

Dear Jim, re possible 226 remark + FBI records I've just read

4/12/79

Attached is what may be the most scrupulous observance of the first law of the FBI - Cover The Bureau's Ass. It has importance, several, other than what the FBI intended.

These pages are from FBIHQ 62-109060, its "assassination" file, but not from the regular part of that file. It is Serial 4194 33F, which means it is an "enclosure behind file" as I recall, perhaps envelope. In general it represents a "bulky." It is from Part 2 of that 33F, a fat one.

What Griffith tells Conrad is a "review" of their printed testimony by Cadigan and Shaneyfelt is actually a word-by-word comparison from the attachment to this memo.

The comparison was between the edited testimony transcript, meaning what the typescript said after the agents went over it, and the printed version in the 26 volumes.

(Unless they took unusual liberties this kind of correcting and clarification of the typescript is perfectly proper, a long-standing practice.)

In particular I draw your attention to the series of apparent Commission alterations beginning on the second page with Volume V, page 154, line 8. This is the most common listing, of the elimination of (what I regard as proper and necessary) FBI cautions, if the bullet was undeflected.

It may become important if there is a remark in 226 and it is an important fact of the assassination, relating to Connally's wounds and the possibility of the single-bullet theory.

If it was not in the testimonies spoken it should have been added. It is an essential caveat from any point of view - because the agents had no way of knowing whether the path of the bullet was deflected, they would say, and because when it hit and broke his rib some deflection would have been inevitable.

This really tells you why the FBI has not come up with the results and reports we seek - they cannot confirm the official story. Rather it is one of the reasons they can't. The tests simply cannot confirm the official account, which is the capability of the tests.

And the FBI was merely keeping itself in the clear while staying not only within the bounds but within the requirements of expert testimony.

Shaneyfelt drafted the memo, which went to much of the top brass. The Central Records copy appears to have been the original adigan copy, which leaves the others to be accounted for and I believe represents unsearched files of the kind I tried to get "artingh to have searched in 75-1996. I'm not critical of this distribution. It is an important thing and the top brass should have been informed of such significant changes when the testimony was published. Remember, the world had access only to the published testimony.

The FBI appears to have caught the Commission and for its own purposes, even when Hoover angered and leaked what was embarrassing to the Commission when the report was out, did not let this out. But what extreme caution- or what paranoia! Or what sources on the inside.

Which reminds me, I have not ~~seen~~ seen any copies of any work that was required for the memo's preparation. I have seen the corrected transcripts, have them.

We may well be past the point where this can be relevant if we take further depositions, but not certainly so. This may be the basis for questioning on the need for reports to have been prepared and to exist - somewhere. Meanwhile, this confirms my very earliest writing and my 226 affidavits. (I'm pretty certain, by the way, the directly or indirectly the FBI provided ~~with~~ Pratt with what it calls "public source material" for his opinion. I can't imagine him taking the time of a clerk having the knowledge required to locate all those special citations he used, with the overights the FBI would prefer.