

copy to
H. WEISBERG

SEPT-30, 1994 - VOLUME 1, ISSUE #3

DATELINE:DALLAS

Nosenko been allowed to tell the Warren Commission that such a thesis was pure rubbish, it would have meant that there was no foreign conspiracy, leaving open only the possibility for domestic conspiracy.

Thereafter, Nosenko was silenced by the CIA. He was not believed. He was subjected to "hostile interrogation." He was beaten toothless. At taxpayer expense, a special, personalized prison was built to house Nosenko. Essentially a hugely expensive cube, it allowed in no light, which was useless anyhow, as Nosenko was allowed nothing to read, not even a toothpaste wrapper (of dubious value to someone without teeth anyhow...), and for three years Nosenko was kept in cruel isolation. Eventually, he was released, given a new identity (and matching teeth, no doubt), and a healthy income for life, again on our tax dollars. This all happened, of course, long after the Warren Commission had expired, and after the various major networks and media sources had ratified Oswald's guilt and we had other political murders, foreign wars, and dreadful economic concerns to occupy our waking hours.

Thus the contrast: an American Marine, possessed of top-secret data defects to the Soviet Union and is allowed, nay encouraged and given financial support to return home, with no questions asked until Dallas homicide Chief Will Fritz began his questions on November 22, 1963. On the other hand, an upper level KGB operative (not the head of the Strategic Rocket Forces, but a "player" nonetheless) defects to the US to tell us all he knows about his own bureau's workings, our sworn enemy's secrets, thus Oswald, and there is something within his knowledge—or perceived by

the CIA to be within his knowledge—that is so frightening that his welcome turns into years of torture, and only JFK assassination ennui brought closure to that torture.

It is difficult to imagine a more bizarre scenario. If these two people had been medieval kings, they would have been named "Oswald the Harmless" and "Nosenko the Terrible," based on our intelligence community's perceptions of them.

It seems obvious that we must question those perceptions. On the other hand, it may just have been a simple mistake: we meant to beat the hell out of Oswald when he reached America in 1962, just as we intended to debrief Nosenko and then allow him to live a normal American existence.

I seriously doubt it happened like that, but that is as good an explanation as anything I've read anywhere else.

Certainly makes you wonder!

THE "DOUBLE HEAD SHOT" THEORY: SOME THOUGHTS ON THE MEDICAL EVIDENCE AS SEEN BY A LAYMAN

By Hal Verb

Recently two mutually exclusive events occurred relating to President Kennedy's assassination which, in this author's opinion, provide further convincing evidence for the theory that the fatal head shot which killed Kennedy was the result *not* of a single bullet but of *two* bullets fired nearly simultaneously from *different* directions.

For the purposes of this article and convenience of the reader I shall refer to this theory as the "Double Head

Shot" (or DHS). Some medical and forensic experts would probably term it as the "second entrance wound".

Regardless of which phrase or terms one uses what I hope to present in this article is evidentiary support for the DHS which challenges the official (and historically established) versions of the assassination (as "proved" by both the Warren Commission in the 1960's and the House Select Committee in the 1970's).

The *first* event that triggered my thoughts about the DHS was prompted by a phone conversation I had in mid-June, 1993 with Dr. Gary Aguilar, a leading and eminent medical critic of the official autopsy evidence especially that "evidence" which appeared in recent issues of "JAMA" (the Journal of the American Medical Association).

I shall return to this first event and my discussion of the medical evidence shortly but before I do allow me to briefly record here the other *event*.

The *second* event that added to my rethinking and further analysis of the DHS as a viable theory came after reading an article On Gerald Posner's book, "Case Closed", (9/5/93) by the San Francisco Chronicle's book reviewer, Patricia Holt, who, incidentally, roundly (and soundly) trounced the book. Further on in this article I shall refer to a particular sentence in that article which, in my view, offered a very revealing and profound insight into the JFK assassination.

Now let us return to the *first* event and the June conversation I had with Dr. Aguilar. I stated to Dr. Aguilar that I recalled instances in the House Select Committee's 1978 investigation of the assassination where that governmental body *avoided* areas of the assassination relating specifically to the medical evidence. In the back of my mind were

DATELINE:DALLAS

thoughts of two bullets striking Kennedy's head but when speaking with Aguilar I told him I could not immediately offer him this documentation but I would look it up and send him the pertinent material. I eventually did find this and what follows here is essentially the information I forwarded to him.

I sent Dr. Aguilar a rather intriguing exchange between several doctors and Dr. Humes which appeared in the House Select Committee's official record. According to HSCA Volume 7, page 255) the following discussion took place:

Dr. Humes: "...These enlargements which you have just shown us now of these other photographs is the first time I have seen these enlargements; I have not seen them before."

Dr. Davis: "These were Just made up 2 or 3 days ago. Two days ago."

Dr. Petty: "May I make a comment on what you just said, Dr. Davis. The problem as I see it, is that this may be in fact a tunneling situation, with the bullet scooting along the skull here or somewhere, and not entering the skull down below. Is that what you're saying now?"

Dr. Davis: "What I'm saying - what I'm inferring: In the absence of photographs and specific measurements, we could only conjecture as to how long the tunneling is, but I could envision this as a tunneling first and then entry into the skull."

Dr. Loquvam: "Gentlemen, may I say something?"

Dr. Davis: "Yes."

Dr. Loquvam: "I don't think this discussion belongs in this record."

Dr. Petty: "All right."

Dr. Humes: "I agree."

Dr. Loquvam: "We have no business recording this. This is for us to decide between ourselves; I don't think this belongs on this record."

What follows all this is a continuing discussion by all the doctors and another doctor (Coe) on the "wound of entrance". Indeed, Dr. Loquvam *repeats* his insistence that they "go off the record". And even Dr. Baden expresses his "concern" and says he'd like to have someone "clarify" the issues.

In the opinion of this writer it would appear that "going off the record" most likely refers to the belief that there were *two* shots to the head and what the doctors were arguing about was a recognition of this as a distinct possibility if not an observed medical fact. Note Dr. Petty's remark about "bullet scooting" and "not entering the skull down below" and compare this also to Dr. Davis's reference to "a tunneling first" and "then entry into the skull".

Why go "off the record" if they're discussing a *single* event?

In the information I sent to Dr. Aguilar I called attention to an instance where the Warren Commission more studiously and carefully avoided the DHS theory. Here I refer to the little noticed testimony of Dr. Paul Peters who was present at Parkland Hospital on November 22, 1963. (See Warren Commission Volume 6, pages 68-72).

In response to a query by Arlen Specter, Dr. Peters accidentally blurted out "Well, I wondered whether or not he (Kennedy) had been shot once or twice - that was my question at the time ... We all (doctors) discussed it."

And so what does our good friend Arlen Specter follow up with - a question about the *two* hits? Certainly, not, for he very quickly and studiously

shifts the questioning of Dr. Peters to the "wound on his (JFK's) neck" and the tracheotomy.

In Harold Weisberg's "Post Mortem" there appears an account of a Dr. David Stewart who is *not* mentioned in the Warren Report or the Warren Commission's volumes of testimony. Like Dr. Peters, Dr. Stewart was also present at Parkland Hospital. Stewart states that "there was a small wound in the left front of the President's head and there was a quite massive wound of exit at the right backside of the head and it was felt by *all of the physicians at the time* (my emphasis) to be a wound of entry which went in the front."

Stewart's comments were made in a radio interview conducted by Joe Dolan, a popular talk show host, whose program originated out of Oakland, California (April 10, 1967). Because of the very controversial statements Stewart had made indicating that there were *two* shots and *not* one striking Kennedy's head Dolan decided to re-interview Stewart on this point. Weisberg's book does not contain this particular interview but I've a full transcript of that interview and it shows that Dolan was relentless in questioning Stewart not only on the alleged "left frontal entry" but on the matter of two shots hitting Kennedy's head as well.

At least five times Dolan hammered away on the "left frontal entry" and to each of these queries Stewart never wavered. Stewart maintained that "at least three of them (the doctors) noticed this and reported it." (He did not identify them on the air). Dolan then asked Stewart if he agreed with the description of Kennedy's wounds as he first described them and, again, Stewart adamantly

DATELINE:DALLAS

replied in the affirmative. Dolan summarized the wounds as follows:

"One at the neckline, one at the right front that blew off the back of his head and one to the left front of the middle line and near the headline."

Stewart added another bombshell at the conclusion of the interview when he pointed out: "... each of the individual surgeons who took care of the President - well, almost immediately after they left the emergency room they went upstairs and each went into his own little corner and they wrote out in long hand each of the things that they had seen, the things that were done, the times as nearly as they could remember."

Does anyone know about the existence of these "long hand notes" and *what* they contain? If so, the assassination literature on this intriguing revelation is non-existent or scanty at best.

Let us now refer to the second event mentioned earlier in this article which occasioned my rethinking and re-evaluation of the DHS theory. As I indicated in my early comments I had noticed a "particular sentence" in a book review of Gerald Posner's book, "Case Closed". That sentence read as follows: "According to McCarthy (CEO of Failure Analysis Associates) the gunman gave up some awfully good shots to (drive) the quarry into a second shooting by other assassins."

As those of us who have followed the JFK assassination well know Failure Analysis results were used, ironically enough, to bolster the JAMA case supporting the doctors who performed the autopsy. McCarthy's comment was cited by TV host, Brian Banmiller, on program, "On the Money", which aired on July, 1993.

Banmiller stated that Failure Analysis had reached a "startling

conclusion" and that was that they had "made a compelling argument that Lee Harvey Oswald did not act alone." Banmiller then uttered the statement by McCarthy about "driving the quarry".

My thoughts zeroed in on the reference to a "second shooting by other assassins" and I recalled an interview I had with Marilyn Sitzman, an eyewitness to the JFK assassination who was standing with Abraham Zapruder (in fact, holding him so that he wouldn't fall as he was filming the motorcade). She and I were standing right near the pedestal where both she and Zapruder stood upon. It was the last day of the Dallas "ASK" conference (Oct. 25, 1992).

Sitzman told me she knew a lot about guns and weapons having grown up with them. She told me the shot that killed the President came from *behind* and that the gunman *must've used a silencer* (her emphasis). She said that if it were *not* a silencer the shot would have knocked down *both* of them because of where they were so precariously standing. She then told me of the great "reverberation" that was felt. I showed her a map of the Dealey Plaza area (she signed it) and she pointed to the area where she thought the shot was fired from. Curiously enough, it was *not* from the alleged and traditionally targeted picket fence area but from a location in the direction of the *north pergola*. This would be to the *left* of and behind where Charles Hester was standing.

What kind of weapon can use a silencer? From gun aficionados I have been told that a rifle would *not* use one but a pistol *could*. A prominent researcher with whom I shared this information says that the possibility does exist for a silencer being used and he does not discount this as a real explanation.

Using a silencer might also dispose of the recurrent and real thorny issue of why many claim *all* shots were fired from the Texas School Book Building and that they *never* heard any shot from any other direction. Acoustically, and I do not state this as scientific fact, it is possible that the reverberating effect and not the sound of a weapon was what witnesses reacted to. Those knowledgeable in acoustics can enlighten us on this score.

As many writers have noted the controversy surrounding the fatal head shot has centered on why *no* evidence exists in the form of bullet fragments for the so-called "second shot". Is there such evidence and if not, *why not*?

Perhaps a clue can be found in a recent book by Harrison Livingstone (see "High Treason 2", page 162). FBI agent, Francis X. O'Neill, who was present in the autopsy room with agent Jim Sibert at Bethesda, told Livingstone that *during* the autopsy Sibert "went out and called the FBI laboratories and asked if there was such a thing as an *ice bullet* (my emphasis). Livingstone does not say what O'Neill was told by the lab (it would be interesting to know what they *did* tell him) but the reference to the use of an "ice bullet" dealt solely with the *neck wound* of Kennedy and there is no mention of an ice bullet striking the President's *head*. (Was this a question raised by Sibert when he called the lab? No one I know has raised this point with him unless I have missed this in the literature).

Suppose an assassin using a silencer had used an ice bullet. Is this a possibility? Not being a gun expert I raised this question with a friend who is very knowledgeable about guns and, like Sitzman, grew up with them. Yes, he said, it is a distinct possibility. But

DATELINE:DALLAS

he said the bullet (or bullets) could not be left frozen overnight. They would need a few hours of refrigeration which would indicate that the bullet (or bullets fired were prepared that day (or morning) of the assassination. Once fired the bullets would melt leaving virtually no trace upon hitting the subject fired upon.

As a final corollary to the silencer theory one should note that the assassins were faced with a serious problem in the assassination of the President. As the Altgens photo shows (taken at the equivalent of the time Zapruder was filming at frame number 255) Kennedy was still alive but wounded seriously after most probably *three* shots were fired and they (the assassins) needed *one* concluding shot to kill him. After all, the alleged "evidence" left behind at the 6th floor window (the *three* shells) required the assassins to "finish the job". Two assassins fired almost simultaneously at JFK's head with the first gunman firing from *behind* the motorcade *first* (but not necessarily from the TSBD) and the second gunman fired from the knoll area a micro-second *after* the first gunman fired. *Both* hit their target.

The evidence for two fatal shots can be found, then, not only in the Zapruder film, the testimony of the doctors cited in this article, but also, in the fact of the unusual irony and against its own uses, the Failure Analysis Associates reconstruction of the crime, which demonstrated convincingly enough that the assassins "gave up some awfully good shots to (drive) the quarry into a second shooting by other assassins."

The case remains "open" on the question of the fatal head shot (or shots) with compelling evidence for *two* shots fired almost simultaneously and from *different* directions.

"ELF ON THE SHELF"

BOOK REVIEWS

By Walt Brown, Ph.D.

In the last three years, documents have trickled out of their formerly sacred vaults, witnesses heretofore frightened have lightened up and told their stories, and Oliver Stone's cinematic JFK taught a whole new generation that there was more to Dallas than a lone assassin stooge.

This has brought both good news and bad news. The good news is that there has been a healthy number of JFK assassination books published, as opposed to the one every other year schedule typical of the 70's and early 80's. The bad news is that there has been some absolutely horrendous tripe put between covers and advertised as scholarship, a problem that compounds difficulties for scholarly works of merit that have to defend themselves against an unfriendly media reception. In short, the bad ones cause credibility problems for the good ones.

In *Kill Zone*, former "sniper" (an odd resume entry to say the least) Craig Roberts tells of standing on the sixth floor of the TSBD and surveying the landscape of Dealey Plaza and coming to the realization that the alleged Oswald shots were not the logical way to plan an assassination. Author Roberts then adds additional data about weapons and ballistics, which are clearly of value.

Alas, almost nothing in the rest of his book is of equal value. It suffers from a dreadful lack of editing, and its grammatical infelicities will overcome the zeal of even the most serious reader. Roberts also admits that the assassination did not shock or upset

him: "many people actually felt relieved." (p.5)

Beyond that, it is difficult to decide whether the work suffers from lack of understanding of the case, whether the author's purpose was to sensationalize. Oswald is seen as a "known Communist with mental problems," (4), a shooter was on the fire escape of the Dal-Tex (55), the mysterious Albert Osborne/John F. Bowen had a ranch in Mexico where 25-30 professional assassins were based, and "After the assassination 'Osborne' disappeared forever," (6), raising the curious question of why the FBI and the CIA interviewed repeatedly.

Those revelations are but the tip of the iceberg. "LBJ insisted that Tex Governor Connally ride with him in his Cadillac..." (57), after which LBJ got into his Lincoln. On the subject of Lincoln, JFK's car goes from blue to black regularly, suggesting it is the "magic limousine." [For the record, it was *Kennedy blue*.] Roberts tells us that one shot was fired "to immobilize Kennedy's head for the high power rifle shots to come later." (60) With respect to the author's understanding of the difficulty of the "Oswald shots," it is hard to imagine that anyone would fire a shot at the President of the U.S. with any other purpose than to kill. We are also told that "...all code books aboard the bombers of the Strategic Command were missing" after the shooting (65), a sensationalized variation on the theme that the code book *on the Cabinet plane bound for Tokyo* was missing. Also, the autopsists at Bethesda were "outraged by almost everyone in the room." (This overlooks the presence of corpsmen, photographers, x-ray techs, two FBI men, and at least 4 Secret Service agents, none of whom