

First 5 pp excellent except for refusal to correct misstatement about Commission and autopsy film.

6

7

8

9 "Second" their but not accurate formulation.

10

12

Leans over too far to official story where not necessary

Whe do I get my books back from Ann

James McKinley
7309 NW Maple Lane
Kansas City, Missouri 64151

HOT!

11/10/75 MA
E. ASAS MA

Mr. Weisberg - The first
five pages cannot be changed. Research

"A bad man shot my daddy in the head with a rifle."

John F. Kennedy, Jr.

manifesto
P. 673

2

pub. fall '64

Twelve years ago, just after release of the Warren Commission's Report, ^{OK}
almost everyone knew who the bad man with the rifle was. Lee Harvey Oswald ⁺
had killed President John F. Kennedy. Oswald and Oswald alone had ambushed
the President, according to the Report, in the way described in last month's
article on the Kennedy assassination. Surely that was clear, documented in ^{also}
~~twenty-seven~~ ^{added of testimony + exhibits} volumes which overwhelmed the early tremors of suspicion about ⁺
a plot, which calmed the first wave of rumors launched by the shock of the ²⁶
President's death and by the nearly incredible end of his accused assassin. ^{OK}
True, eccentrics like Bertrand Russell might immediately attack the Report. ⁺
from abroad, but that was typical of the Old World, where assassination ⁺
conspiracies had for centuries been common. Not so, most of us thought, ^{Weisberg}
here in the New World. With the exceptions of John Wilkes Booth's band of ^{London}
anti-Lincolmites and Truman's two Puerto Rican attackers, our Presidential ^{Sunder}
assassins had proved to be lone, maddened men. They were small, white, ^{Tin}
young, coming from disturbed homes, and possessed by a murderous cause. ^{W.R. 475}
^{OK} ^{OK} ^{vt-f}

26
27

Akan-298

S. 1/2

Was not this Lee Harvey Oswald exactly that sort of ~~sort~~ Could anyone reasonably doubt he was the bad man with a rifle?

Today, seven out of ten Americans believe Oswald was not the only bad man. Since 1965 when the first sustained serious attacks on the Report were

mounted, skepticism about the Warren Commission's conclusion has risen steadily. +

Many reasons have been offered. Perhaps the Cold War's climate contributed, with its ceaseless talk of spy conspiracies, with Joe McCarthy finding Reds

under every rug. Or maybe, some say, our refusal to believe was born in the exponential increase of madness in the land when the murder of a President was

followed by the lacerating atrocities of Vietnam, by more assassinations, by civil riots, by the crippling absurdities of Watergate, finally by the dis-

closures of FBI and CIA crimes, until Americans, swirled in cyclones of cynicism, were ready to believe anything was possible. Perhaps, others suggest, it has

from the first been the sheer incongruity of that weak-chinned Oswald bringing down the hero of PT 109 that galled us beyond belief. But these explanations

beg the point.

The Warren Report is doubted because its responsible critics have raised vital and persevering questions about the Commission's conclusions, and about

its procedures, its sins of commission and omission, in arriving at those conclusions. Obviously, the most important conclusions were those on the solidity

of the physical evidence against Oswald, and on the reciprocal question of a conspiracy (clearly they are reciprocal, because the more the physical evidence

points to Oswald alone, the less likelihood there is of others involved unless

69- Watergate break

ok

+ who was who +

←

+

Oswald was the victim of an impossibly complex

you believe in super-human frame-ups. In what follows we will look, as objectively as possible, at the key elements of the physical evidence and at the plausible possibilities of conspiracy, with the warning that the enormity of data on the Kennedy assassination prevents examination of more than the major elements and theories. There are, after all, well over one hundred books and broadsides in English alone dealing with ~~the assassination~~ John Kennedy's murder (many more in other languages). There are hundreds of magazine articles, scores of broadcast transcripts, along with uncounted news accounts, films, novels, plays, records, slide-collections, and assorted elements of an informational deluge unprecedented in our history of assassinations (and certainly, a measure of its powerful aftershock).

Indeed, the central strength of the Warren Report is its monolithic character, for the critics have no single alternative. If one rejects the Commission's findings, for example, in the matter of where guns were fired in Dealey Plaza, you have a wide choice (as the accompanying schematic shows).

Similarly, if you reject Oswald as a solitary killer, you can choose conspirators from the Russians, Castro, dissident elements of the CIA and FBI (with Oswald perhaps an agent for each and all), or the Teamsters-cum-Mafia-cum-CIA, or Lyndon Johnson, or H.L. Hunt-style Texas right-wingers acting for God, country and LBJ. You can consider anti-Castro Cubans incensed over the Bay of Pigs, the Minutemen, the Klan, an embryonic military junta (assisted by military intelligence and key industrial leaders), the Dallas Police Force, or New Orleans homosexuals connected with organized crime and the CIA (the CIA is, understandably, most often involved in speculations on the assassination).

Arlene - If Castroites is an acceptable word McKinley is for that to make this more parallel

You even have your choice of Oswalds, two or even more, and one can be +
 a programmed Manchurian candidate. All have been proposed, and with +
intriguing, if sometimes tenuous, circumstantial evidence. In many +
 instances the theories overlap in rings of persons and places rippling OR
 out from the central incident of the killing in Dealey Plaza to encompass
 so much (out as far as Watergate) that one wonders +

(if any conspiracy could be so huge and remain secret
 for so long. Three or four men, perhaps, yes, that's plausible, but
 many more . . . well, why didn't they just wait and vote Kennedy out? *Why?*

Yet the fact that the Report's critics cannot agree on every specific point
 (except that Oswald alone didn't do it) should not disqualify their views, +
 especially those buttressed by the persuasive evidence some have unearthed.
 Neither should the fact that ^{reported} assassination buffs take extreme, even
 lunatic positions, cast doubt on the painstakingly documented work of
 others. They are people working without the resources available to the
 U.S. Government, who have been largely dependent upon the Government (which
 most of them don't trust) and on the media (which is not always trust-
 worthy) for their information. If various of them are open to charges
 of being careerists out for a fast buck, or trendy egomaniacs, or paranoids
 in the twilight of logic, or erectors of vast clockwork systems in which
 human error does not exist and every act is linked with all others, then
 they are little worse than the Government itself, which through the Warren
 Commission failed to answer the question for good and all, who killed
 John Kennedy. It was, we must remember, the Government who had that

responsibility and the resources to discharge it. It was the FBI who
 out of guilt or vainglory decided after Kennedy's death to cover-up a
 threatening note of Lee Harvey Oswald to Agent James Hosty that fateful
 week in Dallas. It was the FBI and the Commission's staff who it seems
 persuaded some witnesses to agree with the Commission's already-conceived
 view. It was the Warren Commission who failed, when it was crucial, to
 view, let alone release Kennedy's autopsy photos and X-rays so that his
 nation might be assured just how he died. It was the Commission's failure
 to call certain witnesses or to credit only selected others that fueled
 suspicion of their findings. It was the Commission's questionable inter-
 pretations of ballistics data, its strained reconstructions of the crime,
 its unwillingness to pick up beguiling threads of inquiry, its seeming
 blindness to the conspiratorial connotations of Oswald's odd life, that
 aroused the critics (excluding Mark Lane, who as Marguerite Oswald's
 lawyer came first into the field more as a defender of the murdered Oswald's
 right to be presumed innocent). And there are other governmental tics to
 match the gaffes of the Report's detractors, especially when considering
 the possibility of conspiracy.

But before anyone can talk of conspiracy, or of the one deranged
 Oswald, we must go back to Dealey Plaza, to the critical physical facts
 of evidence. All theories begin with these. Some may end with them,
 for upon the facts of ballistics, the autopsy, the photographic records,
 and the location of Lee Harvey Oswald everything depends.

MORE TO COME

all cleared
 cw/McK...
 at first

distinctly
 members of

and to a lesser degree
 the Secret Service

and less so the
 secret service

Lane said he
 would drop
 case if
 Oswald guilty
 was long

OK Wash...

?

+

+

+

+

+

+

++

+

Although it does not mean Lee Oswald killed Kennedy, there is little doubt he ordered the Mannlicher-Carcano which did slay the President. The handwriting on the order to Klein's Sporting Goods of Chicago (and on the order for a .38 Smith and Wesson revolver ordered from Seaport Traders, Inc., Los Angeles) has been identified as Oswald's. Both weapons were ordered by "A. Hidell," a name also appearing, with minor variations, on counterfeit identification found in Oswald's wallet after his arrest in the Texas Theater on November 22 about 1:50 p.m. CST, shortly after Officer J.D. Tippit had been killed with the .38 Smith and Wesson. Both guns were sent in March, 1963, to P.O. Box 2915, Dallas, which had been rented by a "Lee H. Oswald" whose handwriting and signature matched that of "A. Hidell." Thus, at least so far as their purchase is concerned, the linkage is strong between both Oswald and the rifle found at the Texas School Book Depository and the gun that *allegedly* killed Tippit. Of course, whether they use them or not, lots of people buy guns. Most do not use aliases, which raises the question why Oswald did. No-one knows, though some psychiatrists have suggested Oswald may have recognized himself as a split personality, the good Lee struggling against the evil Hidell. Such metaphysics don't explain the curious alias itself, though. Why not Smith or Jones? A Marine acquaintance of Oswald's, John R. Heindel, opined that Lee merely used his name, which was frequently mispronounced as "Hidell" to rhyme with "Rydell." Marina Oswald suggested a more sinister reason in view of speculations about Oswald's possible motive, that "Hidell" was derived from "Fidel," a sign of Lee's admiration for Castro--as manifested the spring of 1963 in New Orleans when he formed a chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, himself as sole member and "A.J. Hidell" as president

("Hidell" had a P.O. Box there, too). (Incidentally, Marina signed the membership card which Lee had printed, but despite her epic helpfulness to the Commission (a product, Marguerite Oswald sniggered, of tender loving care by the Secret Service) she later was unsure just when and how she learned her husband sometimes thought about himself as "Hidell.")

- but she was actually pressurized by the FBI

X

Clearly, Oswald himself, or someone, believed "Hidell" deserved conclusive evidence of existence. Among the identification cards found on Oswald were two clever bits of forgery, both in the name "Alek James Hidell" (during his Russian exile, Marina said, Lee was called Alek). They were a draft card and a certificate of service in the U.S. Marine Corps, each made of prints from doctored photographic negatives (the Warren Commission said of Oswald's original ID) which were pasted back-to-back. Oswald knew quite a bit about photography. He'd had some experience in the Marines, and his best job in Dallas had been as a photolitho processor with Jagers-Chiles-Stovall, a graphic arts firm. Then, too, after he was arrested in the Tippit chase, Lee told Dallas police in the course of his aggressive uncooperativeness that the photos they'd scavenged from Marina's lodgings in Irving, showing him posed with rifle, pistol and leftist publications, were fakes, that he knew someone had pasted his head on somebody else's body and shot a new negative. (The Warren Commission expert said no, but other experts have said yes, the background shadows are inconsistent with the face shadows and the relative size of head and body are peculiar.) But even if, as seems likely, Oswald created "Hidell" and bought guns for

body with head is different

?

him, it does not prove he killed the President.

More germane are the questions, did Oswald ever practice with the Mannlicher, and did he have it with him that November 22? Marina, again, said she remembered Lee working the bolt and squinting through the sight in New Orleans in May, 1963 (oddly, she also once told the Secret Service that the rifle she saw in New Orleans had no telescopic sight, although the Mannlicher-Carcano had come with a cheap four-power scope). She also said on other occasions in Dallas she saw him clean it and work the bolt. Once, Marina said, he took the rifle concealed in a raincoat, saying he was going to practice shooting. A Russian friend of the Oswalds (they were often among the emigrés of Dallas and ^{nearby} Ft. Worth) testified Lee told him of target shooting. One such target, [↑] was the virulently right-wing Major-General Edwin Walker, (according to Marina) at whom Lee said he took a shot with the Mannlicher on April 10, 1963, after leaving a note in Russian for her with instructions what to do if he were caught, along with the pictures of himself with rifle and "The Worker" in hand. (The gunman fired through the house window, missing Walker's head, not by much, and escaped. ^{Commission said} The slug was too mutilated to determine if the Mannlicher had fired it.) ^{The police said it was of larger calibre)} ?

By far the most intriguing tale, though, is that of Oswald at rifle ranges. On several days in November prior to the assassination, witnesses placed a man they said looked like Lee Harvey Oswald at target ranges. For example, on November 9 the man was seen at the Sports Drome Rifle Range in Dallas by several people. On November 17, the man had an alter-

cation with a Garland A. Slack over shooting at the wrong target. Slack said he'd never forget the stranger's glare, and that when he saw Oswald on TV, it was he. Dr. Homer Wood, and his son Sterling, also saw the shooter, remembering that "fire balls" came out of his rifle's barrel. Wood's son identified the gun as an Italian 6.5 carbine. The man was a good shot. Later in November the man supposedly was again seen at the range. All of that would seem further to incriminate Oswald, were it not for the fact that other evidence developed by the FBI for the Warren Commission placed Oswald other places. Were, then, these witnesses simply mistaken, as eyewitnesses so often are? Did they want somehow to participate in the crime of the century? Or had they, as critics Richard Popkin, Robert Sam Anson, and others suggest, been witnesses to the "Second Oswald"--the look-alike who is where Oswald isn't, acting to attract attention to "Oswald," putting the frame tightly around the decoy, the patsy of a convoluted plot, Lee Harvey Oswald. Serious consideration of that theory must come after the next matter, though, that of whether the real Oswald who worked at the Texas School Book Depository had his Mannlicher-Carcano with him when John Kennedy's motorcade snaked around the corner of Houston and Elm streets at 12:30 p.m. CST, November 22, 1963.

Neither first in alone

?

Once more what would seem to be straightforward is complicated. The Warren Commission was satisfied that Oswald brought the disassembled rifle to his work at the Depository the morning of November 22 in a 38-inch long brown paper bag which he had made earlier of wrapping paper

and tape available in the Depository's shipping room. Oswald's right palmprint and left-index fingerprint were detected on the bag. Buell Wesley Frazier, who drove Oswald to work that morning from Irving, said Lee had with him a longish, heavy, brown-paper package. Lee said they were curtain rods, and since the day before, he'd ^{grumbled that} his bachelor's room at 1026 N. Beckely in Dallas' Oak Cliff section needed curtains, that seemed logical to Frazier. He and his sister Linna ¹² Mae Randle were neighbors in Irving of Ruth Paine, who had taken in Marina Oswald and her children--an ideal arrangement for Ruth, who was herself separated from her husband, and who loved Marina and the study of Russian almost equally. Buell and Mrs. Randle both saw the package that morning when Lee came over, as he did those occasional times he stayed with Marina, for a ride to the Depository where both men worked. They got there on time through the early morning rain (it cleared later, something conspiracy theorists say a peculiar man with an umbrella at the assassination site seems not to have noticed), and Lee surprised Frazier by hurry-
^{to or toward} ing into the building ahead of him, holding the package upright with his right hand, the end seemingly tucked into his armpit. Thus, the Commission said, the rifle in the Depository.

Fine, except that both Buell Wesley Frazier and Mrs. Randle repeatedly told the Commission's lawyers that the package they saw was no more than 27 inches long, whereas the shortest component of the broken-down rifle, the stock, was 34½ inches long (too long for Oswald to have tucked in his armpit). Even after considerable ^{questioning}, the witnesses kept to their estimates, and the Report concluded they were simply

Daughter
not into
bldg

mistaken. After all, they had the bag didn't they? Hadn't it been found near the southeast--or "snipers nest"--window of the Depository? Wasn't it later said to have brown-and-green viscose fibers in it similar to those of the blanket in which Oswald wrapped the rifle for storage in the Paine's garage? Hadn't it been made in the Depository? Harold Weisberg who has from the beginning been one of the most assiduous and sane critics of the Report, asks when? If, as the Report hints, Oswald made it on the 21st, why didn't Marina and Frazier see it when they drove Lee to Irving that night? If on the 22nd, the morning before the shooting, what did Frazier and Mrs. Randle see? Probably it is as the Report suggests, and Oswald somehow got the bag to Irving. What may be the only indisputable fact is that there was a Mannlicher-Carcano found in the Depository, and that bullets from it were fired at the President.

EVEN SO
constellations of questions surround the weaponry and ballistics of the Kennedy murder, the brightest glowing around the famous "magic bullet" which the Commission said pierced Kennedy's neck and throat, entered Connally's back, ^{shattered a rib} exited into his wrist, ~~deflected~~ to his thigh, and finally came to rest little the worse for wear to be found on the Governor's stretcher at Parkland hospital. But before that wonder can be explored come simpler considerations. First is the number of shots. Eighty-three percent of the witnesses in Dealey Plaza who offered an opinion reported three. Only seven percent said two (though they included Mrs. Kennedy and Secret Service men, notably Clint Hill), and only 4.6 percent reported three or more than three, a percentage ^{militating?} mitigating against theorists who favor several assassins, unless their fire was simultaneous. ^{tending to disprove}

There is solid, tangible evidence of more than 3 shots

Accepting the majority's rule becomes easier, if not necessarily correct, when we recall three cartridge cases were found next to the wall under the sill of the southeast window, sixth-floor, Texas School Book Depository. There, ~~two~~ Dallas police photographs showed, were three boxes stacked to the west side of the partially-opened window, allegedly presumably to form a gun rest for the sniper. Other boxes stacked along that side of the building concealed the shooter from anyone else who might be on the floor. According to Dallas police and FBI laboratory reports, one of the ^{Warren} gun-rest boxes held the right-index fingerprint and left palmprint of Lee Harvey Oswald. Another small box set back from the window had on it Oswald's right palmprint. So, three shots and Oswald in the "sniper's nest." But, as many critics have said, Oswald worked in the building, filling book orders from cartons, including on the sixth floor. Why shouldn't his prints be there? Furthermore, Harold Weisburg ² points out, there are other photos of the "nest" which give a different arrangement of boxes. Which, if any, were taken before investigators moved the boxes, and did those square with what people outside saw looking upwards? The Warren Commission's best witness to Oswald in the window was Howard Brennan, a [?] weak-sighted steamfitter who was seated on a concrete wall opposite the Depository. Saying nothing substantive about the boxes, he testified Oswald was standing in the window, with the rifle, leaning against the left sill--a flat impossibility since ~~The window ledge upon which the topmost gun-rest box allegedly rested, is only a foot above the floor, and the window was open only~~ ^{about and a half?}

46

1

2

1

ww2045

?

ww 33-4

ww 207
EX 1312

1

a foot and a half more - leave a 30-inch opening only. For a standing man? There would have been two thickness of dirty window glass through which there were three shot

two feet above that. Still, the testimony of other witnesses, especially

that of the 15-year-old schoolboy Amos Lee Euins, does establish that there was at least one man seen in the window, as another witness said "crowded in among boxes," and that he had a gun.

When did he fire it, and how many times, and what did he hit?

The Warren Commission and the critics alike have been forced to time the shots, and to hypothesize about their effect, based on the film record of the assassination created by Abraham Zapruder, a Dallas dress manufacturer who had stationed himself and his zoom-lens Bell & Howell 8 mm. movie camera on a concrete pedestal holding up one end of the Plaza's northern "pergola"--a bandstandish structure immediately west of the Depository, ^{the eastern end of} and next to a grassy knoll which led up to a line of trees fronting a six-foot stockade fence, which itself screened a parking lot next to railway yards. Zapruder's camera, tests later showed, ran at an average 18.3 frames per second. Thus his film of the smiling, waving President being borne around the 120 degree leftward turn off Houston onto Elm, a turn which forced driver William Greer to slow the limousine, provides both a clock and a visual record of Kennedy and Connally's reactions during the horror of the next ^{partial} ~~six~~ ^{to 11} seconds. Indeed, Zapruder's film might have put quiet to all the speculations about Kennedy's death had it not been for ~~the Texas State Highway Department,~~ which had ^{erected,} ~~one assumes innocently,~~ a large traffic-direction sign at a spot between the camera and Elm Street, obscuring the exact location,

Time?
dep ind ob.
ity?
Rowland?
wall Max?
Euins has
two different
men - strike
substante.

That
made
in a
hole

like a
bandstand

precise
instant

hence ^{The Commission says} ~~time,~~ when President Kennedy ^{was} ~~must first have been hit.~~ As it is,

the cameras speed, the sign's obstruction and the rapidity with which the Mannlicher-Carcano could be operated ^{among} are the variables which have continually plagued ^{serious} investigators of the assassination in determining the timing of the shots and their effect. The Warren Commission's staff, and soon conscientious skeptics like Josiah Thompson, Robert Groden, and the egregious Mark Lane-Dick Gregory tandem have tried mightily to unravel precisely what happened. But little is absolute except the mathematics. Tests with the Mannlicher-Carcano revealed it could not be fired and re-bolted to bring another round up from the clip in the magazine in less than 2.3 seconds. For a three-shot firing sequence consistent with the Zapruder film then, the sniper must aim and fire the cartridge lying ready in the chamber, ^{twice} bolt ~~the~~ new cartridge in and re-aim (a tricky maneuver with the Mannlicher-Carcano since the long rearward bolt movement ^{requires re-aiming} ~~can dislocate~~ the shooter's eye from the scope), fire, bolt again, and fire, and it all must be done in less than six seconds.

If the shooter could have ~~aimed & fired~~ in 1/8 of a second for the first shot (or a second more than the minimum required time). Only that much time

was available, because the sniper's view of Kennedy's body from the southeast window of the Depository was obscured by a large ¹¹⁰⁰⁻ oak tree from ¹ Zapruder frame 166 until approximately frame 210 (curiously, Kennedy was a fine target before that time, all the way down Houston Street and through the turn just below the window, yet no shots were then fired,

leading cynics to wonder if the sniper [?] was a born back-shooter). There ^{a con-} is ~~a moment~~ at frame 186 when a shot might have been fired through an opening in the foliage. Some observers believe one was fired about

not also aimed or ready in a first shot

Just one 1/18 of a second

not conscientious but commercializers, not original work & literature to men this aspect.

then, hitting the pavement rear of the President's car (several spectators in retrospect thought they saw something splatter, but the Mannlicher-Carcano's copper-jacketed rounds at 2,200 feet per second might

From what could not have hit Elm street at this point James Tague receive a minor wound - be several hundred yards, one of which pinked Mr. James Tague, who was

standing on Main Street near the Triple Underpass the motorcade was approaching. (A section of curbing there, belatedly examined by the

The diagonal extreme of Dealey Plaza from the alleged sniper's nest.

From PM

FBI, showed under spectrographic testing ^{only} traces of lead and antimony, ^{about a} quarter of the number of elements ¹ a common combination in the lead core ² of bullets. No trace of copper

was found, suggesting either it was a fragment or another kind of bullet.

Because the FBI report is ~~inconclusive~~ ^{in not showing a} ~~on whether the metals match those~~ ^{with} those

or not could be

of the Mannlicher-Carcano rounds, the last explanation is preferred by those suspecting more than one gunman. Further complicating matters,

Mr. Tague maintains he heard shots before he was struck. If so, a frag-

ment from another bullet, possibly from the fatal head shot, may have

bounced off the curb to injure him, or again, ^a multiple-gunmen theorists

suppose, he was hit by splinters from another gun's bullets.)

~~from the official accounts~~ Unfortunately, ^{it either} (it is impossible to say ^{assuming} ^{only} three shots were fired from the Depository, which ¹ of the first two missed because by the time

the President's limousine cleared the oak tree, ^{we} ^{and} offered the gunman a good ^{side} view.

~~clear shot~~ ^{pictures} the car has also passed behind the ~~bedeviling~~ street sign.

We only know that by frame 225, when the limousine emerges from behind

the sign, John Kennedy has been hit. His arms and hands ^{had} ^d move upward

toward his throat, his shoulders ^{are} ^{etc.} hunched. In James Altgen's photo taken

This refers to me only and is not accurate impossible

an instant later at frame 255, we see the Secret Service crane back toward the ~~unfamiliar~~ ^{unexpected} fire-cracker pop! while Jackie ^{supports} grabs Jack's arm and Governor John Connally turns awkwardly to his right. This the Commission ^{in reaction to what} calls the first shot from the lone gunman, and is the "magic bullet."
 The second probably misses, they say. The third, about 4.2 seconds ^{later} ^(after the car emerges from behind the sign) at Zapruder frame 313 blows out the right ^{side} ~~ear~~ of Kennedy's skull, ending the New Frontier there in the chief city of the Old West. Obviously, the critics do not agree, but before giving them their moment, we should return to the southeast window of the Depository, to the gun, the cartridges, the gunman.

not near

impossible
responsibilities
& responsibilities
No disagreement
among
responsible

Several quick, but significant questions ^{hover} about them,

inside a barricade of

Could ^{this} the 1940-vintage Mannlicher-Carcano, which was later ^{carefully placed} found stuck between two rows of boxes near the descending staircase on the west end of the building, have all by itself killed John Kennedy? Yes. At short range, with the 160-161 grain copper-jacketed bullets, it had more than the necessary penetrating power ^{and} accuracy despite a tendency to shoot high and right, which defect could easily have been compensated for by ^{if he had test-fired enough} anyone familiar with the weapon. Is it certain three shots were fired from that window [?] ~~as so many witnesses heard?~~ No. ^(so many did not hear from that window)

Kennedy may well have been the target of just two shots from there. Even though three expended cartridges were found, one casing ^{impossible} was dented at the neck in a way occurring commonly when dry-firing a weapon, that is, chambering and unchambering an expended round to practice the mechanism. It is conceivable that Oswald brought the rifle to the

Depository with an empty hull in the chamber, and a clip containing three live rounds in the magazine. Since one live round was in the rifle when it was discovered, that would mean only two shots were fired from the window, both hitting their mark, one maybe going on to Connally. / no other ammunition for the rifle was found among Oswald's possessions (he had only about 15 rounds for his .38, too), which may mean that he bought only one box (Lee was quite thrifty) and expended these three or four rounds in practice, ~~less one maybe loosed at Edwin Walker~~. Or perhaps, a few sleuths whisper, an as yet unknown and stingy employer doled out these necessary rounds to Oswald, who had been enlisted in a Byzantine scheme to assassinate a President unaware that the final act required himself, as gunman, to take the rap. That conjecture rests easily or uneasily in one's judgment on the final questions involving Oswald's rifle, ammunition, and presence in the building.

*J /
response
who?*

*also
imp-
sible -
but in
which
whom*

*- much more than this
a true evidence*

The 6.5 Mannlicher-Carcano found in the Depository (and at first mistakenly identified to the press as a 7.65 Mauser, ^{one of several statements} a police error that fueled suspicions about a conspiracy since it suggested ^{not} two weapons) was directly tied to Oswald by only ^{that one disappeared from} one palmprint, ^{found on} the underside of the barrel, under the stock's wooden forepiece. No usable prints were found on the cartridge cases. Thus, the assumption that Oswald used the rifle that day ^{assuming} ~~his ownership of it is established~~ rests as much on his ability and opportunity as on the weapon itself. Was Lee Oswald a good enough shot to get off ~~two or~~ three rounds with deadly effect? Certainly, for a trained marksman, the distance was not great--about 175 ?

?

?

To be honest this should say that marksmanship practice is needed.

11/18

deceptive

and more
100 yds

feet when the President's limousine first came from behind the oak tree. Through the scope it looked no more than fifty feet. Oswald had been trained by the Marine Corps, which boasts of producing the finest marksmen in the world (Charles Whitman, the "Texas tower sniper" was one such).

Lee qualified as a Sharpshooter with the M-1, ~~though~~ later he dropped to the lowest end of the Marksman scale. Nelson Delgado, a Marine buddy, testified Lee was a very poor shot. A stronger malediction came from a

strange quarter. In February, 1964, a Russian KGB agent named Yuri Nosenko abruptly defected. One of his statements concerned Oswald who, while living in Russia

(EVEN with a shotgun)

was such a bad shot that when he went hunting his companions somebody had to go along to provide him with game. Nosenko also assured the CIA that Oswald was not a Russian agent, a possibility which Lee's own defection to Russia and his espousment of left-wing causes since his return had raised--especially with President Lyndon B. Johnson who initially feared he was President by virtue of a Communist conspiracy

(LBJ also feared a nuclear war should Oswald turn out to be a Russian spook). ~~Exactly why Nosenko defected when he did is unknown, although~~ ~~any mention of his work~~ ~~from a Soviet viewpoint he went at an opportune time, just after Kennedy's~~

~~death, bearing assurances that the KGB had nothing to do with it.~~ Anyway, the verdict is mixed on Oswald's marksmanship prior to the Kennedy killing.

Certainly he was a trained shooter over ranges up to 500 yards. He was familiar with the weapon. If he was in that window, he had moving below and to his right at 11.2 miles per hour the most important target in the world, ~~and his adrenal glands would~~ ~~have served him well~~ (ironically ~~it~~ it was Kennedy who suffered Addison's disease, a malfunction of

HWS
with
NW II

not
true

11/18

Oswald ^{that} this accurately 19
the adrenals. Could he have fired the weapon three times within six
seconds? In tests run for the Warren Commission's investigation, three
National Rifle Association "masters" shot Oswald's weapon at stationary ^{from half the height and}
targets positioned at distances corresponding to Zapruder frames #210
(175 feet), about #252 (240 feet) and #313 (265 feet). These experts,
albeit shooting an unfamiliar rifle, succeeded two of six times in

getting off three shots in less than six seconds. They hit the first
and third targets consistently, but often missed the second because the
aiming movement from first to second target required a change of firing

position. In 1967, CBS News, as part of their first "Inquiry" into the
Kennedy assassination, ^(had) constructed a tower and a ramp, complete with
moving silhouette, to simulate the heights and distances between the
Presidential limousine and the Depository window. ^{a few of the authentic} Marksman in that test,

conducted with a gun like Oswald's, could get the three shots off in
time, and several hit the silhouette ^{three times} twice or thrice. Almost half the
tests, though, were invalidated because the rifle malfunctioned--some-
thing we can't say happened in the Depository. Later tests showed

Oswald's rifle operated well. In sum, all we can suppose is that if
Oswald had a good day he ^{might} have fired and hit from the window. We
would have to ^{all} suppose, too, that the bullet fragments, and the "magic bullet,"
^{not} came from the Mannlicher-Carcano. Two good-sized fragments, one from

a bullet's nose and another from a base, were recovered from the limou-
sine, plus several ^{three were} tiny pieces were retrieved from the automobile and
Conally's wrist. (X-rays showed ^{many - about 40 -} other miniscule pieces in John Kennedy's

They never
doubt that
what was
attributed
to Oswald

only
after
head
parts
were
found

15 front seat.
Others
came from
JFK's head
and

tr.

not
now

floor under Mrs. Conally's
seat

skull, and a sliver embedded in John Connally's femur). These fragments, ^{and the cartridge cases} the nearly-pristine bullet found in Parkland, were said by the FBI to have been fired from the Mannlicher-Carcano to the exclusion of all other weapons. Spectrography ~~tests~~ revealed the slugs had similar metallic composition--not surprising since all were made in 1944 by the Western Cartridge Company of similar materials. However, even these seemingly unassailable facts have been questioned by several critics of the FBI investigation (the Warren Commission had no investigative staff, and were forced to rely on Hoover's men). These skeptics asked if tests showed the magic bullet went through human tissue. They wanted conclusive neutron-activation analyses done, for example, on Kennedy's shirt and coat, through which the magic bullet supposedly passed, to determine if any metallic residue marks that passage, and if so, whether the residue ~~is~~ identical in ^{chemical} atomic composition with the bullet. Similarly, the inconclusive spectrographic tests linking Connally's wrist fragments with the wondrous bullet have been challenged. Nothing, obviously, is accepted on its face.

me only

too much lead missing?

Not even that Oswald was on the sixth floor and so had access to the window. The Commission's ^{only} witness on that crucial point was Charles Givens, a worker in the Depository who said he saw Oswald at about 11:55 am November 22, walking from the southeast corner of the sixth floor toward the freight elevators which were on the building's north side. Oswald carried a clipboard then, Givens said, ^{month later} (one was later found slipped among book cartons near the elevators). Surely such testimony was beyond debate, and would be were it not that Givens first told the FBI that he had seen

This was 35 minutes before the assassination.

used in the Report

Oswald on the first floor about forty minutes before the shooting--a story he stuck to until April, 1964, when intensive interrogation by Commission lawyer David Belin brought forth the new version. The Dallas police, by the way, considered Givens the kind of witness who might say things for money, and since Mrs. R.E. Arnold, a secretary at the Depository, also told the Commission she thought she might have caught a glimpse of Oswald on the first floor around 12:15, Givens' testimony, while telling, ^{seems} ~~is~~ questionable. (LHO placed himself on 1st floor etc 12:15)

Not ready this any way
not accurate to my recollection
LHO placed himself on 1st floor etc 12:15
not all on this

Can it be proved that Oswald was on ~~that~~ floor, in or near that window? Three eye-witnesses--Brennan, Euins, and an Arnold Rowland--^{did Rowland?} ~~had good long views~~ of a man with a gun there. But eyewitnesses are frequently mistaken. Predictably, such witnesses offered contradictory stories, e.g. as to just which floor the gunman was on, how tall he was, how long the rifle was, even as to whether he was alone. Rowland, for example, ^{also and the Commission} ~~told~~ the FBI he'd seen two men, a rifleman in a southwest window and an elderly black man in the southeast (three black men did watch the motorcade from below the "nest," on the fifth floor). Another witness, Mrs. Carolyn Walther, said she saw ^{a earlier (?)} the gunman and beside him, another man, but they were on a floor lower than the sixth. This point, ^{if it was} ~~whether Oswald~~ ^{and whether he} was accompanied or not, cried for proof. For a time it seemed that photography would produce an answer. Kennedy's death, or its circumstances, was filmed by ^{many} ~~more~~ people than Abraham Zapruder (though none profited like Mr. Zapruder, who received \$150,000 from Life for his filmed history). ^(at least?) Twenty-two photographers ^{were} ~~stood~~ in Dealey Plaza after the fatal shot with film in their cameras which might be invaluable in

say they saw

They did not just stand

solving the murder. One was Mr. Robert Hughes, who stood a block away from the motorcade shooting an 8 mm. movie. As the fateful turn onto Elm Street began, Hughes' camera recorded the southeast window of the Depository. Could close examination of those frames reveal a figure waiting in ambush? Two other witnesses, Ronald Fischer and Robert Edwards, thought they saw one ^(about) then. Professor Josiah Thompson, a most able critic of the Report, raised the question based on Hughes' film and the witnesses in his conscientious book Six Seconds in Dallas (dubbed a microstudy of the assassination because of its reliance on photographic records, mathematical calculations of trajectories, available autopsy records, and the like). Thompson asked, too, if the figure moved, as a gunman would have to, and if--as yet other witnesses thought--there was a second figure next to the first, an accomplice perhaps. An answer came, or seemed to, in the recent CBS re-inquiry into the killing. Comprehensive computer studies of shape, contrast, and depth of the tiny images (a fraction of a small frame, taken 100 yards away) by the Itek Corporation showed yes, there was movement (hence the gunman) and no, there was no other human being there. Again, definitive information within the limits of knowledge, but again, Itek's findings generated skepticism. IteK Corporation, after all, has as its President a former CIA man, and was it not the CIA who, we've learned, hires news correspondents as informers (including one Sam A. Jaffe, once of CBS, who said it seemed to him quite possible that the CIA got him hired by CBS in the first place). If the CIA could get people hired at CBS, could they not also influence Itek's report to CBS, particularly inasmuch as 60% of Itek's business was photo interpretation for

PWD FBI
 Ex 29 1/4
 mt

not
 brief
 so
 did not
 miss

the government? Naturally, such skepticism flourishes ever more in the current atmosphere of distrust for the CIA. In some critics--Robert Sam Anson comes to mind--it grows to monstrous shape, metamorphosing to a Kali-goddess of suspicion whose many arms, each labeled "CIA," "The Mob," "Watergaters," "Cuba," encircle John Kennedy's death, and squeeze until they strangle reason.

Nonetheless, questions about the photographic records of the killing must be asked. Another movie film, this by Mr. Orville Nix, aroused high excitement among ^{Some} assassination ^{b HPPS} students during the time of the initial critiques of the Report. Nix's film seemed to show a rifleman perched on a car parked directly behind the concrete wall bordering the "pergola" near the grassy knoll. Edward Jay Epstein, whose book Inquest ~~best~~ ^{S/} illuminated the Commission's procedural inadequacies and blindness to unorthodox explanations of the crime, brought this theory to national prominence in Esquire, while another critic, Jones Harris, who'd discovered the malevolent figure, proceeded with UPI's help (they'd bought the Nix film for \$5,000) to subject the film to the greatest possible scrutiny. That's right, by Itek. Their conclusion was that, because it lacked depth, the "figure" was really a shadow, and the car, appearing otherwise through a trick of perspective, was a sedan parked in the lot far back of the pergola. Harris then decided that Itek and UPI had collaborated to cover-up this sensational break in the assassination, this proof of conspiracy. To answer this, Nix's movie--8 mm. and the lowest possible quality of film--was once more analyzed, this time by computers at Caltech. The

But how about what I published in 1965 & I later confirmed in 1967. That there was a man on the knoll? From a still, WILU #5.

Not "students" really & not authors, etc.

results received in February, 1975, supported the Itek findings, although not positively ruling out a "grassy knoll" assassin. As of today, the theorists have not done with Mr. Nix's film. Some ~~now~~ ^{of the more irresponsible} claim to see ~~unc~~ ^{unc} ~~three~~ ^{three} assassins ~~aligned on a walk descending from the knoll toward Elm Street.~~ ^{walking in front of the TSBQ toward Houston} ~~Two of these, it's said, resemble Watergate plotters E. Howard Hunt and Frank Sturgis.~~ ^{They claim!}

This is not the way all of it goes with the JFK must have had "with all the records"

So it goes with the photographic records, and with all the records, for that matter. It seems the more we know, the less we know. Any bit of evidence so fascinates ^{some} devotees of John Kennedy's murder that, spider-like, they spin out of it webs of intrigue stretching through time and space unto, almost, eternity. One more example now.

This is not true

MORE TO COME