

226 - for remand + depositions

Dear Jim, re possible 226 remand - FBI records I've just read

4/12/79

Attached is what may be the most scrupulous observance of the first law of the FBI - Cover The Bureau's Ass. It has importances, several, other than what the FBI intended.

These pages are from FBIHQ 62-109060, its "assassination" file, but not from the regular part of that files. It is Serial 4194 EBF, which means it is an "enclosure not in file" as I recall, perhaps envelope. In general it represents a "bulky." It is from Part 2 of that EBF, a fat one.

What Griffith tells Conrad is a "review" of their printed testimony by Madigan and Shaneyfelt is actually a word-by-word comparison from the attachment to this memo.

The comparison was between the edited testimony transcript, meaning what the typescript said after the agents went over it, and the printed version in the 26 volumes.

(Unless they took unusual liberties this kind of correcting and clarification of the typescript is perfectly proper, a long-standing practise.)

In particular I draw your attention to the series of apparent Commission alterations beginning on the second page with Volume V, page 154, line 8. This is the most common listing, of the elimination of (what I regard as proper and necessary) FBI caution, if the bullet was undeflected.

It may become important if there is a remand in 226 and it is an important fact of the assassination, relating to Connally's wounds and the possibility of the single-bullet theory.

If it was not in the testimony as spoken it should have been added. It is an essential caveat from any point of view - because the agents had no way of knowing whether the path of the bullet was deflected, they would say, and because when it hit and broke his rib some deflection would have been inevitable.

This really tells you why the FBI has not come up with the results and reports we seek - they cannot confirm the official story. Rather it is one of the reasons they can't. The tests simply cannot confirm the official account, which is the capability of the tests.

And the FBI was merely keeping itself in the clear while staying not only within the bounds but within the requirements of expert testimony.

Shaneyfelt drafted the memo, which went to much of the top brass. The Central Records copy appears to have been the original Madigan copy, which leaves the others to be accounted for and I believe represents unsearched files of the kind I tried to get Harting to have searched in 75-1996. I'm not critical of this distribution. It is an important thing and the top brass should have been informed of such significant changes when the testimony was published. Remember, the world had access only to the published testimony.

The FBI appears to have caught the Commission and for its own purposes, even when Hoover angered and leaked what was embarrassing to the Commission when the report was out. Did not let this out. But what extreme caution- or what paranoia! Or what sources on the inside.

Which reminds me, I have not ~~seen~~ seen any copies of any work that was required for the memo's preparation. I have seen the corrected transcripts, have them.

We may well be past the point where this can be relevant if we take further depositions, but not certainly so. This may be the basis for questioning on the need for reports to have been prepared and to exist -somewhere. Meanwhile, this confirms my very earliest writing and my 226 affidavits. (I'm pretty certain, by the way, the directly or indirectly the FBI provided ~~xxx~~ Pratt with what it calls "public source material" for his opinion. I can't imagine him taking the time of a clerk having the knowledge required to locate all those special citations he used, with the oversights the FBI would prefer.

Mr. Conrad

11/12/64

W. D. Griffith

**ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F.
KENNEDY, DALLAS, TEXAS, 11/22/63**

Special Agents James C. Cadigan and Lyndal L. Shaneyfelt have reviewed the following portions of the printed transcript of the testimony taken by the President's Commission and contained in the 26 volumes recently released:

Volume IV, pages 89 through 101 and 279 through 294
Volume V, pages 135 through 165 and 176 through 193
Volume VII, pages 410 through 433
Volume XV, pages 686 through 702
Volume XVII, pages 517 through 526
Volume XVIII, pages 1 through 26
Volume XXI, pages 442 through 463

The significant variations between the transcript contained in the 26 volumes and the transcript as furnished by the Commission and edited by representatives of the Bureau prior to the printing of the final report are set out on the attachment.

RECOMMENDATION: For your information.

62-109060

Enclosure

- 1 - Mr. Belmont - Enclosure
- 1 - Mr. Rosen (Mr. Rogge) Enclosure
- 1 - Mr. Sullivan (Mr. Leahan) Enclosure
- 1 - Mr. Conrad - Enclosure
- 1 - Mr. Griffith - Enclosure
- 1 - Mr. Cadigan - Enclosure
- 1 - Mr. Shaneyfelt - Enclosure

LLS:cmh (3)

62-109060-4194 EBF Pt 2

Volume IV, page 282, lines 39 and 40

Volume IV - "...and in the simulated photographs 743 and 741."

Transcript - "...and in the simulated photograph 741."

Volume IV, page 280, lines 30 and 31

Volume IV - "...and it then becomes narrower as you are looking at the edge of two ropes..." "...between the strands slightly..."

Transcript - "...and it then turns into a narrower area as though you are looking at the edge of two ropes..."
"...between them slightly..."

Volume IV, page 281, line 1

Volume IV - "...screen pattern..."

Transcript - "...strip pattern..."

Volume V, page 154, line 8

Volume V - "...under his right nipple?"

Transcript - "...under his right nipple, assuming the bullet followed an undeflected path?"

Volume V, page 154, line 9

Volume V - "No, Governor Connally..."

Transcript - "No, if the bullet continued in a straight path, Governor Connally..."

Volume V, page 154, line 13

Volume V - "...undeflected path."

Transcript - "...undeflected path. However, I have no personal knowledge that it was undeflected."

Volume V, page 154, line 24

Volume V - "...with the window."

Transcript - "...with the window, if it followed an undeflected path."

Volume V, page 155, line 8

Volume V - "That is correct."

Transcript - "That is correct, again provided the bullet is undeflected."

Volume V, page 177, line 57

Volume V - "Those are 8mm too."

Transcript - "Those are 8 mm too."

Volume VII, page 417, next to last line

Volume VII - "..., but it is my feeling that it is probably identical."

Transcript - (changed from above to) "..., but it may very well have been made from the Life Magazine cover."

Volume VII, page 436, line 39

Volume - "...exception of the Hiddell signature..."

Transcript - "...exception of the Hiddell signature..."
(misspelling of name)

Volume XV, page 692, lines 6, 9 and 14

Volume XV - Refers to Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 22 but Vol. 21 showing the exhibit has it marked Shaneyfelt Exhibit 022A

Volume XV, page 700, line 24

Volume XV - Line 24 is actually a repeat of line 22 and the following text that should have been on line 24 is omitted:
"Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct. Examinations of the mark on the curving..."