



FILLINGER: Well, again, the question comes are those bone fragments or bullet fragments?

ROFFMAN: From a radiologist and from Dr. Fisher they're bullet fragments.

FILLINGER: And this is the bullet that's supposed to have gone into Connally, isn't it?

ROFFMAN: Well, supposedly. But I'm very dubious of that. In fact, I would say from certain information that I have that it's absolutely impossible.

FILLINGER: Well, I think that nothing has been shown as far as I know that would make it impossible except that it these really are fragments, and if I remember right the bullet that was recovered from Connally was not fragmented.

ROFFMAN: No. There is a possibility of some fragments lost from its base.

FILLINGER: Well, then that doesn't work. They don't come off the base.

ROFFMAN: Do you remember I told you there was a 3 cm. exit hole in the head in addition to that real large defect? Now, I told you also that a fragment of bone was recovered that had the other half of this exit hole with the beveling on it and that imbedded in the sides of the bone where the exit holes were there were minute metal fragments. Did you say something about this being indicative of low velocity or isn't that--

FILLINGER: It suggests either low velocity or a bullet that will leave metallic residues on its margins - on the bone margins. You can appreciate the fact that a jacketed projectile is going to leave very little on the margins because it's basically a hardened jacket, and it's designed so that it will not scrape off when it goes through a steel barrel. One can appreciate the fact that going through a bone, which is not as hard as steel, any etch or scratch it, but it's not going to peel off much metal. In contrast to this a softer projectile might very well leave little metallic residues around the margins.

ROFFMAN: Would the same thing apply to the big fragment that was in the entrance hole in the head?

FILLINGER: Perhaps. But only perhaps.

ROFFMAN: Also, when we were watching the slides, you had said something to me that if a bullet exited from this hole, it couldn't produce the beveling and still blow out all those bones, at least this one portion of the bullet.

FILLINGER: We're talking now about the Kennedy thing? I think this is a

pretty unlikely thing to have happened in view of the sheer Kennedy ballistics of the projectile itself.

ROFFMAN: Is it possible--I'll give you a little bit of a hypothetical circumstance, here. That after the bullet entered the head from in back, it split up into at least 2 major portions, and that one portion exited from this hole and made the 3cm. exit you see that was on the head and then that another portion ruptured out another area of the skull that ~~ESSEN~~ took a fragment with it. It had part of this exit on it. Could that have happened?

FILLINGER: I think it's highly unlikely. When you consider the number of gunshot wounds that we see here, and almost none of them break down--either rifle or pistol. Now military ammo, of course, it can do some strange things, but sporting ammo has a better chance of breaking down ~~EXXEM~~ than military ammo.

ROFFMAN: That's something else I wanted to bring up to you. I've talked with some hunters, in particular varmint hunters that use this very high velocity and very frangible bullet, and they said that when a bullet like this strikes heads, and they've ~~seen~~ seen it happen, that immediately on its impact it'll explode in the sense that it creates a massive defect with no discernable entrance wound in the sense of a clean entrance wound.

FILLINGER: That's correct, but, you see, it doesn't come out either because you have nothing left to come out.

ROFFMAN: Right. They say that it has a short penetration.

FILLINGER: That's right. We have just the opposite with this thing.

ROFFMAN: What I was wondering about--~~WHEN~~ you see, it's definite that at least one bullet entered the rear of the head, and this is pretty much at the top of the head. And then we have that 3cm exit on the side of the head. Now, something like this, since it ~~WHEN~~ was so confined to the top of the head, I imagine it could have gone through without causing too much brain damage.

FILLINGER: Could have.

ROFFMAN: But then you have that gigantic defect on the side of the head with the skull--the calvarium--completely fractured out of shape and all this brain damage. I was wondering if it was possible that this one bullet goes through the head and causes those two small holes with no--just a negligible amount of fracturing, nothing that would even distort the cranium, and that another bullet struck the head to produce that ~~MASSIVE~~ massive defect, a sort of hunting bullet, a varmint.

FILLINGER: Well, there's several things that speak against this. Number one, to produce this kind of effect, you have to have a very high velocity projectile, and the Carcano will not stand very high bolt pressures.

ROFFMAN: Well, I'm not saying that the varmint bullet was fired from the Carcano.

FILLINGER: O.K. Now, the next problem then arises, if you consider the photographs, his head really disintegrates from one shot looking at the photographs. And if he is struck by two bullets simultaneously or almost simultaneously, which I think is very, very difficult to conceive of, considering that he's a moving target at, let's say 15mph, 35mph, whatever it's supposed to be. What was the speed of the car?

ROFFMAN: 11mph.

FILLINGER: 11mph theoretically. Now, there was ~~NO~~ no tape on that speedometer, was there?

ROFFMAN: No.

FILLINGER: Then you can imagine in all this ruckus, who looked at the speedometer.

ROFFMAN: It's measured over films. It's a pretty general thing. No greater than 20 mph.

FILLINGER: All right, let's say it's between 10 and 20. Now, a target moving at 10 to 20mph fired on by two separated shooter, to effect a simultaneous strike without electronic firing is just as good as being impossible. It would be like you and I sitting 100 yards apart trying ~~WHEN~~ ~~WHEN~~ to hit a squirrel running across the ground.

ROFFMAN: I see what you mean.

FILLINGER: Number one, I've got to say "fire" at the same instant you pull your trigger I've got to pull my trigger because the Zapruder photographs show only one series of blam of the head, right? There's not a second series immediately following it. Just one ex plisive blast of the brain blown out.

ROFFMAN: If his head was hit from behind in a manner where the top rear was struck and then this 3cm exit occurs on the right side ~~WHEN~~ with no massive defect. Now this would be the Ex right side towards the top. Is it possible that that wouldn't show in the film?

FILLINGER: No. I don't think so.

ROFFMAN: So that if it was struck by two shots it would have had to occur in that instant where you do see that instant where you do ~~EX~~ see the explosion?

FILLINGER: Right. And you only really have, let's say, two or three frames that show that head ~~WHEN~~ really blowing up, and when you time those by the second, you don't really have much time to get two shots in there. I think the people who speculate on these theories spend a lot of time, you know, just thinking about how ~~WHEN~~ we're going to get to the moon, but if they ever go out and try to duplicate the feat, just as some people said you couldn't fire the three shots that fast and so on. Well, a lot of experts ~~WHEN~~

went out and duplicated it, and I have seen it duplicated myself with that kind of a gun. In fact, I have one friend who did it with the Carcano in my collection. And he can put out 3 shots in less than 5 seconds.

ROFFMAN: It's interesting on your point there. Have you seen it done from the position it was ~~alleged~~ alleged to have been done from?

FILLINGER: Well, there are two various positions that are suggested, as I understand it. One of them leaning from the window, right? And one of them in a crouched position.

ROFFMAN: The thing is, it's almost impossible to get into a firing position by that window because you have a gigantic stack of boxes 22 inches from the sill, and the sill is a foot off the ground.

FILLINGER: I think he was very pleased with his arrangement because I think these cramped quarters worked to his advantage.

ROFFMAN: Oh, really.

FILLINGER: Yes. They gave--because he was cramped in there, it compressed his firing movements to a certain extent. But it also gave him a lot of steadiness. You see, he's kind of hunched on the gun all the way around. He's ~~been~~ squeezed in very tightly, and it doesn't leave a lot of room for recoil and a bouncing around of the gun. So once he starts to track his target, he's pretty well locked on. He's almost like he's got a swivel mount up there.

ROFFMAN: I see. Getting back to what we were saying about the head wounds, is it, again considering with the film the ~~unlike~~ unlikely of it, but just from the medical evidence, the ~~is~~ hypothetical situation I gave you, is that possible?

FILLINGER: Well, I don't know. I suppose it's possible although I think it's so remote that to even consider it is really begging for the ludicrous. To assume that a bullet strikes in one area and then assume that another one comes in and totally disrupts the previously--the partially destroyed target area is awful hard to figure, and I think you ~~could~~ could speculate on it without being any smarter when you got done with it.

ROFFMAN: It's something that puzzles me so much.

FILLINGER: ~~Because~~ Because physically it's so difficult to consider that 2 shots were fired into that area that when you consider the high improbability of it being pulled off--number one, we know that the one shooter couldn't have done that because you can't work the bolt and the photographs would belie it. You can't work the ~~is~~ bolt that fast. And even if it were a semi-automatic weapon, you couldn't fire and put 2 in the same spot at that speed. You can't track it that well holding it by hand. And he's not that kind of a shooter. He's a good shooter although some claim that he's not. He's not a bad shot at all, and this has been demonstrated with his target practice and so ~~on~~ on.

ROFFMAN: He was rated by the Marines as a fairly poor shot.

FILLINGER: Well, you have to realize that that's just a rating, and that's a recruit rating. That doesn't say what he was doing since he got rated, number one. Nor does it say that that's a valid rating, and we have seen--for example, recently, a very interesting expose of military marksmanship where the recruits were such poor marksmen, and the pressure was put on to get them all qualified that they just blankly qualified the whole damned outfit whether they could shoot or not. And we have seen repeated distortions of notations of military marksmanship because the emphasis is on good marksmanship and the fact that most people nowadays don't know anything about shooting guns. The pressure on the NRA to cut down their ~~high~~ high school and civilian marksmanship courses, and the gun clubs are all under a lot of pressure, and an awful lot of people just aren't interested in shooting firearms. ~~As~~ As a consequence, when they come into military service, they don't know a muzzle from a tea kettle.

And until you've had at least a certain familiarization with firearms, you're not worth a damn. He may have just crossed the gunnery Sergeant just a ~~XXXX~~ little bit the wrong way so he put him down on his ~~6000~~ score. Maybe he did something stupid on the range, and they deducted 10 points.

ROFFMAN: I see where there's

FILLINGER: And realizing too that what a Marine calls a crack shot may well size above the criteria he was expected to perform to produce this kind of a shooting.

\*\*\*\*\*

FILLINGER: As a matter of fact, I was just talking to a friend of mine a couple days ago down in Washington, and apparently some of this material has been withdrawn now from accesability.

ROFFMAN: How do you mean?

FILLINGER: From the Archives. Some of it that was being made available has been withdrawn.

ROFFMAN: By the Department of Justice?

FILLINGER: I don't know.

ROFFMAN: That's interesting. I'll have to check into that.

FILLINGER: I don't know what the material was.

\*\*\*\*\*

(I explained to Dr. Fillinger how, by superimposition, it could be conclusively shown that Kennedy is thrown backwards when struck in the head.)

FILLINGER: Well, several questions arise there. You're presuming which way his face is turned?

ROFFMAN: He's facing towards the front, a little bit--

FILLINGER: Exactly dead ahead at the time the shot strikes?

ROFFMAN: No; he's turned obliquely to the left.

FILLINGER: That's right. O.K. Now realizing that the head is on a pivot which rotates as well as goes forwards, backwards, side to side. And you have this bullet striking on the right upper side. Now, as it strikes, it tends not only to throw the head forward, but to spin it to the left just like a cue shot, which can create the illusion of having the head thrown backward when in fact it is rotation.

\*\*\*\*\*

ROFFMAN: In addition to the incompetance of the men who were performing it (the autopsy), I think one of the important factors in it is the control that was placed over them about what they could release--things of that nature, and their subsequent testimonies.

FILLINGER: Well, number one, you have to expect, of course, that the control is to be expected because they wanted to control everything that had anything to do with it. That's why the body wasn't left down there for autopsy, and it was maintained in tight federal control. I think they realized they had got a goose and didn't know how to cook it. They got him up in Washington. They didn't have any idea what they were going to do. They never heard of anything like forensic sciences. They didn't know anything at all about coroner's business or medical examiner which they never heard of. So they were stuck with calling a pathologist because somebody knew that pathologists do atupsies. I mean, who are they going to call? Well, they're certainly not going to call a civilian pathologist. They have to call military. And the President always had a leaning to Bethesda so they called Bethesda. You know, that was the automatic move

right there. From there on in it was just a matter of--you know, once one guy was called, then another guy was called, and the third guy was called. Realizing that none of these people had any concept of forensic science, really, or what they were getting into--Pierre maybe more than anyone else, but, you know, we discussed Pierre's limitations and problems and so on. So of course, he's stuck with the best of a good deal or a bad deal. He's the only guy in the Army who has any prerequisites, and although his are skimpy, there isn't anyone else. So they, you know, there was a tremendous amount of haste about the whole thing. They didn't have--they didn't take time to think or ask questions, and they weren't prepared to go into channels to know to find out answers. They just ~~HE~~ blundered right through.

I don't think anybody appreciated how complex the thing would have gotten or way going to get until they got in the middle of it. Then it was too late. If it had been a simple in and out, you know, or a simple shot like that druggist I had here over the weekend up here in Olney. Ki- bang; that's no great sweat to that. I could show you how to do one of those in a couple of hours. It goes through 7 organs so you know at least what you're talking about. But something like this is an extremely complex thing. You could put 20 people in that ~~XXXXX~~ autopsy, and everyone would have probably had a little bit different idea of what was going on. I mean any 20 well trained, long experienced, competent guys. There would have been a lot of discussion about it. They might have all eventually arrived at the same conclusion, but maybe they wouldn't have either.

ROFFMAN: And with those men there, you just wonder what you've got.

FILLINGER: Well, number one, they used people who didn't know much. Number two, they didn't give them much in the way of material to draw conclusions from. Now when I'm presented with tough case, I want to know from all the investigators what they've got so I can correlate my findings, and I don't put my foot in my mouth. Because I could get a 5 month old baby dead in bed with no physical findings--looks like a natural death. Then in comes the mother and says "Oh, I sufficated it." Well, there's no marks on the baby. There's no way of telling at autopsy whether it's been sufficated or not.

ROFFMAN: In the autopsy report, what they use for their information is newspaper stories and thing of that nature.

FILLINGER: Right. They're being given a lot of lousy information on top of lousy expertise, and you just can't expect the product of this combination to be worth a damn for drawing any kind of valid conclusions.

\*\*\*\*\*

FILLINGER: As I say, they can only do so much. This is why I personally think that most of the inquiry into this case, while extremely intriguing, centers to a certain amount around the autopsy itself. And this is such a gaping defect and ~~EX~~ can never be improved on, that it just destroys any kind of analysis of the case in this area at all. All you can do is sit back and say, "Well, it's can awfully big hole. What made it, a pea-shooter or a cannon?" You can't tell because the hole's big. That's about as far as you can go. And all of the conclusions are all so tainted by this defect that you just can't make ~~EX~~ any tracks at ~~KIM~~ all.