

ANOTHER ARGUMENT AGAINST THE SINGLE-BULLET THEORY USING LOGICAL CONNECTIONS BETWEEN ISSUES

by

Dr. Thomas J. Donahue

*Copy to:
Hoe WEBBER*

I recently argued ("A New Type of Argument Against the Single Bullet Theory" in the January, 1994 issue of *The Fourth Decade*) that we should search for and use logical connections between apparently unrelated issues in order to formulate additional arguments against the single-bullet theory. In many cases, this method will yield very persuasive arguments to the effect that the Warren Commission's own evidence implies the falsity of its single-shooter conclusion.

In the aforementioned article, I explained how the Warren Commission's own reconstruction photographs as they relate to the issue of lateral trajectory implied that any double-hit, i.e., any single-bullet impact on President Kennedy and Governor Connally, would have to have occurred so early (approximately Zapruder frame 210) that Governor Connally's involuntary physical reaction to being shot (principally his "cheek puff" at approximately Zapruder 238) could not possibly have resulted from the same shot which non-fatally wounded President Kennedy.

However, being logically compelled to push its alleged double-hit back to approximately Zapruder 210 creates an additional problem for the Warren Commission's single-bullet theory and hence for its single-shooter conclusion. Once again, the Warren Commission's nemesis is its own evidence.

The Warren Commission's own reconstruction of the assassination revealed that from Zapruder 166 to Zapruder 209 any shooter firing from the southeast corner window of the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository would have had his view of the President obstructed by the foliage of a large live oak tree (the only exception to this being Zapruder 186 when the President came back into view only "for a fleeting instant").

[1] On the basis of this key claim, the Warren Commission concluded that "it is probable that the President was not shot before Zapruder frame 210, since it is unlikely that the assassin would deliberately have shot at him with a view obstructed by the oak tree when he was about to have a clear opportunity" [2] and since "it is also doubtful that even the most proficient marksman would have hit him through the oak tree." [3]

Thomas J. Donahue
539 Talcott Rd.
Waterford PA, 16441

So the Warren Commission admits that President Kennedy was shot after his reemergence from behind the foliage of the oak tree at Zapruder 210. Yet its own reconstruction photographs require that any double-hit must have occurred approximately Zapruder 210. The problem should be clear: If the President wasn't even visible to a shooter firing from the alleged sniper's window until Zapruder 210, how likely is it that the President was shot at approximately 210? Is it likely that any assassin would have been able to reacquire a moving target, aim his weapon accurately and squeeze off a shot instantaneously? Isn't it much more likely that this three-step process would have taken one second, at least two-thirds of a second? If so, the alleged double-hit so essential to the single-bullet theory could not have taken place until at least Zapruder 222 and maybe as late as Zapruder 225. However, by these frames, President Kennedy and Governor Connally were already out of the requisite lateral alignment to have received from a single shot the wounds which they actually sustained. By Zapruder 222 through Zapruder 225, President Kennedy is much too far to the left of Governor Connally for a shot from the alleged sniper's window to go through Kennedy's throat and then (having hit only soft tissue in Kennedy) continue on in an essentially straight line to strike Connally near the right armpit. This is shown by the Warren Commission's own reconstruction photographs of Zapruder 222 and Zapruder 225. [4]

Once again, the Warren Commission's own evidence contradicts its single-bullet theory and hence its single-shooter conclusion. This is the valuable insight which can be gained by attending to the logical connection between the lateral trajectory issue and issues involving the timing of shots.

In my view, there is no more persuasive argument against the Warren Commission's single-bullet theory than one which shows that even the Warren Commission's own evidence refutes the single-bullet theory. Such arguments are valuable weapons in the struggle to combat the lamentable tendency of many, especially those in the mainstream media, to take the Warren Commission's version of events as authoritative in the wake of Gerald Posner's *Case Closed*.

Notes

1. *Warren Commission Report* (New York: St. Martin's Press), p. 98.
2. *Warren Commission Report*, p. 98.
3. *Warren Commission Report*, pp. 98-105.
4. *Warren Commission Hearings and Exhibits*, Volume 18, pp. 89-90.