

Roger,

4/9/89

There is a considerable background to the Harwood story in the WxPost in the FBI records you gave me yesterday, to me the most interesting part being that there is no mention of it at all. I believe this is not because the FBI suppressed it but because the FBI did not know it. This means that DJ did not consult with it.

When former Maryland U.S. Senator Charles "Mac" Mathias was the Congressman from our district we were friends. When I finished Whitewash and was having trouble getting it published I asked him to read it. He had just returned from major surgery but he found it so interesting he stayed up when he should have been asleep and read the first half that night in bed. He tried to interest others in it, ranging from Manny Celler, then House Judiciary chairman, Mac a member, to Al Friendly on the Post. Friendly assigned it to the late Larry Stern, who did nothing for so long a time I went in and asked for it. I had to drive him to his home to get it and when I looked at it he had read only a few less than the first 50 of the triple-spaced pages.

When I printed the book the next year and had a copy I went to the Post with it again and again saw Friendly and this time also Ben Bradlee. I gave Bradlee copies of some of the FBI records I then had and some I used in the book and he was, from appearance, impressed and gave the book to Dan Kurzman to read. Dan was quite excited after reading it and took me to the Post's cafeteria to tell me about it. When we returned to the reading room I was asked to prepare a few questions to be asked of DJ, as I now recall including Howard Willens. (These are reflected in the story.) I left and returned after they had returned or was there when they did. Stern went in to see Bradlee and Kurzman spoke to me, in essence, "Boy, you are in! They had no answers for anything."

Next thing I knew Kurzman was not on the story and Dick Harwood, then new to the Post, had replaced him. When he spoke to me he was, as I recall, antagonistic. In any event, when the story appeared they had jumped the release date on Epstein's book and featured it rather than Whitewash. I regarded this as a breach of our agreement and - am confident I was correct.

From then on the Post's attitude has been antagonistic to both our side of the controversy and to me.

I am surprised that the DJ people made no mention to the FBI of the coming appearance of criticism and in thinking of it now I think it is out of the usual ^{for} from DJ not to have been in touch with the FBI after the story appeared. It was across the top of page 1, above the logo, with a lengthy jump.

Willens was then a fair-haired boy to the Post as I now recall.

Kurzman was fired. I have no reason to believe it was over his attitude toward Whitewash and he was reluctant to talk to me about it before he left. I think it was in some way connected with some of his Dominican reporting but I'm not sure. Last I heard he was in New York City and with the passing of time it might be interesting to talk to him about these things. We were not good friends. We'd only just met. I was, however, quite impressed with his reporting.

And since then I've often wondered whether his departure was the real beginning of major changes in the Post's policies and positions, which did undergo a radical change.

I think they gave him some form of severance.

Harold



Memorandum to Mr. DeLoach
Re: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

as it passed through the shirt. It would appear the statement concerning the medical examination of the President's body indicating the bullet had penetrated to a distance of less than a finger length was incorporated in this report in order to point out the apparent conflict between the information originally furnished by medical authorities on 11/22/63, and the results of our Laboratory's examination of the President's clothing, which indicated a bullet had exited his body. It is noted the Warren Commission report subsequently concluded a bullet had exited the President's body as reflected in the official autopsy report and as incorporated in the Commission's report.

Based on the above, it is evident the assumptions made by Weisberg and Epstein are inconclusive and erroneous, since they have extracted only those items from the President's Commission report that bolster their own theories and hypotheses leading to their conclusions.

ACTION:

This is submitted for information.

[Handwritten initials and marks: "JFK", "R", "D", "V", "JK", "ds"]

Memorandum to Mr. DeLoach
Re: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

DETAILS

An article appeared in "The Washington Post," on 5/29/66, Sunday Edition, under the byline of Richard Harwood, captioned "An Inquest: Skeptical Postscript to Warren Group's Report on Assassination." The article relates the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy Report is now under attack by scholars and writers who believe the Commission's findings are marred by conjecture and by inconsistencies which the Commission was unable to resolve.

The article relates to grave doubts about the competence of the Commission's work which are raised in two new books on the assassination - "Whitewash" by Harold Weisberg and "Inquest" by Edward J. Epstein. The article revealed perhaps the greatest source of controversy and doubt over the integrity of the report in the minds of Weisberg and Epstein, was the unpublished FBI document which was a five-volume report from the FBI dated 12/9/63, that contains "a finding" which would almost certainly have led to the conclusion that Oswald had an accomplice in the assassination. This report was located in the National Archives. The controversy arises in connection with the report that the bullet which wounded President Kennedy in the shoulder did not exit from his body and the supplemental report of the FBI on 1/13/64, indicated medical examination of the President's body indicated the bullet which entered the President's back had penetrated to a distance of less than a finger's length. Further, the article revealed that one of the bullets entered below the shoulder to the right of the spinal column at an angle of 45 to 60 degrees downward and that there was no point of exit and further the bullet was not in the body.

It was contended this statement is in direct contradiction to the official autopsy report from the Bethesda Naval Hospital written the last week in November, 1963, which indicated that the bullet which struck the President in the lower neck passed through his body and came out his throat. The article infers that the discrepancy between the FBI report and the autopsy report is crucial for the Commission's conclusion that Oswald acted alone is right only if the autopsy report is right and wrong if the FBI report is right.

The article continues, "If a bullet did not pass through President Kennedy's neck and cause Gov. Connally's wounds, a second assassin must have been involved.

Memorandum to Mr. DeLoach
Re: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

"This is so because films of the assassination proved conclusively that Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Connally were wounded within a period of one-half second, at the minimum, and less than two seconds at the maximum.

"It was physically impossible for a sniper to fire two rounds in that flash of time from a bolt-action rifle of the type Oswald used. Thus, either Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Connally were struck by the same bullet or two men fired two nearly simultaneous bullets."

There are no discrepancies in the Bureau's reporting of this matter. Initially, a five-volume report relating to the assassination of President Kennedy was furnished to Chief Justice Warren on 12/9/63, followed by a supplemental report dated 1/13/64. These are the two reports which are purported to be in contention with the official autopsy report concerning President Kennedy.

It is specifically pointed out the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy Report clearly states that "of principal importance was the five-volume report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, submitted on December 9, 1963, which summarized the results of the investigation conducted by the Bureau immediately after the assassination."

The newspaper article indicated that our December, 1963 report revealed the bullet that wounded President Kennedy in the shoulder did not exit from his body. This, in substance, is true. Our 12/9/63, report states "Immediately after President Kennedy and Governor Connally were admitted to Parkland Memorial Hospital, a bullet was found on one of the stretchers (subsequently determined this bullet was found on Connally's stretcher). Medical examination of the President's body revealed that one of the bullets had entered just below his shoulder to the right of the spinal column at an angle of 45 to 60 degrees downward, that there was no point of exit, and that the bullet was not in the body. An examination of this bullet by the FBI Laboratory determined that it had been fired from the rifle owned by Oswald."

Our supplemental report dated 1/13/64, under "FBI Laboratory Examinations," concerned information relating to bullets used in the

Memorandum to Mr. DeLoach
Re: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

assassination of President Kennedy and the examination of the President's clothing concerning a small hole in the back of his coat and a slit appearing in the front of his shirt approximately 6 inches below the top of the collar and 2 inches to the right of the middle seam of the coat. Contained in this information was the comment "medical examination of the President's body had revealed that the bullet which entered his back had penetrated to a distance of less than a finger length."

The confusion appears to exist around this comment as our examination of the President's clothing indicated an entrance wound in his back and an exit wound in his shirt which had the characteristic of an exit hole for a projectile.

HW
The initial findings of the doctors performing the autopsy of the President on 11/22/63, at the Bethesda Naval Hospital, were verbally made to two of our Agents who observed the autopsy. The doctors' statement to our Agents appears in the report of SA Robert P. Gemberling dated 12/10/63, captioned "Lee Harvey Oswald, aka," commencing on page 281 (105-82555, Section 12, Part II). It was reported the body of President Kennedy was X-rayed and photographed, which revealed a path of a missile which appeared to enter the back of the skull and the path of disintegrated fragments could be observed along the right side of the skull. During the latter stages of this autopsy Commander James J. Humes, Chief Pathologist, Bethesda Naval Hospital, who conducted the autopsy, located an opening which appeared to be a bullet hole, which was below the shoulders and two inches to the right of the middle line of the spinal column. This opening was probed by Dr. Humes with the finger, at which time it was determined the trajectory of the missile entering at this point had entered at a downward position of "45 to 60 degrees." Further probing determined that the distance traveled by this missile was a short distance, inasmuch as the end of the opening could be felt with the finger by Dr. Humes. No bullet could be located in the back or any other area of the body as determined by total X-rays and inspection revealing there was no point of exit and the medical personnel performing the autopsy were at a loss to explain why they could find no bullets.

This information was telephonically furnished to the Bureau Laboratory, at which time a Laboratory Supervisor advised the Laboratory had received

Memorandum to Mr. DeLoach
Re: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

through Secret Service, information that a bullet had been found on a stretcher in the emergency room of the Parkland Hospital, Dallas, Texas. Immediately following the receipt of this information it was made available to Dr. Humes, who advised "that in his opinion this accounted for no bullet being located which had entered the back region and that since external cardiac massage had been performed at Parkland Hospital, it was entirely possible that through such movement the bullet had worked its way back out of the point of entry and had fallen on the stretcher."

Also during the latter stages of the autopsy a small piece of skull was furnished to Dr. Humes, who determined one corner of the section revealed minute metal particles. An inspection of this same area disclosed a chipping of the top portion of this piece, both of which indicated that this had been the point of exit of the bullet entering the skull.

On the basis of the developments, Dr. Humes at that time stated the pattern was clear that one bullet entered the President's back and had worked its way out during external cardiac massage and that a second high velocity bullet entered the rear of the skull and had fragmentized prior to exit through the top of the skull. He, therefore, attributed the death of the President to a gunshot wound in the head.

It is to be pointed out that information relating to the official autopsy report of the President was not made public until the Commission's report was released on 9/24/64. In a memorandum Mr. Rosen to Mr. Belmont, 12/24/63, (62-109090-68) it is pointed out that the President's family indicated a strong desire to keep the autopsy report as confidential as possible. It was recommended and approved that the copy of the autopsy report be maintained in Bureau files but that no further dissemination of it be made at that time.

The Commission specifically pointed out, when released, the autopsy examination further disclosed that the bullet after entering the President, passed between two large muscles. It bruised a portion of the right lung, ripped the windpipe (trachea) in its path through the President's neck. The surgeon concluded the wounds were caused by the bullet rather than the tracheotomy performed at Parkland Hospital. Further, doctors concluded the bullet exited from the front portion of the President's neck that had been cut away by the tracheotomy.

*FBI & other
declined w/gy
of autopsy
report
JW*

Memorandum to Mr. DeLoach
Re: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Thereafter, when the conclusion was made the bullet passed through the President's neck, the doctors at Bethesda Naval Hospital rejected the theory the bullet lodged in the large muscle in the back of the President's neck and fell out through the point of entry when external heart massage was applied in the Parkland Hospital. The Commission clearly pointed out in the early stages of the autopsy the surgeons were unable to find a path into any large muscle in the back of the President's neck and at that time they did not know there had been a bullet hole in the front of the President's neck when he arrived at the Parkland Hospital because the tracheotomy insertion had completely eliminated that evidence.

When the surgeons learned of the location of the bullet this led to the speculation it might have penetrated a short distance and then dropped out as a result of external heart massage. Their further exploration during the autopsy disproved this theory. Dr. Humes, who believed the tracheotomy had been performed, based on his later observations, on the morning of 11/23/63, telephoned Dr. Malcolm O. Perry in Dallas, Texas, who was one of the attending physicians at Parkland Hospital, and learned that his assumption was correct that Dr. Perry had used the missile wound in the President's neck as the point to make the incision; therefore confirming Dr. Humes' conclusion that the bullet had exited from the front part of the President's neck.

Based on these professional findings the President's Commission arrived at its conclusion. It is obviously evident that the assumptions made by Weisberg and Epstein are inconclusive and erroneous, as they have extracted only those findings from the President's Commission that would bolster their own theories and hypotheses which led to their conclusions.

It is further pointed out that they have attributed results of investigation to the FBI as all-conclusive rather than the fact that we reported only that information which was furnished to us by authoritative physicians, which was for the specific use of Chief Justice Warren, members of the President's Commission and Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, who at that time was the Deputy Attorney General.

CONTINUED - OVER

Memorandum to Mr. DeLoach
Re: ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT
JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

The article further alleges that the Agents attending the autopsy obtained their information based on hearsay and that the Agents left the autopsy before the doctors had completed their examination. Both statements are false. Our Agents obtained their information from the head pathologist and remained in the autopsy room until the physical examination was completed.

An Inquest: Skeptical Postscript

Warren Group's Report on Assassination

- Tolson
- DeLoach
- Mohr
- Wick
- Casper
- Callahan
- Conrad
- Felt
- Gale
- Rosen
- Sullivan
- Tavel
- Trotter
- Tele. Room
- Holmes
- Gandy

By Richard Harwood
Washington Post Staff Writer

On Sept. 24, 1964, the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy reported to the world that it had "ascertained the truth."

Said the Commission: "The shots which killed President Kennedy and wounded Governor Connally were fired by Lee Harvey Oswald."

This report, issued under the imprimatur of Chief Justice Earl Warren and six other distinguished Americans, is now under attack by scholars and writers who believe the Commission's findings are marred by conjecture and by inconsistencies which the Commission was unable to resolve.

They have unearched, for example, a five-volume report from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, dated Dec. 9, 1963, that contains a "finding" which—had it been true—would almost certainly have led to the conclusion that Oswald had an accomplice in the assassination.

This "finding" which now appears to have been completely erroneous, was the product of an impulsive report by FBI agents a few hours after the President was killed. Although it was apparently based on little more than hearsay, it found its way into the Dec. 9 document.

It has given ammunition to the Commission's critics and contributed to a serious disagreement within the Commission itself over the manner in which Gov. Connally was wounded and over the ultimate explanation given by the Commission of the events of Nov. 22.

For these reasons and others, grave doubts about the competence of the Commission's work are raised in two new books on the assassination. One, "Who Was Oswald?" by Harold Weisberg, and "Inquest," by Edward Jay Epstein. Weisberg is a former Government

worker who now operates a poultry farm. Epstein is a Ph.D. candidate at Harvard.

Epstein's book—written as a master's thesis at Cornell—carries an introduction by the New Yorker magazine's Washington correspondent, Richard Rovere, who writes: "Nothing Mr. Epstein reveals is quite so shocking as the fact that this great investigation was carried out by men who could not give their full attention to it and who, because of their own needs and also because of certain political circumstances, were in a desperate hurry to get it over with . . . The day the Warren Commission Report was issued, the American press should have begun to do what Mr. Epstein has done; it should have cast a very cool eye on the Report and sought to learn from those who prepared it how it was prepared . . ."

Weisberg charges: "The superficial and immature manner in which the Report deals with the possibility of a conspiracy or of a different assassin is only one of the ways in which the Commission may have crippled itself."

The Epstein book, based in large part on interviews with members of the Commission and its staff, gives a picture of the investigation at sharp variance with the common conception of how it was conducted.

It reveals that no single member of the Commission heard all the testimony and that "most of the Commissioners were present for only a minor portion of the hearings. Senator (Richard) Russell (D-Ga.) who attended the fewest, heard only about 6 per cent of the testimony; whereas Allen Dulles, who attended the largest number of hearings, heard about 71 per cent. Only three Commissioners heard more than half the testimony, and the average Commissioner heard

Lawyers' Comment

"Opinions differ," Epstein writes, "as to what the Commission actually did. Joseph Ball (one of the Commission's staff lawyers) commented that the Commission 'had no idea of what was happening; we did all the investigating, lined up the witnesses, solved the problems and wrote the Report.' Wesley Liebeler (another Commission lawyer) when asked what the Commission did, replied, 'In one word, nothing.'"

(Others connected with the investigation dispute these harsh judgments. "The Commissioners," said one staff lawyer, "contributed significantly to the final Report.")

The actual work of the Commission fell, in any event, on a few younger

What about the dissemination of this info at the time of the Kennedy assassination?

REC 30

- The Washington Post and Times Herald
- The Washington Daily News
- The Evening Star
- New York Herald Tribune
- New York Journal-American
- New York Daily News
- New York Post
- The New York Times
- The Baltimore Sun
- The New Leader
- Wall Street Journal
- The National Guardian
- World
- Date

JUN 20 1966

MAY 29 1966

JUN 22 1966

members of the staff were able to devote full time to the job. Many of the eminent private lawyers brought in to help continued their private professional activities and gave little time to the inquiry.

Among the working staff, Epstein reveals, there were bitter disagreements about the credibility of witnesses, about the quality of the evidence compiled by Government agencies, and about the ultimate wording and conclusions of the Report.

FBI's Unpublished Report

Perhaps the greatest source of controversy and doubt over the integrity of the Report—at least in the minds of Epstein and Weisberg—was the unpublished FBI document, which is now in the National Archives.

It states categorically that "medical examination of the President's body revealed that one of the bullets had entered just below his shoulder to the right of the spinal column at an angle of 45 to 60 degrees downward, that there was no point of exit, and that the bullet was not in the body."

This statement is in direct contradiction to the official autopsy report from the Bethesda Naval Hospital, written the last week in November, that the bullet which struck the President in the lower neck passed through his body and came out his throat. The autopsy report said:

"The missile contused the strap muscle of the right side of the neck, damaged the trachea (windpipe) and made its exit through the anterior (front) surface of the neck."

The discrepancy between the FBI report and the autopsy report is crucial, for the Commission's conclusion that Oswald acted alone is right only if the autopsy report is right, and wrong if the FBI report is right.

If a bullet did not pass through President Kennedy's neck and cause Gov. Connally's wounds, a second assassin must have been involved.

This is so because films of the assassination proved conclusively that Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Connally were wounded within a period of one-half second, at the minimum, and less than two seconds at the maximum.

It was physically impossible for a sniper to fire two rounds in that flash of time from a bolt-action rifle of

the type used. Thus, either Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Connally were struck by the same bullet or two men fired two nearly simultaneous bullets.

Both Epstein and Weisberg argue that the first possibility—two wounds from a single shot—is disproved by the evidence itself and that a second assassin was involved who remains free.

Independent study of the evidence does not necessarily lead to the same conclusion, although there is substantial testimony other than the FBI report that raises grave questions about the manner in which Gov. Connally was wounded.

This evidence is of such weight that Sen. Russell, according to Epstein, "reportedly said that he would not sign a Report which concluded that both men were hit by the same bullet. Sen. (John Sherman) Cooper (R-Ky.) and Rep. (Hale) Boggs (D-La.) tended to agree with Russell's position."

Accordingly, the Commission was forced to hedge its conclusion by saying that the evidence, while not certain, was "very persuasive . . . to indicate that the same bullet which pierced the President's throat also caused Governor Connally's wounds."

(Congressman Boggs said any implication by Epstein that the Commission was divided on its ultimate conclusions is wrong. There were many discussions involving many points of evidence, he said, but the findings were unanimous.)

(Sens. Russell and Cooper were out of the city and could not be reached for comment.)

The reasons for the Commission's uncertainty on this vital point are well documented:

(1) Gov. Connally, who was conscious when all three shots were fired, told the Commission he could not have been wounded by the bullet that struck Mr. Kennedy in the neck: "It is not conceivable to me that I could have been hit by the first bullet . . . Obviously, at least the major wound that I took in the shoulder through the chest couldn't have been anything but the second shot."

(2) Two of the three pathologists who performed the

autopsy on the President, Commander James J. H. . . and Lt. Col. Pierre Finck, an authority on gunshot wounds—testified that it was either "unlikely" or "impossible" that the wound in President Kennedy's neck and the wounds Gov. Connally sustained were caused by the same bullet.

(3) The FBI's principal ballistics expert, Robert Frazier, told the Commission: "I myself don't have any evidence which would permit me to say one way or the other, in other words which would support it (the theory that Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Connally were hit by a single shot) as far as my rendering an opinion as an expert. I would certainly say it was possible but I don't say it probably occurred . . ."

(4) After reporting on Dec. 9, 1963, that the bullet that wounded Mr. Kennedy in the shoulder did not exit from his body, the FBI on Jan. 13, 1964, issued a supplemental report on the President's wounds which stated:

"Medical examination of the President's body had revealed that the bullet which entered his back had penetrated to a distance of less than a finger length."

(5) On Dec. 18, 1963, The Washington Post and other newspapers reported on the basis of rumors from Dallas, that the first bullet to strike the President "was found deep in his shoulder." This report was confirmed prior to publication by the FBI.

The cumulative effect of these various statements was to raise very considerable doubt about the principal conclusion of the Warren Commission: that "the shots which killed President Kennedy and wounded Governor Connally were fired by Lee Harvey Oswald."

They have no bearing on Oswald's involvement but, if true, they point unmistakably to the involvement of at least one other assassin.

The commission handled this crucial problem, in effect, by rendering a highly misleading verdict:

"Although it is not necessary to any essential findings of the Commission to deter-

mine just which shot hit Gov. Connally, there is very persuasive evidence from the experts to indicate that the same bullet which pierced the President's throat also caused Gov. Connally's wounds. However, Gov. Connally's testimony and certain other factors have given rise to some difference of opinion as to this probability but there is no question in the mind of any member of the Commission that all the shots which caused the President's and Gov. Connally's wounds were fired from the sixth floor window of the Texas School Book Depository."

Contrary to what the Commission reported, it was not only "necessary" but absolutely essential to determine which shot hit the Governor.

"To say that they were hit by separate bullets," Norman Redlich of the Commission staff told Epstein, "is synonymous with saying that there were two assassins."

Specter Had Responsibility

One of the reasons the Commission had difficulty with this problem was that while, on paper, 34 men, including the seven members of the Commission, were engaged in the investigation, "the entire task ascertaining the basic facts of the assassination fell upon one lawyer—Arlen Specter, Specter," according to Epstein, "had the responsibility for determining the sources of the shots, the number of assassins, the exact manner in which the President and Gov. Connally were shot, and the sequence of events—in short, all the facts of the assassination."

Specter read mountainous stacks of reports and conducted the examination of key witnesses before the Commission. But Specter's independent investigation, Epstein reports, consisted of nothing more than interviews with 28 doctors and other medical personnel at Parkland Hospital in Dallas, none of whom had any thorough knowledge of the President's wounds. "With one minor exception," says Epstein, "these interviews comprised Specter's entire field investigation of 'the basic facts of the assassination.'"

Specker, moreover, was under constant pressure from the Commission — as were all members of the staff—to complete his work by June 1, which was the arbitrary deadline chosen by the Commission.

Deadline Extended

The deadline was not met and Chief Justice Warren, according to Epstein, "reportedly lost his temper and demanded that (Howard) Willens (the staff director) close down the investigation immediately." The deadline, in the end, was extended to July 15, then to Aug. 1, and then into September, despite Epstein says, pressure from McGeorge Bundy at the White House and members of the Commission to complete the report well in advance of the presidential election.

Specker developed the theory that a single bullet must have wounded both Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Connally and he filled the record with testimony that supports his hypothesis.

He never entirely convinced the Commission that his theory was correct, in part because of the frequent absence of Commissioners from the hearings. Nor did he convince Epstein and Weisberg, in part because his evidence was so scattered through the 26 volumes that it was hard to piece together.

Thus, it was possible for a reader—or a member of the Warren Commission—to find in the hearings evidence to support almost any conclusion, even contradictory conclusions. Some of the contradictions are relatively simple to resolve, however.

The first one involves the credibility of the FBI report of Dec. 9, which states that the bullet which struck Mr. Kennedy's shoulder did not leave his body.

This report, the FBI said last week, was based on the medical evidence at that time. But there is other evidence that it was based on nothing more than hearsay.

The autopsy on the President began at Bethesda Naval Hospital at about 8 o'clock the night of Nov. 22.

Wound Confused Doctors

Two FBI agents who were present overheard Dr.

J. T. [redacted] all speculate about the President's shoulder wound. The doctors were confused by it because an incision made in the front of the President's throat in Dallas obscured the exit wound.

Before the three doctors at Bethesda had completed the autopsy and before they had traced the path of the bullet from the President's shoulder to his throat, the FBI observers left the room and called in a report that the bullet had not passed through the President's body.

Incredibly, this verbal report became the basis of the erroneous statement that appears in the Dec. 9, five-volume summary submitted to the Warren Commission.

The official autopsy report which contradicts the FBI was in the hands of the Secret Service, not the Bureau, and may never have been supplied to the FBI.

In any case, the basic error was repeated in the Jan. 13 report from the FBI which unaccountably acknowledges that there was an exit wound in the President's throat.

The second contradiction involves the conflicting medical testimony on the likelihood that one bullet wounded both Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Connally.

The bullet which caused these wounds was found and was virtually intact. It weighed about 158 grains, as against an original weight of about 161 grains.

Commander Humes and Lt. Col. Finck, the presidential autopsists, doubted that this bullet could have caused all of Gov. Connally's wounds because they had read a medical report from Dallas describing the presence of fragments in his wrist wound. Thus, they thought the bullet must have been broken into fragments rather than emerging intact.

They were unaware that these fragments were miniscule and that Connally's principal surgeon, Dr. Robert Shaw, was convinced that the intact bullet did cause the wounds. The "fragments" it left in the Governor's body were thin shavings, not much larger than dust particles.


The final problem—Gov. Connally's own recollection of what happened—cannot

But his surgeon, Dr. Shaw, had an explanation for that, too. It is not uncommon, he testified, for people to suffer a wound without knowing it immediately.

This would account for Mr. Connally's belief that he was not hit by the first bullet and this explanation is consistent with the Governor's failure to hear the "second shot" which he believed caused his wound and his recollection of the final shot which smashed the President's skull.

The "single-shot" theory developed by Specker and the Commission, in other words, is not refuted by the apparent inconsistencies in the record which Weisberg and Epstein recite.

And so long as that theory holds up, assumptions that there was a second assassin in Dallas on Nov. 22 can only be assumptions.



By Charles Del Vecchio, Staff Photographer

DISAGREEMENT—The Warren Commission's report on the assassination of President Kennedy, for all its detail, still leaves some questions open, with the result that books and articles continue to debate the investigation's findings.