The JFK Assassination: Why Congress Should Reopen the Investigation

BY ROBERT BLAIR KAISER

The JFK Assassination: Why Congress correspondent for Time magazine is new a freelance living in California.

Acting alone, assassinated President Kennedy and that nightclub owner Jack Ruby, acting alone, killed Oswald two days later in the Dallas police station.

And Judge Griffin's reasons for reopening the case should serve as an example to long-time critics of the Warren Report. Says Judge Griffin: "I don't think some agencies were candid with us. I never thought the Dallas police were telling us the entire truth. Neither was the FBI." The memo, in late August of 1966 to the Director of the Commission (J. Lee Rankin), in which I call into a whole series of evidentiary questions. We only get answers on two or three of them. Judge Griffin didn't keep copies of his own memos and the original of that memo isn't where it ought to be in the National Archives in Washington. But one of the stipulated questions Griffin recalls had to do with hypothetical other than Oswald's on the packing cases in a six-floor room of the Trinity School Record Depository. After some delays, the FBI finally confessed to the Commission that the other prints belonged to an FBI agent. "We accepted the answers we got," says Judge Griffin, "even though they were inadequate and didn't carry the battle lines, but who's going to stand and fight until we're tired."

"Because of possible reprints from the FBI," he said, "though I'm worried about the fact that I am when Hoover was the director." The informal testimony of Judge Griffin and his colleagues confirmed the findings of the independent critics of the Warren Commission.

These critics have dramatized new documentation which proves that the Warren Commission's investigation was not the free and independent inquiry it's been told; that the FBI concluded, too soon, there was no conspiracy and then as an effort to justify its early conclusions did a grudging re-investigation whose only purpose was to prove its own premature conclusions. The critics' most important piece of documentation: a long-form top secret transcript of an executive session of the Warren Commission on January 27th, 1964, which was declassified only last year (after a long and expensive Freedom of Information suit filed by Harold Weinberg). That transcript suggests the FBI and other intelligence agencies may possess significant information they withheld from the commission. The information may still be available in some agency's files or in the "OC" (official and confidential) files moved to J. Edgar Hoover's home at the time of his death in 1972.

Critics have been calling for a reopening of the JFK assassination case for years. Some of the calls have come from crackpots, others from solid analysts. Most of the calls, however, lacked focus and some of the questions had no reasonable hope of a solution.

But Judge Griffin's comments and the documentation of the critics help narrow the scope of any inquiry and make it possible for a congressional committee to ask questions that have answers. They can subpoena Dallas police records as well as key figures like Marina Oswald; they can subpoena the files of U.S. intelligence agencies which were aware of Oswald long before November 22nd, 1963.

Peter Dale Scott, a Warren Commission critic who teaches English at the University of California at Berkeley, insists that abundant clues point to a conspiracy "demonstrable from the very procedures which it used to cover its tracks." A is Watergate.

The time is right for reopening the case in another sense. The assassination seems to dominate the national subconscious. A majority, as polls show, have always had their doubts. Watergate, White House horrors and high-level cover-up have only deepened doubts about America's ugliest murder mystery. Recent news stories only serve to intensify them.

A 1960 memo from J. Edgar Hoover to the State Department surfaced in 1975. It is a warning from the director that someone posing as Lee Harvey Oswald in Russia might try to get Oswald's U.S. passport. In itself, the memo may not be significant. Oswald's mother had complained to the FBI that she'd sent a birth certificate to Oswald in Switzerland and he'd never received it. But, linked to other reports that "a second Oswald" left traces in New Orleans, Miami, Dallas and Mexico City in 1963 and that some (even members of the Warren Commission) speculated that Oswald may have worked with the FBI as an undercover agent, the memo is a startling clue that Hoover and the FBI knew something about Oswald they
never told the commission. Why would J. Edgar Hoover himself be concerned about an official taking a day off to work in a factory in Minsk? David Sloanow, formerly a staff lawyer on the Warren Commission and now a professor of law at the University of Southern California, has one innocent explanation: "The signature of J. Edgar Hoover went on all the official communications coming out of the FBI. Hoover probably never saw the memo."

Nevertheless, the memo raises questions. Robert Kennedy's aides confirm the continuing rumor that the CIA contracted with the American Mafia to assassinate Cuba's premier, Fidel Castro. It is an unsettling development, shocking to many in foreign countries who still have to deal with an American government to which may sue assassination as a political tool. But as Tom Wicker pointed out in the New York Times, "The mentality that can order or undo murder for political purposes already need not be warped to order or condone murder for political purposes, a fact particularly as it becomes clear that the commission's investigation is focused on the assassination of President John F. Kennedy." A very bad movie, Executive Action, attempts in documentary fashion to reveal the scene in which the assassination might have been plotted. In The Man from Arlingtont, a best-seller novel by Joseph DiDonna, the CIA plots President Kennedy's murder. In The Tears of Austin, novelist Charles McCarry spins another theory: The Diem family plotters President Kennedy's death in retaliation for the American assassination of President Ngo Dinh Diem. And there's the so-called "National Enquirer" case. In The Tears of Austin, novelist Charles McCarry spins another theory: The Diem family plotters President Kennedy's death in retaliation for the American assassination of President Ngo Dinh Diem. In a better movie, The Patriot, Warren Beatty plays a reporter who uncovers the plot by a major U.S. corporation to kill U.S. leaders. At the movie's end, the plotters kill him, too. The dots and the drama enjoin America with fear and a feeling of frustrated helplessness.

Confronted by this, many Warren Commission members decided their work like so many Pontius Pilate: "Quid scripsi, scriptum est."

The Secret Service was playing games with the Warren Commission. The agents were behaving as if they had something to hide. Just what were they hiding? It is open to official inquiry.

III. THE RECENTLY DISCOVERED TRANSCRIPT OF AN EXECUTIVE SESSION

Some Warren Commission critics believe they were hiding Lee Harvey Oswald's intelligence connections. As we have learned in the past few months, after then attorney general Sabato's revelations about the FBI's Cia/keit and CIA director Colby's report to President Ford on the CIA, both agencies were embarrassed in the early Sixties on a massive domestic spy effort. It was a big, expensive program that added to the size and power of the FBI and CIA apparatus.

The last thing the FBI or the CIA needed was public exposure of (and a public response against) their programs—by having a Le Harvey Oswald tied to them. Whatever Oswald's real role was, no one in the U.S. government engaged in up-country gamma wanted to assume any responsibility for him. The transcript of the commission's executive session of January 27th, 1964, demonstrates the commission's concern about this possibility—a possibility pointed out to the commission by some of the top law enforcement officials in Texas. These officials had
Boggs agrees and McCloy says, "I don’t think we could recognize that any door is closed to us unless the president closes it to us." Mr. Clay says he wants to get to the bottom of all this.

Dubbs says McCloy may be asking the impossible. "How," asks Dulles, "do you dispel a fellow you are not your agent?"

Boggs wonders whether Dulles, as head of the CIA, had bad agents with no records.

"The record must not be on paper," says Dulles. "But on paper [we] would have herapeutics that only two people know what they mean, and nobody outside of the agency would know and you could say this meant [dead] agent and somebody else could say it meant another agent."

Boggs mentions the U-2 pilot, Francis Gary Powers. Dulles says Powers had a signed contract with the CIA. Boggs says, "Let’s say Powers did not have a signed contract but he was recruited by someone in CIA. The man who recruited him would know, wouldn’t he?"

"Yes," says Dulles, "but he wouldn’t tell."


Dulles says, "I wouldn’t think he would tell it under oath, no."

"Why?" asks Warren.

McCloy says, "You would know in your own office."

Warren says, "Don’t tell it under oath?"

McCloy says, "Wouldn’t tell it to his own chief?"

"He might or he might not. If he was a bad one, wouldn’t. Boggs may have thrown up his hands here. "What you do, you make the problem utterly impossible because you say this rumor can’t be disputed under any circumstances."

"No," says Dulles, "I don’t think it can, unless you believe Mr. Hoover, and so forth and so on, which probably most of the people will."

Furthermore, Hoover may have had a reason to hire Oswald. "It is Mr. Hoover’s job to watch the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and try to penetrate it in any way he could," says Dulles. "But he doesn’t believe the FBI did hire Oswald. "He was not the kind of fellow that Hoover would hire. . . . He was no stooge."

McCloy says, "I wouldn’t put much confidence in the intelligence of all the agents I have run into. I have run into some very stupid agents."

Dulles says, "Not such irresponsible."

(McCloy is a strange description of an assassin of a president. If Oswald was a little nut, then "irresponsible" is simply the wrong word. To whom would Oswald be responsible?)

McCloy creeps. "Well, I can’t say that (have I run into a fellow comparable to Oswald) but I have run into some very limited mentalities both in the CIA and the FBI."

The commission’s meeting room rumbles with what the stenotypist describes as "laughter."

Warren tries to sum up: "Agencies do employ undercover men who are of terrible, terrible character."

The man who immediately agrees with Warren is the one man on the commission who should know. Says Dulles, "Terrible bad characters."

Rankin is impatient with all this. "You would be acceptable to go to Mr. Hoover," says Rankin, "and tell him about the situation and that we would like to go ahead and find out what we could about these."

"Well, let’s," interrupts Warren, "I wouldn’t be favor of going to any agency and saying, ‘We would like to do this.’ I think we ought to know what we are going to do and do it, and take our chances one way or the other. The most fair thing to do would be to try to find out if this is fact or fiction."

Rankin is afraid of Hoover and says so. "What was fromful of was the mere process will cause him to think . . . that we are really investigating him."

"If we are investigating him," says Warren, "we are investigating the rumor against him. We are investigating him, that is true."

The implication—that the commission may have to investigate Hoover —seems to bother Boggs. "Mr. Dulles, says Boggs, "when you headed up the CIA, the notion that you would know the countless informers and people employed played by the agents was fantastic. You couldn’t know about all of that."

"No," replies Dulles. "But by this time I would have known whether we did hire him or not."

McCloy says, "You would know in this case who, if there was anybody, who would have hired Oswald, who it would be."

Dulles admits that he’d know what area to look in. "Someone," he concedes, "might have done it without authority. The CIA has no charter to hire anybody for this kind of work in the United States. It has aboard, that is true. But the CIA has no charter. I don’t say it couldn’t possibly have been done but it has no charter of authority to run this kind of agent in the United States."

Was the CIA involved with Oswald? There is reason to believe that the CIA performed its own unpublicized investigation on Oswald after the assassination. Yet there’s little on the record of what the CIA told the Warren Commission. But the commission is quick about the CIA. The members seem inclined to want to go beyond the FBI. But then McCloy points out that some "sheep" he has been brought from a piece of evidence, it is probably a copy of Harold Felstein’s proving article in the Nation, "Oswald and the FBI,” 27th, 1964) "and is designed to be an attack on the FBI." Says McCloy, "We don’t want to be in the position of attacking the FBI."

With this, the commission does a quick about-face. Forgetting their only clear, truth, the commissioners agree that none of them wants to attack the FBI. They decide on a "marriage" of Senator Russell’s two alternatives: They end up resolving to ask Hoover about the relationship between Oswald and the FBI and to perform their own independent investigation.

But the commission did very little independent investigation. Evidently that with an attack on the FBI, the commission let the FBI investigate itself.

Rankin thought this was pretty controversial material. He confounded the stenographers’ notes of the January 27th meeting—and they ran out on this day. Rankin specifically requested no stenotypists at all for the January 27th meeting—and they ran out on this day. Rankin specifically requested no stenotypists at all for the January 27th meeting and the stenotype in question from the Warren Commission to keep the January 27th meeting under a top-secret classified code. Weisberg says there’s nothing in any commission record about this.

[The transcript of the Jan. 27th meeting is reprinted in Weisberg and Shrum’s Whitey IV, 623 from H. Weisberg, Jr., R. 8. Frederick, Md. 21701,]
III. THE SERIOUS CRITICS AND THEIR EVIDENCE

Though Rankin tried to hide the material, some critics managed to dig it out. They learned to find their way around the National Archives, they studied the commission's working papers, compared drafts of the report's chapters and examined internal memos among the commission's staff and letters between the commission and the FBI.

Paul Hoch is one of these critics, a young man who got his Ph.D. in high-energy physics in 1974 from the University of California, now laying aside his physics research work on a book which codifies evidence he has gathered through most of his student years. In the book, The Oswald Papers: The FBI versus the Warren Commission, still unfinished, Hoch shows how Hoover underestimated information to the commission only when necessary, tried to define theiformant relationship-out of existence, declined to answer substantive questions about the basis of the FBI's relationship to both Lee Harvey Oswald and Jack Ruby and presented flatly contradictory explanations to the Warren Commission without explaining. Hoch's highly documented and readable book shows how the commission knew Hoover was hiding something and how the commission let him get away with it. "It is conceivable," concludes Hoch, "to the integrity of the investigation.

The best of the Warren Commission critics do a masterful job of piecing together names may well go down some day on an honor roll of those who cared enough to get involved: Vincent Santandrea, Harlow Weirige, Sylvia Meagher, Robert Oradear, Edward Jay Epstein, David Lifton, Lillian Castellano, Find Nemser, Perry Morse, Roy Marcus, Marjorie Field, Shirley Martin, Jerry Poling, William Arkin, Robert Service, Richard Angler, and Mark Lane.

Among the most prominent critics still hard at work and making new contributions are:

* Bernard Fenstermaker, a successful Washington D.C. lawyer, who out of his well-shredded pocket, finances the activities of something he calls the Committee to Investigate Assassinations, a loose confederation of citizens working to unearath Assassination of Kennedy's and a King's. A King's name may well go down some day on an honor roll of those who cared enough to get involved: Vincent Santandrea, Harlow Weirige, Sylvia Meagher, Robert Oradear, Edward Jay Epstein, David Lifton, Lillian Castellano, Find Nemser, Perry Morse, Roy Marcus, Marjorie Field, Shirley Martin, Jerry Poling, William Arkin, Robert Service, Richard Angler, and Mark Lane.

The best of the Warren Commission critics do a masterful job of piecing together names may well go down some day on an honor roll of those who cared enough to get involved: Vincent Santandrea, Harlow Weirige, Sylvia Meagher, Robert Oradear, Edward Jay Epstein, David Lifton, Lillian Castellano, Find Nemser, Perry Morse, Roy Marcus, Marjorie Field, Shirley Martin, Jerry Poling, William Arkin, Robert Service, Richard Angler, and Mark Lane.

Among the most prominent critics still hard at work and making new contributions are:

* Bernard Fenstermaker, a successful Washington D.C. lawyer, who out of his well-shredded pocket, finances the activities of something he calls the Committee to Investigate Assassinations, a loose confederation of citizens working to unearath Assassination of Kennedy's and a King's. A King's name may well go down some day on an honor roll of those who cared enough to get involved: Vincent Santandrea, Harlow Weirige, Sylvia Meagher, Robert Oradear, Edward Jay Epstein, David Lifton, Lillian Castellano, Find Nemser, Perry Morse, Roy Marcus, Marjorie Field, Shirley Martin, Jerry Poling, William Arkin, Robert Service, Richard Angler, and Mark Lane.

* Robert Groden, a young expert in optics from New York City, has magnified the central part of each frame of the Zapruder film and produced what he calls a refracted copy. The result is a tiny film of the assassination, made through a zoom lens, with much of the jiggly removed. Now, even more starkly than before, the lay observer at least, it appears that the shot which took off the top of the president's head and splattered two trailing police uniforms came from the front. The president's head clearly snaps back and to the left. Mrs. Kennedy changes her story at that moment was deleted from her testimony as published by the Warren Commission, Gioven in saying he saw Senator on the sixth floor of the Building Report, not the sixth floor of the Building Deposition. About 30 minutes before the shooting. Gradually, Gioven changed his story (the FBI had quoted a Dallas police lieutenant to the effect that he thought Gioven would change his story for money) and by the time Ben Gioven took Gioven's testimony for the Warren Commission, Gioven was saying he saw Senator on the sixth floor of the Building Deposition, not the sixth floor of the Building Report.

The original FBI interview in front of him, Ben Gioven was not about to look a gift horse in the mouth; when he heard Gioven's revised account, Gioven did not cross-examine Gioven to determine why Gioven's story had changed. Instead, he went ahead and, in the chapter of the Warren Report he co-authored, the newer version as the commission's only evidence which he has examined explained the evidence, that he that Ben Gioven would change his story for money) and by the time Ben Gioven took Gioven's testimony for the Warren Commission, Gioven was saying he saw Senator on the sixth floor of the Building Deposition, not the sixth floor of the Building Report.

With the original FBI interview in front of him, Ben Gioven was not about to look a gift horse in the mouth; when he heard Gioven's revised account, Gioven did not cross-examine Gioven to determine why Gioven's story had changed. Instead, he went ahead and, in the chapter of the Warren Report he co-authored, the newer version as the commission's only evidence which he has examined explained the evidence, that he that Ben Gioven would change his story for money) and by the time Ben Gioven took Gioven's testimony for the Warren Commission, Gioven was saying he saw Senator on the sixth floor of the Building Deposition, not the sixth floor of the Building Report.

* Robert Groden, a young expert in optics from New York City, has magnified the central part of each frame of the Zapruder film and produced what he calls a refracted copy. The result is a tiny film of the assassination, made through a zoom lens, with much of the jiggly removed. Now, even more starkly than before, the lay observer at least, it appears that the shot which took off the top of the president's head and splattered two trailing police uniforms came from the front. The president's head clearly snaps back and to the left. Mrs. Kennedy changes her story at that moment was deleted from her testimony as published by the Warren Commission, but her actual words, released by the Archives in 1972, may have been more significant here: "you know, you were trying to hold his hair on his face and his skull." Groden, who reconstructed the Zapruder film from a pirated copy belonging to Time Inc., has had his film shown recently on scattered TV stations all over the U.S. and Canada. According to government to examine the assassination evidence at the National Archives. Trouble is, he reported in August 1972, the president's brain is missing from the medico-legal exhibits at the Archives. So are certain important sections taken from the point where bullets were supposed to have entered the scalp and upper back of JFK. So are photos of the sections. Nevertheless, even without the missing materials, Dr. Wecht concludes that the physical evidence which he has examined doesn't support the Warren Commission's findings. "More than one person," he says, "was involved in the shooting of President Kennedy.

Wecht says he bases his conclusion on an analysis of the famous single bullet (Commission Exhibit 399) which the Warren Commission said was supposed to have entered the right side of the president's back, coursed through the uppermost portions of the thorax and mediastinum and emerged just over the knot of the president's tie—and then entered the right side ofGovernor Connally's back (breaking his right fifth rib), emerged from his chest, shattered a bone in his wrist and entered his left thigh. After all this the bullet had only two grains from its original weight and, said Wecht, the upper two centimeters of the bullet show "no grossly visible deformities, areas of mutilation, loss of substance or any kind of significant soiling. There is one small piece that was removed from the bullet's jacket by an FBI agent for "sophisticated analysis" (which analysis might show that JFK and Connally were not hit by the same bullet).

Furthermore, says Wecht, there was something strange about the trajectory of that bullet from the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository. It was supposed to have been traveling downward and passing through JFK from right to left. It should, therefore, have missed Governor Connally completely. Under the Warren Commission's hypothesis the bullet may have made an acute angular turn in midair. Wecht believes a second assassin may have been firing at JFK from the rear, possibly even from the front, but he says it cannot be confirmed because he examined the materials that are missing.

* Robert Groden, a young expert in optics from New York City, has magnified the central part of each frame of the Zapruder film and produced what he calls a refracted copy. The result is a tiny film of the assassination, made through a zoom lens, with much of the jiggly removed. Now, even more starkly than before, the lay observer at least, it appears that the shot which took off the top of the president's head and splattered two trailing police uniforms came from the front. The president's head clearly snaps back and to the left. Mrs. Kennedy changes her story at that moment was deleted from her testimony as published by the Warren Commission, but her actual words, released by the Archives in 1972, may have been more significant here: "you know, you were trying to hold his hair on his face and his skull." Groden, who reconstructed the Zapruder film from a pirated copy belonging to Time Inc., has had his film shown recently on scattered TV stations all over the U.S. and Canada. According to
to Groden, his blowup shows not only that President Kennedy was killed by a shot from the front (and therefore from a shot on or near the grassy knoll); it also shows the rifleman standing near the grassy knoll holding the rifle up in the air as the presidential car disappears through the railroad underpass.

Interestingly enough, when Groden showed the film at Bernard Fensterwald’s home in November 1973, neither he nor anyone else made any mention of a rifleman on the knoll. Groden says it wasn’t until January 1974 that he started scanning the last 18 frames of his Zapruder film and then began to see that what he thought was the wheel well of the presidential Lincoln wasn’t the wheel well at all, but the rifleman—because the car was moving forward and the ‘wheel well’ was moving backward.

* David Lifton is an engineering-physicist graduate of Cornell and a drop-out from graduate school at UCLA who, according to his own admission, has never been to the Grasslands. Groden there on the grassy knoll holding a rifle: it clan shows the rifleman standing from a shot on or near the grassy knoll. Groden says it wasn’t until January 1974 that he started scanning the last 18 frames of his Zapruder film and then began to see that what he thought was the wheel well of the presidential Lincoln wasn’t the wheel well at all, but the rifleman—because the car was moving forward and the ‘wheel well’ was moving backward.

In 1960, Rampart, dubbed the tramp of medium height named Cyril Wecht and it was he who provided the producers of Executive Action with the documentary record which supported that movie’s attempt to prove how several assassination teams might have worked in Dallas. Lifton is a 35-year-old bachelor whose Brentwood apartment has 22 filing drawers on the train representations.

Lifton has a work in progress which challenges the authenticity of the evidence on which the Warren Commission based its major findings.

* George O’Toole, a former computer analyst for the CIA, has turned to a new technological tool as an important adjunct in his assassination research. The tool is

The Mystery Tramps in Disguise?

Add Dick Gregory, the comedian turned amateur, to a long list of assassination buffs who have been stalking around with a set of photos taken by three press photographers at Dallas, November 22nd, 1963.

The photos show three men, short, medium and tall, being led through Dealey Plaza by two Dallas policemen to the Dallas County Sheriff’s Office. The cops released the men without, apparently, getting their names. “They were just tramps,” the policemen were supposed to have said, “and we let ‘em go.”

For years, buffs looking for “the real killers of JFK” have been trying to identify the tramps. Richard Sprague, a computer scientist from New York and former board member of the Committee to Investigate Assassinations, has maintained that one of the tramps is a Minnesota man named Fred Lee Cranston. Sprague dubbed the tramp “Freckles” and it was Sprague who fed Rampart and the New York Times the intelligence that “Freckles” bore a startling resemblance to a widely circulated police sketch of a man wanted for the assassination of Martin Luther King in 1968.

In 1972, after years of trying to link up the tramp photos with, mainly, anti-Castro Cubans and some of their American sympathizers, the Huff started scanning photos of the killers in the Warren report. Could any of the Watergate crowd have been in Dallas? And if so... 

Sprague, then said, the short guy was E. Howard Hunt and the tall one was Frank Sturgis.

Frank Sturgis

The short man does bear a resemblance to current photos of Hunt, to be sure, but the tramp photos were taken in 1963, when Hunt was 43, and the short tramp looks at least 55. Some facial features of the tall tramp appear to bear some similarity to Sturgis’s, the shape of the nose and chin most particularly. But the gets is different. The tall tramp is obviously Nordic and Sturgis is obviously Latin. Furthermore, there is a great disparity in height between the tall and the short tramps. The tall tramp seems to be at least eight inches taller than the short one. Sturgis seems to be no more than two or three inches taller than Hunt.

To the Huff wanting to believe, however, the photos were too good to drop. They proved a CIA complicity in the plot to kill Kennedy. Underground newspapers all over the country began to reprint the tramp photos, alongside those of Hunt and Sturgis, with the blatant assertion that the tramps were Hunt and Sturgis.

Two months ago, Rolling Stone had the tramp photos examined by the Institute of Forensic Sciences in Oakland, California. There, criminologist Charles V. Morton measured the facial characteristics on comparison photos of Hunt and Sturgis and tramps and concluded that the tall tramp was definitely not Sturgis. The short tramp was probably not Hunt—though the details in the fuzzy photos of the short tramp were insufficient to provide Morton with an absolute basis for an opinion. However, reported Morton, “at least one definable characteristic appears to argue strongly against identity. This is the shape of the ear.” According to Morton, the helix of the ear in the Hunt photos is concave and the helix of the ear of the short tramp is convex.

All this seemed somewhat superfluous in light of Hunt’s angry denials of his presence there. Hunt said he’d been in Dallas in November 1963 or part of a plot to kill JFK.

But he made similar disavowals on network TV and local TV shows during November 1974. Nevertheless, the tramp photos (with one of the tramps now labeled “Hunt”) seem to have a life all their own, have become part of the collection of artifacts surrounding the JFK assassination mythology. Dick Gregory found the tramp photos circulating at the Assassination Information Bureau convention in early February and latched on to them (along with Robert Groden’s Zapruder film lawsuit) and took tramp photos, Groden’s blowup and Groden on the road.

Because Gregory is who he is, however, something of a folk hero who commands attention from the media, the Rockefeller Commission called Gregory to testify before it in Washington for a firsthand account of his charges. There Gregory stopped short of identifying the short tramp as Hunt but played the role of “aggrieved citizen.” If this isn’t Hunt, said Gregory, then the government has an obligation to tell us who it is. —R.B.K.
Groden believes that the head and rifle of a fourth assassin can be seen at lower right through tree branches (see diagram p. 36).

Behind stockade fence at right, says Groden, the face of the first assassin can be seen (see diagram p. 36).
Besides the official version of the events in Dealey Plaza plaza,

1. Oswald fired the first shot between Zapruder frames #210 and #224 (the camera was running at 18.3 frames per second). This was safe for the commission, for during this entire time span President Kennedy was hidden from the view of Zapruder's camera by a large road sign. Therefore, an exact moment of impact is impossible to show. (The interval between fire and impact would have been one to two frames.)

2. The second shot, missing completely, was fired at an unmentioned moment sometime later.

3. Finally, a third and last shot at frame #313 was the shot that ended the president's life.

The first shot struck the president in the base of his neck and exited from his throat. This same bullet then proceeded to hit Governor Connally in the back, shattering his fifth rib. It emerged from his chest, passed through his right lung, shattered bones and, finally came to rest in Connally's left thigh. The bullet (some call it Superbullet) that inflicted these seven wounds and broke numerous bones was found in nearly perfect condition on a stretcher in Parkland Hospital, officially designated 15 minutes of the film. (Davis, Carraway-Bryd Building, 411 Elm Street, Dallas, Texas) with an Italian-made Mannlicher-Carcano 6.5mm rifle.

2. Three and only three shots were fired.

3. All of the shots were fired within a 5.6-second time span.

Abraham Zapruder was a Dallas dress manufacturer. On November 22nd, 1963, he stationed himself on top of a concrete building which is part of the Dealey Plaza section of Elm Street in downtown Dallas. With his secretary Marilyn Stitarman by his side and a Bell and Howell movie camera in his hands, he waited for the presidential motorcade to pass in front of him. As one of history's most significant and politically significant events was witnessed by him, Mr. Zapruder kept his finger pressed down on the shutter release and filmed the entire event. The result is a graphic film of a presidential assassination, a historical moment captured for posterity. But of far more importance: The Zapruder film provides absolute, incontrovertible proof of cross fire and conspiracy.

Zapruder died of cancer on August 5, 1983. During his years of work and study on this one subject, almost nine years, he has worked with the JFK and Connally were hit by the same bullet.

The Zapruder film shows that by frame #224 JFK has already hit and Connally is undamaged until frame #314, at least one-half of a second later. But when Connally was wounded, it appeared shattered at the moment of impact and his reaction is recorded on film. The time for the bullet to pass from Kennedy to Connally would have been at most two frames. There is no question that he was hit by a different bullet than the one that the commission says hit JFK.

The third bullet hit President Kennedy in the back of the head—and in violation of the laws of physics thrust him violently backwards. In the published frames of the Zapruder film, volume 18 of the commission's evidence, two frames, frame #314 and #315, were "accidentally reversed, leaving the impression that the president's head moves forward—the reverse of fact. Interestingly this was the only trans- position of frames. (J. Edgar Hoover later acknowledged the "printing error")

President Kennedy's throat wound was a threat to the commission. If it was an entrance wound, of course, the commission members could not admit it. This small hole, consequently, gave them license to further the "single bullet theory." The only problem: The hole in the front of the neck was approximately six inches higher than the wound in the rear. Oswald was supposed to have been six floors above the motorcade. If the hole in the front of the neck was made by the egress of CE 399, it would have to have been at least three to four inches lower than the back wound.

Faced with this problem, the commission simply performed verbal plastic surgery—and moved the back wound up by six inches, to a point in the back of the president's neck, just to the right of center and above the shoulder blades. This wound was described by the many who saw it at Parkland Hospital. Every one of them, including Secret Service men, place the wound at the moment of impact. The bullet wound was not inflicted at Parkland Hospital. It is here that a "warning shot" was fired. It was probably a bullet fired at anyone. It was, in all likelihood, a blank fired as a coordinating shot for the firing pains. JFK must have at that time known that something was up. Many witnesses have stated that there was a "dissent sound to the "first shot.

It appears that JFK does not start to wave again until he feels that the sound was only a backdrop, a firecracker or some similar sound, which were the descriptions of those witnesses reporting the sound of the "first shot.

At frame #189 JFK starts to wave again slowly, nervously... until frame #188. At approximately frame #189 a shot (1) is fired. It misses the car completely. It was fired from behind. From all indications it was from a broom closet on the second floor of the Dal-Tex Building. The shot was high. It flew over the Lincoln and landed at the curb line on the far (south) side of Main Street—its closest point to Commerce Street, just east of the triple underpass. A section of carving was struck with the bullet and a fragment of the concrete flew up and was caught in the windshield of the car. At this point JFK's right hand falls in his lap as he tries to comprehend what is happening, which were the descriptions of those witnesses reporting the sound of the "first shot.

At frame #206 JFK's arm continues to drop at this point. His entire body is now obscured by the sign announcing the Stemmons Freeway. Only his head is still visible. At frame #207 we have one of the biggest points of discussion in the en- tire film. On the glass is an obvious horizontal line running through the en- tire width of the frame just below the halfway mark. At frame #208 we have a similar line one-third of the way down. Only there this is a true one-third of the frame, which would be the right side of the frame on the top sec- tion, but on the bottom, the view is half- way to the middle. The reason is that frame #210 and #211 have been spliced out. The official reason is that when
film was purchased by Time Inc., it was put in the hands of a junior member of the photographic department for enlarging purposes. It was during that process that the four frames were damaged. Also, frames #207 and #212 were damaged as well for the splicing.

In all there are ten missing or damaged frames in the film—not counting stress marks from the sprocket holes following the second splice (frame #212).

FRAME #210

It is here that the commission says JFK could have first been shot. For this is the first frame at which Lee Harvey Oswald could have fired at the president. He had to be as high as or higher than the easternmost window. Prior to that point, there is a large oak tree blocking any line of fire from that window to the location of the assassin. However, Oswald wasn't there, although someone else was. Someone in a red shirt who appears in an in f mm color movie taken by Robert Hughes is clearly seen moving in that window. This is also the moving shape of a man in the pair of windows next to "the sniper's nest" in the same room. This frame is also important because it is dead center among the missing frames between #207 and #212. This may be the reason for this missing: not for what it shows but for what it doesn't.

FRAME #212

Although it isn't generally known, the president's head is still visible after the splice. There has been no movement in the president's head. He has not hit at frame #210. The Warren Commission report cannot have JFK as early as possible for Oswald to have shot #224. He has to get second and third shot by frame #213, but at the same time it is late as possible for him to have been hit by the same bullet (CE 399) as Connally. If he were not for the oak tree and Zapruder's film, they might have succeeded in framing Oswald. But because of the tree they had to concede a first shot as late as #210.

Unfortunately for the commission, not one man in this entire country could duplicate the incredible feat attributed to Lee Harvey Oswald, who was, according to his Marine Corps records, "rather tall, rather thin." The commission hired some of the nation's best marksmen, gave them every advantage, and they still couldn't duplicate the shots.

Right after the splice at frame #212, at the bottom of the frame and to the right of the sign we begin to pick up a strange object. By frame #221 it is clearly an open umbrella.

FRAME #226

JFK's left sleeve and shirt cuff now become visible from behind the road sign. At this point, the umbrella starts to rise and twirl counterclockwise. This umbrella is being held by a conspirator known for obvious reasons as "the umbrella man." This man is the only man in the entire motorcade route with an open umbrella. It was a sunny, wintry day. Very impractical to have an open umbrella. Photographic evidence has shown that his umbrella was closed until JFK's car turned onto Elm Street. After the killing, while all around him ran away or dropped to the ground, he just stood there. He closed his umbrella and looked to see the end of the motorcade, and slowly walked up Elm Street toward the Depository. He has never been identified.

Whenever a bullet actually strikes, this actual impact can be seen at the exact moment of contact. However, since JFK was behind the road sign (in relation to Abraham Zapruder's camera) we can't see the moment of contact.

We can only assume that he was hit at frame #218, give or take one, certainly no more than two frames. For as JFK becomes visible from behind the road sign at frame #223, his hands are still dropping in the arc started around frame #168. Allowing for one-third of a second for reaction time, with Zapruder's camera running at 18.3 frames per second, when his hands started to rise toward his cheek in a protective motion on frame #225, we go back one-third of a second (7 frames) to frame #218. The bullet entered the president's throat after nicking the knot in his tie. This shot (I) was fired from behind the corner of a wooden stockade fence on the grassy knoll in front and to the right of JFK. It did not exit.

JFK's arms are still dropping as he is hit. At frame #225 he reacts. His arms rise in a protective motion toward his throat. The rising arms continue until frame #227. At frame #227 a second shot (III) hits President Kennedy in the back, approximately six inches below the shoulder blades and just right of the spinal column. This was probably a second shot from the second floor of the Dal-Tex Building. The bullet entered, went in approximately two inches as but did not exit. JFK is at this point compressed downward and pushed forward.

FRAME #234

Governor Connally is hit at this frame. His cheeks puff out as frame (IV) knocks the wind out of him. His right shoulder starts to droop and his hair appears disconnected. This shot was probably fired from the sixth floor of the Depository Building's western corner, or from the roof of the County Records Building. The bullet entered his back, exits from his chest and enters his left knee.

FRAME #312

This is the last frame before the fatal shots.

FRAME #313

A shot (V) hits John Kennedy from behind in the right temple. At this point his head explodes. Since this was a glancing blow, he is thrown forward only slightly. I feel strongly that it was either this bullet or a fragment of it that caused Governor Connolly's wrist wound.

FRAME #314

A high-powered rifle bullet (VI) entered JFK's head from the right front, throwing him violently backward and to his left against the seat towards his wife with such force it actually lifted him out of his seat. The rear shot was possibly a second shot from the sixth floor of the Depository near the western end. The shot from the front came from behind the center of a low retaining wall that is an extension of the concrete pergola on the grassy knoll to the front of JFK.

The driver of the presidential limousine, William Greer, testified that he sped up prior to the head shots and that he had been factored out by the time. At the moment of the head shots, Greer appears to be looking directly at JFK's head. Only after the president was dead did he begin to accelerate. If it were only a slow reaction time, why this inaccuracy under oath?

Immediately after the head shots, both Greer and Roy Kellerman, the Secret Service guard next to him, duck their heads down in reaction to the shots. They both knew what had happened. The question here is why the total nonreaction of trained men.

(Greer told the Warren Commission that he heard a sound which he thought to be the backfire from one of the motorcycles flanking the presidential car. When he heard the same noise again, Greer said that he glanced over his shoulder and saw Governor Connally fall. It was then, he said, that he realized something was wrong and pressed down the accelerator as Kellerman said, "Get out of here fast.")

FRAME #347

Jackie sprints, tears the tunic of the car to try to retrieve a section of her dead husband's head. A shock reaction. Secret Service agent Clint Hill finally reaches the car and climbs on at frame #367. He never reaches Jackie. She climbs back in by herself.

Here another strange thing appears. It is round and near the bottom right of the frame. By frame #412, the president's head begins to become evident.

At frame #413 Zapruder stops panning for one frame, and the head, ear and rifle of the fourth assassin become clear. He then fades to the left as Zapruder pans right toward the triple underpass.

FRAME #448

Zapruder pans to the stockade fence on the grassy knoll. By frame #454 the first assassin can be made out with his backup man (not as clear). He stays visible until frame #474. At #486 Abraham Zapruder stopped filming.
something called a Psychological Stress Evaluator (PSE—
a machine which a skilled operator can apply to anyone's recorded words and tell, by evaluating the stress patterns in the speech (seen on the machine's screens as a series of mountains and valleys), whether that person is telling the truth or lying.

The PSE presents advantages over the old polygraph exam (which is why old-time polygraph examiners don't like it). A skilled PSE examiner can play the PSE game with remote subjects who don't even know they're participants. All O'Tools needed in order to find out whether some of the actors in the JFK assassination scenario were telling the truth was access to old taped interviews they'd gone out years ago.

O'Tools found some of these—radio and television interviews with officials like Dr. J.J. Hurtig, who performed an autopsy on President Kennedy, and members of the Warren Commission, and, most notably, Lee Harvey Oswald's halfway interviews in the Dallas police station. Where previously taped interviews didn't exist (especially in the case of certain witnesses in Dallas and members of the Dallas police), O'Tools played the role of a student and doing a tenth-anniversary story on the assassination, went down to Texas with a tape recorder and got his own testimony. In O'Tools's just-released book, The Assassination Factor, he contends that many of the principals in this case (even Justice Warren) were not telling the truth when they said they'd found no evidence of a conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy.

And, most startling of all, that Lee Harvey Oswald was telling the truth when he said, to a newspaper reporter in the Dallas police station who asked him whether he had shot the president, "I didn't shoot anybody, no sir.

IV. LOOKING FOR THE SUPPORT OF CONGRESS

If Oswald didn't do it, who did?

There are a lot of conspiracy theories.

A congressional task force is needed to evaluate them all. If the agencies themselves, the Secret Service, the FBI, the CIA, army and Navy Intelligence, are themselves object of the investigation, then, quite obviously, we can't expect them (or anyone in the ranks of traditional law enforcement) to investigate themselves, or investigate anyone with old-boy ties to any part of the intelligence community.

And don't expect much from the Justice Department either. A group of Warren Commission critics, including Marty Perrell of Dallas and Bernard Fenstemwald, recently presented the Justice Department with a standing request for an investigation. Without pressure from the press, government officials do little. Attorney General Richard Kleindein promised that the Justice Department would attack Watergate with "the most intense investigation since the assassination of President Kennedy." The Justice Department did that—and went no farther up the line than Gordon Liddy. But the press didn't believe that official truth was the whole truth. The Washington Post went after the story and so (later) did the rest of the national press. Finally and almost reluctantly Congress acted.

Now, 11 years after the assassination of President Kennedy, the press may get back on the story it was once covering. Back in August 1966, an aide to the Kennedys who had served as a speechwriter for both President Kennedy and President Johnson, Richard N. Goodwin, called for a reopening of the case—and added that other members of the Kennedy family agreed with him.

By early 1967, both Life and the Saturday Evening Post did stories blasting many of the Warren Report's conclusions. Life used frames from the Zapu- ter film to make a case for a new official investigation. And the New York Times organized a task force of reporters under Harrison Salisbury to go back over all the areas of doubt and eliminate them.

But Salisbury and his team didn't eliminate all the areas of doubt. In a recent interview, Salisbury said his task force got about halfway through the investigation when a standing request he had made for a visa to Henri Cahn came through at last. He put the JFK project on the back shelf. "I was thronged by Miss Fitzgerald. I held all the strings," he says, "and I didn't want to step on anyone's toes" and flew off to Paris and Henri Cahn. Salisbury's research from France forced a cause in Washington, and after he returned, he had to testify before congressional committees.

By April of 1967, Salisbury says, his team had simply "burned out" in their JFK project. "Nobody told us our report was a write-off. We just felt no body cared.

But it was precisely at this time that New Orleans district attorney Jim Garrision indicted Clay Shaw (Garrison said he was CIA) for conspiracy in a plot to kill President Kennedy. Representatives of the press streamed into New Orleans from all over the world to see what Garrison really had. It turned out that he didn't have much. Salisbury doesn't remember that Garrison's activities were a factor in his decision to drop the investigation (he tells it, there wasn't even an overt decision to drop it. He just had other things to do).
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Gene Roberts, now executive editor of ROLLING STONE APPLIANCE RENTAL.
The folks who brought you the great campaign songs of 1972—such as that Ed Mankle New Hampshire hit, "When Polish Eyes Are Crying"—are not singing President Ford's praises on the bus. The boys on the bus, the Washington-based press corps that follows the president on his travels, recently penned a song you'll never hear on the radio.

I have a very special feeling for Kansas," the president said to the Kansas State Legislature last month, "because Kansas is where Dorothy lived before she went to visit the wonderful land of Oz, where all kinds of strange, whimsical and unexpected things happened.

About the press plane after Mr. Ford's appearance, national correspondents focused their dirty and saucy to the tune of "The Scarecrow's Song" from "The Wizard of Oz.

I could while away the hours, reflecting on my errors. While we go down the drain.

I could make the Aran cover, I could be an Elmhurst. I could be a good man. Oh, yes, if I could be, like Truman in his prime.

I could hold down grocery prices, wipe out the oil crisis, solve problems with no strain.

of the Philadelphia Inquirer, is a member of Sabato's team. He has a new, "We took all the critics' complaints and in our own, original version and we couldn't find anything that really had them upset." National correspondents, still a reporter for the Times in Texas, was another member of the team. He says that he, and others came up with a "lot of unanswered questions." He doesn't know why the Times didn't bother to pursue them. He says that he's never sure that the Times ever made much of a decision to start looking in the first place.

"I'd be off on a good track and then somebody'd call me off and send me off to California on another story or something. We never really reached anywhere for this. We weren't really serious.

But perhaps that's exactly the kind of journalistic commitment which is needed. Some of the best work on Watergate was done by newspapers, still a reporter for the Times in Texas, was another member of the team. He says that he, and others came up with a "lot of unanswered questions." He doesn't know why the Times didn't bother to pursue them. He says that he's never sure that the Times ever made much of a decision to start looking in the first place.

"I'd be off on a good track and then somebody'd call me off and send me off to California on another story or something. We never really reached anywhere for this. We weren't really serious.

Perhaps that's exactly the kind of journalistic commitment which is needed. Some of the best work on Watergate was done by newspapers.