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Review of the Forensic Science Examinations Embodied in the Warren Commission Report (A Panel Discussion)*

Introductory Remarks**

Charles A. McInerney, A.B.*** Moderator, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

In the view of ninny, the American Academy of Forensic Sciences would be remiss if it failed to treat this timely topic, The Forensic Science Examinations Embodied in the Warren Commission Report. It is the opportunity to evaluate the workings of a fact-finding body in a case which is familiar to all. More important, it is an opportunity to study the workings of a commission that had the unique opportunity to investigate a sequence of criminal activities under the optimum condition of unlimited resources in personnel and facilities. The whole of the talents in academic and technical communities of the country, as well as the services of federal agencies, were available to it.

For purposes of this panel discussion it is assumed that all of those present have better than a cursory knowledge of the events surrounding the assassination of President Kennedy. Valuable time, therefore, will not be utilized with a chronological summation. Nor will time be spent in discussing those problems, such as protection and security, which do not fit comfortably into the normal province of this Academy.

The panelists have made an evaluation of the report from the perspectives of their separate disciplines. The approach

---
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The Warren Commission: A Commentary on Issues of Importance in the Study of Investigation and Criminalistics

James W. Assorburg, MPA

The literature of criminal investigation is sparse indeed. For this reason alone the Warren Commission Report is a document of landmark proportions. However, the inherent importance of the inquiry and the not inconsiderable sum spent by the government to consummate the investigation are other aspects that contribute to its significance. Since the report is based on a procedure which is neither pure criminal investigation, a trial, or other regular judicial process, it affords an opportunity to examine the nature of the investigative function and to inquire whether the means chosen were the best of the possible alternatives. In the sub-specialties of forensic science: pathology, criminalistics, questioned documents, and psychiatry, the printed testimony reveals the state of expertise that was available at the time for the most demanding homicide investigation ever undertaken. A clear reading of the testimony of some of the experts utilized, at least in criminalistics, suggests that there are some areas in which the basic research necessary for the effective utilization of these techniques was lacking. In those instances where the participants treat their subject harshly, these should be recognized as natural consequences of learned, objective studies, totally consistent with the aims of the Academy to advance the application of forensic sciences. In fact, the nature of this symposium is not appreciably different than some presented in former years where real case situations provided the basis for panel discussions and mock trials.

Some of the questions to be considered are: Was everything done that could have been done? Was anything done that should not have been done? Were the "expert" witnesses truly expert? Should additional independent witnesses have been consulted? Was there a conflict of interest? Did the evidence support the conclusions of the experts? The Warren Commission Report is a document of primary importance to those who are seriously engaged in the study of criminal investigation and criminalistics.

The Warren Commission
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The Commission was created by President Lyndon B. Johnson on November 29, 1963 by Executive Order No. 11130. This measure to investigate the assassination of President John F. Kennedy on November 22, 1963 was undertaken because throughout the world, reports on these events were disseminated in massive detail. Theories and speculations mounted throughout the world. The domestic or foreign. His subsequent death heightened public interest and stimulated additional interest and speculation. How best to resolve this doubt was a question that required an immediate answer.

Several procedures—including a court of inquiry before a Texas state magistrate, a grand jury investigation in Dallas County, Texas, and hearings before Congressional committees—were designed to avoid parallel investigations and to concentrate fact-finding in a body having the broadest national mandate. The Commission was given two important investigative weapons, viz., the power to issue subpoenas requiring the testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence relating to any matter under investigation. In addition, the Commission could compel testimony from witnesses claiming the privilege against self-incrimination under the U.S. Constitution by providing for the grant of immunity to persons testifying under such compulsion.

The Commission was given the power to conduct any further investigation that it deemed desirable. The President's appointment of the Warren Commission was a deliberate alternative that sought to avoid parallel investigations and to concentrate fact-finding in a body having the broadest national mandate.

WARREN REPORT. COMMENT OF A CRIMINALIST

It would seem that the authority and resources of the Commission were commensurate with its responsibility to study and report upon all facts and circumstances relating to the assassination of the late President, John F. Kennedy, and the subsequent violent death of the man charged with the assassination.

How the Commission proceeded in order to accomplish its objective and how well it succeeded are two questions of great interest to anyone concerned with the investigative process. The Commission in its report discusses the procedural question: The Commission has functioned neither as a court presiding over an adversary proceeding nor as a prosecutor determined to make the accused confess. The evidence was obtained as a result of agreements with the American public, not from persons who had no background in law enforcement but who had an interest in the resolution of the question of the assassination. The question of how well it succeeded is more difficult to answer. Several carping essayists have left a legacy of critical commentary on the fact-finding and explanations offered by the various official governmental agencies, including the Warren Commission.

The question and response (in part) were as follows:

Percent
Percent

45
45
10
% Full story in report
Still unanswered questions
Not sure
Any investigation which fails to satisfy 55 percent of those for whom it was made can hardly be designated as outstanding success. It would be interesting to repeat the poll to learn what change, if any, has occurred with time.
contributing to this skepticism is the fact that the commission, despite the high quality of its work, received a number of negative comments from the public. The commission's report was met with both acclaim and criticism. Unfortunately, the suggestion that such people might be used in the following manner:

To assist in the review of the case as to the comprehensiveness of the investigation. Were any investigative leads not discovered by people competent in the field of investigative administration is a major consideration for your commission (12).

The demands of good scholarship should have been no different in this inquiry than they will be when the matter passes to a panel of experienced jurists. The commission is the weaker for it. Perhaps, to paraphrase Clemenceau, investigation was too important to leave to lawyers!

An example of scholarly concern with the investigative process is seen in the paper by Professor William P. Brown (14). He has suggested that the President's assassination must be regarded as one of a class of "crimes of national significance" and that in these cases the resources and competence necessary to deal with them is not always present. In many cases, the commission's physical evidence was inadequate to the task. Professor Brown's critique is important to those interested in the investigation of the assassination of high federal officials has since been taken care of. Under legislation passed in 1965, this would presumably be a simple federal offense (like treason) investigated and prosecuted in a routine way by regular federal agencies.

The problem remains however of dealing effectively with other crimes of national significance such as the assassination of foreign dignitaries on our soil.

An abundance of physical evidence was available to the investigators of the assassination of President Kennedy. For example, the following types of clue material were found:

- Fragments of clothing from the assassination site
- Hair and fibers
- Blood and semen
- Fingerprints
- Ballistics evidence

It is interesting to speculate whether a similar amount of physical evidence is often available in other homicides. Moreover, if such evidence is present, is it overlooked in many cases? Is it disregarded owing to the lack of convenient criminalistic resources? It is my belief that there is considerable physical evidence present at many crimes, not just homicides, that is not discovered or utilized for technical reasons. In any case, the commission's physical evidence was inadequate at the task. Professor Brown's critique is important to those interested in the investigation of the assassination. The commission is the weaker for it. Perhaps, to paraphrase Clemenceau, investigation was too important to leave to lawyers!

An example of scholarly concern with the investigative process is seen in the paper by Professor William P. Brown (14). He has suggested that the President's assassination must be regarded as one of a class of "crimes of national significance" and that in these cases the resources and competence necessary to deal with them is not always present. In many cases, the commission's physical evidence was inadequate to the task. Professor Brown's critique is important to those interested in the investigation of the assassination. The problem remains however of dealing effectively with other crimes of national significance such as the assassination of foreign dignitaries on our soil.

The assassination of high federal officials has since been taken care of. Under legislation passed in 1965, this would presumably be a simple federal offense (like treason) investigated and prosecuted in a routine way by regular federal agencies.
WARREN REPORT, COMMENT OF A CRIMINALIST

An admission of a softly-mentioned problem in criminalistics, viz. the philosophical basis of interpretation of physical evidence. Dichotomy in Interpretation

In its simplest terms the dichotomy in evidence interpretation may be stated as the black and white versus the black, gray, and white views. Almost all fingerprint experts are now in the black-white camp. This view is readily accepted as satisfactory. Furthermore, as testimony, this view meets the requirements sometimes demanded by the legal mind; it does not produce the conflict which results when the "gray" area of doubt intrudes. This disagreement is reflected in the hearings. First let us consider the statement of the black-white view (18).

Q. . . . do you feel that the amount of markings here were sufficient to make positive identification?
A. Yes, sir. Q. Have you made identification in the past with as few or less markings as are present on this bullet fragment?
A. Oh, yes; and much less of an area. The character of the marks is more important than the number of the marks.
Q. . . . here you were of course unable to see all of the lines which were present on the bullet before mutilation. Have you ever had an occasion where you examined a bullet and saw one portion of it which was an apparent match and then found out that the balance of the bullet was not an apparent match?
A. No, sir; and if I understand your words "apparent match," there is no such thing as an apparent match. It either is an identification or it isn't, and until you made up your mind, you don't have an apparent match. We don't actually use that term . . . Unless you have sufficient marks for an identification, you cannot say one way or the other as to whether or not two bullets were fired from a particular barrel. In other words, you cannot identify on the absence of similarities any more than you can identify when you have no similarities present.
Q. In other words, you won't make an identification unless you feel enough marks are present to constitute a basis for a positive identification?
A. That is right, and I would not report any type of similarities unless they were sufficient for an identification, because unless you can say one bullet was fired from the same barrel ... room for error, and in this field of firearms identification, we try to avoid any possible chance of error creeping in.
Q. Do you avoid the category of "probable" identification?
A. Oh, yes; we never use it, never. Q. And why is that?
A. There is no such thing as a probable identification, it either is or isn't as far as we are concerned.
Q. And in this case it is?
A. It is, yes.

In a discussion involving a different set of bullets (or commission exhibits) another witness presented the "gray" viewpoint when the issue was raised by counsel (19). Q. . . . we had testimony . . . yesterday . . . that the . . . (laboratory) does not make probable identifications, but merely positive or negative identifications. A. I am aware of their position. This is not, I am sure, arrived at without careful consideration. However, to say that because one does not find sufficient marks for identification that it is a negative, I think is going overboard in the other direction. And for purposes of probative value for whatever it might be worth, in other words, the marks are more important than the number of the marks.

In a discussion involving a different set of bullets (or commission exhibits) another witness presented the "gray" view.

(12) Point when the language was first employed by the Strayview Mission Excursions another witness presented the "gray" view. In a discussion involving a different set of bullets (or commission exhibits) another witness presented the "gray" view.
Concerning tool marks rather than bullets, the most common view held by criminalists about evidence interpretation (20).

As a result of the microscopic or photographic comparisons made, four conclusions are possible:

1. No opinion or conclusion is reached due to alteration in the questioned mark or tool since the crime occurred.

2. The questioned tool did not make the evidence mark.

3. The questioned tool may have made the evidence mark, but a conclusive identification is not justified. Most cases involving tool marks where only class characteristics of the tool are present fall in this category. Occasionally, this conclusion may vary greatly and depend upon the examiner's judgment of the probabilities involved.

4. The questioned tool did produce the evidence mark.

Research Requirements

Intimately connected with the question of interpretation is the problem of basic data, upon which objective criteria for the evaluation of physical evidence must be based. If the research work had been done and published, the problem would be relatively simple and such an evaluation would be possible. The serious deficiency of data are clearly revealed in the following testimonies:

Q. Finally, we had discussed briefly your examination of consecutively manufactured bolt faces to see whether any two such consecutively manufactured bolt faces were identical. How many such examinations have you performed?

A. I would say about four examinations of pairs of bolt faces which have been consecutively manufactured.

Q. And in each case the result was that?

A. The marks on one bolt face in no way resembled the marks on the other bolt face (21).

Q. Have you examined consecutively manufactured barrels to determine whether their microscopic characteristics are identical?

A. Yes, sir; I have three different sets of, you might say, paired barrels, which have been manufactured on the same machine, one after the other, under controlled conditions to make them identical. Their rifling impressions of course would be identical, but the individual marks there would be entirely different (22).

This testimony is typical of the type of explanation offered by experts throughout the country in this area of criminalistics and accepted by courts at all levels. Therefore, it is not necessary to submit this part of the analysis.

The evaluation of evidence is the foundation of the technique of criminalistics.
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When I am called "document examiner" I can say with much cordiality and considerable truth "You are another," because the use of documents in human affairs is universal and documents may be called the standard for test of any currently questioned document. In the ordinary use of documents, questions are likely to be, "Is the signature genuine?" "Was the document put forth in good faith?" "Does the document have some significance beyond its superficial or obvious meaning?" and answered quite rapidly and in most instances the document is quickly passed as genuine, or promptly acted upon, but when one of these questions fails to produce a satisfactory answer, the document may be tested more rigorously and it is usually as the result of these more searching questions that the document examiner is called upon.

The examiner of questioned documents is concerned with a document as a record of thoughts—not necessarily as ideas but as purposes—and he is concerned with paper and ink as the instrument with which the words were written. He is interested in the context in which the words were written and the circumstances under which they were written. He is interested in the purpose for which the document was written and the person who wrote it. He is interested in the age of the document and the time when it was written. He is interested in the use to which the document was put. He is interested in the people who have handled the document and the places to which it has been taken. He is interested in the condition of the document and the care with which it has been kept.

The examiner of questioned documents is concerned with the document as a record of thoughts—not necessarily as ideas but as purposes—and he is concerned with paper and ink as the instrument with which the words were written. He is interested in the context in which the words were written and the circumstances under which they were written. He is interested in the purpose for which the document was written and the person who wrote it. He is interested in the age of the document and the time when it was written. He is interested in the use to which the document was put. He is interested in the people who have handled the document and the places to which it has been taken. He is interested in the condition of the document and the care with which it has been kept.

The examiner of questioned documents is concerned with a document as a record of thoughts—not necessarily as ideas but as purposes—and he is concerned with paper and ink as the instrument with which the words were written. He is interested in the context in which the words were written and the circumstances under which they were written. He is interested in the purpose for which the document was written and the person who wrote it. He is interested in the age of the document and the time when it was written. He is interested in the use to which the document was put. He is interested in the people who have handled the document and the places to which it has been taken. He is interested in the condition of the document and the care with which it has been kept.
of the document. This habit of seeing the document as a whole is often develops additional important information, and also it is one of the ways the examiner remains keen about his work.

The physical document, as opposed to an oral statement, offers attractive opportunities for extended study. Whenever documents are involved in an important or notorious event, it is the custom to make the studies in a very careful manner. Documents demand our attention for as long as they may give some new thread of information, or give material for new interpretations of events. No doubt this will be true of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and the death of Lee Harvey Oswald.

The principal documents are those which bear upon the purchase and delivery of the carbine with telescopic sights used to fire the fatal shots from the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository, documents connected with the purchase... on November 22, 1963, the killing of police officer J. D. Tippit, and the death of Lee Harvey Oswald two days later.

The assembly of questioned documents that may appear to bear upon a crime usually occurs before collection of necessary standards for comparison, and we have observed that some of the documents connected with the purchase and delivery of the assassination weapons were disclosed by painstaking investigation. Under questioning by Dallas police and federal law enforcement officers immediately after arrest, Lee Harvey Oswald denied any connection with the deaths of President Kennedy and officer Tippit. He lived barely 43 hours from the time of his arrest; therefore, the information developed by study of documents is of great importance.

The Warren Report—Forged Documents

The formation of the Warren Commission, as well as the publication of its report, has provided an opportunity for extended study. This report includes a detailed examination of the documents connected with the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. It presents a comprehensive analysis of the evidence and provides insight into the events leading up to the assassination.

The report notes that the documents related to the assassination were largely classified and were not available to the public. However, it also highlights the importance of the documents in understanding the circumstances surrounding the assassination.

The report further discusses the role of documents in the investigation of the assassination, including the use of questioned documents. It emphasizes the importance of careful examination and analysis of documents in determining their authenticity and relevance.

The report concludes that the investigation of the assassination was hindered by the lack of access to certain documents, but it also notes the importance of the documents that were available in understanding the events leading up to the assassination.

Overall, the Warren Report provides a comprehensive analysis of the documents related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. It highlights the importance of these documents in understanding the circumstances surrounding the event and serves as an important resource for future research and analysis.
The purpose of this section is to present documents printed in different styles and scripts.

Warren Report—Forged Documents

The forged documents included in this section are all printed in different styles and scripts. The forged documents include:

- A letter to the American Civil Liberties Union, dated November 4, 1963, with accompanying card.
- Application for a library card of the New Orleans Public Library, No. 8640, showing the hand printed name “Oswald, Lee.”
- Signatures as endorsements on salary checks issued from October, 1962 to March, 1963, inclusive.
- A change of address card dated May 1, 1963, bearing identification data across the lower line which apparently connects it with the application for review of discharge.
- A diary of many pages maintained by Lee Harvey Oswald while in Russia and probably continued after his return to the United States.
- A note to the American Civil Liberties Union, received November 4, 1963, with accompanying card made out by Lee Harvey Oswald.
- Application for review of undesirable discharge from the United States Marine Corps filed with the Department of State, showing issuance of a passport to Lee Harvey Oswald, bearing hand printing, a signature, and a photograph.
- Two envelopes, postmarked Fort Worth, Texas, June 19, 1962, and August 1, 1962, addressed to the Navy Discharge Review Board, Washington 25, D.C.
- Application for a library card from the library of the New Orleans Public Library, No. 8640, showing the hand printed name “Oswald, Lee.”
- A letter to the Navy Discharge Review Board, Washington 25, D.C.
- Several fragments of handwritten notes, one of which mentions “Roveiwr” Board.
- Several handwritten notes, one of which mentions “Roveiwr” Board.

These documents are important as standards for comparison. The hand printing of the many paged diary must have been an onerous task for him. Oswald was able to write at a fair speed but not with easy fluency when trying to achieve best legibility so that the hand printing of this many paged diary must have been an onerous task for him.
This card signed by Lee Oswald bears a considerable quantity of hand printing, which makes it valuable for comparison with certain other cards that bear the critical address "P.O. Box 2915" and with still another card that bears the name "A. J. Hidell" as a person authorized to receive mail in the box assigned to Lee H. Oswald.

It is rare that a document problem is accompanied by such extensive and varied standards for comparison, embracing, as they do, documents made upon different occasions for reasons of habit, which is fully sufficient as a basis for identification or differentiation of handwriting and handwriting.

The questioned documents are those related to purchase and delivery of the assassination weapons, to establishment of the alias "A. J. Hidell" or "A. J. Hidell," and use of the address "P.O. Box 2915, Dallas, Texas." The principal questioned documents are as follows:

1. United Postal Service Order, dated Dallas, Texas, May 12, 1963, in the amount of $21.45, made out to "Klein's Sporting Goods," the purchaser's name being given as "A. Hidell" (3). This is in payment for the carbine with telescopic sight.

2. Microfilm copy of an envelope addressed to Klein's... Chicago, Ill., with microfilm reproduction of the coupon order for an article now known to be the assassination weapon, specifying delivery to "A. Hidell, P.O. Box 2915, Dallas, Texas." (4).

3. Coupon order form of Seaport Traders, Inc., Los Angeles, California, for "1 .38 St. W. 2\) Bbl" (revolver) at a cost of $29.95, again calling for delivery to "A. J. Hidell, P.O. Box 2915, Dallas, Texas." (5). The acquisition of a firearm must be regarded as a serious and deliberate act, yet it is strange that the writing on this order form appears to be below the ordinary skill of the author. We have...
The second function of the comparison and the third step of standardization

The second function of the comparison and the third step of standardization is to make sure that the comparison is fully consistent with the requirements of standardization. This procedure involves the utilization of non-standardized, cursive and hand-printed writing, to include a good record of the writing habit of the author. The writing is natural for the author and stands apart from the body. The letter could as well be placed with the standards as it is fully consistent with them.

The formal conditions for comparison of handwriting have now been established; namely, the presence of a body of standard writing judged to be individual and distinctive, and the questioned writing also judged to be the product of habit which is extensive enough to show an identifiable pattern. The number of points of similarity and the weight assigned to them would enable the examiner to draw a reasonable conclusion. The process of comparison can absorb many hours of time, but when it is performed with the care of a possible need to re-examine the evidence, it can be significant in those grounds to which the writer can be connected. In this process of comparison, the comparison of standard or known writing with the questioned writing is essential in all significant points of contact, where the known writing is used in the examination. The comparison of standard or known writing with the quoted material is to be expected with the care of a possible need to re-examine the evidence.

The comparison of standard or known writing with the questioned writing is essential in all significant points of contact, where the known writing is used in the examination. The comparison of standard or known writing with the quoted material is to be expected with the care of a possible need to re-examine the evidence.

The comparison of standard or known writing with the quoted material is to be expected with the care of a possible need to re-examine the evidence.
two examples of the writing of the address “P. O. Box 2827”.

Chart B: The inset (black background) shows questioned writing on the postal money order in payment for the carbine with telescopic sight shipped to the address shown. All other writing is from documents submitted as bearing the standard or known handwriting of Lee Harvey Oswald.

Chart C: The inset (white background) shows questioned writing on the postal money order in payment for the carbine with telescopic sight shipped to the address shown.
Chart C: This chart shows hand printing and numerals from the standard writing on lines 4 and 13. Here again there is an exact agreement with the word "Texas" of the questioned writing. A particular interest is the method of making the letter "x." The chart shows how the letter "x" is formed in the word "Texas."
though the writer believed he might form the “x” as a continuous movement without the need for a separate bar, but since ... This is a highly unusual method of forming the letter "x" and it is the same in both standard and questioned writing. Chart C shows standard hand printing. The insert of questioned writing is at line 4 with the address "P.O. Box 2915" in a form of hand printing, and a printed "A" on the line 5 ... the way down on the left side by means of a stroke that moves to the left across the top of the letter and then downward.

There are many other similarities of this order between the questioned writing and the whole body of the standard writing. It will have been appreciated from this description ... the questioned and standard specimens other than those chargeable to normal variations, and there are none that require classification as part of a pattern of writing habit of some other person. Instead, there is a pervasive similarity ... enough to warrant the firm belief that all of this writing is in the hand of Lee Harvey Oswald. Summary and Conclusions

Handwriting is produced by the operation of habit. The process of learning to write means the acquirement and development of a set of habits which makes the production of handwriting a natural expression of the writer’s will. While every literate person has a natural ability in recognizing individuality in handwriting, the forensic identification of handwriting is properly a specialty, involving a formal responsibility for making such judgments subject to rigorous tests of correctness over a period of years in order that the results of such judgments may be reliable. These conditions are met in the case of the questioned and standard specimens of the documents in this case. The documents give information of the standard and questioned handwriting is by Lee Harvey Oswald. Beyond the idealistic demonstration of the writer of the documents, the documents themselves give information of the writer of the documents. The writer of the documents is shown to be the writer of the documents and the writer of the documents is shown to be the writer of the documents and the writer of the documents is shown to be the writer of the documents.

Psychiatric Observations on the
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2730 Blaine Drive Chevy Chase, Maryland 20015
The American public may be reassured that the life of our President was not extinguished by deliberate plan of an overt racial, political or religious cause. The Commission has performed a conscientious, detailed and often brilliant task. Only an individual set and rigid in his belief that our society is corrupt will continue to doubt the facts established by the report. Certainly evidence is not suppressed and areas of doubt have been explored in detail. The Commission found no evidence that anyone assisted Oswald in planning or carrying out the assassination.

Herbert L. Packer, professor of law, Stanford University, reports in "The Nation," November 2, 1964, "The Warren Commission has admirably fulfilled its central objective of demonstrating that the tragedy was proximately the work of more than one man and therefore ultimately the outcome of a conspiracy" (2). Professor Packer is of the opinion that those who would revise the Warren Report are now merely "flogging a dead horse." It is quite easy to attack the inaccuracies of the statements that Oswald was the sole owner of this rifle and it was purchased through mail-order, and the shots could have been fired by Oswald who was in the Book Depository at the time.

None of the basic facts of the Warren Report depends upon "eyeball" witnesses. That Oswald was capable of firing a gun at another human whom he looked upon as an enemy is certainly probable. Although the attempt to kill Major General Walker is peripheral to the central thesis of the Commission, the commission has failed to give sufficient recognition to the possibility that there may have been two snipers. In theory, Mr. Ruby could be the other sniper and therefore the so-called single-shot assassin a "rear" sniper - Mr. Ruby.

What is lacking in the Warren Commission Report is a structured study of Oswald which sufficiently reveals his personality, growth and emotional development. Motivation is concealed behind the usual sociological and psychological generalities. The Commission's conclusion that Oswald was under the influence of mental illness is inadequate in the absence of a sufficiently comprehensive study to support this conclusion.
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Experts in the forensic sciences are experts only when they speak authoritatively in those areas in which they are adequately qualified. While an analytical chemist may report on the chemical composition of a mixture, his training and purpose prepare him to discredit rumor, speculation, conjecture and most of all, motivation.

After a comprehensive study of the Warren Report, this writer was astonished to learn that of the 522 witnesses interviewed or deposed and over 25,000 reports presented to the Commission, the study of unconscious forces, upon which behavior is based, is not the concern of the law, for it is based on conjecture rather than fact, concept rather than a knowledge of purpose. Yet it is clearly and distinctly not the concern of the law. For "We are dealing in a very delicate field here, and I am pressing you very severely." Mr. Jenner, a one-time Marine colleague of Lee Oswald, replied, "These are sometimes very grey thin lines we have to distinguish between." Mr. Jenner then stated, "We are probing for motivation." Despite pages upon pages of detailed information gathered by competent police and legal investigators, the report is quite deficient in establishing motivation.

While reading the report in detail, the writer found himself in many ways assuming the position of a juror listening to evidence. Ballistics data, fingerprint studies, report of the CIA and FBI, were all presented to the Commission. The Commission, composed of the highest professionals in the field of forensics, was presented with the evidence, but it was not sufficient to prove the defendant guilty.

In August of 1962, the Warren Report in detail notes that Oswald attempted to initiate dealings with the Communist party, USA, by subscribing to the "Worker" and he continued to join that party, and actually subscribed to the "Militant," the official party newspaper of the Socialist Workers party. In April 1961, the Warren Report in detail notes that Oswald attempted to initiate dealings with the Communist party, USA, by subscribing to the "Worker" and he continued to join that party, and actually subscribed to the "Militant," the official party newspaper of the Socialist Workers party.
In addition, he wrote to the Socialist Labor party identifying himself as a member of the "Fair Play for Cuba Committee." Although he claimed to have membership of 35 in the "Fair Play for Cuba Committee" in New Orleans, there is adequate evidence that he was a loner, and it appears that he wanted more immediate recognition and instant acknowledgment as a political leader. Hidell is a personal pseudonym, a name so closely synonymous with Fidel that its origin can be readily identified.

The photograph of Oswald holding two newspapers which represent the official publications of political parties that are thoroughly antagonistic gives convincing evidence of his political affiliation. As a personal observation, I find the pictures more convincing than reams of print.

The personality of Lee Oswald was characterized during boyhood by withdrawal. He played by himself, frequently refused to leave home and, by the age of 10, he preferred to stay in his room. At the age of 12, he was accused of knife on his mother during a quarrel, giving evidence of a rage reaction when frustrated of considerable future significance.

Once settled in New York, Lee Oswald's school adjustment deteriorated and the mother transferred him from a Lutheran day school to a public school. He attended school about one year and was remanded to Youth House for psychiatric study. He refused to appear before the presiding judge. Dr. Renatus Hantels, the only psychiatrist who examined Lee, who was then aged 13, indicated that Lee was a withdrawn and socially maladjusted boy whose mother would not interest herself in his education and that he had an anti-social personality.

The impression that his home life was utterly unstable, that his family moved frequently between Fort Worth, Texas, and New York, and that he had an alias, Hidell, a name so closely synonymous with Fidel that its origin can be readily identified, is a personal observation.
the court. Fearful that the boy might be retained in some type of protective custody, Mrs. Oswald took Lee out of the jurisdiction of the court early in 1954 and returned to New Orleans where Lee completed the 8th grade.

During the ensuing few years, Lee was described as demanding and insolent toward his mother and several witnesses have reported that the mother had little or no control over her son, who was described by one as "a bottle of dynamite with a fuse." He was said to be, according to one witness, "as bad as he could be," and another described him as "a wild child." The mother, however, denied these allegations and claimed that Lee was a "normal child." The court decided to hold Lee for further observation and he was transferred to the Texas Children's Home. There, he was described as being "out of control" and "aggressive." He was also said to be "difficult to get along with." The mother, who visited him regularly, reported that he was "very jealous" and "resentful." He was also said to be "violent" and "aggressive." The home concluded that he had "emotional problems" and "behavioral difficulties." Lee was discharged from the home after a period of observation, and the mother was given custody.

There certainly seems to be some identification between Lee and his older brother. Lee spent his entire sixteenth year memorizing the Marine Manual which he had received from his brother. As soon as he was 17 years of age he joined the Marines. The pattern of development thus far revealed in the above sketch is not at all deviant from that of scores of young adolescents whose behavior can be considered collectively as deviant. The overall protection of the delinquent son by evasion, counter hostility, and manipulation is clearly demonstrable.

That Lee Harvey Oswald used rage reactions and temper tantrums to gain his ends indicates the degree of character disorder already prevalent; yet nothing is revealed which shows how he became so violent. He was so difficult in barracks discipline that other members of his quonset hut secured his transfer to another barracks.

Unquestionably he had a pronounced interest in world affairs and appeared much better informed on the international issues than some of his officers. He frequently baited his officers and military personnel and he also ordered the removal of several of his superior officers. He also frequently visited the Marine Corps newspaper, "The Stars and Stripes," in which he stored a loaded pistol in his locker which discharged and sent a bullet into his left elbow. The second court martial followed pouring beer on a noncommissioned officer and cursing him while Oswald was intoxicated in a cafe.

A review of the boyhood and young manhood of Lee Harvey Oswald indicates little more than rejection, withdrawal, and a compensatory need for a self-assertive aggressiveness in areas of politics, religion, and philosophy. These tendencies together with his interest in world affairs and his relatively successful academic performance in college provide support for the conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald had potential for personal development.

I am reluctant to come embroiled in those areas which properly belong to the discussants skilled in the law. There was certainly indication upon reading the Warren Report, that there was no significant relevant emotional factor in the growth of Oswald. While the mother is still alive he deserves the same protections accorded to the mentally ill and the emotionally disturbed and sent a bullet into the court by the psychotic. The second court martial was over the incident and Oswald was returned to the Marine Corps. He was transferred to another barracks and was discharged from the service.

Oswald was court-martialed in 1956 and received a dishonorable discharge.

During the ensuing few years, Lee was arrested as a communist in some instances. He was reported to have had a "rash of cases" involving subversion and espionage.

Oswald was later convicted of the murder of President John F. Kennedy in 1963 and was later executed in 1964.
A thorough psychiatric study; his former wife, Marina, should certainly be interviewed to gain some professional insights. This study, I believe, is one of the most significant contributions the psychiatric profession could offer to augment the Warren Report. A reassessment of the details, facts, and information could lead to a deeper understanding of the personality of Lee Harvey Oswald. A study in depth of those individuals significant to the emotional growth of Oswald is indicated in order to better understand his motivation. A study of his contacts, acquaintances, and interactions within the Soviet Union could add much to the knowledge of his personality.

Conclusion

This study involves a review of the Warren Report and a more detailed study of the unique personality of Lee Harvey Oswald. Although the Warren Commission, a body of outstanding attorneys, appeared to follow the practice common to a group of intellectuals functioning as "lay" psychiatrists, this writer is appalled at conclusions reached which involve psychiatric evaluations and judgments without the benefit of trained professional thinking. A study in depth of those individuals significant to the emotional growth of Oswald is indicated in order to better understand his motivation. A better understanding of Lee Harvey Oswald is indicated in order to further understand the motivation behind the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.
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A Critique of the Medical Aspects of the Investigation into the Assassination of President Kennedy

Cyril III. fliecht, M.D., LL.B., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Following the initial shock of President Kennedy's assassination on that fateful day of November 22, 1963, the nation addressed itself to the postmortem investigation and the subsequent proceedings that would ultimately be conducted to lay to rest the question of how and why this great man of the people met his untimely death. In the minds of law enforcement officials, attorneys, and forensic scientists, not to mention the lay public, there are several questions that never seem to be resolved.

To thoroughly and officially sift through the overwhelming and frequently conflicting pieces of evidence, President Johnson appointed a committee of distinguished Americans, headed by a former President of the United States, to conduct an investigation into the assassination of President Kennedy. This committee, known as the Warren Commission, was charged with the task of determining the facts and circumstances surrounding the assassination and preparing a report summarizing those findings. The Commission, after many months of investigation and deliberation, issued its report in 1964, which has since become a central document in the debate surrounding the assassination.

The tragic demise of John F. Kennedy poses no problem for us in terms of determining the cause and manner of death. These two questions are the primary and most important ones to be answered by a forensic pathologist in evaluating any death by gunshot wound. However, having answered these two questions, the forensic pathologist must proceed further, for he often will be called upon in a court of law to testify as an expert witness on the nature and extent of the injuries sustained by the deceased. In this particular case, all of us, as critics, are handicapped by not having been involved in the autopsy. Consequently, we are limited in our evaluation to those portions of the report that have been made public through official sources. The only other material that we have access to is that which has been released in the media or that which we have been able to acquire through other means.

There are several questions that must be raised by a forensic pathologist in evaluating the autopsy report on John F. Kennedy. By standards found in most competent medical-legal literature, the autopsy report on Kennedy is deficient in several respects. First, the report does not include a detailed description of the bullet wounds and the associated injuries. Second, the report does not provide a complete and accurate account of the circumstances surrounding the assassination. Third, the report does not address the possibility of a conspiracy to assassinate the President. Fourth, the report does not include a comprehensive analysis of the ballistic evidence.

However, the Warren Commission report provides a more detailed account of the autopsy findings. The report includes a comprehensive list of the wounds sustained by Kennedy, along with a detailed description of the bullets and the manner in which they were fired. The report also includes a detailed analysis of the evidence recovered at the scene of the assassination, including the bullet fragments and the gunpowder residue.

The issue of the Medical Aspects of the Assassination of President Kennedy remains a subject of much debate and controversy. While some believe that the Warren Commission report was biased in favor of the government, others maintain that the report was a fair and thorough investigation of the events surrounding the assassination.

In conclusion, the Warren Commission report provides a valuable resource for those interested in the Medical Aspects of the Assassination of President Kennedy. However, it is important to remember that the report is not without its limitations and that further investigation is warranted to fully understand the complex events surrounding this tragic event.
WARREN REPORT—CRITIQUE OF MEDICAL ASPECTS

official autopsy report and in the subsequent testimony given before the Warren Commission. It is my purpose briefly to discuss some of the areas of incomplete information and the unanswered questions that have arisen therefrom.

At the outset, it should be stated that this discussion will include comments on the various medical aspects of the assassination of President Kennedy that might not be considered to be directly within the realm of forensic pathology. However, inasmuch as there is no representative of clinical medicine included in this symposium I would be remiss if certain observations of a general medical nature were not made.

The various observations having to do with medicine and pathology contained within this paper will be discussed in chronological fashion rather than in other possible ways, such as an anatomical division of the body. This discussion would seem to be the most logical approach in this particular instance.

Bleed Type of the President

The first thing that is noted by a physician in reviewing the assassination of President Kennedy is the fact that his blood type was not known or immediately available to the physicians at Parkland Memorial Hospital. Consequently, Type A, Rh negative blood was administered. It should be emphasized that this lack of vital medical information did not play a significant role in the treatment of the President. However, the importance of having the blood type available at the hospital cannot be overlooked. If the President had been brought to a hospital where Type O blood was not available, an immediate transfusion of Type A blood would have been necessary. The importance of having the blood type of a patient known cannot be overemphasized.

One wonders why such vital information is not readily available on small medical information and identification cards present at all times with the President and also with one or more of the Secret Service men who accompany the President on all trips.

Treatment at Hospital

There can be no criticism of the medical and surgical treatment administered to the President at Parkland Memorial Hospital in Dallas, Texas. As a matter of fact, it is only fair to say that the medical personnel at the hospital did everything within their power to save the life of the President. The administration of blood, oxygen, intravenous fluids, and other measures was done with due dispatch.

At this point, it is important again to emphasize that the President was beyond the possibility of being saved when he was brought to the hospital. His pupils were dilated and fixed, there was no obtainable pulse or blood pressure, and there was only a faint suggestion of a heartbeat. All other measures taken were directed toward the restoration of these vital signs.

It is necessary to comment on one particular surgical measure, namely the tracheostomy. A wound was noted in the anterior aspect of the neck at approximately the level of the knot of the tie. This wound was the result of the President's latest injury to the neck. The importance of this wound and the necessity of performing a tracheostomy at this point cannot be overemphasized. The effectiveness of the tracheostomy in restoring respiratory function cannot be overemphasized. The fact that the President was brought to the hospital in this condition emphasizes the need for prompt action in all cases of head injury.

The President's condition was such that no matter what the medical or surgical treatment administered, the President was beyond the possibility of survival. The importance of this fact cannot be overemphasized.

The significance of the President's condition at the time of his arrival at the hospital cannot be overemphasized. The fact that the President was beyond the possibility of survival emphasizes the need for prompt action in all cases of head injury.
The physicians were aware of the presence of a number of stab wounds to the body but did not have sufficient presence of mind to have them repaired. Thus, while forensic pathologists frequently bemoan the fact that surgeons destroy sites of gunshot and stab wounds, thereby making it impossible for the forensic pathologist to determine the cause of death, the prime consideration of the surgeon is to attempt to save the patient's life. Thus, in those cases in which it is more feasible medically to make an incision through an existing wound of the body for a specific surgical reason, there should be no criticism of the surgeon for doing so.

Unfortunately, the performance of the tracheostomy through this site was responsible for several misconceptions and controversy that developed subsequently and which remain with us today. This will be commented on later in this paper. External Wounds

The surgeons at Parkland Memorial Hospital noted only two external wounds. These were the wound in the anterior midline of the neck, already described above, and a large gaping wound of the skull in the right occipital parietal region (8).

As a matter of fact, there were two additional wounds of the body that none of the attending physicians at Parkland Memorial Hospital noted. These were a wound in the upper right quadrant of the abdomen, already described above, and a knife wound of the liver, noted above. The two doctors did not notice these wounds because the President was dead when they arrived at the hospital. The critical question, however, arises with regard to the actions of the doctors after the President was pronounced dead at 1 p.m. At that time, there was no other medical need to look elsewhere for other wounds. The critical question is, What was done or not done at that time?

It is true that a rapid, cursory examination of the body should have been performed in cases of multiple injuries, for it is often the case that an immediate laceration or injury to the body is masked by the body's own defensive responses. In the case of the President Kennedy, however, it was not necessary to look elsewhere for other wounds, since the President was already dead when the medical team arrived. Therefore, the critical question is, What should have been done at that time?

It should be noted in any discussion of the President Kennedy assassination that the wounds were not discovered until late in the day, after the President had been pronounced dead. This was due to a number of factors, including the delay in the results of the autopsy and the confusion surrounding the President's death. It was not until late in the day that the wounds were discovered, and even then, the wounds were not immediately associated with the President's assassination. Therefore, the critical question is, What should have been done at that time?
It should be noted at this time that all the President's clothes were not removed from his body at Parkland Memorial Hospital (12). Fortunately, they were available for subsequent examination by the official coroner of the Dallas County Medical Examiner's Office. It was also important to note that the examination was conducted by a pathologist who was not involved in the initial investigations at the scene of the crime.

It is sad to note that such was not the case with Governor Connally's clothing. For some reason, never explained in the Warren Commission Report or apparently commented on by any other source, the Governor's clothing was not examined until after the Governor was pronounced dead and removed to surgery. The stretchers that the President and the Governor were placed on were not examined officially after the President was pronounced dead and the Governor was transferred to the hospital. It was not until after the Governor was pronounced dead that any examination of his clothing was conducted.

The Warren Commission Report states that the Governor's clothing was examined by a pathologist who was not involved in the initial investigations at the scene of the crime. The examination was conducted by a pathologist who was not involved in the initial investigations at the scene of the crime.

The Warren Commission Report states that the Governor's clothing was examined by a pathologist who was not involved in the initial investigations at the scene of the crime. The examination was conducted by a pathologist who was not involved in the initial investigations at the scene of the crime.

The Warren Commission Report states that the Governor's clothing was examined by a pathologist who was not involved in the initial investigations at the scene of the crime. The examination was conducted by a pathologist who was not involved in the initial investigations at the scene of the crime.
Warren Commission, the body that conducted the investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy, attempted to "take charge" and who demanded that the body be kept in Dallas for the performance of an autopsy. This decision was made because of the concern for security in transferring the body, since there was a belief that presidential assassination was a possible threat.

The autopsy was handled at Bethesda Naval Medical Center. News conferences by medical personnel at Parkland Memorial Hospital were the subject of a critique. I would not agree that it was improper and unwise to conduct a medical conference at the hospital following President Kennedy's death. Once again, when one bears in mind that the media was present, the substance and extent of the statements made by the physicians at the medical conference should be commented upon.

The fact that there some difference of opinion among the physicians and the news media personnel as to exactly what was said at the conference, and further that this apparent confusion and conflict continued to exist in terms of the testimony recited before the Warren Commission, would seem to prove that one or more of the Parkland Memorial Hospital physicians could have agreed to a question posed by one of the news media. The physicians who were in attendance should have borne in mind the fact that they had not examined the entire body and, therefore, could not be certain as to what the exact nature of the bullet wound was. Their comments regarding the nature of the bullet wounds were imprudent, medically unsound, and quite unnecessary. It would have been sufficient to state "that the President had a bullet wound in the neck". If this had been done, a considerable amount of subsequent confusion would have been eliminated.

The body of President Kennedy was taken to Bethesda Naval Medical Center pursuant to a request by Mrs. Kennedy, who felt that the autopsy should be done there because of the President's final request. Bethesda Naval Hospital is large institution with adequate facilities for the performance of a competent autopsy.

A point strongly to be criticized is the fact that the three pathologists who were designated by the government to perform the autopsy did not contact the physicians at Parkland Hospital after the body arrived. It should be standard procedure for every forensic pathologist who is going to examine a person who has died to make a preliminary examination of the body before beginning the autopsy. This is to be done to avoid any subsequent misconception.
The work of the forensic pathologist is difficult enough; it should never be reduced to a guessing game when this is not necessary. Any and all clinical information that can be obtained before performance of the autopsy is always valuable and should be sought out whenever possible.

**Choice of Pathologists**

I do not believe that the government was wise in its choice of pathologists. One or more prominent civilian pathologists should have been called in to help perform the autopsy, and those who were selected lacked the necessary medical-legal experience. It is my understanding that two of the three pathologists who performed the autopsy are not forensic pathologists, namely Commander J. J. Humes and Commander J. Thornton Boswell, both of whom are at Parkland Memorial Hospital. Fortunately, someone did have the good judgment to call in Lieutenant Colonel Pierre A. Finck, M. C., U.S. A., who is a well-trained and very competent forensic pathologist with particular experience and knowledge in the field of missile wounds (21). One can only imagine how inadequate and incomplete the results of the autopsy findings would have been if Colonel Finck had not been present.

With regard to the question of utilizing civilian pathologists, it must be borne in mind that many of the foremost forensic pathologists in the country are located within a few hundred miles of the site of the fatalities. Therefore, the performance of the autopsy in this case was such a complex and important task that it would have been prudent, under the circumstances, to have brought in additional pathologists from another area.
The conclusion of the Warren Commission Report mentions that the findings of the pathologists were made available to the public. It states that the Commission agreed with the conclusions of the autopsy report, which concluded that President Kennedy was shot twice, once in the back of the head, and once in the upper right chest. The first wound entered the upper posterior right chest, coursing in a slightly downward angle and exiting in the middle of the anterior neck region at about the level of the clavicle. This was followed by a second wound of the skull. The report notes that the first wound was likely to have been fatal and incompatible with life beyond a few minutes. It also suggests that the second wound could have been saved if medical treatment had been available.
It is to be noted that the pathologists studied the gunshot wounds microscopically and thus confirmed their gross autopsy opinions as to which were wounds of entrance and which were wounds of exit. It is an unproved fact that the two bullets that struck President Kennedy were fired from a point to the rear of the Presidential car. I also agree that there were three bullets fired and that all three bullets were fired from the same place by the same person, namely, from the sixth floor of the book depository.

Some controversy exists as to whether or not the bullet that injured Governor Connally was the same bullet that penetrated President Kennedy's chest. It is very likely that this was the same bullet that had gone through President Kennedy's cheek and that the two bullets that struck Governor Connally were fired from the same place by the same person. It is also possible that the bullet that penetrated Governor Connally's chest was the same bullet that went through President Kennedy's neck or whether it was a separate shot.

It is fascinating to note how various inadequacies and shortcomings of the total investigation are intermingled and have ramifications throughout the entire postmortem evaluation and the events that followed the shooting of President Kennedy. The actual report of the Warren Commission presented the evidence in a clear and concise manner, and the findings of the commission are supported by overwhelming evidence. The commission's conclusions are based on careful analysis of the available evidence and their findings are supported by the majority of the commission members. The commission's conclusion that there was no evidence of the involvement of any foreign government or organization in the assassination is supported by the absence of any such evidence in the commission's report. The commission's finding that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in assassinating President Kennedy is supported by the evidence presented in the commission's report and the lack of any evidence of any other person being involved.

The commission's conclusions are based on the evidence presented in the commission's report and the lack of any evidence of any other person being involved. The commission's finding that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in assassinating President Kennedy is supported by the evidence presented in the commission's report and the lack of any evidence of any other person being involved. The commission's finding that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in assassinating President Kennedy is supported by the evidence presented in the commission's report and the lack of any evidence of any other person being involved.
Conclusion

While I agree with the ultimate conclusions of the Warren Commission, the various forensic scientists and pathologists who were involved in the investigation believe that there were several instances in which the scientists were not only to have been a very wise thing for the American Academy of Forensic Sciences to participate in the autopsy, but also to have called upon the American Academy of Forensic Sciences to act in the role of advisor and consultant to the Warren Commission.

A critique of the medical circumstances and events associated with the assassination of President John F. Kennedy has been undertaken in the Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy. The treatment given at Parkland Memorial Hospital, Dallas, and the autopsy performed at Bethesda Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Maryland, have been reviewed and commented upon by the American Academy of Forensic Sciences. It is fortunate that the American Academy of Forensic Sciences in a consultant capacity during the compilation and evaluation of its findings is noted.
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