

John & John

TEB-1644

Found 2 missing links

Perjury (of Subornation) in dictators
Oswald JUNE agent

John to FBI 12/63 at lastest!!

Larry generally says he agreed but
wants to strain at Red words as
John feared.

Told me 2 disquieting things.

Asks to learn about contract &
said Van said 50-50 on all. I
said no, I improve on ^{what you}
said was generous. That is it.

I also think he can & should do it
without ^{to types} advance, which I may
need for typing but I will if he
insist keep my word in this.

And he said you changed your
mind about contract & want

one. Is this why I haven't got-
ten it by mail as you said?

As long as contract says what we
agreed to I am satisfied. But

on Larry's part it has to specify
performance or he served no
purpose. He acted as though

he wanted to buy the 26 vols.

to do what I can do in g. No.

I think we can get Lane's
book now, but only if he sits
down & writes something

else. If he cannot or will not we can do one of 2 things - get someone else or I'll stop research & write it myself. With the fatigue we have from the great concentration we have put into this, that will not result in one best-written book, but I will get it done. I think he should be able to turn out the book in 30 days from receipt of material. If you agree, put that in contract. If you agree & he will not guarantee this, then I'll do it alone, get my own collaborator, or you get one - or just get a ghost. But there ~~can~~ be no delays. I should have had the contract before proceeding with anything to Larry. He said he thought you could have the contract drawn by Monday & we could get it signed & agreed to then.

I said I would be in NY by noon & would have all or enough of the material by then. We have lost almost a week on this, which I regret, but I think we can still get ~~done~~ ^{done} & I want to

The contract should specify the way it is to be done, and it should be done as we agreed, in keeping with the agreed title, which he liked & agreed to, The Ruben or the Warren Report.

This is, & I told him, why I am willing to share.

I don't think this is the kind of a book that requires a "name".

It is state what the commiss in said
and then prove this false by the com's
own evidence & to conclude that now
the job is to be done, completely, completely
in public, possibly by Congress.

No speculation, no conjecture, no purple
prose, and no private investigations
by the writer, Harry or anyone else.
Otherwise, we can not get done. If Harry
has doubts of the Mings I say, all of
my material has page references.

We have been working up to 5am often
1 ~~pm~~ ^{a.m.} & how long we can continue I
don't know. But we can't waste what
we have done with delays.

I think it would speed things up if I
know the provisions of the contract in
advance & could, if necessary, have
my lawyer check them. Harry said
he'd call you today & you & he
should be able to agree & it would be in
the mail tonight. I have to be in D.C.
tomorrow & I can give you an address
There, my lawyer's office - EB&H, Sp. Del.

Can be less than 500 pages & still do it.

I am giving up what looks like it will
amount to a lot of money, and I think in
return I should get what I can giving it up
for - speed & conformity with what we

over 400
page now

agreed to.

Index for re-runs - also affecting of
new material as it is developed

Do I understand my part of contract
is standard re: my return, better, or what?

Target date 1/31/68?

Items - I
Destruction of autopsy notes
" " " " alleged rifle tag
Brennan's description "most
probable" source of police ass.
description. Police must
know source. But without
Brennan there is nothing to
account for the broadcast
description. And he didn't
see what he said he saw. So,
where did it come from? And
if from Brennan, how could
police have failed to search
this spot immediately?

Pres's lat wound called
back wound - p. _____

12/17 - Marina letter re 11/11/00 -
wants get test in my (with out
paying) ...
test in my old Green
copy. Judiciary Committee has
to try them.

Yet more was ordered. Det. Shuff
Luke Mooney "hit" file of boxes
about 1 pm, about 1:12 he found cart-
ridge cases, following which (p 79)
Capt Fritz was notified in an un-
specified way. Fritz in an un-
specified way to unspecified people
issued ~~unspecific~~ instruction that
nothing be moved or touched until
technicians take photos & fingerprints.
Then Lt. Day arrived (at an un-
specified time) and took photographs
of the cartridge cases before anything
had been moved. How about these

photos & fingerprints? It is clear from the context that these
things are not listed in chronological order & that Lt Day
arrived after the discovery of the rifle at 1:22. In other words,
if Brennan gave an immediate eye-witness description, it
was still about an hour or perhaps more, ~~before~~ before higher
ups were on the scene & there never was an order to
search the spot Brennan (if others) described.

Fritz (#3,289) "picked up the cartridge cases, began to
examine them." !!! (money) No evidence yet were taken of
rifle after it was discovered & before it was moved! Pres
all over the place.

(First?)

(D)

Reference to "found" bullet (p 79) is not foot note. But on p 81 the
moving of the gun from the emergency to the operating room is;
to the test in my (H 11516) of nurse Paula Jeanette Stand-
ridge who helped witness gunner, saw no bullet, heard none fall, says
Pres was also under the completely standard practice. She gave gunner

Clothing of Cliff Carter of his staff after speaking to Hosp Administrator (p. 118) apparently without police SS or FBI not rest. There then follows several sentences that do not follow logically, about something being found later in the office of Long Grayley of Texas. The hat was found is not indicated. Nurse Gene ^{Winters} ~~Winters~~ follows VI H 120 B.

(D)

But as was with stretcher when wheeled out of operating room. Joe's clothes in paper sacks on bottom of stretcher, from which he was transferred to operating table, in hallway outside operating room. She describes things that were on stretcher, how she rolled up sheets, one inside the other (12) turned it over to orderly R. J. Jimison. Sharp sheet on which ~~Joe~~ ^{Joe} was lying dying had only ~~been~~ ^{been} ~~found~~ ^{found} it. Not asked about bullet. The testimony had been "highly rehearsed" (so had St. Michaels) & she had been interviewed at unspecified time by Saint Dennis.

(E)

Op. Room Technician was Henrietta M. Fox ~~123-4~~ 6H 123-4. She was on guard outside operating room & saw stretcher under Jimison's control outside Room 3.

(D) R. J. Jimison, 6H 125/B Parkland Hosp orderly. He helped transfer ~~Joe~~ ^{Joe} from stretcher to operating table & put stretcher on elevator. Saw nothing unusual on stretcher. No bullets. Had been rehearsed.

(D)

Dwight C. Tomlinson, senior engineer at Parkland Hosp. 6H 128/B Had been sent to mount ~~down~~ ^{down} from ~~stretcher~~ ^{stretcher} to operate it.

Removed stretcher & put against wall near another stretcher. He is uncertain & appears reluctant but he said that after he had occasion to move the stretcher that had been there - not ~~loosely~~ ^{loosely} - he "bumped" it against the wall, "a spent bullet or cartridge rolled out that apparently had been lodged under the edge of the mat." There is no question or discussion of it, but ~~Joe~~ ^{Joe} "mat" means mattress. He & ~~then~~ ^{then} said there was a bumper around ~~the~~ ^{the} stretcher. How the bullet could have gotten out of ~~Joe~~ ^{Joe} ~~loosely~~ ^{loosely} body ~~from~~ ^{from} the mattress of a different stretcher is not addressed. Counsel ~~later~~ ^{later} ~~tries~~ ^{tries} seems to try & trick him into changing his identification.

of the stretchers, it may have been an accident, but if so, it was certainly the kind of "accident" the commission needed. ~~There~~ also there were times when he was away from the stretchers & the one between the time he took Connolly's stretcher off the elevator & the time the bullet fell to the floor. When she counsel pushes him about the identification of the stretcher, Tomlinson makes a point of saying he isn't changing his story & has no way of knowing what happened to the stretchers, if anything, in his absence. When Specter pushes the secret service agent who did not convince Tomlinson to saying the bullet came from Connolly's stretcher (and another stretcher is proved to have been Connolly's - it is again ~~just~~ ^{supposed to be} just a stretch) Tomlinson still won't change his story. So Specter concentrates on trying to confuse him & gets him to repeat that he just isn't sure. In p 134 Tomlinson says he doesn't really know where the stretcher he took off the elevator came from!! This is anything but the story of the "found" bullet in the Report! The Report misrepresents this testimony in a way ~~that~~ ^{that} cannot be regarded as accidental.

Even the attempt to get all the witnesses to say what was on the stretcher fails. They don't agree!

D Diane Hamilton Brown (134/10) emergency room nurse. She took a stretcher to the emergency entrance, helped with Kennedy throughout. Four stories are introduced to exhibit. They are not printed the way it is possible to tell if & where they are printed.

U. Miss Margaret M. Hanchette (139/10), nurse in emergency room who helped with President. 12 yrs experience. In p 136 she is asked if she saw "any other (than her) wound on President's body" and replied negatively. No one could, ~~except for~~ for his clothes covered the other wounds, as Specter shows. She names ⁽¹⁴¹⁾ doctors who were present who are not named in Report. She says she has had much experience with gunshot wounds, that this was an entrance wound, & that she had never seen an exit wound that looked like this one. After she was released, Specter

on one point of Kennedy's wounds

Called her back to ask if she had any other information re
 gunshot wounds of the man summoned she couldn't remember but
 told her a post bullet that... soft tissue might make an
 mark on... embolus in chest wound.

D Mrs. Davis Mae Nelson ^{LH#} 143-8, nurse, supervision, emergency
 room. Corroborative of what happened in Emergency Room, also
 said a stretcher that had been in that room was removed ^{when}
 Kennedy brought in. After Kennedy put into cabinet, ~~the~~ his
 stretcher was moved into other Emergency Room, after strapping

D.
(LH 148-52)
changed time
of Presid. visit
arrived in Wash
Emergency room from
12:38 to 12:43

Charles Jack Price, administrator, Parkland Hosp. Had seen
 individuals who participated in the case & treatment of
 President Kennedy and Governor Connally... prepare &
 submit reports... "Statement entered into record an -
 sum when in most if not all cases, could have been
 given by people who executed them. H. Geyman
 "wrote" his. Kennedy & Connally originally mis -
 identified car records. (also p 149) say without any question that he

D) Michael O. Couch ^{LH#} 153/WFAA-TV news cameraman,
 ministerial student. Saw 5th & 6th car of motorcade which was
 "clipping along" after they turned into Houston & offered photos
 as proof of speed. Car 15-20 feet past turn into Houston
 at first shot. 50-60 feet past turn into Elm when
 he heard 3rd shot. Saw about a foot of people faced as it was
 with drawn into building but no person after coming from
 Bob Jackson, who had seen rifle.

(Did any of these press people notify police of what they saw -
 and was they asked if they had by commission?)

Exposed footage as his car turned into Elm, including part
 con of report by Bely, which Commission has. Note was it
 determined for Ladd's? Some of photos printed out right
 after the car turned into Elm; the others preserved the
 drive so let them out about 75 yds past 11th & Couch got some
 "surprising pictures" of the crowd after he ran back, possibly
 including part don not over 1 1/2 mins after 3rd shot. Enlarge -
 ments might show identity of the people in front of car on leaving.

Note this: When he was "standing on that little

11/11/5

sideways ~~that runs~~ between the Book Depository property & the beginning of the parkway" ... "It's there that I saw blood on the sidewalk." (1/15/64) He makes specific identification of this spot where there was an 8-10 inch diameter blood area & is then asked questions I think were intended to confuse him. The distance from the car is in fact not of any unnecessary extent. He located a specific place that required no estimates. At this point the questioner, Asst. Counsel David W. Bolen, leaves the subject, without seeking to learn if it could be related to the location of the President's car at the time of his head wound. Very likely because it would have placed the spot undeniably by close to the first wound location to suit the Commission's preconceived designs.

Quotes Lee Wise KRLD-TV, re rumor Wise saw Ruby leave Depository 5-10 minutes after assassination. (Check to see if Commission checked this) (Wise not in report)

Says FBI got his statement of 10 seconds lapse between shots wrong - that he has to time his film & shot periods & 10 seconds - "That's a long time". Says there is five seconds ~~less~~ at the longest. Estimate angle of rifle when he saw it as "approximately a 45° angle westward."

DLH 102

Tom C. Dillard, Dallas Morning News photographer & head of its photographic department. 46 yrs old, also reporter (46 yrs old) Says car both in position but was to have been closer / as pool press car to have "spot news" as "prime photographic car" but "he lost our position at the airport." No questions asked by Asst. Commission Counsel Joseph A. Ball.

They could see President's car "on very few occasions in high rises in the ground" in the entire trip in town. He identified sounds as rifle shots, compare with agents, who referred only to "pops", backfires, etc. Others also identified them as shots & rifle shots - why not agents?

17 pms-6

On p 164 he says he got 2 pictures of the body as soon as the third shot was fired. (~~doesn't~~ ~~the~~ ~~report~~ ~~case~~ ~~of~~ ~~refer~~ ~~to~~ ~~only~~ ~~A~~?) He had had 2 cameras ready & was watching tops of all steps along route (pictures show secret service house), "which, of course, is a newspaper's line on a police false shot."

He is "a gun nut", has "a great ~~various~~ number of high-powered rifles... so know a bit about guns." He said with respect to the origin of the shots "We were getting a sort of re-echo, which made it difficult to pinpoint the actual direction." and "I very definitely smelled gun powder when the car moved up at the corner." Could he have, if ~~he~~ ~~did~~, smelled gun powder from a 6th floor flat, if he really did smell gun powder? With a "breeze with wind"? Ball drops this line of questioning right there.

D6H167ff

James Robert Underwood, ext news director, RR10-TV & Radio for photo car with Dillard & others. His camera was taken to Sheratonade ("I thought it was the fastest motorcade that passed through a crowd; this was nearly morning...") was going so fast he couldn't get to step it for a good one with his assistant stationed along the route. He says car was closer to Elm than main ~~area~~ at time of first shot, which he said sounded like an explosion (Dillard says "bumped") which he attributed to a reverberation (the same word Dillard used). But the second and third shots sounded different & he "realized" they were shots again, as Dillard had. He said of the first "I have heard many rifles fired but it did not sound like a rifle to me." On origin, he specified only last 2 sounded as though they came from "over head", from the Department. When Johnson said he saw a rifle Underwood looked and saw nothing.

(7 Nov -)

why didn't
police
check
after
at
reported
from
person

He ran back and got a camera span again so one
important saw people "most of the people in the
area were running up the grassy slope toward the
railway yards" behind the Depository "I recognized
at least a dozen deputy sheriffs running also in
that area" He shot some film. He then went
back to the Elm & Houston entrance of the Depository
and took some pictures of men "going in and out of
the bldg." At that time the police had Evans at
their door, and he quotes Evans Evans, who was
himself a negro, as telling the police he saw a
colored man lean out the window with a rifle.
He also says that when closely questioned by the police
Evans insisted it was a colored man.

Underwood remained there & took pictures. He says
"there was quite a time lapse between the time
the shots were fired and the time anyone checked
the building." It is clear he meant by this
"kept the spot clear out" note "out" only - no
reference to denying 24IT (p. 170) Earlier he had
reported taking pictures of men "going in & out of
the building." Apparently the Commission
didn't check for his film & accepted his statement
that "during jamming when things had calmed
down" he had checked his films for several days
and found no "face that would be ~~important~~
have been important to this" Why didn't the
government do this? Is there any excuse for this
obvious fault? And immediately!!! And why
were not he & Phil and specifically asked if they had
reported what they saw to police? And how would
police have failed to ask them? Among the other
than obvious values of this film to the Commission
and the police - and unless the conclusion of
Oswald alone was already from typed text
could anyone know what face a face were

Items 8

input out - was when, by whom, was seen or how the building was sealed. At least, of course. Is it that the Commission report have proof that it was in, which would have in fact contradicted Smell's story of the phone?

None of this is referred to in the report, which is also incorrect in its indexing of Underwood. (He is briefly mentioned on p. 65, but the index says 64 & 65) However, on p. 64 the Commission states that at 12:38, after speaking to Evans, Sgt Harkness radioed his report of the 2:15 pm shooting to headquarters, making even more inexplicable the failure of the police to order an immediate search & quarantine of the area if the Commission's failure goes into why not!

CH 1 Dr. Charles J. Carrico D. by Specter He wants to "prove
qualify in my books in general surgery" (Pressure point?)
gives different time of bullet than in statement? (12:30 vs
12:45?) His descriptive language is 100% technical (p3) & ~~leave~~
was asked to explain what any of it means, although on p2 he
is asked what "agonal" meant. If the point needs wound he
says "there were no jagged edges." There is ~~first~~ persistent
pneumothorax-like questioning about whether he or anyone saw
the president's back, and no word other than "back" is used.
Again on p4 Specter returns, persistently, to the "back" side of the doctor
had examined the Pres's clothes, even though Carrico had already
explained they had to do just things just in a desperate
effort to save the ~~pres~~ Pres. During this questioning there is
(p4) a clear inference of an effort to embarrass Dr Carrico, or
get him to change his testimony before the deposition was
begun. He had called the point needs wound that of
entrance. Specter had not made any reference to entrance
a bit ~~was~~ but was passing Dr C. when the doctor said
of his hasty examination in for a major back wound
"now this certainly would not detect a small bullet
entrance" !! On p3 he described the point wound as
"4-7 mm." which may or may not be the same as the
report says "4x7 mm." The ~~first~~ quote in the report
is not flat in any event. On p5 Specter gets him to
say the point wound could have been either entrance
a bit. Then (p6) Specter shows him Exhibit 392 his own
At a time of 1630 hours 11/21/63, and asks "are the facts set forth
in these true & correct?" to which Carrico replies "They are." But
in this exhibit Dr Carrico describes this point needs wound as a
"small penetrating wound." When asked if he'd been previously
interviewed Carrico refers to a Secret Service interview shortly
after the President's death (his own description by exhibit C-5)
Then Specter again returns to his effort to destroy the doctor's
best opinion that the point was the entrance wound.
~~Carrico~~ Carrico's replies are evasive. He says that they were

Carrico - 2

asked "what he felt the wounds were from, the direction, and so forth," and Specter's replies were "Essentially the same as have (given) me. Said I don't remember specifically." I believe an examination of the Secret Service report will, in fact show that Carrico was shot of the spine in the front neck was the entrance wound. He was ~~prepared~~ rehearsed in his ~~test~~ interview before the taking of the deposition by Specter. He also ~~is~~ asked "Have you ever changed any of your opinions regarding your treatment of and observations of President Kennedy?" and he replies "Not as I recall." This is an obviously false statement (see exhibit 392) into which Specter clearly misled him.

Note that on page 5 asked Dr. Carrico for an opinion based on a set of medical circumstances about the President's injuries, and included as this "without violation of the pleural cavity." Compare this with the apparent source of Specter's medical information, the autopsy report, exhibit 357 on ⁵³⁸ page 357 ff. At the top of p 542 there is this language referring to "the right pleural cavity," "In this region there is contusion of the parietal pleura and of the extreme apical portion of the right upper lobe of the lung" etc. Is this a description of "without violation of the pleural cavity"? Yet this questionably Specter's is the basis for Dr. Carrico's answer about the neck wound & the path of the bullet, which "would very likely not tumble, thus producing a small, round, lacerated wound", etc.

6H7H Dr. Malcolm Oliver Perry, D. by Spectra Perry is best.
Prof of surgery at Southwestern Medical School of The U of
Texas. When he got to emergency room, Dr. Carnes was already
working on Pres. Kennedy. Spectra is very vague on time,
i.e., "shortly after 12:00 on Nov. 22." (The times fixed
by the various medical people as already noted in
the analysis of the Report, do not agree). Perry sent
Jay who was in the emergency room. He said the
size of the front neck wound was about 5mm which he then
says was as precise a description as he could give. He asked
Dr. Carnes if ~~there~~^{there} was a wound in his neck or had he begun a
tracheotomy. Then he anticipates Spectra by saying "I
did not turn him over." (Was he too well rehearsed, too
cooperative?) P on p. 10 Spectra returns to the question
of time & misrepresents what Perry said about the time
in ~~an~~ a transparent effort to place as early as possible a
time (Remember the Oswald time reconstruction;
remember the attraction of the records from 12:43 to
12:38 re: arrival?) When Perry volunteers that when he
had done what he could do - before the work on the President
was completed & before he was pronounced dead - he
rested for 10 or 15 minutes then went to help with Connally,
and that this was around 1:15 or 1:20, also to help Dr.
Spectra, Spectra abruptly changes the line of questioning
to ~~go into~~ get a lengthy explanation in medical terms,
of ~~the procedures~~ "the procedures" in detail, the
procedures used on the President. He seems to indicate
an airway to the lung or pleural space, having seen
things that "could be indicative of a wound of the right
hemithorax." (p 10). Spectra also (willingly & entirely
unnecessarily) accepted hearsay. P on the bottom of p 11
Spectra says he had earlier asked if ~~then~~ Perry had
turned the President over (false - Perry had anti-
cipated Spectra) & then asks, again only to establish
part of an unfair and inappropriate prosecution case,

Why did you not turn them over to the...
conclusion of these forensic procedures? The apparently
well-informed Perry replied "I did not have a specific
reason... There was nothing further that I could do."
The truth, as is clear on p. 10 and as Speer clearly
knew, is that Perry was not even there! This is a
loaded question. It is dishonest. And its only possible
purpose is deception. P. M. J. R. B. admitted that at a
press conference 11/16/67 he said the front neck wound
(the only one of which the Dallas doctors knew) would
have been an entrance wound. He says this was
speculation. This whole thing strikes me as another of
the Commission's straw-man lectures & if possible the
Doctor's testimony should be compared with the TV
or radio tapes that should exist. On the more important
point of whether the neck was an entrance wound
if there had been more than one bullet he seems
to be evasive. P. He is then asked about a press conference
he gave at McAllen, Tex., a few days after the assassina-
tion. Again he is evasive in answer to only a general
question, and there is a pretty clear hint that he then
said something the Commission is now unhappy
about because it conflicts with the Commission's
preconception. Speer is careful to drop this after Perry's
single, evasive answer. P. Then Speer goes into the
autopsy report and again uses the language
"without venturing the pleural cavity," getting the
desired answer from Perry that the description
would be "entirely compatible" with what he had seen.
The attempt to cover up last witness on p. 15, where Perry indicates
the things he has particular saying are not as to there was
nothing saying them, by inference ~~that~~ that the neck wound was
of entrance. He then falsely says he initially described the
wound as "between 3 and 5 cm" and "roughly spherical."
~~but~~ Actually, the measurement was much smaller,
in m.m.

Perry 3. on p 16 Perry admits he had 2 conversations with Mr. James Humes of News Corp, Bethesda. Although the Commission has always rehearsed its witnesses, Perry has insisted that at first either ~~he~~^{she} was Friday (as he thought) or Saturday, at Spectra Hotel, ~~Bethesda~~ (His McAllen Pres Conference was the following Tuesday) He then decides it was Saturday. He says he also told Mr Humes the Dallas doctors had not examined the President back (Between this statement & the Washington Post story, if the Bethesda doctors were looking for a way to ~~set~~ claim in the post neck as an entrance wound, which would free Clinton Oswald, already in custody, as the sole suspect, the Bethesda doctors had some help)

On the top of page 17 Spectra asks Perry about a copyrighted story in the NY Herald Tribune dealing with the treatment of the President. This story is not described and, based on reference to the press accounts have been treated, is muddled with great vagueness. Spectra asks "Was the content of that story accurate?" and Perry replies "There were certain inaccuracies -" but doesn't say what they were and isn't asked! "at least"

He was ~~interviewed~~ interviewed on 3 occasions by the Secret Service & says he can't remember the names of the agents on the last 2 occasions. Asked the name of the first agent, he can't remember that either. Asked if "there was" any variation in the information which you have given the Federal investigators? He answered "No, Sir; not in essence" and then says "There may have been a variation in wording or sequence..."

He also spoke to 2 FBI men whose names he also doesn't recall. He says they asked "Essentially the same questions in regard to what I might speculate as to the origin of the missiles and their trajectory, and

Perry 4 I replied to them as I have to you that I could not ascertain this of my own knowledge, and described the wounds to the extent I saw them" (my emphasis). This is a highly improbable if not false representation of the blind questions asked of him. They should have wanted just not speculation, unless they were trying to get him to change the stories he had given out. The ~~exam~~ commission had the names, dates and what the agents quoted Perry as saying. None of it is here. It is clear Specter is only trying to patch up whatever he can ~~do~~ then immediately drops it. Specter also had rehearsed Perry (page 18) just before the deposition-taking began. began. He was told to be in Washington 9 a.m. Monday. He also is an Here ✓ another haul loader of ammunition.

3H366-390 In Perry appeared before the commission 3/30/64 with Specter again doing the great inking. It soon became clear that he had learned something from Specter in Dallas. For ~~example~~ example on p 366 he gives a number for the gunshot wounds he has seen, whereas he availed this with 18. And on 367 he gives Specter the 12:30 time for the call to assistance for the President, which he hadn't done on 6/10 men after Specter had there said "... you knew it was 12:30..." On p 368 he gives the size of the ~~face~~ neck wound as 5 mm on his face also Dallas didn't know enough about what happened to know that Dr. Carnio, who had just testified, was present. He was, in fact, the first doctor there and Perry had testified had been in charge until Perry arrived.

On p 370, in describing his operation, Perry said "let that point I was down in the trachea". ~~Does this~~ Does this indicate the trachea was lower in the President's body than the point at which Perry saw the bullet hole & from which he began the

Perry 5 (Richard) My? He says he "in used the unwrapped at the point of the bullet injury. Hence he had a way of knowing the path of the bullet, even though he was not asked it (which should have been only too obvious), and even though he denied it at the deposition taking (B H 11), where he said what about the "cause" of the injury or the trajectory (absence in the deposition) to this perjury? (asked the time of death (372) he replied "Approximately 1 o'clock." But on L H 10 he said he had left & worked up & was resting when the President was pronounced dead. On 372 he says of the neck wound "Its edges were neither ragged nor were they punched out but rather clean." On L H he had said "... but the blood obscured any detail about the edges of the wound exactly."

Asked if he can state whether it was an entrance or exit wound (373) he replied "No, sir. I was unable to determine that since I did not ascertain the exact trajectory of the missile." Perhaps "it is" keep this part of the sentence from being false because he had the requirements the trajectory (p 370) the point of entry or exit & the point of "bullet injury" to the wind pipe, which he indicated on that page was, from the point, "down." P Specter then asks him to "assume" certain "facts" and goes into a similar description to that he gave Corio (L H 5) & Perry (L H 14) but this time adding something missing from those two, after the words "without violating the pleural cavity," with out anything appearing between, "but bruising the apex of the right pleural cavity and bruising the most apical portion of the right lung..." He reiterates the point could have been the exit wound, exp on p 374, in the light of the autopsy report, which he had seen.

On the bottom of this page they begin to discuss the press conferences. When asked what was asked at the first press conference, about 2 p.m. 11/12/63, he is again evasive, saying he doesn't recall them "with accuracy" but they were "similar" to the questions that were asked here. The answers he gave

Perry 6

"essentially the same, but in my case as in the case of the
given here." He is asked several questions in regard to the
They were asked and how he answered them. He is,
again, not asked the obvious question, as at Dallas, trying to
be asked had he said the neck wound was an entry
wound - with the head wound separate?

Conrad Ford asks if any recordings were made of
Spectra replies "That was one of the things I was
mad about my Ford" I can imagine just
how mad!!! He admits there were tape recordings
made (God knows how many!) of TV sound, and
"I know there were recordings made but who
made them I don't know" He then gets incoher-
ent. He doesn't once say he tried to find out who
had recordings or if anyone did. The networks &
local stations were, of course, obvious places to look
also, a clipping service would reveal any impositions
in the papers, at least on points of agreement, nor
does Spectra say he looked in that direction.
When Ford asks if there was an "official recording either
made by the hospital officials or by the White House
people or by any government agency?" Perry
answered "Not to my knowledge" and of
course, it can be assumed he had no knowledge.
But Spectra remained mute. When Ford repeated
the question, rephrased, Spectra again remained
mute. Wells asks "Was there any reasonably
good account in any of the press of this in Texas?"
and Perry says "No, Sir." Either he saw little or
nothing, or the whole press was wrong, for they
all covered it, or he was a liar! Then Ford asks
if the reports by the news media accurate or in-
accurate" and Perry replies "In general, they were
inaccurate." He weasels a little by saying he
was out of town & "didn't ~~see~~ ^{read} a lot of them."
He doesn't say how or on what he was requested.

were

Perry? And they all manage to ~~the~~ wrong answers only
specific questions, especially the obvious one.
By the bottom of page 374 Perry finally gets specific
of complaints about the various letters having the wrong letters
assigned them.

Then McCloy gets to the neck wound & asks if
Kennedy would have survived it. Perry said he
didn't even think Kennedy's speech would have
been impaired, for the wound was "below the
larynx." On the top of 377 McCloy asks if
Perry ever called it an exit wound &
Perry replied, "No sir; Obed not." But even
this close, the crucial question - "exit" - is
not asked by anyone.

Later, in the middle of the page McCloy asks
if ~~the~~ he discussed "with any of the other doctors" at the
time "whether this was an exit wound or an entrance
wound?" Perry says "Yes, sir; we did at the time."
He then evades the answer, without anyone trying to
pin him down even to this, which still is not
what he told the press. He is a single newspaper, radio
or TV version referred to or even listed at!

~~off~~ After an off the record discussion Dulles
suggests (bottom of 377) to Specter "if you feel it is
feasible, you send to the doctor the accounts of his
press conference or press conferences," and that
Perry, "if you are willing, sir, you could send
us a letter... pointing out... where you are in-
accurately quoted... Is that feasible?" Imagine!
No direct order, not under oath, if he feels like, if
it is "feasible"!! Perry says it is feasible!!
On 378 Perry says "I can & will do this."

Specter then refers to a non-existent part of the
Perry deposition (if it refers to McClelland's it is a non-
sequitur) relating to a clipping from "La Express,"
(sic) & he continues "and I questioned the doctors

Perry 8

quoted therein and developed for the record what
was true & what was false in the statement attributed
to them, so we have conducted where that in some circles
but not as you suggest to Mr. Perry because he
has been trying diligently to get the tape records
of the television interviews, and we were unsuccessful.
I discussed this with Mr. Perry in Dallas Wed-
nesday (note - not in the deposition, where the
part of the press interviews begins on 6/12 & the
only paper referred to is on 6/17 - The New York
Herald Tribune, with no reference to anything
it said), and he expressed an interest in seeing
them and told him we would make them
available to him prior to his appearance before
deposition, before the committee, except our
efforts at CBC and NBC, ABC and everywhere including
New York, Dallas and other cities were to no
avail. "What does this mean?" "Last Wednesday"
was March 25, 1964, four months after the assassina-
tion. Didn't they then know whether or not
they could locate the tapes - and it is inconceiv-
able that they couldn't. If they couldn't, why not
show him the newspaper? He certainly knew
Wednesday, if that is what he said, whether he
could have them before Monday, 5 days later. This
is a monstrously elaborate ~~stare~~ diversion.

Spenta then said (and there is nothing omitted
from the beginning of the direct quotation above)
"The problem is they have not yet catalogued all
the footage which they have, and I have been ad-
vised by the Secret Service, by Agent John Hewlett,
that they have in excess of 200 hours of transcripts
covering all of the events and they just have not catalogued
them and could not make them available." Presumably
the "they" here refers to the media, not the Secret
Service. Spenta then asks "Do you intend to catalogue them?"

July 9

Spota replied "Yes, they do, Mr. Dulles. They intend to do that eventually in their normal process, and the Secret Service is trying to expedite the news media to give us these, and it was our thought to do the film clips, which would be the most direct of the recordings, which would be the most direct, to make comparisons between the reports in the news media and what Mr. Perry said is that fine, and the facts which we have from the dotas through our department transcript today."

Note confusion between Dulles' "you" and Spota's "they" above. Is it an accident, and is it conceivable that one person didn't type in N.Y.C. What was felt from Dallas on this? Is it conceivable that this business of "cataloguing" was anything but a diversion, an excuse to avoid confronting the data with what he had said that was opposed to what the Commission had already decided to try to establish, as best it could.

~~McClay~~ ~~Dallas~~ Spota says "it may be a matter of a couple of weeks before they can turn it over." There is then of the usual discussion following which McClay of Dallas laments their own diversions, McClay saying the dotas couldn't be asked to comment on all the things that had been said all around the world and Dulles opening, saying "we cannot run down all the rumors in all the press." What any of this has to do with specific answers to specific questions or any official proceedings I cannot see. The dotas still never asked if he said the news would use red ink, as Comiso's report did.

There then follows more than a page of general discussion in N.Y. Herald Tribune and Ad.

Perry 10

Evening Post Times say was accurate, you... dramatic, etc, but never once says what they said that was inaccurate, etc, and is never asked to say what was accurate. In fact, what they said, accurate or inaccurate, was not mentioned or asked by anyone

CH 47-8

While on p 377 Perry said "The only people who saw this (contaminated) wound for sure were Mr Carno and myself," he concedes on 381. When Spectra said that M.T. Jenkins claimed he had, Perry concedes he could hear. Both ignore the nurses, at least one of whom had already deposed having seen it and being positive it was the X-ray (see ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ Brown, ~~at~~ Hrenchcliffe, 64141)

Benton

Spectra says Dr. Jones also, and Perry concedes the possibility

On p 382 once again Perry is asked if the President was ever turned over at any time at Parkland, and he replied not to his knowledge (presumably in connection with the paternity "mark" wound. But the commission ignores ~~that~~ the fact that the President was unharmed, and was at least in part lifted for his and other purposes. It has referred to the paternity wound as a "mark" wound which by ~~in~~ inference should have been seen if he was raised. But it was, in fact, hidden by both his shirt & his coat.

On p 388 he says the neck (wound) wound was not ragged or pushed out in any way. When asked if there was any indication "that wound had come from the front" he said "There is no way to tell for sure" But he also ignores the probabilities. He then says if the bullet had not been deformed the wounds of entrance & exit would not be substantially widely different.

When on p 389 Dallas goes to the "found" bullet,

Perry 11

spect a say he has that all straightened out, "and, in fact it came from the stroke of governmentally."
He then says it was "found on a stretcher" and they have eliminated the possibility it was Kennedy's stretcher. He doesn't go ~~in~~ in to the ~~fact~~ details, which indicate the bullet was under the mattress (Tombrison) and at no point is there any quest in my to determine how it could possibly have gotten under the mattress. There was still another stretcher from which it could have come.

If anybody at any time came back to the question of the types of interviews, the newspaper or other accounts of what Perry said, there is no indication of it here or anywhere else I have thus far seen. It is not in the Report (naturally). But there is no cross-referencing between Perry's definition of fact in my before the Commission and the clear situation is that he was never confronted with the obvious question.

The question arises: why was Perry called to Washington before the Commission itself to duplicate what had already been covered in his deposition? Two of the possible answers: Because the Commission had some doubt about whether the anterior neck wound might have been one of entrance, thus destroying its entire "case" (and possibly a stiff effort to brown wash the Commission); and public comment on the nature of the wound - also opposed to the Commission's position.

~~Note that the two doctors, Jenkins & Jones, & Trause Henchcliffe, who continued to insist the anterior neck wound was one of entrance, were not called before the Commission! How biased can you get?~~

3723 / 10
Dunn - 1

Spector examining - detail of Threatment of Kennedy
at the bottom of p. 361. They go into the neck wound. Dulles asked
where it entered and Carnio who called it entrance in his
report said in reply "at the time we did not know -" Size, 5 to
8 mm. no jagged edges. Guest would be sure at the time he
did not have "a sufficient basis to form an opinion as to whether
it was an entrance or an exit wound" It could have been
either. Spector asks him to assume set of circumstances -
his version of the autopsy report - "no violation of pleural
cavity" With these facts, he says it was an exit wound,
or could have been. Then he qualified it further by
saying that he assumed "no other bullet was formed."
But we also know there was another bullet "formed" and
its source is unknown. It was never established even
as coming from the normally stretcher, as the commis-
sion assumes. Also, he says only if "no other bullet was
formed," so that even the "finding" of the so-called nor-
mally bullet can be interpreted to mean that Carnio
says, still, that this was an entrance wound.

He had 2 interviews with the Secret Service, one,
briefly, "shortly after the President's death," perhaps a
week later. The agents were concerned over whether
this was an entrance wound & he was given the best copy,
which led him to believe it could have been an exit
wound. Then, questioned, even though on 11/12/63 he
called this an exit entrance wound, he says he has not
changed his "opinion in any way" meaning his "observations
or ~~based~~ conclusions..." He mentions his report but
isn't asked what it said.

But on p. 365 he admits he hasn't read autopsy
report "carefully. I have seen it. Mr. Spector showed me
parts of it..." He also says he cannot recall making
any statements to the press in conflict with his
testimony.

CIA/R, MM. Kemp 6 H 18 dentist, neurosurgery, Parkland
① His time sequences show him not at all of the President's
injuries before they happened and put him in the emergency
room 13 minutes before he said in his statement (R516) that
the President was moved at the hospital. His handwritten note of 11/22/63,
dated 11:15 hrs, says that the incident began at 12⁰⁰ pm. Other
dentist's statements show Clark was also not just on the scene.
On 6 H 20 he is not if it is 4 who certainly he proceeded him;
possibly as many as 7.

11/22/63 Perry was at 2:30 engaged by White House
(Kilduff) He described head wound and quotes Perry
(6 H 22) as saying he "felt that one (pats) simple had
wounded the President's chest." And he says
Perry reported the wound "was small and clean so
it could have been an entrance wound."

He quotes Perry (6 H 23) as having "stated that he had
talked to the Bethesda Naval Hospital on 2 occasions
that morning ^(11/22) and that he knew what the autopsy
findings had shown and that he did not wish to be
questioned by the press, as he had been ~~asked~~
asked by Bethesda to confine his remarks to
that which he knew from having examined the
President, and suggested that the major part of
this press ~~conf~~ conference be conducted by me."

But on 6 H 16 Dr Perry had sworn ~~before the~~ ~~5 days~~
~~before the Commission~~ that Mr. Humes "told me, of
course, that he could not talk to me about any of it and
asked me to keep it in confidence, which I did..." And
5 days later, before the Commission (3 H 388), of the fact of
2 calls from Humes, "He advise me that he could not
discuss with me the findings of necropsy..." This would
seem to involve both perjury & the subornation of
perjury. It makes some sense of the treatment of
Perry both in deposition and before the Commission.
If Dr Perry, Carnio and others had been wrong about
the entrance neck wound, there was no reason why
they could not have just come out and admitted

Clark

It is ~~the~~ government officials ~~as~~ ~~can~~ ~~not~~ ~~have~~
done so. And why should Perry have lied about
what Holmes told him? Is it possible that, if this is
perjury, he committed it jumping entirely on his own
summary of the risk of jail and a ruined
career, and perhaps a unique note in the
annals of infamy?

And say Mr. Speer & Miss May have been present
when Perry made his statement.

Councilly was unconscious until next morning
in surgery (124)

On Feb 26 Speer who Rump is id out of 2 statements, he
made - the only ~~one~~ ~~one~~ ~~of~~ ~~which~~ ~~was~~ ~~handwritten~~ (R5245)
and is dated 11/24/63, 1615 hrs (4.15 p.m.)

once he made Clark said, Speer said of me "I
now show you ~~a 2^{3/4} page~~ ~~the~~ ~~second~~ ~~and~~ ~~third~~ ~~pages~~,
which purport to be the summary made by you
and ask if this was prepared by you?" And of the
second Speer said "and I now show you a 2^{3/4}
page summary which purports to bear your
signature, being dated Nov 22, 1963, and ask you
if that, in fact, is your signature?" Then Speer
asked "and was, in fact, this report made in your
own hand..." All Clark's responses confirm
Speer's questions.

But the facts are otherwise. There is a ^{2-page} hand-
written report, signed, dated Nov. 22, 1963, 1615 ^(R5245-5) hrs. There
is also a typed document, ^(R516-8) not in Clark's "own hand,"
about which there is some mystery. It is, in fact,
not dated. It is signed. The third page is num-
bered 2, and the second page, which appears to be
the first, is numbered 1. The first page ~~it~~ is not
complete and is ^{less than} ~~about~~ half page, with the word
"Statement" written in a neat hand in the upper
right. The rest of the sheet has been cut off and
the ~~re~~ reproduction shows only the part of the

Clark 3

page with typing. It seems to be in a different
typing than the other 2 pages. It is this part
which begins with the statement that the President
arrived at exactly 12:43 p.m. The second page goes
on a heading, "Summary." This also is one of
the copies the time of 12:43 wasn't changed to
12:38, important if the famous Oswald time
reconstruction isn't to be destroyed.

Clark ~~he~~ had earlier been interviewed by both the
FBI & Secret Service twice. On one occasion the
Secret Service asked if he "had a copy of the
written report submitted by Mr. Ronald Jones, and
I told him that I did not."

Copies of all the reports of all the doctors were kept
under Cook & Key at the hospital. It seems unlikely
that the Secret Service was in need of the report. In
view of the fact that Specter knew (3#351) Mr. Jones
insisted the author needs would not be reviewed, but
that the contract can be put on this that the Secret
Service would no copies ~~be~~ done

He also was rehearsed

Clark was questioned by Specter again 4 days later,
3/25/64. He is asked whether he ever made statements
quoted from the translation of an article from
the 2/20/64 issue of "L'Express" which in turn
quotes the New York Times of 11/27/63 as its source.
One is on the author needs would as that of en-
trance. He doesn't deny having said it. He
just says he doesn't recall having said it (6#28)
He also says Mr. Perry "assumed" the "penetration of the
missile into the chest." This addition also rehearsed.

6 H 45-51

Dr. Marvin Thomas Jenkins 3/25/64, anesthesiologist.
He saw the neck wound "before the tracheostomy was performed." (p 47) He says he should have put into his report that it was a "clearly demarcated, round, punctate" as those of entrance usually are. He had only a glance at it.

But on p 51 he said that at the time of the emergency he had thought "that the one bullet must have traversed his pleura, must have gotten into his lung cavity, his chest ~~cavity~~ cavity, I mean..." He said this mean, since he knew of no back wound, that he really thought the neck wound was of entrance? Rehearsed.

(B)
CH 51-57

Dr. Ronald Lay Jones 3/26/64, Resident Physician in Gen. Surgery at Cumberland. Saw exterior neck wound (p 53)

"No greater than a quarter of an inch in greatest diameter..." and it was "just above the suprasternal notch." In his report at the time of the emergency he had

said ~~the neck wound~~ he thought of the neck wound

"... thought to be a bullet entrance wound."

If it had been of exit "you would think that it exited at a very low velocity to produce no more damage than this had done..." It

would be "consistent... with an exit wound" only

if "of very low velocity to the point that you might think that this bullet ~~had~~ barely make it

through the soft tissues and just enough to drop out of the skin on the opposite side."

He saw as many cases of bullet wounds as "4 or 5 a night." Rehearsed.

(LH 55)

6H57-60

Dr. Don Ted Curtis, oral surgeon resident. Licensed dentist. Did not see "nature of the wounds" when he entered - just dent a after Carino. He alone so far of the dentos saw he didn't discuss the neck wound with the dentos. Released.

D 4461-63

Dr. FOUAD A. BASHOUR 3/25/64 ENT professor, cardiology saw nothing of neck wound. Retained what he did

Am Secret Service asked him, as it apparently asked cell dentos, if they had any memoranda of any thing else than in their reports. Released.

6H 43-68

Dr Gene Solomon 3/5/64, ~~anesthetist~~^{anesthesiologist} anesthetist. Did not see neck wound until after tracheotomy, called it "punctate wound" and "the thought passed through my mind that this might have been an entrance wound" (p. 65) But he also thought it could have been exit wound. Released.

D-4468-72

Dr. Paul Conrad Peters. 3/4/64. Ent. Prof. Urology. Kennedy had one bandage under brace, figure-8 wise, around lower pelvis & both thighs. Did not see neck wound. Released.