

Rep 2

July 27, 1964

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Alfred Goldberg
FROM: Howard P. Willens
SUBJECT: Appendix on Allegations

I have a few general comments:

(1) As I mentioned to you previously, I think you should consider drawing on the F.B.I. reports which reflect investigation of a wide range of allegations and rumors, and use a few examples in your introduction to the body of your draft.

(2) I think you should consider providing more detailed answers to the more important allegations. By this I mean only an additional two or three sentences which would summarize the findings set forth in the body of the report. An alternative which you might want to consider is to supply a summary of the Commission's findings in the beginning of each section (such as the section on the source of the shots), and then settle for more abbreviated responses to the allegations.

Some specific suggestions which come to mind are the following:

(1) In the allegation on page 2 respecting the guarding of the overpass, it is an open question whether the people on the overpass other than the Dallas policemen were authorized or unauthorized. I think the instructions were to exclude everyone from the overpass, which would have excluded terminal or railroad company employees. Obviously the instruction was not so interpreted by the two patrolmen on this overpass.

(2) In the next allegation, it is not completely accurate to say that witnesses on the overpass confirm that the shots came from the depository. These witnesses, like others on the scene, believe that the shots came from a wide variety of directions. Most of those who have any recollection of direction, however, do state that the shots apparently came from the corner of Elm and Houston.

cc: Mr. Rankin
Mr. Redlich
Mr. Willens

(3) In the allegation at the bottom of page 4, you suggest that the remains of two bullets have been located and identified. The fragments permit the conclusion only that at least two shots were fired, since the remains discovered may have, in fact, come from three separate bullets.

(4) At the bottom of page 5 I am not as confident as you are that the Presidential car did not slow down slightly after the firing of the first shot. I do not think that Greer accelerated until after the second shot hit the President.

(5) On page 8 you make reference to the hole in the back of the President's head, of which the doctors were not aware. Neither were they aware of the hole in the back of the President's neck. Both wounds should be mentioned and care taken to distinguish them.

(6) On page 11 your reference to "the Elm Street access" is not consistent with the way we have described the roads in the text. I think it is best to reserve the Elm Street reference for the road leading down to and under the Triple Underpass. The road branching over to the Stearns Freeway should be referred to as the access road to the Stearns Freeway.

(7) On page 19, I do not think we should suggest that it is probable that it was the first or third shot that missed rather than the second. I have always subscribed to the "second shot missing" school of thought around the Commission and recent evidence has tended to corroborate me.

Also on page 19, I think that you will be able to enlarge on the Oswald capability problem once the section of the chapter has been written dealing with this. I would not emphasize Oswald's qualifications as a sharpshooter in the Marines. It also may be possible to suggest, based on the testimony, that the shot was not very difficult.

(8) On pages 21-22 you deal with the Irving Sports Shop problem. It is very likely that this will be the only place in the report where this is dealt with in detail, although we may try to work it into the conspiracy chapter.

(9) On page 47 I think it is a mistake to suggest that Oswald's name was on file in the F.B.I. office in the category of people to be checked up on. This suggests something other than the fact that Oswald was the subject of a continuing investigation by the F.B.I.