

7/3/64

(Discussed briefly, not read by Mr. Ford)

FVF 7/31/64

Questions on Commission

No in
links
Dropped

1) Dallas Morning News of Sat June 27, 1964

a) Results of FBI inquiry on leaky story

b) Where did they get "detailed account of statements which Ruby made" to Warren & Ford on June 7? The story refers to "an informed source." Was this one of the "representatives of the prosecution and defense" who were also present?

What is the Commission's position on this kind of a leak? Any objection, or measures to be taken?



No agreement
re: by Commission's
Chapter 7
not yet received.

2) Note Mr Robert Kennedy's statement: "Ideology in my opinion did not motivate this act." — This emphasizes the seriousness of the question of motivation, & the Commission's treatment of it. How important was his "Marxism"? his "disenchantment" with Russia (dairy)?

Write letter
has been
examined

3) Did Mrs. Earle Cabell see Oswald, or the gun, in the window? ~~The~~ U.S. News & World Report 7/6/64 says yes; she has not to our knowledge appeared before the Comm. (She is the wife of the former mayor of Dallas and was in the motorcade.)

OK
Bubble to
would it have
and original
written

4) How significant was Pres. Kennedy's decision to ride in an open car? Does this mean, as U.S. News quotes as White House official "It is not your (Secret Service's) fault"?

OK 5) Results of today's sessions for Mr. Ray, who is planning to call this afternoon.

- a) Mark Lane - transcript today
- b) Other matters - list of questions & notes - Staff knows of Mr. Ray & Mr. Stiles now.

Draft of this 6) To what extent will the final report show to be coming
Has not come yet.

6) To what extent will the final report directly confront and answer specific questions and problems that have been raised by independent writers? The various articles (Savage, Dies, Feldman, etc) should be analyzed by the staff, and a checklist prepared to see that all the available sources of information have been utilized, and the questions answered as fully as possible. An example of the desired approach is Jack Stiles' check-off list prepared from Mark Lane's first appearance before the Commission. (E.g. Oswald's marksmanship, the logic of his conduct, lack of precautions against him.)

Must be worked up
Still up in air.

7) Nosenko - he claims to have information particularly on the period from 1/7/68 to 1/30/69, ~~at~~ for which we lack any substantiating sources. The Comm cannot ignore him, nor can it rely on what the FBI or CIA ~~told~~ say he told them. His deposition should be taken, preferably with Mr. Ford present. The report should emphasize however that its conclusions do not depend on Nosenko's testimony; alternative conclusions should be formulated, if necessary.



8) Mexican Period - This will be a choice
 Much better draft, area for "plot theorists" to play with;
 but ^{RF} must see authority the record however is extremely meager
 in this area. From the viewpoint of the
 Commissioners there is as yet almost
 nothing on which to base conclusions as
 to Oswald's activities during this period; &
 there has been no tentative draft for this
 period submitted yet. Suggestions:

Call Rankin for
 Risk, no help (7289)
 Hoover
 McCon

- a) C.I.A Report - as much as possible of it
 should be presented to Commissioners
 immediately for consideration & evaluation
- b) As much testimony as possible should be
 put into the official record. This
 would include depositions or affidavits
 from Pugh, Kline, Russian & Cuban
 embassy officials, & all others; a digest
 also of the CIA Report.
- c) Drafts - A draft on this period should
 be submitted as soon as possible
- d) Evaluation by Comm - The events of
 this period must be a subject of
 discussion by the Commissioners
 in an official meeting, with con-
 clusions drawn from all information
 available.

Letter

Call Rankin for
 this if not here soon



mostly OK

9) Recommendations - The whole section of the
 Report dealing with future security measures
 is an area of prime responsibility for the
 individual Commissioners; their ~~task~~

independence from any of the agencies involved was one of the important factors in their selection. The steps that were taken, & the mistakes that were made, are fairly clear. But the procedures and improvements needed to ensure that such errors do not occur again must be thoroughly discussed and analyzed. There should be at least one, and probably several, official meetings on the record on this topic.



Comments on Phase II of Report (pp 71-112)

Page	Incident	Date	Observation
71, line 2 ^x	Carrying rifle, seen in window	Nov 22	- Are these conclusions overstated? Exp the latter, unless treated in pp 38-70.
72-3	^x Baker enters TBDB	Nov 22	- Is there a diagram to clear up these references to doors, etc? - Is the reference to Baker bumping into Truly's back relevant?
73, line 13	Running up stairs - Baker & Truly	Nov 22	- Where is this "hallway"?
73-74	Baker sees Oswald thru door on 2 nd floor	Nov 22	- Diagram in hallway, door, lunchroom
74	^x "	Nov 22	- Where could Oswald have been coming from? Is there any other entrance to vestibule? How much time would there have been between Truly & Baker? - Which door might have been closing? If this is lunchroom area, is it relevant? logical?
75	"		
75	Baker sees her	Nov 22	- Why is reference to empty hands in here? - Does Baker definitely identify this person as Oswald? Why would he have been here?



Page	Incident	Date	Observation
76, lines 8-9	Baker stops Lee	Nov 22	- Why refer to empty hands? Is Coca-Cola statement made or substantiated?
76	x Time for Lee to get to lunch room	Nov 22	- Last paragraph reads like a detective story - should merely state the question.
77, line 12	x Lee comes down stairs	"	- Isn't this stated too dogmatically? It is only a conclusion, for which there are no witnesses.
77, 1st para. x	"	"	- This whole paragraph is very unclear - How & when did Baker & Truly decide where elevators were? What is relevance of time it took them to get from 1st floor to 2nd floor?
77, 2nd para.	Truly & Baker go up to roof	"	- Did they see or talk to anyone else on way up or down?
78	x West elevator location	"	- Couldn't see have taken elevator from fifth to second floor instead of Coughey's? In view of weak evidence here, is conclusion warranted or necessary? Either way, Lee could have gotten to second floor in time. - Why would elevator not have come down when Truly pushed button earlier?



<u>Page</u>	<u>Incident</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Observation</u>
71-78 x	Baker & Truly go up stairs, see C, continue to roof	Nov. 22	This whole incident is poorly told - details are inserted in wrong places (Truly looking up shaft, etc); narrative is not straight-forward or logically organized (elevator incident) - some details seem irrelevant (empty hands, Coke machine)
80	Baker hears Curry on radio	Nov 22	- Why does this show?
81	Time to get from 6th floor window to 2nd floor lunchroom	"	- How long would it take to do this by elevator, all or part way? - Would there have been any one else on stairs then? If not, why? If so, did they see Oswald?
81, para 2	Other people near stairway	"	- This paragraph is poorly organized and unclear at first reading (at least).
82, line 11	V. Adams runs down stairs	"	- Result of her timing is not clear from report - was she separately timed later?
84 x	V. Adams runs down stairs.		- Conclusion from this whole incident is not clear; last sentence irrelevant.



75
75

7

<u>Page</u>	<u>Incident</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Observation</u>
85	Mrs. Reid goes back to office	Nov 22	- Is this office on 2 nd floor? Report not clear. - What took her 2 minutes?
86	x "Reconstruction of time & events"	Nov 22	- What if any other plausible explanations?
86, foot 83	x Oswald leaves building	Nov 22	- Could picture have been taken at time Oswald left building? How closely did time of this picture bear on pointed?
88	Craig talks to Rowlands	"	- Are Rowlands previously identified?
89, line 13	Craig's story of talking to Trutz	"	- Shouldn't this say "he claims to have..."
88-89	x Station wagon incident	"	- Does description match Mrs. Paul's car? Could she have been there? - Who else could this have been?
91	x " " "	"	
90	x Conflicts with Craig's story	"	- How "clear & convincing" is evidence which places Oswald "either on a bus or in a taxicab"?
91	Harbinger on rising of building	"	- Where was he?
92	Sealing of Building	"	- Was Sawyer turned on this?



Page	Incident	Date	Observation
93	x Oswald missing	Nov 22	- How would Tracy know so quickly that O was missing? - Incident not too clear in report.
93-4	Truly tells Fritz that O is missing	"	- Time not clear from conclusion - why would it not be sooner?
95	"Junior" Jarman sees Gueno	"	- Who is J.J. - same as Jarman on p 81? If so, why is he omitted?
100	x Bus driver's testimony & identification	"	- What & when was the "show up"? Different than line up? - Is field a reasonable place for Lee to have taken photos?
99-101	Description of streets & bus stop & route	Nov 22	- Not clear or organized. - Would Lee have seen bus route, bus stop?
103	x Whaley goes to police station	Nov 23	- Why did he not report to TV cable?
104	Identification by Whaley	Nov 23	- Reference to O's name just too long & irrelevant?
105	x Trip manifest & time conflict	Nov 22	- Where is "that 15 minutes"? What is probative value of trip manifest - can times be reconciled? Other trips?

<u>Page</u>	<u>Incident</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Observation</u>
105-6	x Cab ride	Nov 22	- Drop "old lady" story, unless she can be identified and questioned.
106	x Cab ride	"	- Quote much too long - just summarize his story.
107	"	"	- Conflicting stories are possibly arranged - probably view to be in chronological order as told.
103-110	x "	"	- Whole story much too wordy and unclear.
109	As story of cab ride	"	- How do they know this is his first cab ride?
109-10	Reconstructing time for trip	"	- First sentence ("again reconstructing") awkward, as well as bad grammar.
112	x Police talk to Mrs. Roberts at Berkeley	"	- Facts in this incident are not clearly stated.
112	x Police car on Berkeley around 1 P.M.	"	- Is there more on this?

