has been a large number of publications, films and statements postulating that more than one person was involved in the murder and that at least two guns were fired, one of them firing from a place in front and to the right of the presidential limousine. Tree foliage and some sky in a photograph of that place is interpreted as gunsmoke and a man with a gun. We hear "eyewitness accounts" saying they saw a big wound on the back of the presidents head and that his face was intact, that the blood was seen to come out of the back of his head and therefore the bullet must have entered from the front. We hear people state that the official photograph of the back of his head is a forgery because it shows it intact except for a small bullet hole. We hear the "explanation" that the bullet forced him "back and to the left" and therefore the bullet must have come from the right front. Frames 314 and 315 of the Zapruder film, as numbered by the Warren commission, are named as proof of this.

It is a pity that to this day no analysis of the evidence of the Zapruder film by experts who understand the physical laws of nature seems to have been made public, or if it has then it has not been published very widely. That film is believed to be recognized as genuine and free of any forgery by everybody involved in these arguments.

The Zapruder film runs at a speed of 18.3 frames per second. In video versions of the film where the frames run at 30 (or 25 in PAL) frames per second with interlace, there is overlapping of frames when video copies are made so the events appear at their proper speed. In such copies the individual frames of the film are not readily identifiable by number, although no frames are omitted. Some video copies of the film or of important portions of it, are however made by synchronizing the film frames with the video frames. If, for instance each film frame is copied on two consecutive video frames only, then the individual film frames can be readily identified, each film frame appearing twice as the video frames are viewed frame by frame. If such a copy is run normally the speed will be reduced by a ratio of 15 to 18.3 or by a factor of 1.22 (1.464 in PAL). This is the case in the enlarged portion of the Zapruder film showing the head wound as shown in the film "JFK" by Oliver Stone. That portion of the Zapruder film can thus be analyzed film frame by film frame by just viewing the video frames, two consecutive video frames showing one film frame.

Measurements were made on the 12 frames representing film frames numbered from 310 to 321 by the Warren commission. Frame 313 is the first frame after the impact. The following table shows the approximate distance in cm from the rear edge of the back cushion in the limousine directly behind the president to the back of his head, both to the top (A) and to the bottom (B) and to the edge of Mrs. Kennedys hat (C). Each interval between frames corresponds to 54.6 milliseconds of time:

| Frame no: | C(cm): | A(cm): | B(cm): | |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|---|
| 310 | 92 | 50 | 45 | |
| 311 | 90 | 50 | 45 | |
| 312 | 90 | 50 | 45 | Both heads almost stationary relative to the car. The impact happens before frame 313. |
| 313 | 90 | 53 | 47 | He has moved forward. Back of head seems intact. |
| 314 | 90 | 57 | 49 | He has moved forward. The forehead is gone. |
| 315 | 90 | 50 | 46 | He has moved backwards. |
| 316 | | 48 | 43 | The forehead is flying above Mrs. Kennedys hat. |
| 317 | | 46 | 37 | Back of head seems intact. |
| 318 | | 43 | 30 | " |
| 319 | | 39 | 28 | " |
| 320 | | 35 | 28 | " |
| 321 | | 35 | 27 | " |

If a bullet weighing 10.4 grams (160 grains) with a velocity of 700 meters per second enters a stationary rigid free object weighing 6000 grams and stops inside the object, then the resulting 6010.4 grams will have a velocity in the same direction as the bullet had, of $10.4 * 70000 / 6010.4 = 121.1$ cm per second. This is the same as saying that all the bullets momentum of 728000 dyne-seconds (or 7.28 Newton-seconds) is delivered to the total mass of 6010.4 grams. If the object is mounted elastically and the impact happens in a span of time that is very short compared to other dynamic factors of the system, then the initial velocity immediately as the bullet comes to a rest in the object will also be 121.1 cm per second. There is no time delay after the impact is over until the object has that velocity. All the acceleration of the object due to the bullet happens during the short time it takes for the bullet to slow down and stop inside the object. There is no such acceleration after that. A velocity of 121.1 cm per second corresponds to 6.6 cm per interval between film frames.

Frames 310 to 312 show no motion of the head relative to the car, the values of A and B being 50 and 45 for those three frames. The fact that we see only a forward motion of about two to four cm per frame interval from frame 312 to 313 and again from frame 313 to 314 instead of about 6.6 cm is explained by several factors: Much material is seen on frames 313 to 316 to be expelled out of the forehead along with the forehead itself thereby absorbing much of the bullets momentum which is transferred to the expelled material instead of to the remaining skull. Also we can only observe the mean velocity between frames and not the instantaneous velocity at the moment the bullet stops delivering momentum to the head. The neck muscles and the spine will therefore have acted to reduce somewhat the mean velocity below the initial velocity. The impact may have happened many milliseconds after frame 312 thus reducing the displacement seen between frames 312 and 313. The angles between the presumed trajectory and the lines along which the measurements A and B are measured are about 32 and 38 degrees causing a factor of reduction of between 0.85 and 0.79. Furthermore the bullet almost certainly exited from the forehead with some appreciable velocity and therefore could not deliver all its momentum to the head. This bullet may have been the one that struck the street near Mr. Tague. The value of C is constant from frame 311 to 315 showing that the forward movement of the presidents head from frame 312 to 314 was not due to the car slowing down. That would have caused Mrs. Kennedys head to move as well.

The important facts here are the constant values of A, B and C in frames 311 and 312 and the directly observable forward motion of the presidents head from frame 312 to 313 and again forward from frame 313 to 314 while the value of C remains constant. This proves that the presidents head is accelerated forward between frames 312 and 313, that is in the interval when the bullet struck. There is also much greater acceleration forward of the material thrown forward from the head as frames 313 and 314 show. None is thrown backwards. Those facts prove that the shot came from behind the limousine.

The delayed nerve reaction backwards seen from frame 314 to 315 and onward to frame 321 is the cramp due to the nerve injury and has nothing to do with the bullet pushing the head. The frames show that this acceleration backwards increases very much about the time corresponding to frame 314, that is at least 50 to 100 milliseconds after the bullet struck. The bullet could not accelerate an object when it no longer moved inside the object, therefore such acceleration had ceased before frame 313. Both the head and the body are jerked backwards about frame 314. Such cramp is in the direction of bending the neck and body backwards, not forward, as physicians know (see DECEREBRATE RIGIDITY = trunk arched backwards).

A rough calculation shows that the momentum delivered by a projectile fired from the front that would be needed to push both the head and the much heavier body backwards with the velocity they reached as shown by frames 314 to 319 would have to be many times greater than the 7.28 Newton-seconds assumed for a rifle bullet. Such a projectile would have struck about the time of frame 314 and the shooter and his cannon would have been thrown backwards very violently by an equally large momentum, probably breaking his collarbone.

The motion backwards of the head and the upper part of the body can be seen readily when the film is viewed normally and this has been interpreted by ignoramuses as the bullet pushing the president back. Some people have perhaps seen too many westerns where a single

pistol shot is shown to lift a man from the floor and throw him out of a window.

But the false interpretation of people who have seen the Zapruder film and say that the blood came from the back of the head when the impact occurred, cannot readily be excused as unintentional. Viewing the film one can see the blood coming from the forehead and the back of the head can be seen to be intact and no blood is seen there. In frames 314, 330, 333, 334, 335 and 337 it can be seen that the forehead forward of the ear is missing. In frames 334, 335 and 337 Mrs. Kennedys blouse and left shoulder can be seen behind the head in the place on the film where the forehead should have been. In frame 316 it is flying over her hat. Later it was brought to the hospital by a policeman. In frames 330, 333, 334, 335 and 337 much of the brain rests on the right cheek covering the nose and mouth. All the frames show the back of the head intact. Despite these facts "eyewitnesses" have stated that the face was intact and that the right side of the back of the head had a large open wound.

Some people jump to conclusions about the murder of president Kennedy even in the face of contradictory facts. Eyewitnesses lie. Some people seem to think it is extremely important to convince the public that more than one person was involved in the assassination. They seem to think there is an enormous difference between a crime committed by one deranged individual and one committed by two such individuals. In the eagerness to create the impression that they have proved there were at least two conspirators, some people do not recognize simple logic. They misrepresent the facts shown by the Zapruder film, saying it proves what it disproves. They will not admit the possibility that only one gun was used. Their arguments indicate they do not believe that the Newtonian laws of physics apply in this case. They think there is a time delay between the end of an impact and the time when the object struck will begin to move. They think it sits and waits a while before moving and may even take a little excursion in the opposite direction first like in movie cartoons! In their logic the physical laws of nature about mass, acceleration and momentum are no longer valid near the president or in Dealey Plaza. Such "logic" is even heard in court.

The Zapruder film has not proved that there was only one gun. Nor has it proved that there was no conspiracy even if we knew there was only one gunman. But the Zapruder film seems to be in good agreement with the notion that only one gun was fired. One rifle only in the hands of a single shooter could very well have done all the shooting in Dealey Plaza when the limousine was there on Nov. 22 1963. The target was moving almost directly away from the southeast corner of 411 Elm Street at nearly a constant slow speed. Such a target is almost as easy as a stationary target, and the range was only about 55 - 75 meters. At that distance the human body is an easy target for a good rifleman with a rifle fitted with a telescope and supported appropriately.

Bullets entering the human body have a way of going in different directions. They usually change direction somewhat, after entering. One of the first two bullets struck the presidents back near the shoulders. It apparently exited from his throat making a neat exit hole that resembled an entrance wound, because of the nature of the tissues there and because the bullet was slowed down by going through the back. That bullet either had changed direction upwards before exiting and so continued its flight and may have landed near Mr. Tague, or it went on to hit governor Connally in the back and wrist. In the former case the second bullet struck governor Connally. It probably struck both him and the president, in which case the first bullet missed.

If the wound on the front of the neck had been an entrance wound, why was no bullet found in the body by the total body X-rays? There was no exit wound on the back of the neck or on the body.

Any shooter knows that hitting a target that is moving sideways is much more difficult than hitting a target that is coming directly towards or moving directly away from the shooter. People behind the fence on the grassy knoll in Dealey Plaza were in view of other people, for instance of Mr. Bowers at the railroad tower, also there were fifteen people on the railroad bridge. Mr. Gordon Arnold was filming at the fence very close to the (CIA) men there. There was no real hiding place there and the shooter would have to shoot off hand or standing and at a target moving sideways.

Shooters would naturally station themselves in places where they were less likely to be

seen and in places where the target was either coming towards them or going away, for instance in a dark room behind a slightly open window in one of the buildings on Elm street. If there was a second gunman he would most likely have been in some such place, not necessarily as high as the sixth floor. If this was a conspiracy of people in high positions it is almost certain that at least one semiautomatic rifle was used and another type of ammunition than the type that struck Mr. Connally in the back.

A supersonic bullet emits a sharp noise from its impact as well as from its entire supersonic trajectory (in directions of arc $\cos(1/M)$ from the trajectory where $M = \text{Mach number of the bullet speed}$). That explains why many people thought the shots came from a place near the limousine, especially the headshot. An observer who was located at a distance (DL) from the limousine that was less than his distance (DG) from the gun minus the distance (S) between the gun and the limousine divided by M would hear the sound of the impact before the sound from the gun, in other words if $DL < DG - S/M$. That observer would be on the southwest side of a hyperbola with focal points at the limousine and at the gun and having an eccentricity of M. The hyperbola would cross the trajectory of the bullet at right angles at the distance $0.5 * S * (M - 1) / M$ behind the limousine. A higher bullet speed would place it farther east and make it more like a straight line perpendicular to the street. Its equation is:

$$\frac{x^2}{A^2} + \frac{y^2}{(M-1)^2} = 1 \quad \text{where } A = 0.5 * S / M = 0.5 * (DG - DL).$$

The y-axis is perpendicular to the trajectory (x-axis) crossing the trajectory in its mid-point.

For $M = 2$ and $S = 75$ the equation is $x = 352 + y^2 / 3$. Only positive values of x apply if the x-axis is positive towards the limousine, otherwise only negative.

Assuming a bullet speed of Mach 2 the hyperbola for the headshot runs northwest over the pergola and to the southeast over the intersection of Commerce and Houston Streets, if the shot came from the southeast corner of 411 Elm Street. The hyperbola crosses the trajectory at a distance of $S/4$ behind the limousine. Most of the grass lawn as well as the parking lot and the railroad bridge were southwest of that hyperbola, so people there would hear the impact of the headshot before they heard the report from the gun. Therefore, to many people in Dealy Plaza the sounds from the impacts may have sounded like shots coming from a place near the limousine. The sounds from the gun heard later may have sounded like echoes from a building, an effect familiar to soldiers in combat.

People to the southwest of two straight lines drawn from the limousine, about south and west from it, both forming an angle to the trajectory in degrees of $180 - \text{arc } \cos(1/M)$, would hear the sound of the impacts before they could hear any sound whatever from any other part of the trajectory or the gun. For $M = 2$ the angle is 120 degrees. The two lines are parallel to the two asymptotes of the hyperbola.

(A straight line through the limousine at the headshot, perpendicular to the trajectory intersects the hyperbola at a distance from the limousine of

$0.5 * S * (M - 1) / M$. If $M = 2$ that is a distance of $S * 3 / 4$. Mr. Zapruder is believed to have filmed just about on that line.)

Most observers can tell which one of two sounds is heard first, although the time difference between them is quite small. Most people can also tell from what direction the first sound comes and where the second sound comes from, with one very important limitation. The brain will in many cases interpret from which one of two directions a sound comes, based on other senses, such as vision or on the expectation one has about the correct direction. The ears can detect the correct approximate direction if the sound comes from a heading of 90 or 270 degrees, that is directly from the side. A sound coming from the front (0 degrees) can be interpreted as coming from the rear (180 degrees) and vice versa, and such a sound will often be wrongly interpreted by the brain if people for other reasons think the opposite direction is the correct one. This is because the brain detects the time difference between the times of arrival of the sound to the two ears. This difference will be the same for directions of 0

degrees and 180 degrees, namely zero. It will also be the same for directions of, for instance, 350 degrees and 190 degrees. People near the pergola facing the limousine may well have got the impression that the headshot came from behind them, when they heard both the sonic click of the bullet and the impact in front of them.

The first sound reaching Mr. Zapruder from the shot to the presidents back was the sound from its impact, assuming $M = 2$. Then he heard the gun about 50 milliseconds later, if the gun was at 411 Elm. The headshot, however, may have sounded quite different to him. The first sound from it to reach him came from the trajectory, from a direction of about $90 - \arccos(1/M)$ or 30 degrees to his left (his heading of 330 degrees). About 10 milliseconds later the sound of the impact directly in front of him reached his ears, blending with the first crack. This could have given him the impression that the shot came from behind him slightly to his left. About 50 milliseconds after hearing the impact he would hear the report from the gun like an echo if the gun was at 411 Elm. Besides he may also have heard echoes from buildings.

People southwest of the two 120 degree lines mentioned before (assuming $M = 2$) would hear the impacts first and then the gun. People between those lines and the hyperbola would hear the bullets first, then the impacts and finally the gun. People between the hyperbola and two straight lines drawn from the gun at angles of 60 degrees to the trajectory (that is in the same directions from the gun as the 120 degree lines are from the limousine) would hear the bullets first, then the gun and finally the impacts. Those northeast of the 60 degree lines would hear the gun first and then the impacts. From this it follows that many people in the plaza heard two or even three sharp sounds for each shot fired, plus eventual echoes. This explains the great confusion about the number of shots and why many people thought more than three shots were fired, some almost simultaneously from more than one place.

Terrorist groups are likely to spread lies bragging that they have carried out assassinations they had nothing to do with. Stories to that effect from convicts or criminals are not credible. They lied when they explained how and who shot the president from the front.

An unarmed accomplice may well have set off an explosion on the grassy knoll to coincide with the rifle shots, making both sound and smoke to create a diversion with great success. An accomplice in some window may have fired a rifle with a silencer and subsonic bullets at some object on the knoll to make a noise there without his own gun being heard. Standing with a rifle on the knoll almost in the open in view of people behind, and with a witness almost at one's side (Mr. Arnold), firing at a moving target from the side at a range of about 40 meters does not seem to make sense. If there was a shot fired from the grassy knoll it missed as one would expect.

One may wonder why many people, even those in the legal profession, lawyers, prosecutors, investigators etc., supposedly responsible people who interpreted the condition of the bullet found at the hospital and the Zapruder film and other evidence apparently never studied the film closely or consulted experts in acoustics, ballistics or physics who could have told them that:

1: People would hear two, three or more cracks from each shot and some of the cracks would be the first sound heard although they came from places where there were no guns, but only targets or trajectories, and some would come from directions where no echoes would come from,

2: Unexpected sounds from the front may seem to come from behind,

3: Fully copperjacketed common rifle bullets will be almost undeformed when they have hit bones after having first slowed down by passing through much flesh without hitting bones, therefore a test bullet fired at full speed at a bone or through goatskin is irrelevant to the case,

4: Fully copperjacketed common rifle bullets are likely to make small exit wounds after slowing down by passing through much flesh without hitting bones, pressure from the necktie knot would also make the exit hole small.

5: A fully copperjacketed common rifle bullet striking the back at full speed from a military rifle and missing the spinal column and other bones will not penetrate to a depth of only two or three inches, it would penetrate much farther and it would not disappear inside the body,

6: The frames of the Zapruder film that tell whether the headshot came from the front or

from behind are frames 311, 312 and 313, certainly not frame 315 as maintained by several simpletons.

7: At least ten rifle bullets would have to strike near frame 314 to accelerate the president as much backwards as shown by frames 313 to 319,

8: An object struck by a bullet will not sit and wait for 50 to 100 milliseconds after the impact is over, before deciding to move.

9: An object struck will not start to move in the opposite direction first and then decide to reverse its motion, like things do in cartoons.

10: A bullet striking the throat from the front is not likely to make a U-turn inside the body and leave the throat through the same small hole, or to disappear inside the body unless it was magic or could melt (ice bullet) or dissolve in the body.

11: A bullet entering the back of a sitting man six inches below the top of the collar at a downward angle of 18 degrees from the horizontal will exit at a height of about the throat above the breastbone if it goes straight through; a hand-drawn autopsy sheet of the man lying flat cannot show this.

12: When a car is moving at 11 miles per hour there is presumably wind from the front due to the motion, as the flags on the presidential limousine show, therefore much of the blood and material splashed forward in numerous directions within a solid angle of almost a half sphere will be thrown left, right and up and carried back behind the car by the wind, not against the wind to land in front of the car; therefore it is no indication that the bullet came from the front as some people say,

13: Mr. Tague was probably struck in the face by ricochet from the bullet that went through the president's head, after that bullet struck the street.

14: Twenty year old ammunition of normal storage is usually very reliable.

15: A large target like a human head and shoulders moving almost directly away from a good rifleman is an easy target at a distance of 75 meters with a well supported rifle and with a scope, it is very wrong to say that no shooter could fire 3 shots in 7 or 8 seconds with 2 hits at such a target.

16: A bullet struck the president's back very close to frame 215 and it also struck Mr. Connally or he was struck near frame 225 according to his own testimony and the Zapruder film; therefore it cannot be seen that Connally's right hand is "nowhere near his left thigh" as some say.

17: Mr. Connally turned his head only partly to the right (about 60 or 70 degrees) when he heard the first shot and "did not catch the president in the corner of my eye", that happened much sooner than frame 240, by frame 240 he had been hit and again turned to the right, this time almost 180 degrees.

18: A man can hold his hat in his left hand although his right wristbone has been hit by a bullet one or two seconds earlier (no pain is felt at first).

19: Most of the frames from 313 to about 400 of the Zapruder film show that there was no large wound behind the right ear or on the back of the skull as many eyewitnesses said they saw; but the brain lay outside, on the skull. The doctors presumably put the forehead back in its place on the corpse.

20: The shooter would naturally wait until the limousine had turned west on Elm, after that it could not escape quickly out of his range (no side street).

Instead of obtaining the interpretations of experts these "common sense" lawmen pretended they could correctly interpret these things. Their minds may have been too preoccupied by elephants and daisies, or maybe they were dishonest from the start. They interpreted evidence incorrectly and said it proved that a shot came from the front. They have demonstrated that people in the legal profession can get away with much nonsense and untruth in their efforts to make it appear that they have proved things they cannot prove, even when the evidence they use proves the opposite. Such efforts may get innocent people convicted.

One might even suspect that all this nonsense was done on purpose to distract attention away from the location of the assassin(s).

Instead of all their nonsense and wasted efforts barking up the wrong tree on the grassy knoll they should concentrate their efforts on finding out who shot from some place

behind the limousine. They might have discovered something had they done so. They might look at Vincent P. Guinn's result of the nuclear reactor test on Oswald's paraffin cheek cast, outrageously kept secret by the Warren commission. The chemical paraffin test on his cheek had turned out negative! They might find out why Ruby could walk into the police basement past the police three minutes before they took Oswald to the basement, despite Ruby's murder threat against Oswald the evening before to officer Billy Grammer at the station and why the police carried out the investigation the way they did. They might check the possibility that somebody shot with Oswald's rifle using gloves, then donned a police uniform and joined the police in searching the book depository and then slipped away. *)

The present writer finds it odd that he should be the only one - in 31 years - to notice the evidence of frames 311, 312 and 313 of the Zapruder film proving conclusively that the headshot came from behind the president. It would seem more likely that experts employed by the Warren Commission discovered this indisputable proof long ago but kept it secret, possibly in order to keep the critics of the Warren report busy wasting their efforts on their grassy knoll obsession. That might keep them from discovering some facts distasteful to the Commission and to the police which the critics might have discovered if their efforts had been correctly focused from the start. It might not be too late even now to make amends and concentrate on finding out just what went on in buildings on Elm Street between 12.15 and 12.30 p.m. on Nov. 22 1963, especially on the sixth floor of 411 Elm, and to clarify the activities of the Dallas police and others in November 1963.

The following theory is based on speculation and some evidence: The assassination of president Kennedy was planned a considerable time in advance by a small group of people. Some of them were people of influence. The vacant position at the Texas School Book Depository in November was one of the instruments in the assassination plan. Oswald received orders to apply for that position. The building was considered to be one of the best locations for an ambush with a rifle, since the limousine could not escape out of range for a considerable length of time once it was on Elm Street and would drive almost directly away from the shooter. Shooting from a southeast corner window in the direction towards the overpass had the important advantage that the shooter could lean his left arm or shoulder against the window post and rest the left hand (supporting the rifle) on the window sill. This would give him a very stable aim at the target, especially when the direction of fire became more to the west and more parallel to the window as the limousine approached the overpass. The assassin had trained in advance by dry firing in that manner from a similar window.

Many incidents were staged in and around Dallas before the assassination, by impersonating Oswald in a way that would tend to incriminate him after the president was shot. Oswald kept his rifle in a garage in Irving while he lived at a boarding house in Oak Cliff. He usually went to Irving only on weekends. His routine was well known so removing his rifle (nr. C2766) at night from the garage shortly before November 22 was easy. Another rifle (C2566 ?) of the same type may or may not have been put in its place. Oswald's rifle was test fired by the assassin and a scope on it was adjusted.

Oswald had been ordered to be on the sixth floor of the book depository as the presidential limousine drove by, to take care of the doors or to be of assistance while another FBI man was at the window. A man resembling an FBI security man had entered the building with a rifle. He was not noticed by anyone in the building except Oswald, until some time after the shooting when he had put on a police uniform. Oswald did not recognize the rifle the man had, it may have been partly covered by something. Oswald was unaware that it was his rifle. Before the shooting the man was hiding between the window and a high wall of boxes.

After the assassination which may or may not have surprised Oswald, he went downstairs using the stairs. The shooter dropped the rifle on the floor behind some boxes, bending the scope out of alignment. Then he went to the toilet and put on a police uniform making him inconspicuous when the police searched the building shortly afterwards.

Oswald left the book depository a few minutes after the shooting. He soon learned that a man of his own description was wanted by the police. He then realized that he was suspected of shooting the president. After he was arrested the paraffin test result of his cheek turned out negative, since he had not fired a rifle.

Report: Kennedy mistress Exner aborted his child

A report - From USA Today 12/11/96

NEW YORK - Judith Campbell Exner, a reputed mistress of President John F. Kennedy, says in January's issue of Vanity Fair she aborted his child 10 months before he was assassinated. Exner, 62, was interviewed by syndicated columnist Liz Smith for the magazine due on newsstands in New York Wednesday. Excerpts appeared in New York newspapers Wednesday.

Exner says she ended her two-year affair with Kennedy in 1963 because she hated being "the other woman." Exner said she then went to Chicago and discovered she was carrying his child. Kennedy asked Exner if she wanted to have the baby, and then urged her to have Chicago mob boss Sam Giancana arrange for an illegal abortion. Exner has receipts for the January 1963 procedure performed at Grand Hospital, the magazine reported.

"I was 26 and in love," Exner says in the article. "Was I supposed to have better sense and more judgment than the president of the United States?" Kennedy was assassinated Nov. 22, 1963, in Dallas.

Exner, who is living in Orange County, Calif., with advanced bone and breast cancer, said she disclosed her abortion because she wanted to "demystify" the Kennedy legend. She said she never mentioned the story about the abortion in her 1977 autobiography, My Story, because "I was afraid for my life." Exner also said in the interview that she was Giancana's lover during Kennedy's presidency, and carried messages between the president and the gangster, including details of a plot to assassinate Cuban leader Fidel Castro.

She also said that former Attorney General Robert Kennedy, the president's brother, would often ask her at the White House if she felt "comfortable" carrying messages to Giancana.

"Judy, are you OK carrying these messages for us to Chicago?" Exner quotes Robert Kennedy as saying. "I always said I'd let him know if I didn't."

By The Associated Press

THOSE WERE THE DAYS

By Peter Dawnay. copyright, 1996

For me it all began one Sunday morning in February 1967. My fledgling publishing company had just been offered Joachim Joesten's second book in English on the assassination. It was entitled *Oswald: the truth*

From the beginning, the assassination story had puzzled me. How on earth, I remember thinking, could the police have tracked down the man they were looking for, to a cinema so far from the scene of the crime, and so quickly? But my suspicions were not yet aroused. I was just curious to know the secrets of such brilliant police work. It was only when Oswald was shot in the Dallas police station, that I realized that there had to be something afoot behind the scenes. Such an inconceivable happening required more than the banal and meaningless explanations that were being offered.

The more I thought about it, the more I realized that there could only be one answer: that Oswald was not only innocent of the crime of which he had been accused, but that he himself had been murdered, directly or indirectly, by the same people, whoever they might be, that had murdered Kennedy. How, and in what manner, such a conspiracy might have operated, I could not imagine. I didn't envy the Warren Commission their job. I had no idea how one could even begin to look for such a conspiracy. But that it existed, I had no doubt.

It was therefore with some degree of eagerness that, like millions of others, I bought the Warren Report on the morning of the first day that it was published. The paperback edition which I purchased proclaimed on its cover that the Report was essential reading for anyone who wished to know what was going on in the world. Little doubting that the Warren Commission would have made a serious effort to arrive at the truth, I turned the pages convinced that now the mystery would be resolved. But as I ploughed through the first chapter, my sense of anticipation turned to slack-jawed disbelief. Oswald really had done it all by himself. Again, like millions of others, I assumed that the Commission had the evidence to prove their case, and I never read beyond that first chapter. One day, I promised myself, I would plough through the evidence myself to see if there was something which the Commission had overlooked. But, of course, I never did.

I did, however, read Professor Trevor-Ropers' articles in the Sunday Times, and when Rush to Judgment and Inquest were published, I followed the controversy which they aroused in the press. I watched enraged as the eminent QC, Louis Blom-Cooper, savaged Lane during a television interview, and saw with disbelief the way in which the BBC presented the film of Rush to Judgment. It was clear that the establishment was closing ranks behind the Warren Commission and that there had to be a dark secret of which they were all scared to death.

This, then, was my frame of mind when I began to read the manuscript of Joesten's remarkable work, Oswald the truth. It gripped me from the first page, and I was unable to put it down. It was the first account of the assassination which I had read that made sense. Here, I realized, was a man who was prepared to call a spade a spade. Joesten did not hesitate to accuse the police of lying, and even dared them to sue him. Nor was he at all inhibited in his comments about the hallowed FBI and the equally prestigious Secret Service. The shots had come from the front, he declared, and the medical evidence had been fabricated. Oswald was not only innocent of killing Kennedy, he was innocent of killing Tippit too. He had been the victim of a skillful plot designed to place him unwittingly at the scene of the crime, and had been purposefully framed with planted evidence, the use of doubles, false testimony and even falser logic. Inconvenient witnesses had been systematically rubbed out, Oswald himself had been shot so as to ensure that he would never have to stand trial, and the media had been

skillfully manipulated.

The Warren Report, in short, had merely been a whitewash. The commission responsible for it had not sought to find the truth, they had sought to conceal it. Aided and abetted by the FBI, they had sold the public a pup, an entirely false account of what had occurred.

This, in 1967, was pretty heady stuff. Johnson was still regarded as a worthy successor to Kennedy. As for Kennedy himself, no whiff of the future scandals that were to tarnish his reputation, had yet been detected. He was still the sea-green incorruptible, the knight in shining armour, the fallen hero and the martyr. The myth that he had been slain by a demented fanatic had taken so strong a hold on people's minds that even to question it was to raise doubts about one's own sanity. I longed to publish Joesten's book but I had to ask myself what the consequences would be. Would I be sued for libel? Would I be pilloried by the press? Would anyone take the book seriously?

Joestens agent had given me a deadline. As it approached, I asked for, and got, a week's extension. As that extra week drew to a close, I was beginning reluctantly to conclude that I would have to turn the book down, but still remained undecided.

And then it happened. I was just after 8.00 a.m., on Sunday, February 19 and I was beginning slowly to open my eyes. I was aware dimly of a pounding of feet on the stairs, and of someone flinging my bedroom door open without ceremony. "Turn on your radio, I was told, in a voice that indicated that there was not a second to be lost. I stretched out an arm and flicked the switch. I was still half asleep, but within a trice I was more awake than I had ever been in my life. For coming over the air at that moment was the first news to reach the outside world that the District Attorney of New Orleans, Jim Garrison, was reopening the enquiry into the Kennedy assassination. He claimed to have been investigating the role of the city of New Orleans in the crime, to have made substantial progress, and to be on the verge of making arrests. Even from this brief news item, it was clear that, despite the findings of the Warren Commission, Garrison believed that there had been a conspiracy, that Oswald was not a lone assassin, and indeed, might not have been an assassin at all.

Whatever the case, as soon as I heard the report, there was no doubt left in my mind. The news was a godsend. It seemed like the opportunity of a lifetime, the sort of thing that young publishers only dream about. It was obvious what I had to do. By cutting every possible corner I would have to get the book out and into the bookshops within a matter of weeks. In those days, it usually took at least nine months from manuscript to publication, but I knew that I could not afford to wait that long.

Working round the clock, and calling in all the favours I was owed, I had about a third of the book in proof within days and was on my way to Calais for a meeting with Joesten. I found him living in a caravan on the outskirts of the town, with cautious and disbelieving eyes he gazed at the galleys. Never in his experience as an author, had he known a publisher to move with such speed. He seemed to be under the impression that I worked for M15. A Walter Mitty fantasy started to dawn in my mind, as I began to see myself as James Bond. "Well," I asked him, "if you think I am a secret agent, do you think I am a good one?" His answer came without hesitation. "Oh, absolutely brilliant," he replied. We both enjoyed the joke, and our laughter melted the ice and cleared the air. From that moment, we were friends.

By this time, with the indictment of Clay Shaw, it seemed likely that the most dramatic and extraordinary trial of the century would soon be under way. I could scarcely have foreseen at that point that it would take almost two years for the case to come to court. As the preliminaries to Shaw's trial dragged on, I was to publish five of Joesten's book, two of Harold Weisberg's, and a bimonthly newsletter of my own. Quickly, it became apparent that the British media was suppressing all the news coming out of New Orleans and that there was no easily accessible source of information that would keep me apprised of the latest developments in the Crescent City. Even in America, no newspapers reported what was going on, apart that

is from the two published in New Orleans itself, the curiously named Times-Picayune and States-Item, one a morning paper and the other an evening one. I took out subscriptions to both, but since they came by surface mail, I usually received them some six to eight weeks late. Nonetheless, they made fascinating reading. The developments in the case, and almost all Garrison's pronouncements, could only be described as sensational, but the British public was left entirely in the dark as to what was going on.

Just as ignorant as the public of developments in the case, were the journalists themselves. One day in the summer of 1968, I spoke separately to two reporters working for different publications. When I mentioned Garrison to them, their reactions were identical. In tones of utter incredulity, they asked: "Is the Garrison enquiry still going on?" In each case, it was said with a gasp.

Just as extraordinary was the eerie silence with which Joesten's books were greeted. Other books that I published, none of which were as unusual or potentially sensational as Joesten's, would be sent out to some thirty odd newspapers and magazines for review, and most of them would get at least a dozen notices. But Joesten's were simply ignored. It was almost as if the review copies had disappeared down a black hole. But not quite. For on December 14, 1967, a counterblast was launched against Joesten of such virulence as almost to take one's breath away. It appeared in The Times Literary Supplement and was signed, though probably not written by, no less prestigious a figure than the warden of All Souls College, Oxford, Mr. John Sparrow. Running to some 18,000 words, it dealt at considerable length with all the critics, but Sparrow's spleen and venom was reserved for Joesten. The vituperation and abuse which he heaped on the brave man's head, showed clearly that his work had touched on a very raw nerve indeed. For unlike other critics who had confined themselves to a discussion of the Commission's methods and procedures, Joesten had proposed an alternative solution to that which Warren had adopted.

The significance of this astonishing and quite unprecedented attack only became apparent to me years later when I read a document which Mark Lane and Harold Weisberg, by using the Freedom of Information Act, had forced out of the CIA. It was a directive sent to a few selected Chiefs of Station around the world, including the one in London, entitled "Countering Criticism of the Warren Report," and despatched, curiously enough, on April 1, 1967. Its recipients were warned that a new wave of books and articles had appeared which criticized the Commission's findings and that as a result, belief in the report, as shown by the polls, was steadily diminishing. The fear was expressed that polls abroad might show similar, "or even more adverse", results.

The directive pointed out that this trend was a matter of concern to the U.S. government and to "our organization," which was directly involved. Not only had it contributed information to the investigation, but suspicion had been frequently thrown on it by conspiracy theories "falsely alleging that Lee Harvey Oswald worked for us." The aim of the dispatch was "to provide material for countering and discrediting the claims of the conspiracy theorists, so as to inhibit the circulation of such claims in other countries." For this purpose, background information was supplied in a series of attachments to the despatch. The first of these was entitled: "Background Survey of Books Concerning the Assassination of President Kennedy." Paragraph 2 of this attachment dealt largely with Joesten, who, it said, had been "publicly revealed as a one time member of the German Communist Party." The source for this information was 'A Gestapo document of 8 November, 1937 among the German Foreign Ministry files microfilmed in England and now returned to West German custody.' This document showed that Joesten's party book was numbered 532315 and was dated May 12, 1932."

The directive suggested that where discussion of the assassination was active, its recipients should "discuss the publicity problem with liaison and friendly elite contacts (especially politicians and editors), pointing that the Warren commission made as thorough an investigation as was humanly possible," and that the charges of the critics were without foundation. Further speculative discussion, they were advised, would only play into the hands

of "the opposition," and as part of the conspiracy talk appeared to be deliberately generated by Communist propagandists, they were urged to use their influence to discourage "unfounded and irresponsible speculation. For the purposes of refuting the attacks of the critics, they were advised," book reviews and feature articles were particularly appropriate."

With the continued delays in the Shaw trial, my financial position became more and more precarious. I held on grimly, convinced that Shaw would eventually be convicted, and that that would prove to be my salvation. When he was finally acquitted, I was in too deep to be able to get out. But those two years, from 1967 to 1969, when I was compelled to close down my operation for lack of funds were perhaps the most interesting and exciting of my life. I discovered how easy it was for those with the necessary power and influence to manipulate the press and mislead the public. And I discovered how closely, even without two-way TV screens, "Big brother" watches us.

Little do I have imagined when I folded my tent in 1969 and stole away into the dark, that some twenty-seven years later, I would be attending the first European Conference on the Kennedy assassination.

Peter Dawnay, 1996

CUBANS REVEAL JFK ASSASSINATION SECRETS TO US. RESEARCHERS

By Dick Russell

NASSAU, Bahamas--On a full moon in early December, from Havana and many parts of the U.S. a select group of about 25 people converged for a historic gathering. For two years Wayne Smith - former American Ambassador to Cuba and today at the Center for International Policy in Washington where he is a leading supporter of improved U.S. -Cuban relations - had been working to arrange a conference between American scholars of the Kennedy assassination and Cuban officials.

Until now, whatever secret knowledge that Cuban files contained about events leading to the tragedy in Dallas on November 22, 1963, had remained largely hidden. But the Havana delegation included General Fabian Escalante, the former chief of Cuba's G-2 intelligence agency, and his longtime assistant Arturo Rodriguez. Also on hand was Carlos Lechuga, Cuba's Ambassador to the United Nations in 1963, with whom the Kennedy Administration had been privately working toward an accommodation with the island nation 90 miles from U.S. shores.

General Escalante, today the Director of an Institute for National Security Studies in Havana, has been heading a private Cuban investigation into the JFK case since 1992. Now 55, Escalante remains a close associate of Premier Fidel Castro, so clearly his project had the highest sanction. What he promised was a sneak preview of a new book on the assassination authored by himself and Rodriguez, to be published by Ocean Press in 1996.

Portents were in the air from the outset. The road to the Nassau conference site was called John F. Kennedy Drive. The hotel bartender's name turned out to be Oswald. The Assassination Records Review Board, an official body in Washington established to review for public release all still-hidden government records relating to JFK's assassination, sent a representative. Anticipation quickly built among prominent American experts including Anthony Summers, Peter Dale Scott, John Newman, and Gaeton Fonzi.

None came away disappointed from two-and-a-half days of intense discussions. More than ever, the Cubans' revelations pointed toward an American conspiracy to assassinate the 35th President. "We believe Kennedy became an obstacle to U.S. military aggression against Cuba," as Escalante put it. "There were two objectives to the plot - to kill Kennedy and blame Cuba for the crime."

The Cubans presented considerable new evidence linking right-wing Cuban exiles, renegade CIA officials, organized crime figures and possibly wealthy Texans to the conspiracy - a complex scenario in which accused assassin Lee Harvey Oswald was set up as a "Patsy" whose history would implicate Cuba and their Soviet allies. It is a matter of record that, after the Cuban Missile Crisis brought the U.S. and Soviet Union to the brink of nuclear war in the autumn of 1962.

President Kennedy's agreement with Premier Nikita Khrushchev was that America would not attempt further overthrow of Castro or another invasion of Cuba. U.S.-Soviet relations began to thaw and, although on its own the CIA continued to plot the assassination of Castro, the Kennedy Administration simultaneously began seeking a rapprochement with Cuba.

According to Escalante, anti-Castro Cuban exiles got wind of Kennedy's effort soon after the Missile Crisis. Felipe Vidal Santiago, who was arrested on a sabotage mission into Cuba in March 1964, told the Cubans that he had traveled to Washington, D.C. in December 1962 and met with a lawyer/lobbyist connected to a Citizen's Committee to Free Cuba. The lawyer informed Vidal of a conversation he'd had with Henry Cabot Lodge, who said he had heard from Kennedy aide Walt Rostow of "a plan to open a dialogue with Cuba." "Vidal told us he was very surprised," says Escalante, "went back to Miami and told Colonel William Bishop, who worked for the CIA, and the Cuban exiles about this. It was almost like a bomb, an intentional message..... against Kennedy." (From other sources it is known that Vidal was also an information conduit for General Edwin Walker, the ultra-right Texan whom Oswald allegedly took a shot at in April 1963. FBI files reveal that Vidal was a "very close friend" of Mobster John Martino, who apparently had foreknowledge of the JFK conspiracy.)

At the end of April 1963, ex Marine Oswald - only nine months back from a two -and-a-half year "defection" to the Soviet Union - moved to New Orleans and set up a one-man chapter of his pro-Castro Fair Play for Cuba Committee. This coincided with Kennedy's planned overture toward Cuba becoming a matter of record inside the National Security Council. By this time, the Administration was clamping down on CIA-backed Cuban exile raids against Cuba; the exiles, in turn, began publicly accusing Kennedy of betraying their cause.

"By mid-1963, we had infiltrated a special group within the CIA," says Escalante. "A CIA official came to a safe house in Miami and said to a group of Cuban exiles, 'You must eliminate Kennedy.'"

The Cubans did not know this CIA man's name. But they knew plenty about David Atlee Phillips, another CIA official who ran covert operations out of its Mexico City station in 1963. For years, it has been speculated that Phillips was really "Maurice Bishop," whom exile leader Antonio Veciana told congressional investigators in 1976 had been his CIA case officer and was involved in numerous assassination plots against Castro. Most significant, Veciana claimed "Bishop" introduced him to Oswald at a meeting in Dallas in September 1963. Although Phillips' physical description was a near-match for that provided by Veciana, the exile would never positively identify Phillips as "Bishop." And Phillips, who died in 1988, vehemently denied using the alias or working with Veciana.

Now the Cubans say they have strong evidence that "Bishop" was indeed Phillips. "In 1979, Veciana told one of our informants in Miami he had been pushed by the House Select Committee on Assassinations and had given a fake name to the CIA officer, but that it was David Phillips," says Escalante. A close friend of Veciana also told us Phillips had threatened Veciana so he would not reveal his true identity. Further corroboration came from a third Cuban informant who had delivered a written message from Phillips to Veciana in 1959, when both men were still in Havana.

One of Phillips' close associates was a CIA officer named David Morales, who operated out of Miami. Escalante says that Morales was identified by Rolando Cubela as

"one of the officials" who spoke with him in Paris in September 1963 about assassinating Castro. The timing was most interesting indeed. Cubela, a Cuban official/"double agent" given the code name AM/LASH by the CIA, was picking up his weaponry at the very moment of Kennedy's assassination. Cubela, also known to have ties to Florida Mob leader Santos Trafficante, Jr. was finally arrested in Cuba in 1966.

Trafficante was one of several gangsters hired by the CIA to recruit Cuban exiles into assassination plots against Castro. His casino operations had been shut down when Castro's revolution took power in 1959, when Trafficante was briefly imprisoned. Upon returning to Florida in 1960, Trafficante found himself among the leading targets of Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

A recent book by the late Trafficante's attorney, Frank Ragano, contains allegations that the mobster may have worked with New Orleans boss Carlos Marcello and Teamster's Union leader Jimmy Hoffa in helping plan Kennedy's assassination. New information revealed at the Nassau conference tends to support Ragano's statements.

The Cubans' information came from Tony Cuesta, a Cuban exile leader taken prisoner there during a 1966 raid. "Cuesta was blinded [in an explosion] and spent most of his time in the hospital," Escalante recalls. In 1978, he was among a group of imprisoned exiles released through an initiative of the Carter Administration. "A few days before he was to leave," Escalante continues, "I had several conversations with him and he wrote out a declaration. Cuesta volunteered, 'I want to tell you something very important, but I do not want this made public. Because I am returning to my family in Miami, and this could be very dangerous.' I think this was a little bit of thanks on his part for the medical care he received."

Escalante says he is only revealing Cuesta's story because the exile died in 1994. In his written statement, Cuesta named two other exiles who he said were involved in Kennedy's assassination. "We asked, but he did not want to be questioned further about this," Escalante adds.

The two were Eladjo del Valle and Hermino Di'az Garcia. Del Valle was murdered in Miami in 1967, on the same night that David Ferrie, an associate of his - and of Lee Harvey Oswald - supposedly committed suicide in New Orleans, just as Ferrie was about to be questioned by District Attorney Jim Garrison about the assassination.

According to Escalante, del Valle served in both military intelligence and the judicial police under the regime of Fulgencio Batista, the Cuban dictator ousted by Castro. "Del Valle was in charge of narcotics in a little town south of Havana, where he had business dealings with Santos Trafficante," Escalante says Cuban files show. After Castro triumphed, del Valle fled to Miami and formed the Anti-Communist Cuban Liberation Movement.

"We managed to penetrate this organization," says Escalante. "We came to know a lot of plans for invasions, secret overflights to provide arms to internal rebel groups. David Ferris was the pilot for some of these flights. One of our agents talked on many occasions with del Valle, who in 1962 told him that Kennedy must be killed to solve the Cuban problem."

Hermino Diaz Garcia died during the same 1966 Cuban raid on which Tony Cuesta was arrested. Diaz was "a hit-man from the '40s [onwards], part of a gangster group in Cuba [before Castro]." On behalf of Dominican Republic dictator Rafael Trujillo, the Cubans say he was enlisted in an assassination plot against Costa Rica's President Jose Figueres in 1956. "They were arrested in Costa Rica and expelled to Mexico, but Diaz Garcia killed several persons in the 1950's."

"In 1960, he was a bodyguard to Santos Trafficante," continues Escalante. "He left Cuba at the end of 1962 via Mexico. We knew he was in Miami working with Trafficante and Tony Varona." (Varona was another Cuban exile since identified as having been part of the CIA-Mafia plots against Castro). But, until Cuesta's revelation, the Cubans had never suspected Diaz Garcia of involvement in Kennedy's death.

Further substantiation concerning Cuesta's story-and del Valle's role - was earlier

provided this writer by Richard Case Nagell, a "double agent" for the CIA and Soviet intelligence whose body was found last November 1 in Los Angeles. As documented in my book, The Man Who Knew Too Much,

Nagell penetrated several plans to assassinate Kennedy during the 1962-63 period, all of which involved embittered Cuban exiles. Nagell would never reveal the true identities of two exiles whom he said had deceived Oswald into falsely believing they were Castro operatives. But, every time I probed him, Nagell always steered the conversation to Tony Cuesta- indicating that this particular man possessed the knowledge he himself didn't want to express. Nagell also said he had observed del Valle conversing with one of the Oswald-linked exiles in Miami early in 1963.

In September 1963, a little more than two months before the assassination U N. Ambassador Lechna was contacted by Kennedy representative William Attwood. "He told me this was a private initiative," Lechna recalls. "We spoke on three occasions, trying to break the ice between the countries, and Attwood said we should begin an agenda for a dialogue. He mentioned the idea came from Kennedy, but Attwood said it was very very important to keep these conversations secret because if the Republicans found out, there would be a huge scandal in Congress."

Lechna adds that he was initially surprised by the American approach, because clearly efforts to undermine Cuba were continuing at the same juncture. As Escalante explains "There was a double track happening. One path was continued sabotage and isolation of Cuba, to force us to sit down at the negotiating table under very disadvantageous conditions. This is why we never got to hear what the possible North American agenda could be. This is why the Cuban government took its time to deeply study Attwood proposal. In our view, one strategy was coming from the Administration and the other from the CIA, Cuban exiles and Mafia. Even they had their own independent objectives. Around that developed this felt need to assassinate Kennedy. Once they killed him, the agenda of course never came to pass."

The Cubans are convinced that word about the secret negotiations leaked out to the Kennedy conspirators, who then escalated a campaign that was planned to culminate with Kennedy's assassination and an invasion of Cuba. Also in September 1963, Rolando Cubela traveled to Brazil to meet with contacts about killing Castro. Beside his connections to Trafficante, Cubela also an associate of Eladio del Valle.

Simultaneously, an American journalist, Daniel Harker, interviewed Castro at a gathering inside Bavaria's Brazilian Embassy. Harker's article quoted Castro as saying "United States leaders should think that if they assist in terrorist plans to eliminate Cuban leaders, they themselves will not be safe." The story was widely disseminated in the American press, including New Orleans where Oswald was living, and was later used by right-wing U.S. elements in attempts to demonstrate that Castro had retaliated against JFK. But Escalante says the article was a distortion. What Castro really stated was: "American leaders should be careful, because [anti-Castro operations] were something nobody could control." He was not threatening JFK, but rather warning him about the CIA.

Toward the end of September, Oswald made plans to travel to Mexico City. On the way, he showed up at the door of a Cuban exile, Silvia Odio, in Dallas in the company of two Latins who identified themselves as "Angel" and "Leopoldo." They said they were soliciting funds for a moderate Cuban exile organization called JURE, to which Odio also belonged. After the visit, "Leopoldo" telephoned Odio and described their American companion as "kind of loco" he could go either way. He could do anything- like getting underground in Cuba, like killing Castro. He says we should have shot President Kennedy after the Bay of Pigs."

The set-up was obviously in motion. The Cuban hypothesis is that the Odio incident had a dual design. For the JURE group was run by Manuel Ray, a Left-wing exile leader opposed by the CIA but working closely with the Kennedy Administration. Escalante's hypothesis: "The U.S. was going to demand, in their negotiations, that Manuel Ray be part of a new Cuban government. But Angel and Leopoldo's presence at Silvia Odio's might later

serve as a [false] link to JURE as Castro agents who then killed Kennedy."

The Cubans revealed their conclusion that "Angel" and "Leopoldo" were tied to a far-right exile group called the Revolutionary Student Directorate (DRE), which operated under the CTA's umbrella. It was the DRE's propagandists who actively sought to tie Oswald to Cuba immediately after the assassination. Escalante offered a possible identification of "Angel" as a DRE leader, Isidro Borja, who was of Mexican descent and closely resembled a man seen standing behind Oswald in a famous photograph, helping pass out Fair Play for Cuba leaflets in New Orleans.

On September 27, 1963, Oswald showed up three times at the Cuban Consulate in Mexico City, asking for an immediate visa to travel to Cuba. He is now known to have visited the Soviet Embassy on the same day. There has been speculation that this could have been an imposter posing as Oswald, but the Cubans maintain it was definitely Oswald. Besides three Consulate personnel who met directly with him, two new witnesses interviewed by Escalante in 1993 said they have no doubt as to his identity.

Oswald's travel request at the Consulate was turned down. He was told he would first need a Soviet visa, which would take several months, and he angrily stormed out, returning to Dallas shortly thereafter. "We believe Oswald was acting according to a plan - to travel to Cuba for a few days, in order to appear as a Cuban agent, with the whole story to come out after the assassination," says Escalante. "When that operation failed, I think David Phillips set up to have letters addressed to Oswald from Havana, through the Cuban mail."

On the final day of the conference, a slide show depicted five letters addressed to Oswald from inside Cuba. Two were dated before the assassination, and three more in its immediate aftermath. One of these letters was intercepted by Cuban authorities in 1963, and had never before been made public. Dated November 14, 1963, and addressed to "Lee Harvey Oswald, Royalton Hotel, Miami," it was signed "Jorge." According to Arturo Rodriguez, "The text has a conspiratorial character. It was written on the same kind of typewriter as two other letters, which the FBI concluded were composed on the same machine. We think all these letters were written by the same person - as part of the plan to blame our country for the assassination."

On the weekend before the assassination, according to information revealed to Cuban intelligence by Felipe Vidal Santiago, Vidal says he was invited to a meeting in Dallas by Colonel William Bishop of the CIA. "It was a meeting with a few wealthy people to talk of financing anti-Castro operations," says Escalante. "Bishop left on his own several times for interviews. After approximately four days, they returned to Miami."

Not long before his death in 1993, Colonel Bishop confirmed to this writer that he had knowledge of the JFK plot. The Cubans indicate that the Vidal-Bishop trip to Dallas concerned the firming-up of plans for re-taking Cuba once Castro's people had been falsely implicated in the assassination.

Escalante summarizes "that Oswald was an intelligence agent of the U.S. - CIA, FBI, military, or all of these, we don't know. He was manipulated, told he was penetrating a group of Cuban agents that wanted to kill Kennedy. But from the very beginning, he was to be the element to blame Cuba.

We think it was planned to kill Oswald immediately after the assassination, or maybe when he made the date to the theater (where he was arrested an hour after the assassination.) "We do not know why this did not happen." (Jack Ruby killed Oswald two days later inside the Dallas police station)

Escalante also theorizes that "not less than 15 persons took part [in the assassination], because there were several shooters. There had to be communication teams, to inform about when the [Kennedy] caravan was coming. They needed support elements, and a way to go out from Dallas. At the same time, knowing a little about CIA projects, there is the principle of de-concentrated operations-independent parties each with a specific role, to guarantee compartmentalization and keep it simple."

The Nassau gathering marked what is anticipated will be an ongoing exchange between Cuban and American researchers into the assassination. The hope is that access to Cuban

documentation might be provided in the future, such as the written "declaration" of Tony Cuesta. For now, the fact that former Cuban intelligence officials are willing to share their inside knowledge already signifies a momentous occasion in the continuing effort to solve the haunting mystery of who really killed JFK.

JOHN RUDD REFLECTS ON THE CONFERENCE

I am an electrical contractor with an office in Liverpool where my daughter Becky is secretary. From May to July my office was first a conference bureau and second an electrical firm, it was not unusual to receive forty calls a day regarding the conference. I would like to say a very special thanks to my conference assistant, daughter and business secretary Becky, without her assistance in dealing with over eight hundred enquiries over the phone and mail I would not have been able to achieve what was done.

The first letter about the conference was sent out in the middle of May and ten weeks later the first European conference on the assassination of president John F. Kennedy took place. It was a huge success and not just for those that attended the conference and the speakers but also for the British media coverage, the interest shown by the media was tremendous much more than I could have imagined. After the conference, I spoke about the British media coverage to some of the American researchers and they said this conference got more media coverage than any other event relating to JFK's assassination since the assassination.

The following is a small example of the British media coverage leading up to the conference. The interview stretched from the South of England to the North of Scotland, a few Irish stations and a request from New York. Walt Brown (keynote speaker) was swamped by the British media before he left America. His first interview was a week before he left for England. Walt, Dr Charles Crenshaw and I were hooked up in a live radio link with Radio Five Live that went well. Walt landed at Heathrow airport, London on Wednesday, 24th July at 9.15 and was due to be interviewed at Euston station by a newspaper before he boarded the 11.05am train to Liverpool. The next interview was at Radio Merseyside set for 2.15pm, he made it with minutes to spare. The next morning I and Walt sat in the BBC Radio Merseyside studio at 8.30am talking to Radio Scotland then 9.00am for Radio Five Live, 10am I was due to talk to Radio Wales and Walt was on Radio City at 10.30am. I finished my interview at 10.30am and went along to Radio City to sit with Walt for the fourth Radio interview in two hours. This was the pattern for the next six days but not only with radio, we had to accommodate the TV stations and newspapers and magazines. If any of you have any press articles regarding the conference, could you please copy them and send them to me. I am sending as many press articles as possible to our speakers for their scrap books.

The conference was reported on CNN, Sky TV, BBC TV, ITV, and over seventy radio stations, most interviews were live broadcasts. I was involved in over thirty radio interviews with about twenty-five going out live and lasting from ten to thirty minutes long. During the interviews I was asked the same question many times, "Why after 33 years are you interested in the assassination of Kennedy". My answer most time was about the injustice to Lee Harvey Oswald and how could a government be allowed to dupe the people and offer them the 26 volumes of the Warren Commission. Finally after being asked this question more time than you could imagine, I answered their question with a question.

"Why are you all interested why I am interested? There must be a huge interest by yourselves for so many Radio and TV stations to still be interested"

I was due to be one of the speakers but due to the amount of time it takes to organise a conference I found it impossible to research my topics for the planned forty five minute

presentation which would have covered the following:

- 1) "The acoustical evidence".
- 2) "Late arrivals", which would have included amongst others, John Elrod, James Files, Ron Lewis and Shari Angel.
- 3) The last part of my talk would have been similar to Fred Litwins article, "A Conspiracy To Big".

Having the conference in Liverpool during the summer was a good idea when Wayne Smith informed me that this was the week to suit our American speakers. Some of our speakers are also school teachers and the week we chose was during school holidays. The last weekend in July is holiday time in Britain and many potential attendees told me of their disappointment in not being able to attend due to holidays abroad. If we are to have a conference in 1997 we will have to think hard and make many contacts to potential speakers to try and get a suitable weekend for all and possibly include the Friday to make room for more presentations. If you are interested in helping to arrange next years conference please contact me.

In conclusion I would like to say thanks to the people who helped me over the two days of the conference:

All of my family for their support and my good friend Dougy Bogg. Between them they controlled things outside the main room. Paul Mahon, Robert Mahon and Steve for the excellent audio and video arrangements. Wayne Smith for the conception, I said in the conference program that it was Wayne's idea to have a conference outside of the USA. I had envisaged a conference in Liverpool for many years but Wayne gave me the push to do it sooner than I could have imagined. The Britannia Adelphi Hotel and the Merseyside Tourist Board for their help and support. Danny Rudd, my son, Walt Brown and Rick Nelson for their assistance for seven days before during and after the conference. Their expertise with the media was brilliant. Just when I thought I was going to give way to the pressure they all came to my rescue and took over the handling of the media. A very sincere thank you, to everyone that attended the Conference, it was all made worthwhile by the enthusiasm shown by all.

BACK ISSUES

Many of our members have requested information on back issues of the Journal but until now it has been a difficult request to comply with as the original proofs have not been available. I am therefore pleased to advise, that with the support of Pat Kelly, we have managed to produce a compendium of back issues. They are bound in the same fashion as the current Journal but each compendium contains 3 issues, ie one contains issues 1-3 and the other issues 4-6.

Because of the considerable time required to produce them I have a very limited number for sale, so it will be on a first come, first served basis. Price will be £8 for each set of three, postage paid. Please contact me direct if you wish to order.

Tony Saunders
