

ASSASSINATION INQUIRY COMMITTEE

NEWSLETTER

VCL.2 NO.4

RIGHT ON, BIG JIM

As you all know by now, Jim Garrison won handily in the primary election last month. He piled up more votes than all three of his opponents put together. We want to congratulate him heartily and wish him luck and good health. Now he has to take on the Republican candidate, Phil Trice, in April. Trice, who claims that he is "now the last hope for the good people" of New Orleans, stated after the primary election that he welcomed the support of everyone who had opposed Garrison. He indicated that he will not only pick up on the charges that have already been leveled against Garrison but will also argue that Garrison has become "a part of the New Left" (New Orleans Times-Picayune, Nov. 12).

ROGER CRAIG SERIOUSLY ILL

It has come to our attention that Roger Craig, the former Dallas Deputy Sheriff who has courageously come forth with testimony that is counter to the Warren Report conclusions, is now seriously ill. One of our subscribers writes that he has been in a Dallas hospital for about a month and that he and his family are in a very poor financial state. In a letter to our subscriber, Mrs. Craig, who is herself quite ill, writes, "Roger is in the hospital. He was here last March also. This time he is much worse. He has pulmonary emphysema, chronic bronchitis, and this time he came in with acute bronchial pneumonia, and a neurology problem which we don't know the cause of yet. He is numb from the waist down. It has been and continues to be a puzzle to us and the doctor."

Roger Craig, as most of you know, was at Dealey Plaza when President Kennedy was killed, and has testified, among other things, that within minutes after the assassination he heard a shrill whistle from the north side of Elm Street and then saw Lee Harvey Oswald run down from the grassy knoll and get in a light green Nash station wagon that had stopped for him. He has also stated publicly his conviction that the intelligence section of the Dallas police department was actively involved in the assassination conspiracy.

These additional excerpts from Mrs. Craig's letters will give an idea of their situation and how they are confronting it: "There are no words to express the situation that Roger, I and our children have endured during the past almost 3 years. My fear for Roger and the children, Roger's illness and depression at being unable to work and many other things." "Roger . . . doesn't think that anyone owes him anything. He has only told the truth about his knowledge of President Kennedy's death and there's no one on earth that could make him lie or 'change' the things that he has said, when he knows that he's telling the truth."

If you would like to give the Craigs some moral or economic support, their address is 419 Cameron Ave., Dallas, Texas 75223.

THE CURRY REPORT

The book is the size and shape of a rather thick edition of, say, the Atlantic. On its cover--in rather garish reds, whites, and blues--is a collage of pictures of President Kennedy and Jackie and Oswald and Ruby and the Texas School Book Depository Building with a fat white arrow pointing at the

infamous sixth floor window. The title reads: "Retired Dallas Police Chief JESSE CURRY reveals his personal JFK ASSASSINATION FILE" and then, at the bottom, "Limited Collectors Edition." It is published by the American Roster and Printing Company in Dallas, Texas, and its cover is embossed with a shiny gold replica of the badge worn by the Dallas Chief of Police.

This last, the tin badge with the gold star, is I think the perfect symbol for this book, for in a kind of cheap and brassy way it calls to mind the Presidential Seal that is stamped upon each of the 26 volumes of the Warren Commission evidence and testimony. It is, in fact, the Warren Report in microcosm. As in the Warren Report, there are numerous photographs, photostats of identification cards, transcriptions from the police radio log, etc. And again, as in the 26 volumes, there is much here that would actually tend to prove Oswald innocent of shooting the President. Some of this evidence is already familiar to us, either from the Warren volumes or from the Critics. For example, there are Chief Curry's first radio calls, immediately after the shooting: "Get men on top of the under pass, see what happened up there, go up to the over pass. . . . Put everyone of my men there. . . . Notify station five to move all men available out of my department back into the railroad yards and try to determine what happened and hold everything secure until homicide and other investigators can get in there."

On the other hand, and this resembles the Warren Report even more, there are places where Curry, who is the one who furnishes the "report" portion of this, either obscures or contradicts his own evidence. An example of the former is the radio log entry for 12:44 p.m., less than 15 minutes after the shooting, in which the dispatcher is already broadcasting a fairly complete description of Oswald: "unknown white male approximately thirty, slender build, height five feet six weight one hundred sixty five pounds, reported to be armed with what is thought to be a thirty calibre rifle" No mention by Curry of the source of this description or of how it was come by so quickly. Note, too, that when the dispatcher is asked if there is any clothing description, he replies, "Current witness can't remember that." This "current witness," whoever he is, can estimate height, weight, age, and the caliber of the rifle but has no recollection of clothing. The real problem, of course, may be that the clothing is the one part of the description that could not have been known in advance of the shooting.

Another strange radio transmission occurs ten minutes later when the dispatcher, right in the midst of all the calls back and forth concerning the assassination, radios Officer J. D. Tippit and asks, "You are in the Oak Cliff area, are you not?" and then tells him, "You will be at large for any emergency that comes in." Chief Curry claims that Tippit "called in and was assigned an 'at large' status, following standard police procedure to cover districts that had been vacated by other squads." According to the log, however, Tippit is not the one who calls first. And we might ask what kind of "emergency" can the dispatcher be expecting in the suburb of Oak Cliff? Is it possible that it is known that Oswald lives in Oak Cliff and that he would probably be arriving in that area shortly? Well, all of this is old stuff for some of you, but I think it shows how Curry contradicts his own radio log.

All in all, the effect of what I call "The Curry Report" is very much the same as that of the Warren Report. Both are whitewashes, but Curry is merely trying to whitewash the Dallas police, not the whole federal government. Indeed, one of his consistent targets for attack is the FBI, and he does not hesitate to criticize the Warren Commission on occasion, as in this rather startling statement: "The photographs and autopsy evidence were never released by the government. Apparently portions of the material have even been destroyed. The Warren Commission itself yielded to political pressure and never examined the autopsy photographs." The main respect in which this book differs from the Warren Report is that Curry is much less willing to assert that Oswald shot Kennedy, and in fact several of his statements suggest that he was inclined

to take Oswald at his word that he was not the killer (though he leaves no room for doubt concerning the Tippit murder). So, like the 26 volumes, this "personal file" of Curry can serve a useful purpose if it is probed by competent critics.

P. S. Nichols

ANSWERS TO TWO QUESTIONS

While reading JFK assassination books, I have come across some documented material which I haven't seen before and which clears up a lot of questions in my mind. The first lead I will talk about is from Thomas Buchanan's book Who Killed Kennedy?, and the others are from Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy? by Joachim Joesten (both published in 1964).

1. WHAT HAPPENED TO THE THROAT WOUND BULLET? I have always wondered what happened to the bullet which caused John Kennedy's throat wound. The following quote from the New York Times (Nov. 27, 1963) may answer that question: "Dr. Kemp Clark, who pronounced Mr. Kennedy dead, said one bullet struck him at about the necktie knot. 'It ranged downward in his chest and did not exit,' the surgeon said."

2. HOW MANY WERE ARRESTED? Jim Garrison has said that 10 men were arrested in Dealey Plaza for the assassination of John Kennedy. This statement is at least partially supported by the Dallas Times Herald (Dec. 8, 1963): "It was also learned Saturday that an early suspect in the assassination of John Kennedy was still in jail--but no longer as a suspect in the killing. The man, a 31-year-old man who gave a Knight Street address, was arrested minutes after the assassination when officers swarmed railroad yards near the assassination scene. A man was reported seen in the area carrying a rifle. . . . The suspect was unarmed but booked, along with others on charges of 'investigation of conspiracy to commit murder.' The investigative charges were dropped Monday morning but the man was held in jail on 'city charges.'" (J. Joesten's emphasis)

It was also learned from the Dallas Times Herald (Nov. 22, 1963): "Patrolman W. E. Barker saw workers in the Texas School Book Depository pecking on a window from the third floor and pointing to a man wearing horn-rimmed glasses, a plaid coat and a rain coat. The officer immediately arrested the man for questioning and placed him in a room of witnesses in Sheriff Bill Decker's office across the street from the Depository.

"With the young man protesting, the crowd all along the way jeered at him as he was escorted across the street. . . . An unidentified photographer shot a picture of the arrested man and then said bitterly, 'I hope you burn.' Officers on the scene would not explain what connection the man might have with the shooting nor would they identify him."

John Gasparovic

A THIRD PARTY IN THE MARY JO KOPECHNE DEATH?

What follows is a letter that is reprinted from a bi-weekly newsletter published by Joachim Joesten, author of Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy? (see above). The letter was originally sent to District Attorney Edmund Dinis

To: District Attorney Edmund Dinis, Edgartown, Mass.
From: R. D. Cutler, 38 Union St., Manchester, Mass. 01944
Subject: Suggestion re Edward M. Kennedy (EMK) / Mary Jo Kopechne (MJK)

While pursuing your own reasoned line of action please keep in the back of your mind the possibility that **EMK** was apprehended and framed the night of

18-19 July 1969. . . . ideal location, ideal time = ideal crime executed by sea-based mercenaries. . . .

There are four weak points in the story, three of which strongly indicate third party's participation:

1. no skid marks on bridge . . . car was set to run over curb
2. Peachey did not know to whom he talked at 0225 Saturday until EMK's TV speech the 25th . . . the man, distant from the manager and in the shadow could have been other than EMK
3. swimming to Edgartown after exhaustion, shock and legal advice from friends does not add up . . . holdup, knockout, return to motel via launch . . . upon coming to next morning EMK's realization of real trouble explains his non report to police before 1000 Saturday
4. the medical examiner's report, made only after viewing MJK's fully clothed body, was an inadvertent windfall for third party

Having researched JFK's assassination it seems more than a possibility that the same gang had a hand in RFK's death and they will not rest until EMK is either liquidated or at least neutralized beyond the point where he could command the opening of the Warren Commission's secret files in the National Archives prior to 2038. . . .

It is also quite possible that MJK was the intended victim because of some information she may have had concerning RFK and incidentally EMK happened along and had to be handled quickly. . . .

As you experience delays, postponements, extradition difficulties, fifth amendment pleadings and loss of witnesses' memories you may be persuaded to consider this third party action seriously . . . at best you are forewarned and prepared for action should the occasion present itself . . . at worst your mind has only been partially cluttered by a biased opinion which can be readily jettisoned. . . .

(signature)

8/12/69

(Ed. note: If you wish to subscribe to Mr. Joesten's newsletter, which is called TRUTH LETTER, write him at 87-70 173rd St., New York 11432. The rates: \$45 a year, \$25 six months, \$15 three months. Ask for free sample copy.)

INFORMATION NEEDED

We have partial information on the following two incidents, but we need to know more so that we can pass it on to our readers:

1. Suicide of Fred Korth's daughter. Fred Korth, an assistant to JFK who took part in planning the ill-fated trip to Dallas, was fired by the President shortly before the assassination. Sometime around May 1st of this year, the Korth daughter allegedly killed herself with a shotgun.
2. Death of Kathy Fulmer. Kathy Fulmer, known as the "girl in the polka dot dress" in the RFK assassination case, died in Los Angeles on April 11th of this year. There are believed to be strange aspects to her death, including entries made on charts at the L.A. County--USC Medical Center that indicated that she had recovered and was ready for discharge at the time of her death. Allegedly a suit for \$150,000 is being filed in behalf of Mrs. Fulmer's four-year old daughter.

GREEN BERETS: "The cover-up on the Green Berets was ordered by the White House to protect national security. It is unlikely the government will ever reveal the assassinations committed by our intelligence forces in the line of duty."

(Walter Scott's Personality Parade -Parade Magazine).

RFK ASSASSINATION: TOO MANY BULLETS (Part II)

Art Kevin, KIJ radio newsman, asked the chief of the special police detail, Robert Moughton, about the extra bullets in the pantry. Moughton told him that one went off the ceiling*--one went off the floor**--and one was lost***.

Mrs. Elizabeth Evans, in an interview, said that the police had told her that the bullet which struck her in the forehead and lodged over her right eye had ricocheted off the ceiling*.

Ira Goldstein, in an interview, said that the police had told him that the bullet which went through the back of the leg of his pants without hitting him had ricocheted off the floor** before lodging in Irwin Stroll's lower leg. Another bullet then struck Ira Goldstein and lodged in his left thigh.

When Robert Kennedy's coat was introduced into evidence at the trial, it had five bullet holes in it. Three entry and two exit holes. (LAT2/25/69) One bullet is supposed to have gone from front to back through the right shoulder padding without wounding Kennedy. The police say this bullet then hit Paul Schrade in the head. The source for this statement is Al Wiman, KABC-TV newsman and John Douglas, Herald Examiner staff writer. That bullet would account for one entry and one exit hole in the coat. One more entry hole was located at the back of the right armpit and was caused by the bullet which was recovered near the sixth cervical vertebra in the back of Kennedy's neck. The third entry hole was located at the back of the right armpit, very close to the other one, and the exit hole was located in the right of the front shoulder--in the region of the right lapel. Dr. Thomas T. Noguchi, Los Angeles County Coroner, testified to the Grand Jury on June 7, 1968, that this bullet traversed Kennedy's body "from right to left direction, and upward, and from back to front direction" (p. 19). This was never reported by any of the news media. Noguchi also testified that the wound track could not be traced straight without the Senator's right arm being extended forward (p. 21). KARL UECKER: "I took his hand again, and while X was pulling him (Senator Kennedy) . . . something rushed on my right side . . . X heard the first shot and the second shot right after that, and Mr. Kennedy fall out of my hand. X lost his hand." (GJT-pl43) MARTIN PATRUSKY: ". . . he (Karl Uecker) was pulling Kennedy through the kitchen at the time." (KABC-TV-6/5/68)

This bullet must be the one the police say was lost***. If it had hit a wall, the back to front movement would have placed the bullet in the north pantry wall. This is the wall separating the pantry from the kitchen. MARTIN PATRUSKY: "I think one of the shots might of fired off the kitchen wall." (KABC-TV-6/5/68)

The question is--from where did this bullet originate? Certainly not from Sirhan's weapon--the direction was wrong. Do we have another single assassin who can magically fire from two directions at the same time? Nonsense!

Significantly, Dr. Noguchi was not allowed to testify regarding the back to front wound at the Sirhan trial. First, he testified regarding the fatal head wound--then he testified regarding the bullet in the back of the neck--then . . . "Noguchi's testimony was cut short by Judge Walker, who acceded to Cooper's request that some of the 'gory detail' be omitted. He agreed with the defense lawyer that a detailed account of the post mortem 'is not necessary.'" (LAIIE-2/27/69)

So, since Dr. Noguchi's Grand Jury testimony regarding the direction of the wound was not reported by the press or any other news media, the public knows nothing about it. Once again, successfully, the people have been protected against themselves and any bad thoughts they might have about a conspiracy.

Another interesting question still unanswered is the question of powder burns on the back of Kennedy's right ear. Dr. Noguchi testified at the Sirhan trial that the muzzle of the weapon could not have been more than one inch away. (LamE-2/27/69) Yet, not one Grand Jury witness ever said that Sirhan's weapon was closer than three feet to Kennedy. The only statement to that effect was made by Grant Cooper. He said, "You saw Senator Kennedy, you put the gun to his head, about an inch away . . . eventually he died?" Sirhan answered, "I was told to do this, sir." (LamE-3/6/69) Mr. Cooper said it--not Sirhan.

As we learned from the police interrogation tapes, when the police first questioned Sirhan, they asked him how long he thought he could keep them from finding who 'John Doe' was. Sirhan responded, ". . . it is a challenge for you, sir." They asked him again. His answer: "It's a mystery, sir!" During the trial there was some comment on Sirhan's smiles and laughter when circumstances did not warrant this emotion. A phenomenon which psychology terms 'inappropriate response'. I suggest his smiles may have been stimulated by a warm feeling of pleasure whenever he thought of the enormous swindle he had played on the American people. He had participated in the elimination of a probable President and possibly had saved his friends in the process. Something to smile about? Yes Sir. "It's a mystery, sir!" It certainly is. Address your thanks for this free mystery to District Attorney Younger's office.

Floyd B. Nelson & Lillian Castellano

JUNTA?

Mort Sahl said in a recent L.A. Free Press interview that "General Earl Wheeler, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is finishing his eighth year; I think he's limited by law to a term of two years." This means that the General should have left his post late in 1963.

MORE ON ROGER CRAIG

A great deal depends on the honesty and integrity of Roger Craig. Along with Penn Jones, editor of The Midlothian Mirror, I am inclined to think that Mr. Craig is not only brave but honest. Partial substantiation for this view is now furnished in a photograph that appears on page 72 of Chief Curry's book (see review in this Newsletter). In a recent letter to me, Roger Craig writes that this is "a picture of Will Fritz talking to me in his office the afternoon of Nov. 22, 1963, now Fritz has always denied my presence in his office that afternoon. I find it ironic that this picture should be printed in Jesse Curry's book." I am not certain what Roger Craig looks like, but I believe him to be the young man in the office who is facing the camera (which is outside the glass window of the office door). Mr. Craig informs me that Penn Jones is reprinting the picture in his forthcoming book, Forgive Mr. Grief, -Vol. III.

In the Warren Commission testimony, when Will Fritz is asked if Craig ever came into his office and talked to him in the presence of Oswald, Fritz replies, "No, sir; I am sure he did not. I believe that man did come to my office, and I believe I stepped outside the door and talked to him for a minute and I let someone else take an affidavit from him. . . . I think if he [Craig] saw him [Oswald] he looked through that glass and saw him from the outside because I am sure of one thing that I didn't bring him in the office with Oswald."

According to Penn Jones, "Roger Craig could singlehandedly defeat the entire Warren Commission Report before a Grand Jury or a Congressional Investigation" (Midlothian Mirror, March 14, 1968).

P. S. Nichols

FROM THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE SHAW TRIAL; PART II: DR. NICHOLS & ZAPRUDER FILM
(Mon., Feb. 18, 1969)

Oser then asked for permission to show the Zapruder film to Dr. Nichols. This brought an immediate objection from Dymond, who said another showing of the film would be irrelevant and that the doctor had already testified he had seen the film.

But Judge Haggerty overruled the objection and Dymond objected to the judge's decision. As the assistant district attorneys were setting up the projector and screen in the middle of the courtroom spectators made an exodus with Judge Haggerty's permission from one side of the courtroom to the other. Many had not seen the film before, as it is making its "first-run" to the public during the Shaw trial.

Spectators lined the left side of the courtroom's wall. One man sat on an armrest of a spectators bench. Some spectators knelt in the aisle, craning to see the film. As the film ran its course, there was a short wait for spectators to regain their benches.

"Are you familiar with the film?" asked Oser. "My memory is refreshed," replied Dr. Nichols. "Your honor, the state now requests permission to show the 35mm slides," said Oser.

There was a hassle at this point as the defense objected to the showing of the slides — especially since the state sought to offer them as evidence. "They are irrelevant and they accentuate certain elements of what is already in evidence, the Zapruder film," contended Dymond. But Judge Haggerty overruled the defense.

Jury Removed from Courtroom

Judge Haggerty asked that the jury be taken out of the courtroom.

Again the courtroom came to life as spectators attempted to quietly move from one side of the courtroom to the other to see the 100-plus slides of the fatal impact on President Kennedy.

With the jury out, Dr. Nichols, the state's witness, and Shaw, the defendant, sat side by side in jury box chairs.

Dr. Nichols agreed that these indeed were the slides and color pictures he had viewed earlier in the day. Judge Haggerty ordered the jury back into the courtroom.

"The state remarks its offer that these slides and pic-

tures be admitted as evidence," said Oser. "To this I object," interjected Dymond.

But Judge Haggerty said he would accept the slides and pictures as evidence. Dymond protested that "this seventh showing of the Zapruder film" is prejudicial to his client.

Judge Haggerty granted permission to the state to rerun the slides with the jury present and for the third time in the afternoon, spectators moved over to get a better view of the slides. Dr. Nichols stepped down from the witness stand and took a chair beside the state's table.

Spectators moved into vacant seats of court attaches under Judge Haggerty, but other spectators, their views blocked out, sat in their seats as the 11-minute slide presentation unfolded. Judge Haggerty, with the close of the slide presentation, recessed court for 40 minutes while the jury retired upstairs to view 21 color pictures presented as evidence and have their afternoon coffee.

Witness Is Asked About Three Photos

When court resumed, Oser gave Dr. Nichols three photos which he said he would label S 53-A, S 53-B, S 53-C. "I show you these," said Oser. "Do you recognize them?"

"Yes, I do," replied Dr. Nichols. "Using these three pictures," said Oser, "Dr. Nichols, can you tell us whether you see any body movement?"

"Yes, of the late President and Gov. Connally," said Dr. Nichols.

"In your expert opinion, what are these body reactions?" asked Oser.

"We object that this is outside of the scope of the expertise of the witness," said Dymond. But the judge did not allow the objection, saying he had not only examined the slides but the film as well.

"In 53-A, I note Gov. Connally is squarely in his seat looking forward, straight ahead," said Dr. Nichols.

"I object," said Dymond, "to this witness telling us what these photos show. They speak for themselves." But Judge Haggerty overruled Dymond.

"I note the President is reaching for his throat with his hand," said Dr. Nichols.

"In S 53-B, the presidential auto has gone a little further. Gov. Connally has the same position. The President has his right hand at his throat.

"And in S 53-C, Gov. Connally is sitting squarely in his seat, looking forward. The President has both hands clutching at his throat. He is showing typical reaction to pain in his throat."

Witness Discusses Cause of Reaction

Dymond again objected, but Judge Haggerty overruled him. "Having seen these slides and the Zapruder film, what is your opinion as to the cause of the President's reaction?" asked Oser.

"President Kennedy is probably reacting to a pain in the neck," said Dr. Nichols. "What is your opinion of Gov. Connally?" continued Oser. "Gov. Connally does not appear to be reacting to pain," said Dr. Nichols.

Oser showed Dr. Nichols what he labeled as State Exhibits S53-D, S53-E, S53-F, and S 53-G. He asked the doctor to examine them.

"In S 53-D, I detect the President still reacting to pain," said Dr. Nichols. "Gov. Connally also appears to be reacting to pain."

"And in S 53-E, there is a gushing of air and puffing of the cheeks by Gov. Connally. "In S 53-F, this is more pronounced in Gov. Connally and he is turning to the right. Then in S 53-G, this is still more pronounced."

"And what would be the cause of this reaction?" asked Oser.

"He very likely has sustained a gunshot wound," said Nichols.

"I object," said Dymond, raising his voice. "This is so far out that he is telling us that it was a gunshot wound."

The judge agreed with Dymond's objection. "He can give his opinion as to the action but not the cause," explained Judge Haggerty. There was a resulting objection by the state, and Judge Haggerty said the state would have to rephrase the question. "If the question is rephrased I will permit it; otherwise, I will not," said Judge Haggerty.

"Using these four photos, the Zapruder film and the 35mm slides, doctor, could you give your expert opinion as to what could have caused Gov. Connally's reaction?" asked Oser.

Judge Overrules Defense Objection

"I object," said Dymond again. "Anything could have caused it." But Judge Haggerty overruled the objection.

"Very definitely, very conclusively, he was reacting to a stimulus, which caused pain," answered Dr. Nichols. "This stimuli," said Oser, "could it have been a gunshot wound?"

"I object," said Dymond, "this calls for pure assumption, it is outside of the qualifications of the witness." And, once again, Judge Haggerty overruled the objection.

Dr. Nichols answered, "It could be the impact of a bullet striking the governor."

Oser showed Dr. Nichols more photos and asked for his opinion of them.

"In S 53-H, the presidential limousine has gone further. Gov. Connally is in pain. The President is clutching his throat, leaning forward and to the left, and is being attended to by Mrs. Kennedy.

"It is blurred a little in S 53-I, but it appears that half of the President's head has exploded.

"In S 53-J, essentially this is the same as the preceding photo. But the bloodiness and red effect about his head are much less in size.

that the head and shoulders of the President have moved backwards. This seems to be apparent in S 53-L. Gov. Connally is in pain and leaning on his wife. The President's wife is attempting to hold him in an erect position.

"And in S 53-M, the President's head and shoulders appear to be still further backwards. There seems to be a horrible flesh wound. The halo is no longer in evidence."

Witness Is Asked About Halo, Position

Oser said, "Doctor, could you state as an expert what is the cause of the red halo and what is the cause of the President's backward position?"

Dymond objected, but was overruled.

"It depicts the effect of a gunshot wound in the head," replied Dr. Nichols.

"And from what direction?" asked Oser.

Again Dymond protested. "I most strenuously object to this," he said. But he was overruled.

Then Dr. Nichols delivered his answer. "Having viewed these slides and pictures and the Zapruder film," said Dr. Nichols, "I find it is compatible with the gunshot having been delivered from the front."

"Using S 53-B, can you tell us if President Kennedy is reacting?" asked Oser.

"He is reacting to a stimulus in the neck, probably pain," said Dr. Nichols.

"Now in S 53-B, is Gov. Connally reacting to a stimulus?" continued Oser.

"No," answered Dr. Nichols.

"Then in S 53-G, is the President reacting to a stimulus?" asked Oser.

"More intensely," said Dr. Nichols.

"Is Gov. Connally reacting to a stimulus?" asked Oser.

"Yes," replied Dr. Nichols.

"If the President and Gov. Connally were reacting to stimuli," began Oser, "how fast would it take for Gov. Connally to react to the same stimulus?"

Dr. Nichols never was able to answer the question. Dymond objected to it, and one of the jurors asked for a brief recess. Judge Haggerty later revealed that two jurors had become sick and he called a recess until Wednesday morning.

The morning session began with Dr. Nichols' testimony. Direct questioning by the prosecution started Monday.

Assistant DA Alvin V. Oser opened his brief questioning with the same question he started to ask Monday, and that was a hypothetical question. He asked Dr. Nichols if the same stimulus caused Gov. Connally to react as he said President Kennedy to react, how fast would this stimulus cause Connally to react.

Dr. Nichols said it was his opinion that Connally would have reacted almost simultaneously with the President.

While tendering Dr. Nichols' testimony, Oser asked him to show some photographs, taken from frames of the Zapruder film, and comment on the reaction of President Kennedy depicted in the film.

He was shown pictures of the President after he was struck in the head, and Dr. Nichols said his comparison indicated that the President's head and shoulders had moved to the rear.

Oser then asked, based on his examination of the film, photographs and slides, what the effect would have been of a stimulus applied to the rear of the President's head. Dr. Nichols said that, if the stimulus was of the same magnitude as that of the exhibits, the head and body would have moved to the front.

Witness Believes JFK Hit in Front

Dr. Nichols' replies backed up the opinion he expressed in his Monday testimony, that the shot which hit President Kennedy was fired from the front.

On cross-examination, Nichols told Dymond he was not in Dallas the day of the assassination, and he then explained in detail the procedure he would follow in performance of an autopsy of a person who died of a head wound.

He said this would include study of X-rays of the body, photographs of the body and wound, measurements, and the affected area and vital organs.

He indicated a month might be required before he would be able to issue a final diagnosis, although a provisional diagnosis would be possible in much less time.

Dymond also asked him how he determined the point of entry and the point of exit of a bullet wound.

Dr. Nichols said this "depends on an angle on the nature of the gunshot wound," and he said that if motion pictures of the shooting were available he would study them as well as obtain eyewitness testimony. He added that every situation is different.

"Ordinarily you wouldn't examine the victim?" asked Dymond.

"Oh, no," answered Dr. Nichols, "we'd do a complete, total autopsy."

Dymond asked again for the procedure he would follow, and Dr. Nichols repeated, this time with a little more detail, how he would go about the autopsy.

He said he would dissect all parts of tissue involved in the wound, treat them chemically so they would harden, and then study them under a microscope.

He said the brain would also have to be treated chemically and then studied.

Requests to View X-Rays Are Denied

Dymond then asked Dr. Nichols if he saw X-rays of President Kennedy; and Dr. Nichols said he requested to see them, but his requests were denied.

He then said that the first time he saw the Zapruder film was about two weeks ago in Kansas City, and that the first time he saw the slides — made from the film — was last Monday morning.

Dymond asked Dr. Nichols if he expressed the same opinions he expressed during the trial in the journal of *Archive of Pathology* in 1967. Dr. Nichols asked Dymond if he might see the article, and Dymond said he did not have it.

"It doesn't exist," said Dr. Nichols, adding he never wrote an article pertaining to President Kennedy.

Dymond then asked if he considers himself a ballistics expert.

Dr. Nichols then said that, in connection with the assassination, he has conducted experiments in the laboratory using a Mannlicher-Carcano rifle, and he has fired the rifle into ribs and wrists and examined the bullets. "Yes, I proclaim a degree of proficiency in ballistics to this extent," he added.

He also told Dymond he attended a one-hour lecture on the subject of ballistics, conferred with ballistics experts and removed bullets from shooting victims' bodies and testified in court.

He said the President's wrists and hands were mutilated, and those on the mattress have remained flat.

Dr. Nichols then attempted to make a presentation of his studies which he said he had copyrighted, but Dymond said that if the state wanted him to go into it, "That's their right."

Alcock argued that Dr. Nichols was attempting to make the presentation in answer to Dymond's question.

Dymond countered that "anyone can copyright anything that is unique and original," and he said the "article wouldn't be evidence of his training" in ballistics.

Dr. Nichols, obviously irked by Dymond's use of the word "article" injected that his writing an article "is a figment of someone's imagination."

Dr. Nichols Again Asked of Training

Dymond asked again if his sole training was a one-hour lecture, conversations with police officers and an experiment in the laboratory.

"Were you ever qualified as a ballistics expert?" asked Dymond.

"To the extent that I would identify missiles removed from a body," he answered.

Dymond then questioned him about his expertise in photography, as Dymond has maintained that Dr. Nichols' testimony was more that of a photographic expert than an expert in forensic pathology.

Dr. Nichols said he has used cameras since he was 10 years old, that as a professor of pathology he has access to a far range of cameras, and that he uses them and instructs students in the use of them.

He said he had no formal training in the area of photography.

During the next series of questions, Dr. Nichols told Dymond that he is suing the federal government to obtain possession of clothing that President Kennedy was wearing when he was assassinated.

Dymond asked him if he knew the President was wearing a back brace on the day of the assassination, and Dr. Nichols said he did; and he said this was the reason the President's body remained upright.

"Do you know that as the shot in Frame 313 was fired, the President's ligaments were severed?" asked Dymond.

page 10

CLOSING NOTE

First of all, our apologies for the smeared and smudged reprint from the New Orleans Times-Picayune on the preceding pages. It probably would have been preferable not to print these columns at all, but having done so it is too costly and time-consuming to try any changes. Instead, here is an attempt to clear up the most illegible passages: (1) Paragraph at top of 2nd col. on p. 8: "The morning session began with Dr. Nichols on the witness stand for conclusion of direct questioning by the state which started Monday." (2) Paragraph at top of 4th col. on p. 8: "He said of his own experiments, bullets fired into human wrists and ribs have been mutilated, and those fired into a mattress have remained pristine." (3) Paragraph beginning at bottom of 2nd col. on p. 9: "He then explained entry and exit wounds, In most cases, the entry wound is smaller than the bullet itself; and the exit hole is larger. The doctor then said he is suing the federal government for permission to see the photographs and X-rays of President Kennedy also. Dymond then asked if, in fact, it was not very important for the witness to be given" (4) Sentence at bottom of 3rd col. on p. 9 (got left out entirely): "He told Dymond he wants to see the autopsy pictures and X-rays 'to know the truth'." (5) Next to last paragraph in col. 4 on p. 9; "Dymond said he was finished; and on re-direct Oser asked Dr. Nichols to identify a Mannlicher-Carcano that was used as an exhibit in the case. The doctor said it is a rifle he purchased Oct. 10, 1968"

More than ever before we are in need of your donations because this is the first issue that was done entirely on deficit spending (in other words, we have bills to pay).

New Years Resolution: Let's see to it that whereas the 'sixties was the decade of assassinations, the seventies will be the decade of revelations.

Editor: Prescott S. Nichols
1787 Neale Street
San Diego, CA 92103

Please send contributions and requests to get on the mailing list (also changes of address, etc.) to the address below:

AIC
RFD BOX 52W3
Delmar, CA 92014



Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route 7
Frederick, Maryland 21701