

BEGAN:  
8/13/71

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS ON POST MORTEM I

INTRODUCTION: This is pretty good. It is a successful way to introduce the biased "investigation" and it sticks to one subject (the file classification) which also allows divergence to other subjects in a not-too-confusing manner. Some minor comments:

The first sentence is awkward, and should read: The government never really intended to investigate.....

700  
-5-  
-11-  
P. 5, graph 6: There have been allegations of error against you which are supported by evidence. I have in mind those in "SCavengers and Critics." Whether or not they are major, whether or not they detract from the mass or context of your work is irrelevant, especially since here you say there has not been a single such allegation supported by evidence. Omit the sentence beginning "So overwhelming is this," and take the first sentence in graph 6 and make it the first sentence in graph 7. You later say that no official involved has accused you of error, and that seems to me to be sufficient.

done  
P. 11, last graph: You start by saying the WC had the Oswald autopsy report but "did not print it." This is not true. In fact, it is printed twice in 26 vols, once at 24H10, and once as CE 3002. If you mean did not print in the Report, then you had better qualify your statement.

CHAPTER 1: THIS NEEDS a little editing, but is generally good. Your point seems to be that on the misrepresented and highly publicized event in which Clark turned over a heap of junk to A as if to dispel doubts about suppression, he (or Hoover) really continued suppression, namely by holding on to the spectr. anal. in violation of the order. Here are my comments:

12  
2000  
P. 17, graph. 6 (one sentence): You mention the temporary, limited-purpose law here and on p. 26, yet you never tell the substance of the law, or anything connected with it. You should at least give a brief explanation of the law to show how Clark used it to make his order.

100  
P. 18, graphs 4 and 5: Highly misleading, if not inaccurate. You emphatically insist that the WC refused any pictures "taken at the moment of the assassin that showed the front of the TSBD..." and that there are none in evidence. What about the Altgens picture? Whether or not it was cropped, they did introduce it into evidence in several places and printed it, for as poor a copy as it was, in the Report. Your discussion after these 2 graphs does not make sense in light of them, because you go on to describe pix of the front entrance after the shots, not "at the moment" as you previously complained.

100  
P. 20, graph 5: You say the camera Marina supposedly used to photograph LHO is not in the Fed. Regis. list. It shouldn't be because it was already in evidence, and is in the Archives as part of the record. This is misleading and should be omitted.

100  
P. 20, last 3 graphs, plus graph 2, p. 21: You make the same error here. All these ballistics evidence are already in evidence and are in the Archives as part of the record. You may want to make mention of the fact that their integrity has not been preserved. But it is irrelevant and misleading to say they are not included on Clark's list of what was turned over. They should not be on that list.

100  
In light of these things which you should omit, it will be necessary to revise the one-sentence first graph on p. 21. You should emphasize the spec. anal. but you will have to word that sentence differently.

100  
P. 23, next to last graph: In line with what I say above, you seem to think that because the fragments are not listed, they are not public. Again, not true. They are public and have been shown and photographed. Again, emphasize the fact that the spect. anal. are not public and without them, the fragments are meaningless pieces of lead.

100  
P. 24, last sentence of top graph: This insertion is irrelevant to the current discussion and should be omitted. That simply is not the place to interject that the medical evidence on JBC's wounds does not jibe with official story. Stick to the spectro.

P. 24, graph 4: Here you imply the spec. anal if released might be faked. This would

be a good place to mention the Hoover letter Paul found re NAA. Perhaps you could add a footnote here.

P. 25, first full graph: 399 was kept in a case only when shown the autopsy docs. Shaw and Gregory examined it as did Olivier, I believe.

P. 26., 2nd full graph: As I pointed out before, you must explain the law to which you are referring, otherwise what you say is meaningless.

CHAPTER 2: This~~s~~ deals largely with the transfer of the pix and X-rays. I think, however, in light of all the new info you have, your best bet would be to rewrite the entire chapter. If you leave it the state it is now and write a later chapter in PM II to bring things up to date, it will be too confusing. I strongly urge you to put everything in this category together as one coherent story. As the chapter stands, here are my comments, which you can use depending on how much of the old chapter you use in writing the new one:

p. 28, graph 6: When you say the docs had been denied access to the pix, you should qualify by saying "so we are assured."

p. 28, 4th up from bottom: This is a terrible sentence, which I would omit altogether.

p. 29, 3rd graph: "for there is no error in my work." Change this to "indicating those who had received copies found no errors in my work or, if errors were found, no one cared to acknowledge them." You know good and well there has been some error in your work and it is simply uncalled for to say there is none.

p. 29, beginning 5th graph through p. 30, up to 2nd graph: I would omit all of this because it is not directly relevant to the present discussion, and is in that way confusing. If you want, make a footnote out of this material. You must be content at this point to let your statement that Specter should not alone be blamed stand as it is. Your other works have explained the reasons. Explanations here diverges too much. Even with the Spec. remark you have diverged from the topic of the pix and X-rays. That is enough. You must stay on the subject!

p. 30, first line, 3rd graph: If you omit what I suggested above, change this line by omitting "also", i.e., "It is merely a presumption and nothing else....."

p. 31, 7th graph up from bottom: Middle of that graph you say, "Specter wanted it that way." I object to this as stepping a bit out of the bounds of your evidence. Much more effective to say, "Specter left it that way" and let the reader make the inference.

p. 31, 4th line up from bottom: add which: "...cheap press-agentry which ~~was~~ was prac.."

p. 34, 5th graph down, re front neck wound: here, as elsewhere (esp in PM III) you go on the assumption that because the wound was originally described as "puncture" in the holograph it was being called "entrance." It is simply not that certain. Puncture, on the word of competent authorities, does not mean entrance. You also seem to assume here that Perry cut away the wound, not cut in half. Revise this whole graph to say that the photos can reveal what was left of a wound which was merely cut in half and possibly show the classic sign of bullet entrance, an abrasion ring.

p. 34, 6th graph: Instead of beginning with these questions, why not begin with the answers, i.e., change it to this: THEY can establish that the fatal wound was not from the front, or ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ the exact number of head wounds." Your questions imply that the pictures could <sup>not</sup> establish this one way or another, but in fact they can. Or if you don't like "can" use "may".

p. 34, 7th graph: Omit. Very true and very interesting, but the wrong place and an unnecessary interjection.

p. 34, 10th graph: Just leave "The location of the assassin or assassins?" and omit the rest. It is really unnecessary to the point you are making here and, again, confusing.

p. 35, 1st full graph : last line "and other for its subornation" is not clear whether the its refers to perjury or the film record, even though one makes little sense. Change to "and others for the subornation of perjury."

p. 37, 2nd graph after top quote: You merely give your assurance that the contract assures suppression and you present not one word of the contract to back this up. You must show what about the contract assures suppression, especially since it has been (falsely) represented as making info available.

p. 38, 1st full graph: For what you say about Ford here, you cite not one source, not one sample of his words. If you do not wish to take up space with his words, you should at least refer the reader to where he may find them.

p. 38, 3rd from bottom : Same here, if the papers, radio and TV were full of it, it should be easy for you to cite references. GIVE SOURCES!!

p. 38, last 2 graphs: What is your source for the assertions that too many people understood the English that they atopped to think about the WR defenses, and that the defense backfired because it attracted more attention to criticism. I would like to know and you have a responsibility to your reader to document how this is so, even if in a footnote.

CHAPTER 3: Basicly good and sound, acceptable organization. There are some misrepresentation:

Bottom 41 to top 42: Don't you want to qualify this? The measurements probably are right, just misleading because they were made on a supine corpse.

p. 43, graph 6 (indented): While there is no mention of the slides in the autopsy report, they are mentioned in the supplemental report. Therefore, the slides themselves were not suppressed and it is wrong to imply they were, as you do again at p. 50, first line of indented part. What is significant is that the slides revealed "foreign substnaces" which Boswell specified as bits of fiber in the back wound. This is what was suppressed for some reason not apparent to me, since it corroborates the autopsy. But you must make the change here, for if Levine accurately quotes Boswell that these slides were omitted, then Boswell is wrong.

p. 43, 1st graph after indented portion : (re bullet path and bruises) First, it is not exactly correct to say that the body "was taken apart along the possible path of the bullet." It was not, as Finck admitted. Some of those parts were removed but certainly not all, especially the posterior muscles. The bruise to the top of the lung, to which you apparently refer, could not have been made by the tracheotomy, as Humes explained in his testimony (despite what Specter wrote in his memo). There was not enough circulation at the time of the trach. for bruises to have been made like that. Also, a scalpal cannot make such a bruise. Also, bullets do make a "detectable" path but not always an easily detectable path. This whole graph is misleading and inaccurate. It would be better either to omit it or state simply that no path was found by probing. State that probing is not always reliable to finding paths and that the reliable method--dissection--was not performed on orders.

p. 43, 3rd up from bottom: Bad syntax. Change to "Why, then, was it necessary for Humes to make two telephone calls to "learn" what he already knew?" I would omit it myself, though since I think you are on shaky grounds. The calls can always be justified (and properly so) with the excuse that Humes sought contributory information. What is suspicious and what you should emphasize here is that the calls were made after the body was out of his hands when it definately should have been made either before or during the autopsy.

p. 44, 3rd graph from bottom: You should give a source for your quote from the meeting of the Foresnic science Adademy.

p. 48, 3rd and 4th up from btotom: Here you really misrepersent what Humes said, and you must change it for it is unfair. As far as Humes' measurement of the location of the head entrance, you are right that it is not in the notes. However, in the 2 graphs which I have noted here, Rather was not asking Humes about the location. He was asked about the character of the wound--entry or exit. Rather asked "can you be absolutely certain" the wound was one of entry and to this Humes replied ~~XXXXXX~~ "Very precisely and incontroverti-

bly." Likewise, the "conclusive scientific evidence" referred to was not the chart, as you imply, but the nature of the wound itself and here no one spoke of "measurements" but of observations. You would do well to omit these two paragraphs since prior to them, you have a case which fits very nicely with the end line "This is the 'new science'..." If you leave these graphs in, you are guilty of an overt distortion.

p. 50, first line: Since it is obvious the face sheet was not the only data used to prepare the autopsy report, I would insert "in part" so this reads "...the autopsy report that was prepared from data in part 'never meant to be accurate'..." (my additions underlined)

p. 50, first line indented part: Just a reminder as before that these slides are mentioned in the supplemental autopsy report. It was too soon for them to be in the first report.

CHAPTER 4: I am wondering about the need for this chapter. It seems to me to have little point. In fact, I would think the information in it could be better used in conjunction with other parts of the book, i.e., the things on Connally with your later discussion of his wounds. Stripped of error and needless repetition, there is little left of this chapter anyway.

p. 51: This is all a repetition of the end of chapter 2, pp. 37-39. I think it is unnecessary in both places, although I would leave what you have in Chap. 2 and omit what you have here.

p. 52, graph 3: You say "Scientific analysis would have..." This is improper. There is no guarantee the evidence would have been that good or that sufficient. You must change this to "...could have..."

pp. 54-55: Here you present your theory ~~your theory~~ that the neck shot was solely from the front at a flat trajectory, exiting from the back. You present really no evidence to uphold this theory, and you ignore and offer no accounting for evidence against it. I believe this unfair to a reader not very familiar with the case who would think, from what you say, that everything supports your theory. That is not true, and the theory does have major problems which you must reckon with if you are going to present like this.

p. 54, last graph: "...a shot from the front, which is proven by all the credible evidence..." This is the kind of statement I mean. You fail at all points to confront the evidence indicating the back wound was one of entrance, and of this there is much evidence which cannot be blithely brushed aside with the excuse that nothing from the autopsy is worthy of credence. What you should emphasize, especially in this context here, is that there was no frontal exit. Admit, as I think you must, that we cannot know for sure now whether the back was entrance or exit. What we can be sure of is that nothing exited from the front, which alleviates the need for Specter's "alternatives."

In this same graph, as an attempt to offer substantiation, you say that "consistent with" your theory is the testimony of those who saw bullets (they think) strike near the car. This is consistent with so much else that it is almost meaningless. It is consistent with missed shots, it could be consistent with fragments from the head shot. You have absolutely nothing to connect these reports to the non-fatal Presidential wound and I believe your inference here is simply unfair.

p. 55, first full graph: Until the WC lawyers got to work, "all the evidence is that the President was shot in the front of the neck." Implicit here in your theory is that "all the evidence" is that the rear wound was exit. This is blatantly unfair, either as an implication or as a statement, because "all the evidence" is not that way, and was not that way long before the WC lawyers started their work. There is so much evidence of a rear non-fatal entrance that it cannot be dismissed as you so flagrantly do. You must come to grips with it.

p. 55, graphs 3 & 4: Here you plainly state the theory and, as I've said, unless you can a) produce even an indication of a rear exit plus b) specific reasons to dispute the existing evidence that the rear wound was an entrance, you are really misleading your reader. If you do not wish to do what I suggest, then you must qualify this theory, in the least.

p. 55, last 4 graphs: I still think your interpretation of the reconstruction as off by 30% in time is wrong, based on your apparent failure to realize that the film taken through the rifle scope was made with a camera other than Zapruder's, which was used to film the recon. from the street. This was a major error in WW II and I hope you will omit it here.

p. 57, first full graph: Here again you imply that puncture means entrance. It does not, and if Perry used the word "puncture" (as he probably did), he also probably did not tell Humes this was also entrance, at least to the exclusion of other possibilities. I think you over-work this point, whose significance is not so much the interpretation of puncture as entrance (which is shakey and can be cut down by experts) but merely the fact that there is a completely unauthorized, unindicated change between two ~~XXXXXX~~ reports supposedly identical.

*Mr. Carter* — CHAPTER 5: Perhaps at the end (or beginning) of the chapter would be a good place to put some (most) of the material left in the previous one. I'll reserve final judgement until I finish the book, for I suspect there may be even better places for this info. The chapter itself is quite limited, and I think somewhere, notably in the beginning, you should make the point that what you discuss in it is not the evidence proving that one bullet did not hit both men, but merely the evidence showing that the official investigators never really considered this, for what that is worth (not much, I think).

p. 58, first graph: Terribly, unnecessarily awkward. Change to this: "Neither beginning ~~XXXX~~ nor ending with Governor Connally, but dramatized (or challenged?) by him, is the 'single-bullet' theory for which Arlen Specter takes credit. Though in its Report the Commission suggests this theory is "not ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ necessary to any essential findings," without it those "essential findings" collapse.

p. 58, graph 2, line 2: insert "really": "...even though it really could not."

CHAPTER 6: I am not particularly happy about this chapter. To me, the focus is dubious. There is some information which I would definitely present in a different context.

p. 67, graph 7: I would omit this. Again you repeat your contention that Perry told the autopsy docs the non-fatal wound was from the front. On the basis of the word "puncture" I do not believe you have a sufficient case.

p. 67, graph 6: You omit something very relevant to your discussion here, namely sworn testimony taken by Specter which corroborated McClelland. Dr. Jenkins described a wound of the left temple at 6H 48. You should mention this, esp. Specter's reaction to it: "The autopsy report discloses no such development, Dr. Jenkins."

p. 67, 4th up from bottom: The way you word this you seem to say that Specter consciously and knowingly kept Dr. Stewart's name out of the record. I doubt that he ever knew of Stewart. You may say that Specter's failure to make the proper inquiries, i.e., find out everyone connected with the treatment of the assass victims, resulted in the suppression of Dr. Stewart. But I think the implication as you have it now is unfair.

p. 67-68: This whole matter with Stewart bugs me for some reason. I do find it odd that his name is not mentioned anywhere even though several minor attendants are named, and testimony was taken from some. I do think that you should present some proof that Dr. Stewart in fact was employed at Parkland at the time. This, I would think, is obtainable. If possible, it should also be confirmed that he was in a position to know what he purports to know. Until that is done, I would not be completely satisfied that this man has <sup>not</sup> conjured up something.

There is just something too good about Stewart. I may be wrong, but it is my instinct that his knowledge of facts about the assass outside his (alleged) experience warrants suspicion. He knew all the evidence corroborating a front head entry, which means, whether or not it is true, that if in fact he had no first-hand knowledge of such an entry (as he claims to have), he <sup>should</sup> ~~would~~ be safe to "make up" such first-hand knowledge because other evidence would corroborate it.

And it is not as if no one has ever tried to pull such things on the critics.

At any rate, unless you are prepared to document that Stewart at least could have known what he claims to, I would put this entire thing into a footnote related to the testimony of McClelland and Jenkins on left temple wound.

Bottom p. 70 and ff.: I would treat this matter with the Wash. P. differently. The way you have it now, it seems that your involvement with them and their story is the focal point and the fact that the FBI supplied them false info is an interesting sidelight. It should be the other way around. If you wish to give an introduction to Harwood's story, do it in a paragraph.

CHAPTER 7: This is basically OK. I think what I would do, however, would be to put this and the WP-Harwood material together as one chapter, possibly condensing what you have written on that WP story. I would then take the ~~XXXXXX~~ remaining material in Chapter 5--dealing with Specter--and put it in Chapter 8.

CHAPTER 8: This is a pretty good chapter. Again, I think it is flawed by what I see as either misrepresentation or misinterpretation of the evidence. If certain things are revised or removed, I think this will be a really persuasive chapter.

p. 87, parenthetical 4th graph: This should either be a footnote or it should not be. It certainly does not belong here.

p. 88, 3rd up from bottom: I disagree with your rather strict interpretation of the position of the skull fragments, i.e. if they came from the right side of the head they could not be on the left side of the street. The head was obliquely facing left. A right side explosion, I would agree, would not bast bone directly to the left. But if the bone were cast a sufficient distance forward or rear from the head, it very conceivably could have wound up on the left side of the street.

However, the matter in this instance is this: You take the Harper reports as proof that a piece of bone "exploded" 25 ft. south of the head. This is something you cannot do, simply because the piece of which you speak was found 29 hours after the murder. It very possibly could have been moved. Neither you nor I can a) prove that it was moved or b) prove that it was not moved. Its location of discovery just cannot be assumed to be the position to which it was originally cast. If it was, then I would still dispute your interpretation, based on info which Harper himself gave me. He marked the location of where he found the bone on a plaza map for me and, if he is correct, it was 25 ft. south of Elm, but also about 120 feet west of the President when struck in the head. If you are unwilling to accept my interpretation, then I think in the very least you are obliged to qualify what you have written, i.e., say that your hypothesis assumes the bone fragment landed where Harper found it and was not moved prior to discovery.

p. 89, first 6 graphs: Enough is enough. I would omit all of this. The questions you ask here you have asked countless times, and here I think they are simply inappropriate. When you say it cannot be argued that none of the press saw the documents previously referred to, you are on untenable ground. You indicate you saw CD 5 on the desk of B. Gavzer of AP. So what? Do you really expect that, in that massive collection, he would pick out all the important things and then impart on them the same meaning as you, and then suppress them? It seems apparent to me that he probably did not even know what he was looking at or what it meant. Your implication is that he must have seen what you point out, and this is uncalled for. I strongly urge you to omit these six paragraphs.

p. 90, 3rd up from bottom: You must qualify this assertion. The reports you quote do not give the precise size of the thigh fragment; they give the precise size of the picture of the thigh fragment recorded on an X-ray. X-rays do not always depict objects at their exact size. You present nothing to indicate that this X-ray was made to show the true size of the fragment, and the letter, which I have, says nothing to indicate this either. Also, you cannot presume and if you do, you must tell your reader so. The actual fragment could have been larger or smaller than what was depicted on the X-ray.

*be included*

p. 91, 4th full graph: Here and on the next page you mention Shaw's estimate that more than 3 grains of metal were in JBC's wrist and seem to offer it as proof of the weight of what was in the wrist. I do not believe you should do this. You must make it clear that Shaw was merely estimating. Also, you fail to mention Frazier's testimony that the wrist fragment weighted .5 grains when first examined (5H72) This testimony has its own faults, as you should point out, since the fragment~~s~~ he refers to as CE 842 is in fact 3 fragments

p. 91, emphasis at bottom: You are really on thin ice here. You are offer wide-ranging estimates based on a fragment~~s~~ of estimated size (even though the X-ray measurements are precise, they do not define the precise size of the fragment itself). Here the point becomes tenuous at best. I would really hesitate to put so much reliance on these series of estimates as you do, since it severely weakens your case.

p. 93, graph 3: The thing about Joe Ball's law firm and Pat Brown should be omitted. You have stated it previously in the book.

p. 93, middle of page to bottom: You have an error here in discussing the change in Specter's memorandum. First, and most important, you do not accurately reflect the extent of the change. "Back" was not the only addition. The full addition, as is clearly visible on copies I have, was "'s back." It appears to be a very innocent addition. Without it, the sentence would have read: "All 3 described the bullet wound on President Kennedy as being a point of entrance." This is ambiguous, and the addition specifying "Kennedy's back" merely designates which wound on the body was being discussed. You may find it significant that Specter always calls this a "back" wound although I prefer to avoid the question of semantics. But it is wrong to make it seem, as you do, that a word was erased and changed to "back." You must mention the fact that an apostrophe and an "s" were also added.

p. 94, top graph: Here we go again. You say "all the credible evidence" is contrary to the assertion that the back wound was one of entrance. Harold, you have not presented one shred of evidence that this was other than an entrance wound, except for your theory that, because the front was entrance, the back must be exit. That is certainly not enough and you can hardly expect anyone to accept that. You ~~XXXXXX~~ never address the evidence indicating this was in fact an entrance wound and as I have said before, you must do that if you wish to offer it as an exit.

p. 95, graph 2: Two errors. You say the docs dismembered the body as their task required. This, of course, did not happen, and as Finck admitted, was ordered not to happen. For the extent of the dissection they did--which was very minimal, there is no guarantee they would have seen "where the bullet went" as you say. This is not how paths are found or traced.

p. 95, graph 5: Makes little sense. It seems to me you are trying to draw a relation between the lung bruise and the strap muscles where one does not exist.

p. 95, 2nd graph up from bottom: "This is not what they told Specter 5 days earlier." You must qualify this. Since the only record of what they told Specter is what Specter wrote about it, you can only go so far as to say "This is contrary to Specter's account of what the doctors told him 5 days earlier." It is possible that in writing his memo, he misrepresented (even unintentionally) what the docs told him about the bruises.

p. 98, 4th up from bottom: You point out that instantaneous reaction to the wrist wound was likely because pain is felt more quickly in limbs. Fine. But you fail to mention that it was not until 11/23 that JBC even knew he had been nit in the wrist. The point is moot to me because I think the instantaneous trauma of the chest wound overshadowed recognition and reaction to the other wounds.

p. 99, 2nd up from bottom: Qualify this. As I have said before, we really do not know if the Harper fragment originally landed where it was found, over a day later.

CHAPTER 9: This is a good chapter, but I feel certain omissions are necessary, with minor corrections.

p. 103: Immediately before the first full graph on this page would be the appropriate place to insert the information at p. 53.

If you recall, I previously suggested omitting Chapter 4 and putting the worthwhile info from it into other chapters. The info about the "chain of possession" on 399 at p. 53 would fit perfectly here.

If you revise as I have suggested above, then you will want to change the first sentence in the 4th full graph on this page, p. 103.

p. 103, 2nd graph up from bottom: I think this is very unnecessary and would advise omitting it. If you want to make an issue of Frazier's designation "materials," then you should point out that he avoided calling the residues blood or tissue, which leaves open to question whether the residues were of human or, for that matter, animal origin.

p. 104, 3rd up from bottom, through p. 106, next to last graph: This should all be omitted. It is entirely too lengthy to begin with. You have reached the ultimate in flowery and excessive description of the alleged flight of 399 and at this point, not only is it boring, it is highly repetitious. Everything you say here you have said before in the book. What follows this description is such a great piece of information that you should not risk losing your reader before he gets to it. ~~XXXXXXXX~~ As it now stands, those 3 pages of needless description will surely be impenetrable to most readers, who will probably just skip over it and possibly miss the good point which follows.

p. 113, 3rd up from bottom through p. 114, top graph: This digression to file 7 does not fit in the current discussion and should be omitted, especially so not to confuse your reader. If you want it kept, then make it a footnote. But definitely keep it out of the current discussion.

CHAPTER 10: A couple errors which must be omitted or changed.

p. 120, last graph, to p. 121, 3rd graph: As I had indicated in an earlier note, this info is wrong. The patch you see over the area you incorrectly indicate was a storm sewer was present on November 22, as several unpublished pictures reveal. So there is nothing suspicious about that, and you must remove the incorrect assertion.

p. 124, last 3 graphs, through p. 125: There is a curious mix-up here which must be fixed. You give the background on Slawson's 3/64 outline of the Report and then you claim to quote from it "THE ASSASSINATION: PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S ACTIVITIES FROM DEPARTURE TO DALLAS THROUGH AUTOPSY." However, this part you are quoting is not from the Slawson outline at all. It is from an attachment to a 1/23/64 memo to Ranking from Specter and Adams. This attachment is called "REVISED OUTLINE OF SUBJECT MATTER OF PHASE I" and all that you quote and reproduce comes from this, not the Slawson outline dated two months later.

This is a good place to mention both memoranda, although the Specter one is in my view (considering the context here) more important because it was written earlier. But definitely include excerpts from Slawson's outline, which is also very telling. If you decide to use one and not the other, then you still must clear up this discrepancy.

POSTSCRIPT: Very good. I think I liked this about the best of any other chapter in the book. It is indeed the most damning, and ~~IX~~ I think you make a much more effective and sturdier case when you emphasize concrete things such as ~~XXXX~~ the staff memoranda.  
A couple comments:

p. 134, last full graph: I think this point is unfair to Specter, or rather one aspect of this point, that concerning Specter's lack of interest in Odia when he recommended other witnesses. Odia was not in his field of study and he had no reason to be concerned with her. You are right however, about his failure to suggest calling the photographers.

p. 136, 4th full graph: Here would be the ideal place to insert the info on p. 52, which I had previously suggested moving elsewhere in the event chapter 4 is omitted (as I think it should)