

Deposition - Dr. CHARLES J. CARRICO, March 25, 1964, 6 H 1-7

Questioning by Arlen Specter, asst. counsel, Warren Commission

Dr. Carrico is a duly licensed physician about to qualify for "my boards in general surgery". Could this be a pressure point? Dr. Carrico here gives a different time than in his statement for the beginning of the emergency - 12:30 vs. 12:45. The descriptive language is 100 percent technical (p.3) and he isn't asked to explain what any of it means, although on p.2 he is asked what "agonal" meant. Of the anterior neck wound he says "there were no jagged edges". There is persistent, prosecutor-like questioning about whether he or anyone saw the President's back, and no word other than "back" is used. The point of this is that here and in all the other questionings of medical people, the Commission refers to 'back' whereas in the report they refer to the President's posterior injury as "neck". On p.4 Specter returned, persistently, to the "back" and asks if the doctor had examined the President's clothes, even though Carrico had already explained that they had to do first things first and in a desperate effort to save the President. Specter, of course, knew the answer; he was trying to build a phony case. He knew that Carrico had made only a rapid examination by hand of the President's back for a major wound, by merely running his hand under the President's back while the President was lying on his back. He knew that the nurses had removed the President's clothes.

During this questioning there is (p.4) a clear inference of an effort to brainwash Dr. Carrico, or get him to change his testimony before the deposition was begun. He had called the front neck wound that of entrance. Specter had not made any reference to entrance or exit, but was pressing Dr. Carrico when the doctor said of his cursory examination for a major back wound, "Now, this certainly wouldn't detect

a small bullet entrance." This should be compared with Dr. Carrico's original handwritten statement in the Appendix of the report.

On p.3 Dr. Carrico describes the front wound as "4-7 mm." which may or may not be the same as the report says, "4 x 7 mm." The ~~my~~ quote in the Report is not exact in any event. On p.5 Specter gets Dr. Carrico to say the front wound could have been either entrance or exit. Then on p.6 Specter shows him Exhibit 392, his own statement of 16²00 hours November 22, 1963, and asks, "Are the facts set forth in there true and correct?" Dr. Carrico replies, "They are." But in this exhibit Dr. Carrico described the front ~~wound~~ neck wound as a "small penetrating wound" (my emphasis). When asked if he had been previously interrogated, Carrico refers to a Secret Service interview "shortly after the President's death"; no other description by either Carrico or Specter. Then Specter again returns to his effort to destroy the doctor's first opinion that the front was the entrance wound. Carrico's replies are evasive. He says that they were asked "what we felt the wounds were from, the direction, and so forth", and that his replies were "essentially the same as I have (given) here. ~~I~~ I said I don't remember specifically." I believe an examination of the Secret Service report will, in fact, show that Carrico was still of the opinion the front neck wound was the entrance wound. Unless, of course, somebody had already spoken to him. See also Dr. Perry's deposition.

Dr. Carrico was rehearsed in his interview before the taking of the deposition by Specter. He also is asked "have you ever changed any of your opinions regarding your treatment and observations of President Kennedy?" and he replies, "Not as I recall." This is an obviously untrue statement (see Exhibit 392 as quoted above) into

which Specter clearly ~~has~~ ^{has} lead him.
Carrico

Note that on p.5 ~~Specter~~ was asked for an opinion based on a set of medical circumstances about the President's injuries, and included in this is "without violating the pleural cavity". This same phrase is used by the Commission's counsel from time to time in ~~the~~ ^{the} questioning of the other medical witnesses. This should be compared with the apparent source of the medical information, the autopsy report, Exhibit 387, on p.538 ff. of the Report. At the ~~top~~ of p.542 there is this language, referring to "the right pleural cavity" - "in this region there is contusion of parietal pleura and of the extreme apical portion of \checkmark the right upper lobe of the lung", etc. Is this a description of "without violation of the pleural cavity"? If it is not a fair ~~representation~~ ^{representation}, it should be borne in mind that all of the answers elicited by the counsel from the doctors with respect to the neck wound and the path of the bullet may, in fact, be invalid. Dr. Carrico's answer to the question about the neck wound and the path of the bullet was it "very likely not tumble, thus producing a small, round, even wound", etc.