

ence," as Ford claims. Nor is to call attention to questionable evidence "pathological." In fact, it is the very basis for constructing and testing the type of theory he demands, as it would be for trying an indictment for obstruction of justice.

The "defense," of course, would have its say at such a trial. Non-criminal explanations for this pattern of behavior might include: (1) Inattention and incompetence brought on by nervous anxiety over the very fact that this was "the crime of the century" (CBS anchorman Walter Cronkite used this idea in 1967: This was no ordinary murder. The fact that Oswald was shooting at a president lifted him to peak marksmanship performance). (2) Bureaucratic muddling and "CYA." (3) National security concerns.

Any successful theory must account for such explanations. If the defense "wins," the public is still served; it is surely in the people's interest to know how law enforcement and national security agencies behave in a national crisis.

In any case, the fact remains that we have a pattern of events, all tending to invalidate the physical evidence in the murder of an American president. The pattern itself is the evidentiary base Ford demands for constructing a theory.

I rest my case.

Notes

1. Just a sampler: David B. Perry, "The Lee Bowers Story," *The Third Decade* [TTD], 9 (November, 1992); M. Duke Lane, "The Cowtown Connection," TTD 9 (July, 1993); David Keck, "Zapata: What's In A Name?" *The Investigator*, 1 (Feb.-March, 1993), and follow-up letters by J. Riley and M. Shackelford (April-May, 1993); Ulric Shannon, "First Hand Knowledge: A Review," *The Fourth Decade*, 1 (November, 1993); Gaeton Fonzi, *The Last Investigation* (NY: Thunder's Mouth Press, 1993).

CASE CLOSED OPENS OLD WOUNDS

by

William E. Kelly

Despite the thesis of *Case Closed* (Random House, 1993), Gerald Posner manages to provide a few missing pieces of the puzzle that, rather than cutting off lines of inquiry, prompt further questions. Early psychological testing results of young Lee Harvey Oswald, the identity of the owner of the '57 Chevy Oswald photographed in General Walker's driveway, and the man Ruby was with at the moment of the assassination and Ruby's KLIF connections are all fruits of Posner's research, providing further food for fodder.

William E. Kelly
819 Wesley Ave. Ocean City, NJ 08226

Posner takes pride in reviewing what critics have long neglected—Dr. Renatus Hartzog's report on Oswald as a New York City delinquent. Although its value is predicated on Oswald actually being the assassin, its significance may have been missed. According to Posner, Oswald was tested by Hartzog and diagnosed as having a "passive-aggressive" personality, a unique trait that is mentioned elsewhere among the assassination literature.

In a London Sunday Times article reporting from an Oslo, Norway, NATO conference on stress, U.S. Navy Lt. Commander Dr. Thomas Narut is quoted as saying that a "passive-aggressive" personality trait is exactly the type of person the Navy looked for in recruiting soldiers to become part of special assassination teams. Talking with reporter Peter Watson, Narut said, "U.S. Naval psychologists specially selected men for these commando tasks from submarine crews, paratroops, and some convicted murderers were being released from prisons to become assassins." They were then trained and programmed with the latest multi-media techniques at a Navy base in Southern California.

If Hartzog recognized this trait, certainly the USMC did as well, creating the distinct possibility that Oswald was recruited into this unit or a similar one. While Narut has conspicuously disappeared from public view, another Oslo conference participant, Alfred Zitani, was quoted in the London Sunday Times article saying, "Dr. Narut must realize this kind of information must be classified." In a December, 1993 telephone conversation, Zitani said that he does not know where Narut is today, but said that a British documentary TV producer also recently contacted him regarding Narut.

Zitani noted that the Oslo conference was not concerned solely with combat stress. Zitani presented a paper at the conference on stress experienced by students afraid of school—exactly why Oswald was tested by Hartzog after he was caught at the Bronx Zoo by a truant officer.

The "passive-aggressive" personality trait may not be common, Zaitini said, but nor is it obvious. "You or I may be 'passive-aggressive' and not know it," he said, you have to be tested specifically looking for such a trait.

How someone like Narut, a prominent psychologist and Naval Commander, could avoid further published scrutiny may indicate the significance of his information. Professor P.D. Scott's "negative template"—evidence by omission thesis, should be tested, not only by finding Narut, but by locating and interviewing Mr. Charles Klihr, whom Posner identifies as the owner of the '57 Chevy that Oswald photographed in Gen. Walker's driveway.

Although the photograph was among Oswald's effects taken by the Dallas police, and can be seen complete in Chief Curry's book (*JFK Assassination File*, 1969), the license plate on the car was obliterated after it came into the possession of

the Dallas police. Posner mistakenly writes, "A photo of evidence taken at Oswald's flat after the assassination shows the hole was in the print at that time." (p.117) The photo was taken not from "Oswald's flat," but from Mrs. Paine's garage in Irving, and, as can be seen in Curry's book, the photo was intact when in his possession.

Since such license plate information has been successfully used elsewhere in this case, particularly with the Wise incident (See: Oswald-Tippit associates, HSCA Vol. XI), the car's owner is thought to be significant given the extent someone went to destroy evidence in order to protect another person. Posner continues to belittle this evidence however, dryly noting, "the photo was taken from such a distance that the license plate of the car would not have been legible in any case..." (p.117)

Then, without a footnote or citing the source (another "negative template"), Posner writes, "...and it was later determined the car belonged to a Walker aide, Charles Klihr." (p.117) Given that Walker's group was then being infiltrated by the Schmidt brothers, Charles Klihr's background should be checked and it should be determined why Klihr's identity was significant enough to destroy evidence to protect him.

Then there's the case of Don Campbell. According to Posner's account, "From about 9:45 to 10:45, Ruby had dinner with Dallas businessman Ralph Paul, his good friend and financial backer. They ate at the Egyptian Lounge, a restaurant and nightclub."* (pp. 367,368)

The footnote at the bottom of the page reads:

"The owner of the Egyptian Lounge, Joseph Campisi, was evidently associated with a host of leading mobsters. Ruby was a frequent patron at the Egyptian Lounge, so his Thursday night dinner there was not out of the ordinary...Campisi did not see Ruby that night...Summers, relying on an FBI report, says Ruby had a brief conversation at the Lounge with someone named 'Conners' from the Dallas Morning News and 'no person of that name worked at the News in 1963,' implying there is a mystery about the person whom Ruby spoke to...However, the FBI mistakenly listed the name as 'Conners.' Ruby actually spoke to Don Campbell, a salesman in the advertising department at the News. He invited Ruby to the Castaway Club on Thursday night, but Ruby declined."

Instead of joining Campbell at the Castaway Club that night, Ruby met up with his old friend from Chicago, Larry Meyers, at the Cabana Hotel lounge. Also at the Cabana that night were Meyer's companion Jean Aase, who was in telephone communication with David Ferrie, Meyer's brother Ed and his wife, in town for a Pepsi Cola convention, and mob courier Jim Braden and his friend Morgan Brown. The ubiquitous Beverly Oliver, (in Third Decade, Nov. 1993) also claims to have been at the Cabana that night dancing with auto salesman Jack

Lawrence.

The next day JFK was killed while Brown was visiting H.L. Hunt, Braden was taken into custody as a suspicious person at the scene of the crime, and Ruby was four blocks away at the Dallas Morning News where he had spent the morning with Mr. Don Campbell.

Writes Posner: "On Friday, November 22, Ruby was up by 9:30 and at the Dallas Morning News shortly before 11:00 in order to place his regular weekend advertisements for his two nightclubs...He then stopped by the office of Tony Zoppi, the newspaper's entertainment reporter, but he was not in."

Posner's footnote for this: "Interview with Tony Zoppi, November 23, 1992), is also supported by Ruby's Warren Commission testimony, "So I went down there Friday morning to Tony Zoppi's office, and they said he went to New Orleans for a few days." (9 AH 1102; 5 WH 183; Scott, Deep Politics p. 198); but Zoppi gave a conflicting report to the Congressional investigators in 1978. Their report (HSCA Vol. 5, p. 170) reads:

"Ruby visited Zoppi at 10:30 on the morning of the assassination with a picture of an ESP expert he wanted Zoppi to plug...Ruby he later said, was a 'highly emotional' person and Zoppi believed him to be too calm that morning to have been involved in a conspiracy. Ruby told him he was moving into a new apartment starting Monday that cost \$190 a month (up from \$100 that Ruby had been paying). The new address was 21 Turtle Creek. When Zoppi questioned him about it, Ruby said, 'I've scrimped all my life and now I want to live a little.' These were Ruby's last words to Zoppi..."

The Warren Report (p. 334) reads: "Ruby then went to the office of the Morning News Columnist, Tony Zoppi, where he states he obtained a brochure on his new master of ceremonies that he wanted to use in preparing copy for his advertisements. Proceeding to the advertising department, he spoke with advertising employee Don Campbell from about noon until 12:25 p.m. when Campbell left the office...According to Campbell, Ruby did not mention the Presidential Motorcade nor did he display any unusual behavior."

Posner's version is: "Ruby next went to the second-floor advertising department where he met with Don Campbell, the sales agent he had seen at the Cabana Hotel (sic) the night before."

Campbell had seen and talked with Ruby at Campisi's Egyptian Lounge the night before the assassination, a fact brought out by Posner himself, and then Campbell is with Ruby again up until five minutes before the assassination.

After fifteen minutes Posner then picks up the scene, during which time JFK is shot in the back four blocks away.

"Before 12:40, John Newman, another advertising department employee, observed Ruby sitting at the

same desk where Campbell had left him. He was reading the *Morning News*... "Welcome Mr. Kennedy," (ad)...the text accused the President of being a Communist tool. It was signed by 'The American Fact-Finding Committee, Bernard Weissman, Chairman.' Ruby was very disturbed that the *News* should have run such a demeaning advertisement and was dismayed that it was signed by someone with a Jewish name."

Weissman was an associate of Larry Schmidt, who was trying to infiltrate such right wing organizations as the Young Americans For Freedom, the John Birch Society and Walker's group. They organized the demonstration against UN ambassador Adlai Stevenson and Schmidt's brother had become Gen. Walker's driver. The Schmidt brothers have also become suspects as accomplices in the shooting of Gen. Walker (See: *The Man Who Knew Too Much*, Russell).

Entertainment writer Tony Zoppi was supposed to go to Cuba with Ruby, and was working at the Riviera casino in Vegas when the HSCA caught up with him in 1978, so the conflicting nature of his testimony concerning his presence at the Dallas Morning News that day should be clarified. P.D. Scott has speculated that Zoppi's office was the connection to the Vegas interests, just as Campisi's Egyptian lounge was the connection to Carlos Marcello and New Orleans interests. (See: HSCA, Vol. IX, Campisi testimony, and PBS Frontline).

In addition, what was Ruby doing in the missing fifteen minutes when no one saw him, which just happens to include the precise moment JFK was being killed a few blocks away? Whatever he was doing, his attitude changed drastically after the assassination. Even before he left the newspaper offices it was obvious he was more than just upset over the assassination.

Ruby then went to Parkland Hospital at 1:30, where he was seen by at least three witnesses. For some reason, Ruby later denied he was there, leading to speculation that he planted the "magic bullet" that was found on a stretcher. By 2 p.m. he was back at the Carousel Club, making phone calls.

What is significant about the information Posner brings out is that Ruby met with Don Campbell on the night before the assassination at Campisi's Egyptian Lounge, and then spent over three hours in Campbell's office during which time the assassination occurred.

Posner also confirms Ruby's interesting associations with KLIF radio, even going so far as to conclude that, "As far as Jack (Ruby) was concerned, he was...officially representing KLIF as a reporter" when he shot Oswald. KLIF is the only radio station not listed in Posner's index, and when given the opportunity to mention that Ruby called the home of the station's owner, Gordon McLendon, to obtain the phone number of the station, he merely notes that Ruby, "had obtained the number." (Scott's "negative template"?)

McLendon's KLIF broadcast the rightwing propaganda radio

show Lifeline, financed by the Hunt family, and copies of the Lifeline newsletter were found in Ruby's car. Ruby said he considered McLendon one of his "six best friends" (20 WH 29, Scott, *Deep Politics*, p. 217), and turned the tables on his inquisitors when he asked Earl Warren if he knew McLendon.

Ironically, Ruby had called a newsman at KLIF when he noticed the "Impeach Earl Warren" billboard, and asked who Earl Warren was. He considered the billboard significant enough to take a picture of it at 4 a.m. in the morning. Ruby went to the coffee shop at the Southland Building, where Antonio Veciana had previously met with "Maurice Bishop" and Oswald.

McLendon's friendship with David A. Phillips—(aka Maurice Bishop) dated to the 1940's, so McLendon provides a link between Ruby and Oswald.

Dr. Thomas Narut, Charles Klihr, Don Campbell and Gordon McLendon are four persons who should be further investigated. Thank you Gerald Posner for calling them to our attention.

THE WANDERING WOUNDS

by

Milicent Cranor

They should just move the Texas Book Depository Building to someplace in front of where Kennedy was assassinated. This would be easier than moving the wounds around to fit the story of a gunman from behind—and having Gerald Posner explain it.

Chapter 13 of Posner's book, *Case Closed* is a squirming mass of contradictions that seems to have been put together by Beavis and Butthead, with the help of Slick Wiley. Before assuming they are the result of honest error, you should take a good look at some comments made by a key player, Dr. Marion ("Pepper") Jenkins, a former lieutenant commander in the Navy, and then Chairman of the Department of Anaesthesiology.

In his original report, [Robert] McClelland said there was a wound to the left temple, one that does not show up on any autopsy X-ray or photograph. This has caused some to charge that Kennedy was shot by a second gunman from another location at Dealey, and that the autopsy team either negligently or intentionally overlooked that wound. "I'll tell you how that happened," Dr. Jenkins explained to the author [Posner]. "When Bob McClelland came into the room, he asked me, 'Where are his wounds?' And at that time I was operating a breathing bag with my right hand, and was

Milicent Cranor
163 E. 62nd St. New York, NY 00021

trying to take the President's temporal pulse, and I had my finger on his left temple. Bob thought I pointed to the left temple as the wound."[1]

What Posner doesn't tell you is that on two separate occasions, Dr. Jenkins himself asked about a left temple wound while testifying before the Warren Commission:

I don't know whether this is right or not, but I thought there was a wound on the left temporal area, right in the hairline and right above the zygomatic process. [2]

I asked you a little bit ago if there was a wound in the left temporal area...the left temporal could have been a point of entrance and [the] exit [would have been] here [indicating]...[3]

Here is another fascinating example of deception from Case Closed:

Although no one at Parkland saw JFK's back wound, Dr. Pepper Jenkins later told John Lattimer that he had felt it with his finger when he positioned the President's head and neck to facilitate the passage of oxygen. [4]

Why didn't Jenkins report this to the Warren Commission, to whom he swore to tell the whole truth? Didn't the subject come up when he was questioned closely about the throat wound? He didn't hesitate to ask about a wound he wasn't sure about (left temple), but said nothing about a wound that he actually felt? If he had told his colleagues about it, would they have announced an apparent entrance wound in the throat if the entrance appeared to be in the back?

Lattimer's explanation of the anaesthesiologist's behavior could take your breath away:

The body was removed so unexpectedly and so abruptly from Dallas that no written report about there being a bullet wound in the front of the neck could be prepared in time to send with the body...Nor was Dr. Jenkins' knowledge of the bullet holes in the back and front of the neck entered in the record before the body was carried away. [5]

Was his knowledge of the wounds placed in the coffin and carried off? His explanation brings to mind a child saying, "My mother says to tell you she's not at home." [6]

Jenkins did find the time to enter into the record such items as the fact that he took the stairs to get to the trauma room, and praise for his team.

By the time Jenkins testified before the Warren Commission, he was already quite accommodating. He explained that, although he had only a "quick look" at the throat wound, he meant to put it in his report that he thought it was an exit wound. Asked why, he replied that it was not "clearly demarcated, round [and] punctate," [7] the opposite of what was said by the others, including Dr. Malcolm Perry who performed the tracheostomy, and got a good look at it.

The Dilemma

The head presents a more complicated problem for Posner who explains, "some of the Parkland doctors who treated the President described a gaping wound in the rear of JFK's head...If true, this not only contradicted the findings of the autopsy team but was evidence that the President was probably shot from the front...[and] raised legitimate questions over the authenticity of the photographs of JFK's brain, which showed no such damage." [8]

Their solution to the problem belongs in the Journal of Irreproducible Results.

No One Saw It

We were trying to save the President, and no one had time to examine the wounds (Jenkins) [9]; We never had the opportunity to review his wounds (Carrico) [10]; I don't think any of us got a good look at the head wound (Perry) [11]. The President had quite thick hair, and there was a lot of blood and tissue (Midgett) [12]; the President had a lot of hair, and it was bloody and matted...(Perry) [13]; He had such a bushy head of hair, and blood and all in it, you couldn't tell what was wound versus dried blood (Baxter) [14]; He had a big shock of hair...(Jenkins) [15].

They Didn't See It—But They Know It Wasn't There

Now that he has rendered the Parkland doctors unqualified to comment on the back of the head, Posner announces their confirmation of the autopsy,

"...The Parkland physicians in their discussions with the author [Posner] were almost unanimous in supporting the autopsy findings that the massive exit wound was on the right side (parietal)...not the rear (occipital) [16]

I never even saw the back of his head. The wound was on the right side, not the back. (Baxter) [17]

The autopsy photo, with the rear of the head intact and a protrusion in the parietal region, is the way I remember it. I never did say occipital. (Jenkins) [18]

The photo shows wet-looking, clean hair neatly combed over a head that seems normal in the back and side all the way to slightly in front of the right ear. And he did say "occipital."

They Admit Kemp Clark Saw It

Dr. William Kemp Clark, the Chairman of the Department of Neurosurgery, must have pulled aside the curtain of hair and gore, for he donned gloves [19] to examine the wound in order to make a decision to stop resuscitation. He found

...a large wound beginning in the right occiput extending into the parietal region. Much of the skull appeared gone...[20] The loss of the right occipital and probably part of the right parietal lobes would have been of specific importance. [21]

What No One Else Saw

The other doctors report similar findings, and add more specifics:

The wound that I saw was a large gaping wound, located in the right occipitoparietal area...about 5 to 7 cm. in size, more or less circular, with avulsions of the calvarium and scalp tissue...macerated cerebral and cerebellar tissues...(Carrico) [22]; ...I noticed that there was a large defect in the occiput...It seemed to me that in the right occipitalparietal area that there was a large defect. There appeared to be bone loss and brain loss in this area...we saw the wound of entry in the throat and noted the large occipital wound...(Peters) [23]; ...the right side of his head had been blown off...cerebellum was present—a large quantity of brain was present on the cart (Baxter) [24]; There was a great laceration on the right side of the head (temporal and occipital), causing a great defect...(Jenkins) [25]; I really think part of the cerebellum, as I recognized it, was herniated from the wound;...there was part of brain tissue on the drapes of the cart...(Jenkins) [26] I noted a large avulsive wound of the right parietal occipital area, in which both scalp and portions of skull were absent, and there was severe laceration of underlying brain tissue...(Perry) [emphasis added] [27]

Please Note: They do not appear to have described something that could have migrated from the front to the back; they report a defect, with a specific size, a specific shape, defined by bones with specific names going in specific directions. The donut and the hole.

What Robert McClelland Didn't See

Robert McClelland, an Assistant Professor of Surgery, is the revisionists' greatest obstacle: he refuses to alter his observations. His credentials are impeccable and he has no commercial investment in his opinion:

As I took the position at the head of the table that I have already described, to help out with the tracheotomy, I was in such a position that I could very closely examine the head wound, and I noted that the right posterior portion of the skull had been extremely blasted. It had been shattered...the parietal bone was protruded up through the scalp and seemed to be fractured almost along its right posterior half, as well as some of the occipital bone being fractured in its lateral half, and this sprung open the bones that I mentioned in such a way that you could actually look down into the skull cavity itself and see that probably a third or so, at least, of the brain tissue, posterior cerebral tissue and some of the cerebellar tissue had been blasted out...[28]

McClelland will not move the wound. The solution? Move McClelland, and give his reputation a nick:

[McClelland] wasn't in that position the way I remember

it, as he was on the other side of the table. As for Dr. McClelland saying he saw cerebellum fall out on the table, I never saw anything like that (Peters) [29]; I hate to say Bob is mistaken, but that is clearly not right (Jenkins) [30]. I am astonished that Bob would say that. It shows such poor judgment...(Malcolm Perry) [31] As for the head wound, they couldn't look at it earlier because I was standing with my body against it, and they would only have looked at my pants. (Jenkins) [32]

While trying to save the President's life during 20 minutes of absolute pandemonium, they found the time to monitor McClelland's every move?

They Saw It, But They Didn't Know Where It Was

The Chairman of the Department of Neurosurgery doesn't know the terms and anatomy of his specialty? Experienced physicians don't know the back of the head from the side? I think the back is parallel to the front which is the place where you see eyes and a nose, etc., if the face can be visualized and hasn't moved.

Films and testimony indicate the wound included the right temple, the side, and the right side of the back. They want us to believe the wound was strictly on the side and front, and not the back at all.

It Was in the Back and Side

The occipital and parietal bone join each other, so we are only talking a centimeter or so in difference (Perry) [33]...the occipital and parietal region are so close together it is possible to mistake one for the other (Giesecke) [34]

Please notice they don't tell you where parietal and occipital bone meet: at the back of the head. And a wound in parietal bone alone could be considered in the back if it lies between the ear and the occiput. An "avulsed" wound in the back and side still does not work with the official version.

Dr. Clark nailed down the location of the defect he saw when Arlen Specter asked if a wound 2.5cm and slightly above the EOP could have been present, but missed by Dr. Clark:

Yes, in the presence of this much destruction of skull and scalp above such a wound and lateral to it...such a wound could be present. [emphasis added]

Dr. Clark believed, at least initially, that Kennedy was struck tangentially [35] from the right side. [36] This does not preclude another shot from the front that exited from the right rear. (I believe I have evidence for Dr. Clark's theory, and will be presenting it soon.)

Obviously, the Parkland doctors are not confirming the findings of Bethesda, they are deferring to Bethesda. Such deference is intellectually unsanitary. There was a time when the exit was to be the right supraorbital ridge (bone beneath the eyebrow). Dr. Alfred Olivier of the Edgewood Arsenal

Maryland, who supervised the recreation of the assassination using reconstructed skulls, explained the experiment:

...We were aiming, as described in the autopsy report...the point 2 centimeters to the right of the external occipital protuberance and slightly above it. We placed a mark on the skull at that point, according to the autopsy the bullet emerged through the superorbital (sic) process, so we drew a line to give us the line of flight...(emphasis added) [37]

Did Olivier misread the autopsy report and diagrams placing the exit at the top right side of the head? Was there a different autopsy report? Didn't this render the experiment invalid? Did Specter see the discrepancy? He had interviewed Humes et al, had seen diagrams of the bullet's trajectory. Did he know where the supraorbital ridge is? The subject came up when the autopsists explained a bullet fragment was lodged behind this area. And he had been shown photographs of Olivier's prize skull with the right front of the face gone which hardly resembled autopsy photos of Kennedy's face.

Specter's response: create a diversion. He made Olivier go to a safe, dig out a notebook from his briefcase, and find the exact entrance wound. Specter says not one word about the exit. But you can't say they are uncoordinated: Olivier's skull resembles the X-ray of Kennedy taken from the "modified Waters view" that gives the impression the upper right side of his face is missing.

If they ever go back to that version, the Parkland doctors would have to move the wound from the back of the head to the front, 180 degrees. And Beavis and Butthead will have more explaining to do.

Notes

1. Gerald L. Posner, Case Closed, Chapter 13. Random House, New York, page 313.
2. Warren Commission Hearings, Vol. VI, p. 48. [Jenkins]
3. Hearings, Vol. VI, p. 51. [Jenkins]
4. Case Closed, p. n305-6.
5. John K. Lattimer, Kennedy and Lincoln: Medical & Ballistic Comparisons of Their Assassinations. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, p. 154.
6. This reasoning is reminiscent of Lattimer's explanation of the discrepancy between the entrance wound in the head as reported in the autopsy and in testimony before the Commission, versus an entrance wound 10 centimeters higher (near the cowlick), as reported by the House Select Committee on Assassinations.
- Lattimer pretends the discrepancy is only between drawings: that the artist made the drawings without the benefit of the autopsy photos and X-rays. As if "2.5cm to the right and slightly above the external occipital protuberance" on a better drawing would show a wound near the cowlick. (Lattimer,

J.K., Lattimer, J., Lattimer, G. An experimental study of the backward movement of President Kennedy's head. Surg. Gynecol & Obstet 1976; 142:246- 254)

Posner stretches Lattimer's lie further. He claims it was Humes et al—besides the artist—who didn't have the benefit of photos and X-rays when they made their report, and therefore didn't know where to place the alleged entrance. (Case Closed p. 308, footnote) As if they based their measurements on photos and X-rays alone, instead of the body. I think they based it on Oswald's height and alleged position, but that is a different issue.

Humes told the Commission that the drawings were accurate but that "...it is the bony prominences...which we used as points of references, I cannot, transmit completely to the illustrator where they were situated." (Hearings p. 350, Vol.)

Meaning, I think, the EOP itself was a little off on the drawing. To me, the EOP looks a bit low on the drawing, but the alleged entrance wound is still near it, where Humes put it. As of 1992, the wound is still there, according to Humes' recent statements to JAMA. Someone needs to tell Posner. Lattimer may want to X-ray that drawing.

7. Hearings, Vol. VI, p. 48.
8. Case Closed, p. 308 [Posner]
9. Case Closed, p. 309 [Jenkins]
10. Case Closed, p. 309 [Carrico]
11. Case Closed, p. 309 [Perry]
12. Case Closed, p. 310 [Midgett]
13. Case Closed, p. 312 [Perry]
14. Case Closed, p. 312 [Baxter]
15. Case Closed, p. 289 [Jenkins]
16. Case Closed, p. 310 [Posner]
17. Case Closed, p. 312 [Baxter]
18. Case Closed, p. 311 [Jenkins]
19. Case Closed, p. 291 [re Clark]
20. Hearings, Vol. XVII, p. 10. [Clark]
21. Hearings, Vol. VI, p. 26. [Clark]
22. Hearings, Vol. VI, p. 6. [Carrico]
23. Hearings, Vol. VI, p. 71. [Peters]
24. Hearings, Vol. VI, p. 41. [Baxter]
25. Hearings, Vol. XVII, p. 15 [Jenkins]
26. Hearings, Vol. VI, p. 48 [Jenkins]
27. Hearings, Vol. III, p. 372 [Perry]
28. Hearings, Vol. VI, p. 33 [McClelland]
29. Case Closed, p. 313 [Peters]
30. Case Closed, p. 313 [Jenkins]
31. Case Closed, p. 312 [Perry]
32. Case Closed, p. 309 [Jenkins]
33. Case Closed, p. 312 [Perry]
34. Case Closed, p. 312 [Giessack]
35. Hearings, Vol. VI, p. 21 [Clark]
36. Hearings, Vol. VI, p. 28 [Clark]
37. Hearings, Vol. V, p. 89 [Olivier]