

M. O. Perry, M. D.  
5323 Harry Hines  
Dallas 35, Texas  
April 30, 1964

Mrs. Mark E. Martin  
Horniny  
Oklahoma

Dear Mrs. Martin:

It has been my custom to ignore speculative letters which have been received by me. I think, however, that the enclosure which you forwarded to me is dangerous and is based on so many half-truths, misquotes, unfounded assumptions, and obvious falsehoods, that a reply is deserved. I could take the time to point by point destroy the entire enclosure since there is so little truth in it and so many false assumptions. As you are aware, I probably have more information in regard to the wounds to which you refer than anyone.

Briefly, I would indicate to you initially that the information depicted in the press is for the most part fragmentary, out-of-context, and generally inaccurate. Anyone with experience in dealing with the public and with the press is aware of frequent, accidental misrepresentations of fact.

I would, however, take the time now to point out to you the falseness of several assumptions presented in the enclosure. As I noted earlier, I only do this because I think that this dissertation of yours is harmful to our country, to its citizens, to the Government, and to the responsible people closely involved in those tragic events of November.

RECEIVED  
MAY 1 1964  
FBI - DALLAS

Mrs. Mark E. Martin

Page 2

April 30, 1964

To point of fact, there was no mention of a hematoma stopping the flow of blood; there was no bullet on the President's cart; no doctor indicated that any wounds inspected were clearly identifiable as either an entrance or exit one. Similarly, no doctor reported that there was a bullet left in the body. It is obvious that you are not familiar with emergency procedures, or you would realize that direction or attention to those methods which may be life saving is necessary prior to any morbid examination. Additionally, the reference you made to a leak from the autopsy report is unfounded, untrue, and clearly without any purpose, since it is grossly inaccurate, and does not depict in any way phrases or conclusions of the true report.

As I noted earlier in this letter, this is a departure from my custom in replying to such a collection of inaccuracies, but I would submit to you that such a demonstration of irresponsibility based on half-truths and misconceptions can only produce harmful speculation and unwarranted conclusions. I sincerely hope that you will remember that this discussion is about a President, and should be conducted with honor and dignity as befits his station. Knowing these facts, I trust that you will make a sober reappraisal of whatever motivated you to publish such a document.

Sincerely,

M. O. Perry, M. D.

MOP/rca

## Part 1

The following is the first of a three-part discussion of the wounds received by President Kennedy and Governor Connally, November 22, 1963.

### Bullet #1

We are told the first shot struck the President in the upper-right fleshy back and that there was no damage to any vital organ. The bullet penetrated two to three inches.

We are told a hematoma formed behind this bullet stopping the blood flow. Since there was no blood flow, no staining of clothing, it did not occur to Parkland doctors to inspect the President's back-area while removing his brace, his undershirt, his shirt, and coat. A hematoma, therefore, explains away the lack of blood while at the same time explaining away the doctors neglect which otherwise might be unexplainable.

However, a hematoma restricting blood-flow to this extent would also restrict the back-drop of a bullet! Yet, we are told the first bullet fell downward out of the President's back and onto "a" stretcher on which the President was placed before entry into Parkland's Emergency Room #1.

But, if the bullet fell free, so would the blood! The authorities cannot have it both ways. They cannot have a free-falling bullet and a blood-stopping, stainless hematoma!

We are familiar with emergency room procedure. In emergencies doctors are trained to make decisions regarding bullet wounds. While the patient lives and the bullet's entry path has been remarked, it is mandatory to locate either the bullet's path of exit or to conclude the bullet retained. On such automatic emergency room methods, life depends. Four doctors in Emergency Room #1 concluded President Kennedy had been struck in the front of the throat by a bullet. One doctor (who claimed familiarity with bullet wounds) said flatly: "It was an entry wound." Two other doctors announced to reporters that the President had left their care with a bullet wound in his head, a bullet entry wound in the front of his throat, and a bullet retained in his chest!

The doctors had seen what they considered to be a bullet entry-wound in the front of the President's throat. This conclusion on their part was innocent. It was made sincerely and with no malicious intent. It was not made promiscuously. This added comment by the doctors that the President had left their charge bearing in his body a retained bullet was not medical embroidery! It was a logical declaration based on emergency room procedure as sound as the medical profession itself. The doctors assumed the wound in the throat to be an entry wound. It was imperative, therefore, for them to make a decision concerning the possible terminal location of this bullet. Had it left the President's body? Was it retained? If so, was its presence inimical to life? While life remains and doctors fight for that life, such questions must be answered because on them depends the life of the patient.

Therefore, in order to make a definitive statement (as the doctors did) that the President had left their care with a bullet still embedded in his chest, the doctors had to be convinced in their own minds that they had to the best of their ability searched his body for an exit pattern to what they believed to be the entry pattern of a bullet into the front of the President's throat! To imagine otherwise is to slander the Parkland doctors.

#### The Zapruder Film

The fact of the first shot must be considered from the evidence of the Zapruder film. The President's hands clutch his chest and throat. This is not the action of a man struck in the back. Nor does the President make a sound or a further definitive movement. Although a vigorous man (sustaining, we are told, only a mild flesh wound in the upper back), he makes no gesture towards saving either Mrs. Kennedy or himself in the ensuing critical seconds between the first shot and the third shot considered the fatal one. Yet, Governor Connally struck critically in the back, lung, and chest, finds time and strength to cry out: "My God! They are going to kill us all," before falling back into a position of relative safety.

(It is important to consider momentarily the fragmentation of the 3rd shot said by authorities to be the fatal one. The leaked autopsy report from Bethesda, Md., Naval Hospital states that this bullet which struck the President in the head fragmented, a piece flying through Mr. Kennedy's throat making the throat wound later remarked by the Parkland doctors. However, photographs do not lie, and the Zapruder film shows us that Mr. Kennedy clutched at his chest and throat at the time of the first shot, not at the time of the third shot!)

Plainly, the first shot immobilized the President as it penetrated his windpipe. Both Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Connally have said he made no sound. The penetration of this vital organ prevented both

action and speech on his part.

Chrome Deflection

We must consider why shot #1 did not penetrate the President's body as shot #2 did Governor Connally's body. Shot #1 was fired a number of yards closer to the alleged assassin's roost than was shot #2; yet, it penetrated only two to three inches and did not fling the President forward with its impact---rather (according to the Zapruder film), it flung the President sideways and back! We are told by authoritative sources that shot #1 deflected first against the chromium plate of the presidential limousine, thereby losing impact-power. Unfortunately, the presidential limousine was immediately renovated at the Ford Motor Plant, Dearborn, Michigan, under tight security wraps. No chrome plating (damaged or otherwise) was forwarded from this address to the Warren Commission although this body has been instructed by President Johnson to inspect all evidence concerning the Kennedy assassination.

In accordance with this, we are told that bullet #1 (not found in the presidential limousine, not found in the President's body, but found loose on "a" stretcher in Parkland Hospital) is the only bullet of the three which is uniquely identifiable with the rifle found in the Texas Schoolbook Building. (Bullet #2 and #3 are said to be shattered beyond unique identification.)

But, it is our contention that if the bullet deflected against the chrome before striking the President, it, too, must be damaged, and, therefore, not uniquely identifiable. However, if the bullet did not strike the chrome and is not damaged, why did it not penetrate the President's body as bullet #2 did when it struck the body of Governor Connally?

Can the authorities continue to have everything two ways?

Mrs. Mark E. Martin and Children  
Hominy, Oklahoma  
4/7/64

cc: 100 Europe, Americas, Asia, Anzac Countries