

1 summary that three shots were heard.

2 A Where do you see that, that three shots were
3 heard?

4 Q The first sentence in the second paragraph on
5 Page 2, the first four words.

6 A This is the information we had by the time we
7 signed that autopsy report.

8 Q The information from whom, Doctor?

9 A There were a lot of people who were asked, I
10 wouldn't know their names. I couldn't
11 list all the people by name.

12 Q Who told you that three shots were heard? Who
13 told you that?

14 A As I recall, Admiral Galloway heard from
15 somebody who was present at the scene
16 that three shots had been heard, but I
17 cannot give the details of this.

18 Q I ask you, did you have an occasion to inter-
19 view any of the witnesses that were present
20 in Dealey Plaza on November 22, 1963, you
21 yourself, before you wrote this?

22 A During the autopsy of President Kennedy there
23 were Secret Service Agent Kellerman in
24 that autopsy room. I asked him his name.
25 Admiral ~~Perkeley~~, the personal physician

PP

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

of President Kennedy was present, and
there was a third person whose name I
don't recall who said to Admiral Galloway,
who was there during the autopsy, that
three shots had been fired. At the time
we wrote this we had this information
obtained from people who had been at the
scene to the best of my recollection.

NO HIATUS HERE.

- 1 Q Did you have any information available,
2 Doctor, from people at the scene who
3 heard four shots?
- 4 A From the assassination on I heard conflicting
5 reports regarding the number of shots.
- 6 Q I am talking about at the time you all prepared
7 and signed this report, Doctor, before
8 you affixed your signature to this, did
9 you talk to anyone or have any reports
10 available from people who heard four
11 shots at Dealey Plaza on November 22?
- 12 A I don't remember any.
- 13 Q Did you have any statements or reports availa-
14 ble to you from people who heard two shots
15 in Dealey Plaza on November 22 at the time
16 you made this report?
- 17 A At the time I made the report I don't recall
18 having a report of two shots.
- 19 Q Going further, Doctor, in your autopsy report,
20 it states, "Governor Connally was seriously
21 wounded by this same gunfire." From
22 where did you receive this information?
- 23 A I knew it at the time of the autopsy because of
24 the news media who reported the President
25 had been shot and the Governor of Texas

had been wounded, as I recall.

Q What did you mean, that Governor Connally was seriously wounded by the same gunfire? What did you mean when you said the same gunfire?

A This is the information we had at the time of the autopsy -- correction, at the time we signed the autopsy report, and because the information in the autopsy report may be obtained after the autopsy, and again I can't pinpoint the source of that information.

Q Doctor, I now show you State Exhibit 64, and ask you if you recognize what is depicted in this particular photograph, as being similar to something you have seen before during the investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy?

A This black-and-white reproduction is similar to a bullet that, as best I can remember, I saw for the first time in March, 1964.

Q Doctor, speaking of your statement in the autopsy report that Governor Connally was seriously wounded by the same gunfire, is it not a fact that when testifying be-

1 fore the Warren Commission you stated
2 that in your opinion it was impossible
3 for Commission Exhibit 399 to do the same
4 damage to President Kennedy as was done
5 to Governor Connally because there were
6 too many fragments in Governor Connally's
7 wrist? Did you not so testify, sir?

8 MR. DYMOND:

9 I object to that question. Nobody has
10 stated the same damage was done to
11 Governor Connally as was done to
12 President Kennedy, and that is what
13 this question asks.

14 THE COURT:

15 I think the question was put to the
16 Doctor, did he not make a prior
17 contradictory statement, which is
18 legitimate cross-examination.

19 Let the question be read back.

20 (Whereupon, the pending question
21 was read back by the Reporter.)

22 THE COURT:

23 I am permitting the question. I overrule
24 your objection.

25 BY MR. OSER:

1 Q Will you answer yes or no, Doctor, then you
2 can explain.

3 A This is a difficult question to answer because
4 there were two bullets striking President
5 Kennedy. I have examined the wounds of
6 President Kennedy and I would say that
7 the bullet seen here is an entire bullet.

8 Q Is what?

9 A Is an entire bullet. "By an entire bullet, I
10 mean a bullet that did not disintegrate
11 into many fragments.

12 Q Let me ask you about that in this way --

13 THE COURT:

14 Let him finish his answer.

15 MR. OSER:

16 I thought he had finished.

17 THE COURT:

18 Had you finished your answer?

19 THE WITNESS:

20 Yes, sir.

21 BY MR. OSER:

22 Q Colonel, let me ask you this way: Speaking
23 of State Exhibit 64, the bullet, I ask
24 you whether or not you testified in front
25 of the Warren Commission that that

1 particular bullet could not have done
2 the damage to Governor Connally as there
3 were too many bullet fragments in
4 Governor Connally's wrist. Did you or
5 did you not answer that in front of
6 the Warren Commission in answer to a
7 question by Mr. Specter? It appears on
8 Page 382 of your testimony of the Warren
9 Report about the middle of the page.

10 A It reads as follows: "Could that bullet possi-
11 bly have gone through President Kennedy
12 in 388," Mr. Specter's question. "Through
13 President Kennedy's head --" what is 388?

14 MR. WILLIAM WEGMANN:

15 The one on the right.

16 A (Continuing) "and remain intact in the way you
17 see it now?" "Definitely not." "And
18 could it have been the bullet which in-
19 flicted the wound on Governor Connally's
20 right wrist?" "No, for the reason there
21 are too many fragments described in that
22 wrist."

23 MR. OSER:

24 Thank you, Doctor, that is the point I
25 am talking about.

1 BY MR. OSER:

2 Q Now, referring back to that same paragraph
3 in the clinical summary, in the next
4 sentence you said, "According to news-
5 paper reports (Washington Post November 23
6 1963) Bob Jackson, a Dallas 'Times Herald'
7 photographer, said he looked around as
8 he heard the shots and saw a rifle barrel
9 disappearing into a window on an upper
10 floor of the nearby Texas School Book
11 Depository Building." Can you tell me
12 who called that particular newspaper arti-
13 cle to your attention?

14 A Are you referring to Page 979 of the Hearing?

15 Q No, sir, I am back on your original autopsy
16 report, Page 2.

17 A I have it.

18 Q The sentence right after you said that Governor
19 Connally was wounded by the same gunfire.

20 A What was that sentence?

21 Q Right after "gunfire."

22 A "Governor Connally was seriously wounded by
23 the same gunfire." This is part of the
24 autopsy report I signed.

25 Q Can you tell me who called that particular

1 newspaper article to your attention,
2 and why?

3 A As I recall, it was Dr. Humes who mentioned
4 this article to me.

5 Q Colonel, do you customarily take notice of
6 newspaper articles in an autopsy report?

7 A At times it is done.

8 Q Therefore, Doctor, am I correct in stating
9 that particular autopsy report signed by
10 you was based, partially on hearsay evi-
11 dence, is that correct? By that I mean
12 evidence received by someone other than
13 you having actual personal knowledge of
14 the thing?

15 A Having not been at the scene I had to get
16 information from somebody else.

17 Q Did you have occasion to read a newspaper
18 article of November 22 or 23, which re-
19 ported there were four to six shots fired
20 and they came from the grassy knoll, being
21 stated by Miss Jean Hill? Did you read
22 that before you made your report?

23 A I don't recall reading that before I made the
24 report. I may have been aware at that
25 time of conflicting reports as regards the

1 number and the difference in the direc-
2 tion of the shots, but I cannot pinpoint
3 the time.

4 Q Since you are referring to the Washington
5 post --

6 A Would you repeat that?

7 THE COURT:

8 Mr. Oser, speak into the microphone, it
9 may help a little bit.

10 BY MR. OSER:

11 Q Since you are dealing with the Washington Post
12 article of November 23, 1963 in your
13 autopsy report, I wondered if you had
14 an occasion to either read the article
15 or have it brought to your attention, that
16 one Charles Brehm, one of the spectators
17 close to the Presidential limousine, saw
18 material which appeared to be a sizeable
19 portion of President Kennedy's skull --

20 MR. DYMOND:

21 Objection, that is not in evidence.

22 THE COURT:

23 This is not a prior contradictory state-
24 ment, Mr. Oser, is it?

25 MR. OSER:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I am asking if he took this into account
when he --

THE COURT:

Where are you reading from?

MR. OSER:

An article taken out of the Washington
post on the same day as the article
by Bob Jackson.

MR. DYMOND:

Your Honor, that has no place in this
trial at all.

THE COURT:

Mr. Oser, I think you are enlarging the
scope of the prior contradictory
statement unless you can allege it
was made in the report.

MR. OSER:

I am trying to ascertain what hearsay
they used to arrive at their report.

MR. DYMOND:

If you permit that you will have to permit
Counsel to go through every conflict-
ing report that was reported by every
alleged eyewitness to the assassina-
tion and ask this witness whether

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

they were taken into account. It
certainly has no place in this trial
and is completely irrelevant to the
issues and irrelevant to the credibilit-
ty and qualifications of the Doctor
and irrelevant to the material on
which he is testifying.

NO HIATUS HERE.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE COURT:

I believe that the witness did state a few moments ago that he was not there personally and they did have to accept what Mr. Oser termed as hearsay. I believe the question being put by the District Attorney is to find out what other hearsay evidence they received.

MR. OSER:

That's right.

THE COURT:

Can't you ask a specific question instead of reading the article?

MR. DYMOND:

The thrust of my objection is that we have nothing before The Court to show this was even a bit of hearsay without even asking the Doctor whether he heard it. This is something that is purely out of the files of the District Attorney.

MR. OSER:

Your Honor, the State is attempting to ascertain from the Colonel whether or

1 not he based his conclusions or his
2 autopsy report on any type of hearsay
3 other than that type of hearsay that
4 backed up what the Warren Commission
5 wanted it to be, or the Federal
6 Government. Strike Warren Commission
7 and make it Federal Government.

8 MR. DYMOND:

9 Your Honor, what I'm trying to impress on
10 The Court is you have nothing before
11 you to even show there is hearsay
12 evidence to the effect of this state-
13 ment that has been made by the District
14 Attorney. That is completely outside
15 the scope of the evidence in this case.
16 We don't know any such contention was
17 ever made by anybody.

18 THE COURT:

19 If the witness signed part of a three-man
20 report and you referred to the report
21 without using exact words, I would
22 permit it, which you did previously.
23 I think a general question can be
24 asked, did they interview any other
25 person, without saying what those

1 THE WITNESS:

2 Yes, sir.

3 THE COURT:

4 Mr. Oser's question is, did you and the
5 other two persons personally inter-
6 view these people or get it from
7 another source?

8 THE WITNESS:

9 I personally talked to Secret Service
10 Agent Kellerman. I personally talked
11 to Admiral Berkley, the personal
12 physician to President Kennedy. I
13 personally talked to Admiral Galloway,
14 who was referring to a third witness
15 present at the scene. There may have
16 been others leading us to the state-
17 ment that to the best of our knowledge
18 at that time there were three shots
19 fired.

20 BY MR. OSER:

21 Q Doctor, speaking of the wound to the throat
22 area of the President as you described it,
23 after this bullet passed through the
24 President's throat in the manner in which
25 you described it, would the President have

1 been able to talk?
2 A I don't know.
3 Q Do you have an opinion?
4 A There are many factors influencing the ability
5 to talk or not to talk after a shot.
6 Q Did you have an occasion to dissect the track
7 of that particular bullet in the victim as
8 it lay on the autopsy table?
9 A I did not dissect the track in the neck.
10 Q Why?
11 A This leads us into the disclosure of medical
12 records.
13 MR. OSER:
14 Your Honor, I would like an answer from the
15 Colonel and I would ask The Court so
16 to direct.
17 THE COURT:
18 That is correct, you should answer, Doctor.
19 THE WITNESS:
20 We didn't remove the organs of the neck.
21 BY MR. OSER:
22 Q Why not, Doctor?
23 A For the reason that we were told to examine the
24 head wounds and that the --
25 Q Are you saying someone told you not to dissect

1 the track?

2 THE COURT:

3 Let him finish his answer.

4 THE WITNESS:

5 I was told that the family wanted an exam-
6 ination of the head, as I recall, the
7 head and chest, but the prosecutors
8 in this autopsy didn't remove the
9 organs of the neck, to my recollec-
10 tion.

11 BY MR. OSER:

12 Q You have said they did not, I want to know why
13 didn't you as an autopsy pathologist at-
14 tempt to ascertain the track through the
15 body which you had on the autopsy table
16 in trying to ascertain the cause or causes
17 of death? Why?

18 A I had the cause of death.

19 Q Why did you not trace the track of the wound?

20 A As I recall I didn't remove these organs from
21 the neck.

22 Q I didn't hear you.

23 A I examined the wounds but I didn't remove the
24 organs of the neck.

25 Q You said you didn't do this; I am asking you why

1 3 didn't do this as a pathologist?

2 A From what I recall I looked at the trachea,
3 there was a tracheotomy wound the best I
4 can remember, but I didn't dissect or
5 remove these organs.

6 MR. OSER:

7 Your Honor, I would ask Your Honor to
8 direct the witness to answer my
9 question.

10 BY MR. OSER:

11 Q I will ask you the question one more time:

12 Why did you not dissect the track of the
13 bullet wound that you have described today
14 and you saw at the time of the autopsy at
15 the time you examined the body? Why? I
16 ask you to answer that question.

17 A As I recall I was told not to, but I don't
18 remember by whom.

19 Q You were told not to but you don't remember by
20 whom?

21 A Right.

22 Q Could it have been one of the Admirals or one
23 of the Generals in the room?

24 A I don't recall.

25 Q Do you have any particular reason why you cannot

recall at this time?

A Because we were told to examine the head and the chest cavity, and that doesn't include the removal of the organs of the neck.

Q You are one of the three autopsy specialists and pathologists at the time, and you saw what you described as an entrance wound in the neck area of the President of the United States who had just been assassinated, and you were only interested in the other wound but not interested in the track through his neck, is that what you are telling me?

A I was interested in the track and I had observed the conditions of bruising between the point of entry in the back of the neck and the point of exit at the front of the neck, which is entirely compatible with the bullet path.

Q But you were told not to go into the area of the neck, is that your testimony?

A From what I recall, yes, but I don't remember by whom.

Q Did you attempt to probe this wound in the back of the neck?

1 A I did.

2 Q With what?

3 A With an autopsy room probe, and I did not succeed
4 in probing from the entry in the back of
5 the neck in any direction and I can explain
6 this. This was due to the contraction of
7 muscles preventing the passage of an instrument,
8 and if I had forced the probe through the
9 neck I may have created a false passage.

10 Q Isn't this good enough reason to you as a
11 pathologist to go further and dissect this
12 area in an attempt to ascertain whether or
13 not there is a passageway here as a result of
14 a bullet?

15 A I did not consider a dissection of the path.

16 Q How far did the probe go into the back of the
17 neck?

18 A Repeat the question.

19 Q How far did the probe go into this wound?

20 A I couldn't introduce this probe for any extended
21 depth. I tried and I can give explanations
22 why. At times you cannot probe a path;
23 this is because of the contraction of
24 muscles and different layers.
25

1 Q It is not like a pipe, like a channel.

2 It may be extremely difficult to probe
3 a wound through muscle.

4 Q Can you give me approximately how far in this
5 probe went?

6 A The first fraction of an inch.

7 Q If you had dissected this area, Doctor,
8 wouldn't you have been able to ascertain
9 what the track was, as you have described
10 in this courtroom, without dissecting it?

11 A I don't know.

12 Q You don't know?

13 A I don't know. Wounds are different in one
14 case from another, and I did not dissect

15 Q Let me ask you this, Doctor: Let me ask you
16 whether or not in dealing with this
17 particular back of the neck wound, as you
18 describe it, whether you dissected the
19 skin area, took a cross-section of the
20 skin, submitted that to microscopic
21 examination, to ascertain whether or not
22 there was any singed area or burnt area
23 as a result of a high speed bullet pass-
24 ing through the skin? Did you or did you
25 not do that?

3/11

1 A I remember removing skin at the entry at the
2 back of the neck, or I was present when
3 this was done, and microscopic examination
4 was made of this wound of entry.

5 Q Is the result of that microscopic examination
6 in this autopsy report?

7 A No. I think it is part of the supplementary
8 report where Dr. Humes describes the
9 microscopic appearance of the wound
10 of entry. I made a positive identifica-
11 tion of entry in the back of the neck
12 based on naked eye examination. I
13 examined that very closely and it had the
14 gross characteristics of the wound of
15 entry.

16 Q Isn't it the more accepted pathological pro-
17 cedure at an autopsy to submit a wound
18 area such as this, or a cross-section of
19 it, to microscopic examination to
20 ascertain whether there is a scorch area
21 or burn area of the skin to see if there
22 was a high speed bullet passing through
23 the skin?

24 MR. DYMOND:

25 I would ask Counsel to confine his

21

1 Q How about the results?

2 A I don't remember the timing of the results

3 of the microscopic sections.

4 Q I am not asking you for the timing of the re-

5 sults, I am asking you for the results,

6 Colonel.

7 A From what I recall, Dr. Humes described

8 alteration of the tissue at the level

9 of the wound of entry. Do you have that

10 supplementary report?

11 Q I don't have it, that is why I am asking you

12 if you have your notes here.

13 A I don't have this microscopic report with me.

14 Q You didn't burn your notes also, did you?

15 A No.

16 Q Colonel, you said you remember Agent Kellerman

17 being in the autopsy room. Do you re-

18 member having a conversation with Agent

19 Kellerman at the time you were examining

20 this wound of the President, and talking

21 about that particular wound you said to

22 the Agent that there were no lanes for

23 an outlet of the shoulder wound? Do you

24 remember telling him that, sir?

25 A I remember stating that at the time I examined

1 the wound of entry in the back I didn't
2 find an exit corresponding to this entry.
3 I don't remember to whom it was, it may
4 have been Mr. Kellerman, it may have been
5 one of the two FBI Agents.

6 Q My question was, do you recall categorizing it
7 as a shoulder wound as opposed to a neck
8 wound to this person in the autopsy room?

9 A I don't recall mentioning a shoulder wound. I
10 am referring to a wound in the neck, in
11 the back of the neck, and a wound in the
12 back of the head.

13 Q If I told you, Colonel, that Agent Kellerman
14 in his testimony --

15 MR. DYMOND:

16 I object to this, Your Honor: "If I told
17 you Agent Kellerman's testimony."

18 THE COURT:

19 You cannot ask one witness to decide the
20 credibility of another witness. I
21 think you will have to do it a
22 different way. The objection is sus-
23 tained.

24 BY MR. OSER:

25 Q Colonel, in talking about the wound in the back

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

The Doctor has already testified --

MR. OSER:

Your Honor, what I am doing is --

THE COURT:

When one person makes an objection will
the other person let him finish be-
fore he starts speaking.

MR. DYMOND:

The Doctor has already testified he does
not know whether the President could
speak and there are many factors
which would have to be considered.
This is merely the same question.

MR. OSER:

I am asking for his opinion. He has not
given me his opinion.

THE COURT:

I think, Mr. Dymond, that the State is
going into another area, and because
of that I will permit the question.

THE WITNESS:

To be able to talk you need integrity of
the vocal folds or vocal cords, and
I didn't see the vocal folds of
President Kennedy.

3
1 BY MR. OSER:

2 Q Why didn't you?

3 A From what I remember I didn't -- well, from
4 the best of my recollection the wound was
5 outside of the vocal fold area.

6 Q Isn't it a fact, Doctor, at the time you were
7 performing the autopsy, or assisting in
8 performing the autopsy, you were of the
9 opinion the wound in the back of the
10 President was not a through-and-through
11 gunshot wound?

12 A At the time of the autopsy on that night?

13 Q Right.

14 A Having a wound of entry and no wound of exit,
15 and negative X-rays showing no bullets
16 in the cadaver at that time, the time of
17 the autopsy, I was puzzled by the fact
18 of having an entry and no exit. However,
19 this cleared up after the conversation
20 between Dr. Humes and the surgeons at
21 Dallas who stated that included a small
22 wound in the front of the neck in their
23 incision of tracheotomy to keep the
24 breathing of the President up.

25 Q On the night of the 22nd of November you did

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Q have occasion to see the wound in the
 area of the throat?

A On the skin?

Q Yes.

A No, I examined the surgical incision, but I
 don't recall seeing the small wound de-
 scribed by the Dallas surgeons. It was
 part of the surgical incision and I didn't
 see it.

Q You saw the incision.

A In the front of the neck, definitely.

Q You were puzzled by what you found in the back,
 is that right?

A I was not puzzled by what I found in the back,
 I was puzzled by having a definite entry
 in the back, a bruise in the plural region,
 that is the region of the cavity of the
 chest, which was bruised, between the
 entry in the back and the exit in the
 front, and the three of us, the prosecutors,
 we saw that bruise, and the following day
 knowing that a small wound had been seen
 in the front of the neck that made very
 much sense to me, an entry in the back, a
 wound in the front and a bruise in between

1 due to the passage of that bullet.

2 Q On the night you had the President's body on
3 the autopsy table, if you had dissected
4 that particular area would you not have
5 been able to ascertain it was a through-
6 and-through gunshot wound?

7 A I could have, but it is a difficult question
8 to answer for the reason you deal with
9 many anatomical structures. Tissues are
10 very tight, firm.

11 Q You were a pathologist on that night, were you
12 not?

13 A Yes, I was, and still am.

14 Q How was the President's body on the autopsy
15 table? Can you give me the position it
16 was in, if you remember?

17 A He was on his back and I examined all external
18 areas of the cadaver. While on the table
19 I asked to have the cadaver turned over
20 so as to make an examination of the skin
21 of the entire cadaver.

22 Q What position was the body in, or cadaver in,
23 when you measured from the mastoid tip
24 and from the tip of the acromion in, was
25 it on its face, forward or back at the

1 Q time?

2 A I remember taking the measurements but the
3 exact position of the cadaver I don't
4 recall for the reason we removed the
5 cadaver to examine it. To take measure-
6 ments it had to be held to take those
7 measurements.

8 Q I will ask you, Colonel, if the cadaver had
9 been lying on an autopsy table with its
10 head facing to the right and the left
11 side of its head on the table and you
12 measured from the acromion down, from
13 that position wouldn't the measurement
14 be different than if the body had been
15 lying on its right side with the mastoid
16 turned more to the left? Wouldn't the
17 measurements differ in a good number of
18 centimeters?

19 A There would be some variation depending on the
20 movement of the head. From what I recall
21 we had the measurements made with the
22 head turned in a generally forward direc-
23 tion.

24 Q You can't recall whether or not the President's
25 body was on its back or stomach at the

- 1 time?
- 2 A No. The body was moved. It was not remaining
3 in the same position all the time during
4 the course of the autopsy.
- 5 Q Can you define rigor mortis for me?
- 6 THE COURT:
- 7 I cannot hear you, Mr. Oser.
- 8 BY MR. OSER:
- 9 Q Can you define rigor mortis for me?
- 10 A Rigor mortis, that is r-i-g-o-r, one word
11 and m-o-r-t-i-s is a separate word,
12 rigor mortis means literally stiffness
13 of death in Latin. It is a normal process
14 that occurs after death. The degree of
15 rigor mortis, the time of onset of rigor
16 mortis, varies from one case to the other.
- 17 Q In the case of President Kennedy in your
18 autopsy report signed by you, can you tell
19 me why the degree of rigor mortis or any
20 mention of rigor mortis is not contained
21 in this autopsy report?
- 22 A There is beginning rigor mortis on Page 2 of
23 the autopsy report, and that is the only
24 reference I find regarding rigor mortis.
- 25 Q My question now is, would varying degrees of

J4/N

1 rigor mortis have anything to do with the
2 measuring of wounds in the skin area of
3 a particular body as opposed to when the
4 body was alive?

5 A Rigor mortis may make measurements difficult
6 because of the stiffness of certain
7 anatomic structures and you have diffi-
8 culties in measuring due to that resis-
9 tance of the cadaver to movement.

10 Q Colonel, in speaking of State Exhibit 69, can
11 you give me the angle of entry into the
12 back of President Kennedy as depicted in
13 the photograph, or as you saw it rather?

14 A Does Exhibit 69 show the right side of the
15 head and right side of the upper chest
16 with an arrow in the back of the neck and
17 an arrow in the front of the back?

18 Q That is correct. I am pointing to it. This
19 one here. What is this angle?

20 A This shows that the wound of entry in the back
21 of the neck is higher than the wound of
22 exit in the front of the neck.

23 Q Did you calculate what that angle was in de-
24 grees?

25 A This can't be made with great precision because

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

of variables.

Q Did you calculate it, Colonel, was the question?

A I remember a figure which was somewhere in the records within 45 degrees.

NO HIATUS HERE.

1 Q Within 45 degrees?

2 A To give a general impression this may be much
3 less. What I am saying is that it was
4 not beyond 45 degrees in relation to the
5 horizontal. It may be much less than
6 that.

7 Q In referring to State Exhibit 68, and using
8 the body form diagram in the right-hand
9 side showing the back of an individual,
10 if I were to draw a perpendicular line
11 through the individual, through the mid-
12 line, can you tell me, Doctor, what the
13 lateral angle from right to left that this
14 particular projectile took going through
15 the neck as it described in S-69?

16 A Mr. Oser, you have shown the neck wound on one
17 exhibit and the head wound on another.

18 Q I will restate my question. Taking this back
19 view of an individual human, draw your
20 line down the mid-line of this individual,
21 can you tell me whether or not you all
22 calculated the angle at which this bullet
23 proceeded through this back wound area
24 that you described in the neck, how much
25 of an angle from right to left did this

bullet go in?

2 A Well --

3 MR. DYMOND:

4 If The Court please, we object to that on
5 the ground it is a question which
6 is impossible to answer. You
7 couldn't have an angle between a
8 perpendicular line and a line going
9 in from above and behind. If you
10 wanted to figure an angle on that
11 you would have to have it passing
12 between the path of the bullet and
13 a line drawn through the center of
14 the subject. That is the only way
15 you can answer a question of that
16 kind.

17 THE COURT:

18 I understand it. In other words, your
19 horizontal line down from the head
20 through the mid-line, a fictitious
21 mid-line, would be the straight line.
22 You have a horizontal line so you
23 have a right angle, and you have to
24 have an entrance and an exit. Unless
25 he knows where the exit is he cannot

1 give an angle, and he hasn't testi-
2 fied he knows where the exit was.

3 MR. OSER:

4 He testified it went out through the
5 front.

6 THE COURT:

7 He didn't tell you what part of the front
8 it came out.

9 MR. OSER:

10 His testimony was it exited where the
11 arrow is on -69.

12 THE COURT:

13 I don't recall him testifying to that.

14 Rephrase your question.

15 Doctor, can you give us the
16 angle from your autopsy examination
17 of the neck, as far as you did go,
18 can you give us the angle of the
19 entrance and exit of this bullet from
20 the neck of the President, unless you
21 knew where it came out?

22 THE WITNESS:

23 In relation to the horizontal plane or in
24 relation to the right and left?

25 BY MR. OSER:

1 Q In relation to right and left. My original
2 question was, did he calculate such an
3 angle?

4 A From what I recall at the angle I was referring
5 to, it was within 45 degrees, was in
6 relation to the horizontal as far as the
7 difference of level between the entry in
8 the back of the neck and the exit in the
9 front of the neck. I don't recall angles
10 in relation to a right and left direction.

11 Q Doctor, for a bullet to pass through this par-
12 ticular part of the body as described in
13 S-69, and not hit any bone, would you say
14 that was an extremely small corridor for
15 such a bullet to go through and not hit
16 a bone?

17 A It is possible this bullet produced an entry
18 and exit, as I testified, without produc-
19 ing gross evidence of bone damage.

20 Q I think you testified before, Doctor, there
21 was no bone damage in the area of the
22 neck?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Could you tell me, Colonel, from viewing the
25 autopsy X-rays, whether or not there were

1 any metallic fragments or deposits in the
2 area of the wound described in S-69?

3 A I don't remember seeing fragments in the area
4 of the neck. I remember seeing numerous
5 fragments in the X-ray of the head but
6 that corresponded to another wound.

7 Q In referring once again, Colonel to S-67 for
8 identification, the five-page report
9 signed by you in January, 1967, can you
10 tell me why this report was prepared?

11 A Please repeat your question.

12 Q Can you tell me why this report was prepared,
13 the one you signed in January, 1967?

14 A The purpose of this, as I recall, was to
15 correlate our autopsy report of November
16 1963, and the X-rays and photographs of
17 the wounds, because we had seen the X-rays
18 at the time of the autopsy but we hadn't
19 seen the photographs in November 1963 or
20 in March 1964, so in 1967 we were asked to
21 look at those X-rays and photographs.

22 Q By whom were you asked to do this?

23 THE COURT:

24 Are you waiting for an answer?

25 MR. OSER:

1

Yes.

2

THE COURT:

3

I thought you were referring to your

4

notes, Doctor.

5

MR. OSER:

6

I asked the witness --

7

THE COURT:

8

I heard your question. I was just wanting

9

to know if you were waiting for an

10

answer.

11

THE WITNESS:

12

I think I went first to the -- I saw

13

these photographs and X-rays to the

14

best of my recollection at the

15

archives of the United States in

16

January 1967, the photographs, for

17

the first time.

18

THE COURT:

19

He didn't ask you that question. He

20

wanted to know who asked you to do

21

this. Was that your question?

22

MR. OSER:

23

Yes, sir.

24

THE WITNESS:

25

As I recall it was Mr. Eardley. There are

1 many names involved in this. I think
2 it was Mr. Eardley at the Department
3 of Justice and I had the authority to
4 go there from the military.

5 BY MR. OSER:

6 Q Can you tell me whether or not you were asked
7 to do this summary in January 1967 in
8 regard to a panel review that was going
9 to be done by Mr. William H. Carns,
10 Russell S. Fisher, Mr. Russell H. Morgan
11 and Mr. Alan R. Moritz.

12 A In January 1967 when I signed S-67, to the best
13 of my recollection, I was not aware of this
14 panel review which took place in 1968, if
15 you are referring to an independent panel
16 review.

17 Q I am.

18 A It was composed of W. H. Carns, Russell H.
19 Fisher, Russell H. Morgan and Alan R.
20 Moritz.

21 Q That is correct, Colonel.

22 A I don't remember knowing in 1967 that these
23 four names were reviewing the evidence to
24 the best of my recollection.

25 Q Are you familiar with their work?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A I have read this. I was made aware of this panel review, I had received this panel review in February 1969.

MR. OSER:

Your Honor, I am going to a new area.

Do you want to take a coffee break now?

THE COURT:

Yes. Sheriff, take the Jury upstairs and we will have a 10-minute recess.

(SHORT RECESS.)

NO HIATUS HERE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

* THE COURT:

Are both sides ready to proceed?

MR. DYMOND:

Yes.

MR. OSER:

Yes.

BY MR. OSER:

Q Colonel, referring to the autopsy report of November 24, 1963, of the 25th, the report, the original autopsy report --

A I signed it on Sunday, 24 November, 1963 far as I can remember.

Q Referring to that again on page 2 in the clinical summary in Paragraph 3 you have it marked there that shortly -- in the third paragraph on page 2 of that report you state that "shortly following the wounding of the two men the car was driven to Parkland Hospital in Dallas. In the Emergency Room of that hospital the President was attended by Dr. Malcolm Perry. Telephone communication with Dr. Perry on November 23, 1963 develops the following information relative to the observations made by Dr. Perry and the procedures performed there

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

3 prior to death." Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Did you have occasion, Colonel, to speak to Dr. Perry and I ask you if you did whether or not Dr. Perry classified the wound he found in the throat?

MR. DYMOND:

I object on the grounds that he never --

THE COURT:

First let's find out if the witness spoke with Dr. Perry.

BY MR. OSER:

Q Did either you, Colonel, or one of your fellow members of the autopsy report speak to Dr. Perry in Dallas?

A I personally did not talk to Dallas, to a Dallas doctor but Dr. Humes called him after the autopsy and he told me so.

Q Did you have a conversation with Dr. Humes regarding what was learned in Dallas, Texas from the Dallas doctors concerning --

THE COURT:

Make it one question.

MR. OSER:

I just asked him whether or not he did.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE COURT:

Rephrase your question.

BY MR. OSER:

Q Did you talk to Dr. Humes about his conversation?

A I did.

THE COURT:

That breaks it down.

BY MR. OSER:

Q Will you tell us whether or not you had any knowledge that the wound in the area where the tracheotomy was performed was classified as that of an entrance wound in Dallas, Texas?

A All I learned is that the communication was between Dr. Humes and one or more of the Dallas surgeons, maybe Dr. Perry or it may be others, but they were people taking care of President Kennedy in the Emergency Room, that there was a small wound in the front of the neck of President Kennedy and that they included that small wound of approximately 5 millimeters in diameter in their tracheotomy incision.

1 Q Did you have available to you a further
2 description of this small wound that they
3 found in Dallas, Texas prior to perform-
4 ing the tracheotomy?

5 A Outside of the location in the anterior, in the
6 front of the neck, and the description I
7 don't recall there was more detail about
8 that wound found by the Dallas surgeons.

9 Q Can you tell me, Colonel, whether or not you had
10 at your disposal any information from
11 Dr. Kemp Clark?

12 MR. DYMOND:

13 If The Court please, we have not been
14 objecting to hearsay but at this
15 point any information of this type
16 would be hearsay unless this doctor
17 spoke with that person and even then
18 it would still be hearsay.

19 MR. OSER:

20 I didn't ask what the content was, I asked
21 him if he had any information available
22 from Dr. Kemp Clark.

23 THE COURT:

24 He can say yes or no. Did you understand
25 the question?

1 THE WITNESS:

2 There was a Dr. Clark mentioned. I did
3 not talk to him.

4 BY MR. OSER:

5 Q Did you have an occasion to talk to Dr. Charles
6 Carrico from Dallas, Texas?

7 A I did not.

8 Q Do you know whether or not Commander Humes or
9 Commander Boswell spoke to this doctor?

10 A Again I cannot pinpoint names of these Dallas
11 surgeons with whom Dr. Humes communicated
12 with. I know the results of the communi-
13 cation but I cannot say he did or did not
14 speak to this one or that one.

15 Q Now, can you describe for me as to how large
16 this wound was in the throat area that you
17 saw the night of November 22, 1963?

18 A It was a long sideways surgical incision.

19 Q Could you tell me Colonel whether or not you
20 could have taken this particular area, or
21 the particular wound in the throat, and
22 meshed the two sides of the incision back
23 together again and ascertain whether or
24 not this was a wound within the incision
25 caused by some missile?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A I examined this and I did not
see the bed by the
Dall surgical
see it.

Q If you are a Colonel, I take it
is a small type of wound if it
is there?

A According to the telephone conversation, it was
a small wound in the front of the neck.

Q Did you have occasion, Colonel, to dissect this
particular wound and to make a
cross-section and submit it to microscopic-

THE COURT:

I'm going to stop this if it is repetitious.

NO HEARSAY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. OSER:

If the Court please, he described that he tracked it from the back to the front.

MR. DYMOND:

We object on the grounds it is repetitious.

MR. OSER:

If the Court please, I have previously talked about dissecting and submitting to microscopic examination the wound the Colonel described in the back area and I am now on the throat area or what he alleges is the exit wound of the projectile.

MR. DYMOND:

He covered that this morning and said he did not and that was covered very, very lengthy.

THE COURT:

He said he did not and I don't know where you were when he said that, Mr. Oser. Go ahead and answer the question, Doctor.

BY MR. OSER:

Q Did you dissect any area of the neck muscles which might have been thought to be an exit