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Proceedings

Whereupon,

[2]

JAMES W. SIBERT

was called for examination by counsel for The

Assassination Records Review Board and, having been

first duly sworn by the notary public, was examined

and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR THE ARRB

BY MR. GUNN:

Q: Could you state your full name for the

record, please?

A: Yes, that's James W. Sibert, Sib-er-t.

Q: Mr. Sibert, I'm here on behalf of the

Assassination Records Review Board. As a part of

our work, we have taken the depositions of several

people who have been affiliated with issues related

to the autopsy and to medical evidence. And we are

wanted to talk to you today; in the light of

this other work that we're doing.

We have a few other people here from the

Review Board, whom I would like to introduce you

to. On my immediate right is Doug Hone, whom you

have met, and Tom Samoluk. At the back is Dr. Joan

Zimmerman.

THE WITNESS: How do you do?

BY MR. GUNN:

Q: Yes. I am.

Q: Have you spoken with him since the

deposition was set up?

A: No, not since this was set up.

Q: Other than Mr. Lifton's book about the

assassination, have you read any other books?

A: No, there is not.

Q: What I would like to do during the course

of this deposition is ask you a series of

questions.

A: Yes.

Q: Where you, please don't hesitate to ask me either to

rephrase the question or repeat the question.

BY MR. GUNN:

Q: Mr. Sibert, is there any reason that you

feel that you would not be able to speak with us

today candidly and openly about your memories of

issues related to the assassination of President

Kennedy?

A: No, there is not.

Q: Other than Mr. Lifton's book about the

assassination, have you read any other books?

A: No.

Q: Have you spoken with him since the

deposition was set up?

A: No, not since this was set up.

Q: Was it William Manchester?

A: Yes.

Q: You're referring to Mr. Lifton's book?

A: Lifton's, "Best Evidence"; right.

Q: Okay. Are you acquainted with Frank

O'Neill?

A: Yes, I am.

Q: Have you spoken with him since the

deposition was set up?

A: No, not since this was set up.

Q: Other than Mr. Lifton's book about the

assassination, have you read any other books?

A: Yes, I don't have the list of those

books, but there's several of them that I have.

Q: They're at home.

A: My memory on authors here.

But Crenshaw's book, I read it when

paperback, when it came out. One of the Dallas

doctors.

And one of the other books that I can't

recall. He was designated, I think, by the Kennedy

people to write a book -

Q: Was it William Manchester?

A: Manchester's book; right.
A: Yes, we received a call from Bureau headquarters - I guess, it was probably transferred through our Baltimore headquarters that they wanted these Secret Service agents interviewed. O'Neill and I went over and

A: Now I have read it, yes.
Q: And, so, the answer to the preceding question was, you have not previously seen the document 153.
A: This is the first time I've seen this.
Q: Okay. As you read through that - and I understand that you read it quickly - was there anything that stood out in your mind as something that appeared to you to be inaccurate, or refreshed your recollection about something that you had forgotten?
A: And, again, I'm not asking for a comprehensive statement, but -
Q: No, I understand. [Examining.]

On this page three here: "Question: Prior to SA Sibert's calling the FBI laboratory, did either Dr. Hume or Dr. Finck express an opinion as to whether the bullet wound in the back was a point of entry or a point of exit?"
A: In connection with the probing, I remember Humes saying that, it looked like a 40- or 60-degree downward angle that the bullet had entered the back.
Q: And as close as we were to the autopsy, I was as close as - closer than here to the recorders here - when we're looking at that. And we were at the rear most of the time there at the head. And you could see this tremendous head injury.
A: When you say as close to the reporter, you'd mean somewhere in the area of six to - eight feet?
Q: A: I'd say I was this - this close. Arm's length.
Q: Arm's length.
A: Yes.
Q: Somewhere around three feet?
A: About that. Right.
Q: Three to four feet.
A: Right.

Does Exhibit 153, to the best of your current recollection, reasonably fairly record the statements that you made to the FBI official about the interview with Mr. Specter?
A: It looks like it is accurate. It's been so long, and with no notes, - I can't recall exactly what was said.

Rosen, of course, was the - the head of that unit. And Malley, Jim Malley was his number one man, that O'Neill and I talked to when we went over there on March 12, 1964. It seemed like that there was one other occasion when we were called telephonically on something about whether it was our wording or the doctor's wording. And, of course, our position in that was that we were there in an observatory capacity that night. We had no authority or jurisdiction to conduct an investigation. We were there to observe, obtain any bullets, hand-carry them to the laboratory to preserve the chain of evidence. And that, in particular, there was the statement by Humes made when we first arrived when the body first came in, and they opened the casket. It was wrapped in sheets, a sheet around the body and a separate sheet around the head, which was blood-soaked.

But it was either then or when they placed the body on the autopsy table, that Humes made the statement that there's been an apparent tracheotomy and surgery in the head area.

And this was in my FD 302. I've often said since then, that in looking back, which we can all do after something happens.

After the big piece of bone came in from Dallas - which was found in the limousine out in Dallas, a piece of the skull - that if I would have had the presence of mind to ask a question.

Of course, things were happening fast, and you had brass and rank there that went to the ceiling.

If only I had asked - Dr. Humes, I'm speaking of, the pathologist: "Dr. Humes, now that this piece has come in, does this account for your first statement about there being surgery in the head area?" Which didn't occur to me at the time.

In Lifton's book, this was a central theme, about surgery in the head area. And looking back, I would say that that's been one thing I've always regretted; that I didn't do. And maybe this have clarified a lot, and eliminated a few calls from the Bureau. Well, let me just cite one example here.

Q: Actually, if I could - stop you for a moment. I would like to go through all of these things - in detail.
A: Right.
Q: What I'd like to do is get some preliminary - things on the record, and identify - some documents. Then we'll go through it in very careful, sequential order.

So, just sort of the pending question now is, is, does this document appear to you to be accurately reflecting the words that you said, either to Mr. Malley or Mr. Rosen at the FBI?
A: Well, I think, basically, I can't see anything, unless there's something that you might have found that you'd want to ask me.

Q: Again, the purpose of the question now is just, does this seem to reasonably accurately reflect the discussion that you had with Mr. Malley at the FBI?
A: Yes.

Q: Okay. In addition to the discussions that you've already mentioned - that is, with Mr. Specter and with the interviews of other people - are there any other interviews that you recall having had regarding the Kennedy assassination during the time that the Warren Commission was in existence?

So, I'm - I'll rephrase that.

During the period 1963-64, were there any other interviews or any other activities that you were engaged in that you now recall -
A: Well, when was this House Select Committee?

Q: That's in the late 1970s.
A: '70s, yes. I was thinking that I was interviewed, of course, by Mr. Purdy and Kelly. I can't think of any offhand.

Q: Okay. Between the time of the Warren Commission, which ends in 1964, and the time of the House Select Committee on Assassinations, do you have any recollections of any activities that you were involved in that related to the Kennedy assassination?
So, again, up to but not including the
House Select Committee.
A: Yes. And you say that started in –
A: By this, you mean any telephone calls,
inquiries by individuals? That’s what you’re
referring to here?
Q: Right now, it would be anything that would
be official or semi-official U.S. government, So,
speaking with Secret Service, FBI, any government
agency.
A: I can’t recall any further contacts with
government agents, no.
Q: Let me show you a couple of documents,
Nos. 157 and 158. And see if this helps refresh
your recollection – of any other activities you
may have –
A: Thirty-four years, you get a few cobwebs.
Q: Sure.
A: I remember this name, Raupach. Now, I
don’t think I can recall him.
Q: While you’re looking at those documents,
I’ll just be identifying them for the record.

MR. GUNN: Document MD 157 appears on its
face to be a letterhead memorandum, dated June
29th, 1966, from Special Agent Francis O’Neill and
James Sibert to SAC, Baltimore. It is a two-page
document.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. GUNN: And MD 158 appears on its face
to be a one-page letterhead memorandum – excuse me
– two-page letterhead memorandum, dated October
13th, 1966, from James W. Sibert to SAC, Baltimore.
THE WITNESS: I said I hadn’t had any
other contacts but now I recall those
communications on November the 2nd of 1966, I was
on annual leave, down visiting my sister who lives
in Quitman, Georgia. David Lifton called me the
first time. And that was when I made notes, and
I’ve got those with me.
And when I came back off of leave, I
called over to headquarters. And I don’t remember
the supervisor – whether it was Fletcher Thompson,
or it could have been Malley. But, anyway, whoever
I talked to over there, I told them that Lifton
didn’t mean anything to me, other than what he had
said.
He called me from out in California, and
he read me this 302 that appears in this "Second
Oswald" a book by Popkin. It was an appendix, I
wasn’t aware that he even had it. But I made this
known to the Bureau.
They said, "Well, give us an airtel on
what he said to you that night on the phone call,"
which I dictated from Baltimore, because O’Neill
wasn’t, of course, even in on this. I was on
leave, when Lifton got hold of me. So, that would
have been an official contact with the Bureau
supervisor.
And then, at different times, Fletcher
Thompson would call over. And he’d say, "See, this
wording here in – your 302, on measurements or
something like that, is this your statement, or is
this the doc?”
And I made it very clear. I said, "Look,
I’m not a doctor." I said, "Any measurements that

are given were obtained from the doctor." And if
there was any question about the measurements or –
hearing it correctly, he was asked to repeat it.
And, also, any statement like this
prechotomy and surgery to the head area, this was
voiced by Humes. And we just merely made a note
right at the inception of the autopsy as to what
was said.

BY MR. GUNN:
Q: Let me show you a document that has been
marked: MD 171, and ask you whether that is the
Airtel – to which you just referred?
A: Yes. When he called Hyattsville, that was
my son. He was a University of Maryland student
then. And he said, "He’s not here. He’s down in
Quitman, Georgia." And that’s how Lifton got my
sister’s phone number down there.
I told him one other thing in there, too,
that I didn’t put in this airtel. He put it in his
book. And that was – he said, "Well, this 302
here, here’s your name and everything." He said,
"And you told me it’s something that you couldn’t
go any further on, that I would have to contact the
Bureau."
And I said, "Well, let’s just let the
record stand."
And in his book, it was rather amusing to
me when I read it, because he said that he didn’t
want to put that in his letter to the Bureau,
because Mr. Hoover might not have taken a good view
of that, and I would end up in Alaska. I think
Liefler, the other fellow, said I might end up in
Alaska somewhere on a disciplinary transfer or
something.
But I did tell him that.
Q: Just to make – make sure that the record
is clear. You did tell him that you wanted the
record to stand.
A: I did.
Q: And you did tell him something about
Mr. Hoover.
A: He was quoting this 302. And once I asked
him about this DFL and everything, I said, "Well,
you’ve got the 302." And I said, "And all I can
say is, we’ll just let the record stand."
Because we had two different autopsy
reports by this time. This is ‘66. You had the
Navy autopsy, which we never saw. And we weren’t
even advised that there had been a change in the
original autopsy from what was contained in our FD
302.
Q: Just so – again, so the record is clear.
The point that you made about Mr. Hoover and being
sent to Alaska –
A: Oh.
Q: – that was what Mr. Lifton added. And
that’s –
A: He put this in his book. He said –
Q: No, you said.
A: No, no.
Q: Okay.
A: He put that in his book. And Liefler, I
think, was the fellow, that he did graduate
study under at the University of California, who
made the statement about Hoover sending me to
Alaska.
Q: Wesley Liebler?
A: Liebler; that's correct. I was pretty close.

And Liebler had made that statement to him that, "it's a good thing you didn't put that in your letter." And, of course, I didn't have any feeling one way or the other about that.

But that was the only thing I could say, "Well, you've got the accurate copy of my FD 302, so let's just let the record stand. And if you have any further inquiry, write to FBI headquarters."

Q: Okay. Back to Exhibits Nos. 153 and 157. Are those - do you recognize those two documents?
A: [Examining.]
Q: Excuse me. Let me withdraw the last question. And, again, I'm asking whether you recognize Exhibits Nos. 157 and 158.
A: Yes. I might mention -- on this Exhibit 157 -- that when we were in that autopsy room. One of us was present all the time, with the exception of when photographs and radiology work and X-rays were done.

Of course, you can see the reason for that. We didn't have lead jackets to wear, like a doctor does working in that environment. But, otherwise, one of us was always present.

When I went out to make this call over to Kilien, O'Neill was present. And I think we had a bite to eat. And one -- are, and the other one stayed. And, so, we were there at all times. So, that's the only thing I'd add on that, 157.

Q: So, just to interrupt and make sure the record is clear. Do you recognize Exhibit No. 157 as having been written -- by yourself?
A: Me and O'Neill. And 158 here is my airtel -- or communication, rather.
Q: Let me just try just phrasing a question. Do you recognize Exhibit No. 158 as having been written by yourself?
A: I do.
Q: Now, let me just try this last series of questions on overview, again, the time that I'll be referring to is prior to the time of the HSCA investigation.

I was assigned to Baltimore. And I was sent down to Hyattsville in 1956. At that time, we had a Senior Resident Agent there that retired later on. And I followed him as the Senior Resident Agent.

And that was in '65 -- early '65, I think, because I remember we moved our resident agency location. And Agent O'Neill was the Alternate Director of New Orleans?
A: Yes, I've read about it.
Q: Did you have any involvement with that, one way or the other?
A: None whatsoever.
Q: So, you were never -- contacted by Mr. Garrison, for example?
A: April the 2nd, 1951.
Q: And would that make it fair to say that by 1963 you had been with the FBI for approximately 12 years?
A: Right.
Q: What was your position in 1963?
A: In '63, when this incident happened, I had been assigned to Baltimore. And I was sent down to Hyattsville in 1956. At that time, we had a Senior Resident Agent there that retired later on. And I followed him as the Senior Resident Agent.

And that was in '65 -- early '65, I think, because I remember we moved our resident agency location. And Agent O'Neill was the Alternate Director of New Orleans?
A: Yes, I had witnessed -- let's see how many -- I think, two before this happened. Neither one of them involved gunshot wounds.
The first one was a murder case that happened in Prince George's County, Maryland. A boy had been kidnapped, sexually assaulted, and killed.
And I witnessed that autopsy there in Prince George's County, Maryland.

Then I witnessed a second autopsy over at the hospital at Andrews Air Force Base. It was conducted on the wife of an FBI clerk, they both worked at Ident. He had left that morning. And she was several months pregnant, and claimed that she felt real bad -- with terrific headaches.

He went on to work and kept trying to call her, and couldn't get in touch with her. And when he came home that night, he found her dead and laying across a bed with blood running out of her.
Q: What was the condition of the body when you had an annual inspection of our resident agency that afternoon?
A: I assumed, but I wanted to get it straight from you.
Q: Now, I contrast this with all the books I've read and with what happened there with Kennedy - I mean, at Bethesda.
A: Here we were doing the autopsy. One of the cardinal rules that I've always heard is anytime you get a body in from another jurisdiction, and it has received any medical attention or anything, and you're going to do the autopsy in another area, you always establish contact and say, "What was done there surgically?"
Q: What was the condition of the body when you had one of the persons some cigarettes. And they threw them on the floor near him. And when he reached down for them, one of the agents pulled his gun and told him to freeze. And he swung around like he was going to shoot. And the agent fired three gunshot rounds right up his side.

A: Yes.
Q: Did you have any evidence that there had been an autopsy in Parkland Hospital?
A: We didn't know a thing that had gone on at Parkland.
Q: When you made reference to an autopsy in another area, you always establish jurisdiction, and it has received any medical attention or anything, and you're going to do the autopsy in another area, you always establish contact and say, "What was done there surgically?"

A: No. Did I say autopsy? That's a misstatement if I said it. There wasn't.
Q: Okay. I just want to make sure that...
A: No. I mean, any medical. When I said that, I think if they would have called to find out anything done medically over there. Not an autopsy.
Q: So, in other words, if I can sum up... What I understood - what you were saying is, that your experience in another autopsy was that contact was made between the autopsy physician and the treating physician.

Q: Whereas, you did not see that that had been done - you didn't have evidence that that had been done for President Kennedy's autopsy.
A: No. In looking back at, you know, when you're involved in something like this, you become a part of it. I've often thought about how events took place.
Q: Of course, we all know what went on over there in Texas. The conflict, I mean, about where the autopsy should be done, Texas law and all that.
A: But it seems the smart thing would have been to put a doctor, - one of the doctors from Bethesda and say, "Well, here's what we did." Then you're getting off on the right foot.
Q: Okay. Let me go back to when you first heard about the assassination. When did you first hear that you would have some responsibility connected with investigation of the assassination?
A: A: Well, this goes back to O'Neil, one of his regular assignments was contact with Andrews Air Force Base. That involved anything to do with Air Force One, and any type of violation of Federal Laws that occurred on the base involving civilians, and that type of thing.
Q: So, it was at noon. We had just completed an annual inspection of our resident agency that morning. And we had lunch together with the inspectors, Vic Tury and another man who was down there with him.
And we came back up to our office. They
were leaving our resident agency, going over to
inspect Suitland Parkway, which is the other resident
agency out of Baltimore that covers the lower part
of Maryland, and joins up with D.C. and Virginia.
So, we came back, turned the radio on the
standard radio broadcast there in our office and we
heard this broadcast about Kennedy being shot,/
President Kennedy in Dallas.

So, I went right over to the radio, and I
picked it up and called the car that contained
these two inspectors that were leaving our place
and going to Silver Spring, and said:
"Are you aware that we just heard a radio
broadcast that the President was shot in Dallas?
Thought we'd let you know. Maybe you want to alter
plans, or call headquarters, or something."
So, then I got in touch with O'Neill. He
had gone out to Andrews. And contacted Major
Best, who was in charge of the OSI, where he got
word later on that Air Force One was coming in
there with the President's body. And, so, O'Neill
called that in to me.
I called my boss up in Baltimore, and told
him that I was going to join Frank O'Neill out
there. And that we'd be at Andrews if he wanted to
get in touch with us through OSI there at the base.
Q: When you say OSI, you're referring to the
Office of-
A: Office of Special Investigations in the
Air Force -
Q: That's the Air Force Intelligence.
A: Intelligence, right.

Q: Okay.
A: And, luckily, as I recall what happened,
we were out there, and Air Force One was in a
traffic pattern. And they were probably on base
leg, getting ready to come in on their final
approach.

And Tully, my boss in Baltimore, the
special agent in charge there, called me and said
he just got a call from Bureau Headquarters and I
think that a call was made to the Hyattsville
resident agency, too, that they wanted us to get in
the motorcade, go to Bethesda, observe the autopsy,
obtain any bullets removed, and hand-carry them to
the FBI laboratory to preserve the chain of
evidence.
So, that was it. We were already there.
We wouldn't have been there, if we hadn't
anticipated future developments and gone out there.
And, so, I spoke to Jim Rowley, who was
the head of the Secret Service, comparable to
Hoover's position with the FBI. We showed him our
credentials, told him what our instructions were
from the Bureau, and they put O'Neill and I in the
number three car of the motorcade.
Q: Let me ask you to do the best that you can
think back, and this may be a little bit
difficult.
In the media at the time, November 22nd,
23rd, 24th, it was not clear that there had been an
autopsy performed at Bethesda. So, if one were to
wouldn't necessarily be clear. And I'll just say
that for your information.
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For the record, I was a squadron commander and a B-24 pilot in World War II. And when I came home, I was a base operations officer. And that means going out to every crash scene. And I've gone out to those, where they've put bodies in body bags and zipped them up and everything.

I was opened, or was it out of your sight at any

I can't recall that, either. And I'm pretty sure there were others who assisted, but I can't remember any specific officers or anything.

Q: Did you place the casket onto any kind of stretcher, or cart, or vehicle that would enable you to roll it, or did you physically carry it?

A: As I recall, I don't think there was any cart there. I think we hand-carried it right in.

Q: Did you stay with the casket from the time it was opened, or was it out of your sight at any
time?

A: I was there until it was opened.
I would say somewhere probably between three-quarters of an hour and an hour, somewhere in
the night of November 22nd.

THE WITNESS: Am I speaking loud enough?

COURT REPORTER: Yes, thank you.

BY MR. GUNN:

Q: I'd like to show you a document that has
been marked MD 165, which I have no reason to
believe that you have seen previously, though.

If you could just take a quick look, and
tell me whether you recall having previously seen
that document.

MR. GUNN: While Mr. Siben is looking at
that, I will identify the document.

As it appears on its face is entitled
The Joint Casket Bearer Team, which is a six-page
document, with The Joint Casket Bearer Team
appearing to be a cover sheet.

And it is followed by a document entitled
Company E Honor Guard, First Battalion, Third
Infantry, Fort Myer, Virginia, dated December 10th,
1963.

THE WITNESS: This first line here in
paragraph two, is that 1810 hours? That would be
6:10 p.m.; wouldn't it? Yes. It's blurred. I
couldn't tell what.

BY MR. GUNN:

Q: Sure. I mean, just - I mean, the first
question will be: Have you previously seen this
document before?

A: No, I have not.

Q: What I'd like to do is draw your attention
to a couple of points on this.

A: All right.

Q: And see if it helps refresh your
recollection - or if you have an opinion on the
accuracy of the document.

All right. Under Arabic numeral one, it
says -

Let me just state, it appears from its
face that this document has certain times that the
military honor guard was involved in issues related
to the transfer of the body of President Kennedy.

And it refers - by the way that I would
read it, and it is a little bit unclear - on
Arabic numeral one, from the ambulance to the
morgue, Bethesda, 2000 hours, 22nd November '63.

Now, that would suggest in military time
8:00 o'clock p.m.

A: Yes, 8:00 p.m.

Q: The document also suggests that there was
a casket team that was involved with removing the
casket from the ambulance, putting it in the morgue
at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Now, I don't know, of course, whether this
document is accurate or not accurate.

But this would seem to conflict to some
extent with your own experience. Do you have any
information that could illuminate this apparent
discrepancy?

A: No, I don't.

Q: But you see, at any point at Bethesda
Hospital, a military team unloading any casket on
the night of November 22nd?

A: Not that I recall.

Q: What is your best estimate on the time
that it took from - for the Navy ambulance to get
from Andrews Air Force Base to Bethesda Hospital?

A: I wouldn't have an estimate on the time.

But as I say, there was no delay whatsoever. It
just rolled, and at a good rate.

Q: If you can't answer my next question
please don't hesitate to say so. But do you have a
[1] when I called Chuck, So, it was tight security
[2] there was no question about that.
[3] Q: When you just referred to the Bureau
[4] ambulance, did you mean the Navy ambulance?
[6] Q: Okay. We don't want any extra ambulances
[9] Q: Mr. Sibert, I'd like to show you a
[10] document that's been marked 164, that has some
[11] photographs of the unloading of the ambulance — or
[12] of the casket at Bethesda — or at — I'm sorry —
[14] Can you tell by looking at the photographs
[15] of this casket whether that is the casket — or
[16] that appears to be the casket that you unloaded
[17] from the Navy ambulance on the night of November
[18] 22nd?
[19] A: Well, that's a massive-looking type
[20] casket, the same type that would have been
[22] Q: Now, just a moment ago, you referred to
[23] the telephone call that you made to Mr. Killion.
[24] Can you tell me, was the phone call made
[25] to Mr. Killion before or after the body was
[26] unloaded from the casket?
[27] A: Oh, that was after the body was removed it
[28] was on the autopsy table, and the autopsy was in
[29] progress. Because the reason I made that call was
[30] that the pathologists said, "There's no exit to
[31] this back wound," and probed it with rubber glove
[32] and a chrome probe.
[33] Q: Okay.
[34] A: So, that's when I called and thought maybe
[35] there was some type of bullet that would
[36] disintegrate. There just was no bullet that could
[37] be located.
[38] Q: Do you recall seeing more than one
[39] ambulance in the motorcade?
[40] A: No.
[41] Q: Did you see any other ambulances or
[42] hearses at Bethesda Hospital on the night of 22nd,
[43] other than the one you've referred to?
[44] A: No, this is the only one I saw.

[1] removed from the casket, a mahogany casket was
[2] exchanged for the original bronze one. This was
[3] necessary because the bronze casket had been
[5] A handle on the side was also broken.
[7] think that was President Kennedy's aide — Air
[8] Force aide, if I recall correctly. And he was
[9] listed as being there in the room during the
[10] autopsy. But I don't recall this switch, relieving
[12] And I don't recall this other casket being
[13] brought in right then, either. It was exchanged.
[14] They don't say any time there; it was soon
[15] exchanged or anything. But I don't know what time,
[16] well, that could have been exchanged when the
[17] people from Gawler Funeral Home came out.
[18] Q: President Kennedy was buried in a mahogany
[19] casket. So, that would make sense for that — for
[20] that second casket.
[21] Mr. Sibert, could you look at Exhibit No.
[22] 151, which just as a reminder, is the 302 that you

[1] sense of whether it was close to an hour, 45
[2] minutes, a half-hour or is it really difficult to
[3] say?
[4] A: In thinking of that distance, you'd be
[5] coming in Suitland Parkway, up East Capitol, on in
[6] through the District, up to Bethesda.
[7] Well, it would take a half-hour to travel that distance. And
[8] more than a half-hour to travel that distance. And
[9] — and then when we got there, we waited a little
[11] Q: Mr. Sibert, could you turn to the third
[12] page of the document that you have in front of you,
[13] Exhibit No. 163, and look at the portion that is
down under Part 2B. Now, I will read that into the
[14] record while you're reading along with me.
[15] While the casket was being removed —
[16] Excuse me.
[17] While the casket was being moved inside
the hospital, Brigadier General McHugh relieved
YN/2 Barnum, USCG, from the casket team, and
awkwardly took his place.
"After the President's body had been

[1] wrote afterwards.
[3] Q: I'd like to draw your attention to page
[4] one of the 302, towards the bottom. And I'll just
[5] read this into the record, and you can read along
[6] with me.
[7] "A tight security was immediately placed
[8] around the autopsy room by the naval facility and
[10] contact with Mr. Roy Kellerman. The Assistant
[12] detail advised him of the Bureau's interest in this
[14] A: Yes, the sequence of events is off there.
[15] Contact was made with Kellerman, right before the
[16] casket even came out of the Bureau ambulance. But
[17] the tight security, believe me, it was tight.
[18] About every 10 feet they had a guard posted in the
And when I went out to make this phone
call over to Chuck Killion, a guard went right
along with me to use a phone there in another room
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Q: First incision. How much time was there
between the time that the body was unwrapped from
the sheets and the first incision was made?
A: Well, this is the time that you would have
had the X-rays and the photographs. And I don't
recall. And I think they probably may have waited
a little bit to get those X-rays developed.
Q: Now, the photographs were undeveloped.
A: Yes. And we had to hand-carry this down to the
autopsy.
Q: But I think that it probably - And
how long is it? I mean, from the time you left
Bethesda on the night of November 23rd - 22nd?
A: I would say it was sometime between 11:00
and midnight. That's about as near as I can place
the time. My Bureau car was out at Andrews, and so
was O'Neill's. We had to get transportation into
D.C. and we had to hand-carry this down to the
laboratory.
Q: When you say "hand-carry this", you're
referring to -
A: The two fragments in this little jar. We
turned those over to Bob Frazier down there at the
lab.
And then we had to have a clerk drive us
out to Andrews Air Force Base from Bureau
headquarters. And I got in at 4:00 o'clock there
at my residence in New Carrollton, Maryland.
So, that was the sequence. So, I would
say it was between probably 11:00 and midnight that
we left Bethesda.
This receipt - I guess, you'll get into
that "massile" later on.
But this receipt, we signed it. And we
assumed that for all practical purposes, the
autopsy was over with, and the body would be turned
over to the Gawler Funeral Home attendants that
were there on the scene.
We got their names, so, they had to be
there.
Q: What was taking place with the body at the
time that you left? Were the autopsy surgeons
still there? Had Gawler's started working on the
body? What was happening?
A: Well, the autopsy surgeons were still
there. I mean, Boswell, Humes, and Finck. But, of
course, we were interested in getting this evidence
and getting it over to the lab.
We knew they were fragments. Probably
 wouldn't be too valuable in identifying weapons -
I mean, matching them with weapons.
I don't recall much activity, because they
were getting things together, Boswell had been
making some drawings there. And Humes had his
notes and material. And I think it was sort of a
summation getting together, the record and all
that, and the photographs and the packs of film
and X-rays.
Q: But it was your impression that the
autopsy had been completed?
A: Yes.
Q: And were people from Gawler's doing

[1] Q: First incision. How much time was there
between the time that the body was unwrapped from
the sheets and the first incision was made?
[2] A: Well, this is the time that you would have
had the X-rays and the photographs. And I don't
recall. And I think they probably may have waited
a little bit to get those X-rays developed.
[3] Q: Now, the photographs were undeveloped.
[4] A: Yes. And we had to hand-carry this down to the
autopsy.
[5] Q: But I think that it probably - And
how long is it? I mean, from the time you left
Bethesda on the night of November 23rd - 22nd?
[6] A: I would say it was sometime between 11:00
and midnight. That's about as near as I can place
the time. My Bureau car was out at Andrews, and so
was O'Neill's. We had to get transportation into
D.C. and we had to hand-carry this down to the
laboratory.
[7] Q: When you say "hand-carry this", you're
referring to -
[8] A: The two fragments in this little jar. We
turned those over to Bob Frazier down there at the
lab.
[9] And then we had to have a clerk drive us
out to Andrews Air Force Base from Bureau
[10] headquarters. And I got in at 4:00 o'clock there
at my residence in New Carrollton, Maryland.
[11] So, that was the sequence. So, I would
say it was between probably 11:00 and midnight that
we left Bethesda.
[12] This receipt - I guess, you'll get into
that "massile" later on.
[13] But this receipt, we signed it. And we
assumed that for all practical purposes, the
[14] autopsy was over with, and the body would be turned
over to the Gawler Funeral Home attendants that
[15] were there on the scene.
[16] We got their names, so, they had to be
there.
[17] Q: What was taking place with the body at the
time that you left? Were the autopsy surgeons
[18] still there? Had Gawler's started working on the
[19] body? What was happening?
[20] A: Well, the autopsy surgeons were still
[21] there. I mean, Boswell, Humes, and Finck. But, of
course, we were interested in getting this evidence
[22] and getting it over to the lab.
[23] We knew they were fragments. Probably
[24] wouldn't be too valuable in identifying weapons -
[25] I mean, matching them with weapons.
[26] I don't recall much activity, because they
[27] were getting things together, Boswell had been
[28] making some drawings there. And Humes had his
[29] notes and material. And I think it was sort of a
[30] summation getting together, the record and all
[31] that, and the photographs and the packs of film
[32] and X-rays.
[33] Q: But it was your impression that the
[34] autopsy had been completed?
[36] Q: And were people from Gawler's doing

Q: I'd like you to imagine, if you could, President Kennedy standing upright.
A: Yes.
Q: And think of where his ear is. Was there any injury to the part of his head or face that was in front of the ear? Now, this is - again, imagine him standing up. So, forwards from the ear.
A: No. I don't recall any. Of course, he was lying on his back, and I don't recall too much injury to the facial part of the body itself.
Q: Let's say now the part from the car forward, but not to the face. So, the ear - the end of the hairline. Was there - did you see any injury in that area?
A: I don't recall. Of course, here again, the emphasis was on this massive wound. And that might have taken my interest off of any of the facial area. But I don't recall anything that disfigured the face or any injuries that did that.
Q: I'd like to show you a copy of the document that, it's our understanding, was prepared confidential, secret, and all types of information that's gone through that brain. And look now.

A: I don't recall that.
Q: Do you recall making any drawing or markings on any drawings for the House Select Committee?
A: They showed me some material that I had never seen before, and they said, "Have you seen this before?" And I didn't recall.
Q: But I don't recall making any markings. I think if I would have made this, I would have moved it over a little bit to the right on the back of the head here, rather than dead center.
A: I may have. I won't say I didn't. But I don't recall doing so.
Q: Could you look towards the bottom right of the page, and tell me whether that appears to be your handwriting?
A: Yes. That's my signature, and 8/25/77.
Q: And I'd like to ask you if you'd be willing to draw on that skull, showing the back of the head, rather than the front.
A: All right. Here's my number.
Q: Mr. Sibert, I have here a document that you haven't seen before, and they said, "Have you seen this before?" And I didn't recall.
Q: When you say "back wound," you're referring to -
A: I'm referring to this wound below the shoulders here marked with the dot.
Q: Okay.
A: Now, I may have, but I have no recollection of making that mark in the back of the head. It's in the back of the head here. But I think I would have - probably moved it a little over to the right.
Q: Mr. Sibert, I have here a document that I'm numbering right now, MD 188, which shows the back of a skull.

[ARRB MD Exhibit No. 188 marked for identification.]

BY MR. GUNN:
Q: And I'd like to ask you if you'd be willing to draw on that skull, showing the back of a head, approximately where your understanding of the injury - what you've described as the massive head wound.
A: Well, these are teeth here, I guess. But that's just for -
Q: Showing it.
A: Disregard that; right?
Q: That would be showing it from behind.
A: From behind. Looking at it from this way, yeah. Well, I would think - Of course, this isn't to scale, but something in that area.
Q: When you say this isn't to scale, you're referring to the drawing itself and not the mark that you made on it?
A: The mark I made, yes. But it's off to the right is my recollection of that. It wasn't in the middle. If you draw a midline up from the back of the neck and the collar, it wouldn't bisect. It would be over to the right.
Q: Okay. Now -
A: It could be larger - a little larger than that.
Q: The wound could have been a little bit larger than what you have drawn there?
[Q: Would you mind putting your initials just right next to that, please?]
[A: Right.]

[Q: Do you want the date?]
[A: No.]

[Q: Sure. I think the date is the 11th.]
[A: Oh, I'm sorry. My watch has the 12th.]

[Q: So, I'm wrong.]

[A: Getting behind.]

[Q: With the wound that you have drawn on this document now marked Exhibit 188, was that the largest wound that you saw - on the skull?]
[A: That was the largest wound.]

[Q: You referred to a moment ago, that you were shown some things by the HSCA staff. Do you recall what you were shown?]
[A: I can't even recall that. I can't remember whether they were schematic drawings, or what they were.]

[Q: But he said, "Have you ever seen this before?"
[A: And I looked at it. And I said, "No, I haven't." And that was my recollection.]

[Q: Now, were there any other wounds that you could identify as being on the head or skull area from the time before the first incision was made?]
[A: No.]

[Q: Did you see any wounds or injuries on the neck?]
[A: The front of the neck, you're speaking of?]

[Q: Any part of the neck.]
[A: Yes. This tracheotomy incision was very evident.]

[Q: Okay. Were there any other wounds that you noticed at that time on the body?]
[A: No.]

[Q: Later in - during the course of the autopsy, did you ever see any additional wounds?] Yes. [A: Right.]

[Q: You referred earlier in this deposition to a wound on - I think you said below the shoulders.]
[A: Right.]

[Q: Do you recall that?]
[A: Yes.]

[Q: Can you tell me where that wound was, or describe that for me?]
[A: Well, that drawing you gave me there, it was below the scapula or the shoulders. And down far below the base of the neck.]

[Q: Okay.]
[A: Now, Humes, as I recall, didn't give any measurement on that. He did on this piece of skull that was brought in and the fragments. It was below the shoulders and to the right of the midline of the body.]

[Q: Okay. When you said just a moment ago the drawing that I had shown you, you were referring to the drawings that were attached to Exhibit No. 85; is that correct?]
[A: Right. The back wound.]

[Q: Okay. From the time that you first saw the body until the time that you left the morgue to return to headquarters and then to Andrews, approximately what percentage of the time were you with the body?]
[A: Let's say, other than the time of the fire photographs and the X-rays, what percentage of the time were you actually with the body?]

[A: Oh, we went out to eat one time.]

[Q: And it was a busy place.]
[A: Yes. As I say, it was fairly noisy.]

[Q: Would you characterize it as noisy? Would that be right?]
[A: A would say it was fairly noisy.]

[Q: I'd like to ask you about any kind of record that you saw previously made reference to X-rays and photos.]
[A: You also said, if I recall correctly, that Dr. Humes was making notes; is that correct?]

[A: My recollection was that he was making some notes. And Boswell, I think, was making some schematic drawings, similar to the one on that last exhibit. What was that number?]

[Q: Fifty-three, I think. I'm sorry. It was 85.]

[A: Oh.]

[Q: Exhibit No. 85.]

[Q: Did you see anyone else taking notes that night?]
[A: No.]

[Q: As between you and Mr. O'Neill, was one of us taking notes? And some of them came in later as I mentioned in the 302. They weren't there at the beginning, but they came in to ask a question or get some kind of ruling or something, and went out again. But it was a busy place.]

[Q: Would you characterize it as noisy? Would that be right?]
[A: A would say it was fairly noisy.]

[Q: I'd like to ask you about any kind of record that you saw being created that night, and we'll talk about more about them later. But you previously made reference to X-rays and photos.]

[A: You also said, if I recall correctly, that Dr. Humes was making notes; is that correct?]

[A: My recollection was that he was making some notes. And Boswell, I think, was making some schematic drawings, similar to the one on that last exhibit. What was that number?]

[Q: Fifty-three, I think. I'm sorry. It was 85.]

[A: Oh.]

[Q: Exhibit No. 85.]

[Q: Did you see anyone else taking notes that night?]
[A: No.]

[Q: As between you and Mr. O'Neill, was one of us taking notes?]
[A: No.]

[Q: As between you and Mr. O'Neill, was one of us taking notes?] Yes. [A: We both took notes.]

[Q: Okay. Do you recall whether Dr. Finck took any notes?]
[A: A: I don't recall.]

[I do recall he helped probe the back wound.]

[Q: Do you recall there being any motion picture or video recordings that were made?]
[A: No.]

[Q: Did you hear - have any - ever hear anything about there being any audio recordings at the autopsy?]
[A: No.]

[Q: Did you see any tissue preparations or samples being made, paraffin blocks or things of that sort?]
[Q: Were you at the - in the autopsy room at any time when photographs were being taken?
A: No, I don't think I was.
Q: You mentioned it first that you left the room where photographs were taken. I just want to make sure that no photos, as far as you're aware, were taken after the procedures -
A: I don't recall any additional photos being taken while I was there.
Q: After the first round of X-rays was taken, do you recall needing to leave the room again for additional X-rays to be taken - subsequent X-rays?
A: I don't remember being excluded like we were on that first one when X-rays were taken.
Q: Do you remember any discussion among the doctors about the need for performing additional X-rays during the course of the autopsy?
A: No.
Q: Did you ever see anyone whom appeared to be a photographer at the autopsy?
A: No.

[Q: Did you see any cameras at all?
A: I don't remember. When they went in there to take photographs and the X-rays, someone may have had a camera.
Q: Did you ever see any film being taken out of the camera and exposed to light?
A: No.
Q: Do you ever recall having seen any film that was present in the morgue that night that was being labeled, or sent to somebody, or being counted, or anything of that sort?
A: No. Only this film that they had in packs that was turned over to the Secret Service. That was all in packs. I didn't see any other film.
Q: Were you acquainted with what is called large-format review cameras? Do those terms mean anything to you?
A: No.
Q: In the 302 that you've mentioned, which is marked as Exhibit 151, you record the numbers -
A: Yes. It may have been but I distinctly remember that.
Q: Now, with that description of the Milky Way as the path of disintegrated fragments, did you get that all yourself from your own observation?
A: That was from Humes.
Q: So, it wouldn't help you to look at the X-ray?
A: No, I don't think they showed them to me.
Q: I think Humes was just looking at them and talking, and we were making notes as to statements relative to that.
Q: The very last sentence of this same paragraph - Again, it's on page three. It refers to, "The next largest fragment appeared to be at the rear of the skull." Is that observation, then, also from Dr. Humes?
A: That's from Humes; right.
Q: Okay. When you looked at the skull and what you have described as including being able to see brain tissue, were you able to see inside the skull cavity, and see the brain inside? Again, this is before the first incision.
A: A: I think part of the brain was missing, as I recall, or a statement to that effect was made -
Q: Do you recall seeing -
A: I certainly don't recall seeing an intact brain, you know, like you see on a color photograph in med school or something like that.
Q: Were you present during the autopsy when the skull was opened and the brain was removed?
A: No.
the autopsy, as far as you're - as far as you know?
A: Not while we were there. It could have been, but I don't have that recollection.
Q: Did you ever see a brain at all during the night of the autopsy; that is, somewhat intact brain?
A: No.
Q: Was there any discussion during the course of the autopsy about the location of the brain?
A: Not that I recall.
Q: Mr. Sibert, earlier in the deposition, you referred to fragments that you took to FBI headquarters. Do you recall that?
A: Yes.
Q: Could you describe what the fragments were?
A: Well, they were two small fragments. I don't recall the size of them; but they're described in my FD 302, and were measured by Humes.
Q: They were put in a little jar. Oh, I would say it's about this tall and - with a black screw-type cap on it. And Dr. Humes put those in the jar. And Frank and I initialed it, scraped through the paint on the top with our initials and the date, so that we could identify them later on as evidence that we got from Dr. Humes and hand-carried over to the Bureau lab.
Q: Something has remarkably appeared just behind you right now, a small jar with a black lid.
A: Oh, yes.
Q: And I'd like to ask you if that's the jar that you were referring to. And please take your time to examine the lid, and see if you can identify that as being the jar that you just mentioned.
A: Living down in Florida, it's a long time since I've worn gloves.
MR. GUNN: Let me state for the record that this is Warren Commission Exhibit No. 843 that Mr. Sibert is examining.
THE WITNESS: Yes. And I'm looking on the top there. That's FOX. That's Frank's initials.
11/22/63. And I'm trying to find mine. Oh, here it is. And JWS, 11/22/63. Those are my initials.

BY MR. GUNN:
Q: Do you see any other initials or identifiers that you can observe on the top of the lid?
A: Yes, here's one up here: RF. I assume that would be Robert Frazier, who is hand-carried it over in the lab.
Q: Then there's another initial. It looks like a C. but - Would that be CK? I can't make that one out.
A: But there's two other initials there, other than Frank and mine. I see four sets of initials.
Q: And is this the bottle, then, as best you can tell - that was used to carry the fragments?
A: I said it was about that size. I was right on that, my recollection. And this black cap, and initialed, and everything. That's it.
Q: Now, we've been referring to two fragments. And although everyone in this room knows what the fragments are that we're referring to, could you identify what kinds of fragments they are?
A: They're metal fragments that were removed by Dr. Humes from the skull.
Q: Did you see Dr. Humes remove the fragments?
A: I don't recall seeing him remove them, no.
Q: I'm sure it was done during the autopsy, and he had them there, and he placed them in this jar.
Q: Do you know whether you were in the room at the time the fragments were removed?
A: I'm almost certain I was. As I said 80 percent. But I would be willing to go to even a higher percentage of the time that we were in the autopsy room.
Q: But, nevertheless, you don't have a recollection of actually seeing the fragments removed?
A: No, not the removal where he took them out of the brain.
Q: Did Dr. Humes tell you where he had located the fragments?
A: No, not the removal where he took them out of the brain.

MR. GUNN: I will state for the record that MD 69 appears on its face to be a memo from Francis X. O'Neill and James W. Sibert to Captain J. H. Strayer, dated 22 November 1963.
THE WITNESS: Yes, I recall. I'd like to elaborate a little further on this. Here, we get to this term "missile".
Now, some things I've read about the agents giving a receipt - This receipt was prepared by Navy personnel. I think a Navy corpsman typed it up. And this terminology is U.S. Navy about the "missile". Now, had I been preparing or making out a receipt and giving it to them, I would have said "fragments" here.
This is another thing that's been kicked around a lot in books and everything. I've got some notes here from a guy who called me about this very thing, a "missile".

BY MR. GUNN:
Q: Other than the document that's now marked Exhibit No. 69, did you sign any other receipts on the night of November 22nd/23rd related to fragments or missiles?
A: No.
Q: So, to the best of your recollection -
A: To the best of my recollection on this, this is the only receipt that was signed.
Q: And the document that we have here, Exhibit 69, was attached in a sense to Commission Exhibit 843 - the bottle that's in front of you.
A: Right.
MR. GUNN: Let me go off the record for a minute while Steve takes the bottle.

Mr. Sibert, during the time that you were present at Bethesda Naval Hospital, did you speak at all to any other personnel at the FBI by telephone?

Q: Agent Killion was the only one that I called. Is that who you referred to?

A: That would be one - one possible.

Q: When I called him over in the firearms section, there was no other person with - any other FBI official with whom you spoke by telephone that night?

A: I don't recall. Don't recall speaking with anyone at FBI during the night of the autopsy?

Q: Do you know whether Special Agent O'Neill spoke with anyone at FBI during the night of the autopsy?

A: Frank wasn't with me when I made this call, he was back in the autopsy room. And I don't recall Frank making any calls to anyone over at headquarters or the laboratory.

Q: I would like to show you a document that is marked Exhibit No. 151, which appears on its face to be a letterhead memorandum, dated November 22nd, 1963, from A.H. Belmont to Mr. Tolson. We have the original of the document here.

A: I don't recall. Although it's my presumption that you have not seen the original document before, I'll, nevertheless, ask you if you have seen the document?

Q: Well, this is the first time this document has come to my attention.

A: Mr. Sibert, I'll note that the document appears on its face to be dated November 22nd, 1963, which - I don't know whether that date is correct or not.

Q: November 22nd, 63.

A: O.K.

Q: The stamps on the back have various times that offices received that. The earliest one I can recall is marked Exhibit No. 176, which appears on its face to be a letterhead memorandum, dated November 22nd, 1963, from A.H. Belmont to Mr. Tolson. We have the original of the document here.

A: I don't recall. Whatever it is, it's not what I recall.

Q: Well, you heard about the bullet causing the back wound.

A: Yes.

Q: Okay.
Now, in this particular passage here, there's no reference made to a piece of the skull being found in the limousine, but refers to something that was removed from the President's skull.

Were you, in fact, told at the time that the piece arrived that it was removed from the President's skull?

A: I'm trying to think. There was an agent that brought that in -- I think, a Secret Service agent -- during the latter stage of the autopsy. Maybe he used that terminology, and we picked it up there.

I didn't get this from Killion, because he didn't have anything to do with that. But I don't know where that word "removed" originated. But that was evidently, the terminology that was used that night.

Q: Certainly, as I'm sure is apparent to you, that the question here is: When the explanation was made that the piece of the skull came from the limousine rather than having been removed, it would be plausible to say that -- or one might read this as saying, at the beginning of the autopsy, there's a presumption that there was surgery in the top of the head.

Later in the autopsy, when it -- when the piece arrives, it is assumed that that is the piece that was removed from skull. There isn't any explanation as far as I'm aware, in the 302 about this being found in a limousine or being anything other than having been removed from the skull.

A: I think that was relayed later by someone.

I don't know where I got that. And I cannot clarify that any further.

Q: Do you remember -- I'd like to show you a document that is marked Exhibit 149. And I will describe it while you're taking a look at it.

A: All right.

Q: And my question to you will be whether you have previously seen this document?

It appears on its face to be a teletype, dated 11/23/63, from SAC Baltimore to Director and SAC, Dallas.

Mr. Sibert, do you recall having previously seen the document marked Exhibit 149?

A: No, I've never seen this before.

Q: Could you help me with understanding part of the document? What do you understand this document to be, at least in general? Not the specific content, but what kind of FBI document is it?

A: Well, this was sent on Saturday, the 23rd, the day after the autopsy.

Q: And this is -- went on a teletype machine; is that right?

A: Yes, the teletype out of our headquarters in Baltimore into -- to Bureau headquarters in D.C.

Q: Right -- if you read along the top, where the teletype is it says "urgent". What does that signify?

A: It's been so long, but -- Top priority.

Q: If you look just to the right of the
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11/23/63, there's a 2-00. Do you know what that signifies?

A: This applies to the hour of the day.

Q: The next two, if you keep going across, there's an "AM TRC". Are you able to tell what those are?

A: This would be 2:00 a.m. and the initials, TRC, of the sender in Baltimore.

Q: Could you look at the end of the teletype, the next to last line, where it says, "207 AM OK FBI WA JR". Are you able to tell me what any of that would signify?

A: This would be the acknowledgement by FBI Headquarters in Washington, D.C. that the message had been received at 2:07 a.m. Furthermore, an O.K. was sent back by the Washington, D.C. teletype operator whose initials were furnished as JR.

Q: Now, all of this would suggest, then, this document was probably created somewhere around 2:00 a.m. on the morning of November 23rd?

A: Yes.
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entered the back of the head?
A: The specific place where it entered?
Q: Yes.
A: I don't recall that. Just that general statement.
Q: So, they said it entered the back of the head.
A: Yes.
Q: But nothing more specific.
A: Correct.
Q: Did they ever attempt, or did you hear any discussion about attempting to measure the size of the entry wound?
A: No.
Q: Did you ever hear any discussion about beveling of the skull? Sound familiar?
A: No.
Q: Did you hear any discussion about the estimated size of the bullet that struck the head?
A: No.
Q: Did you see any of the doctors insert probes into the head, in an attempt to determine the angle or entry of a bullet into –
A: Into the head?
Q: Yes.
A: No.
Q: Did you ever see any probes used at all during the night of the autopsy to determine either depth of the wound or an angle of the – of the wound?
A: No.
Q: Well, the back wound, a probe was used there. A chrome probe.
A: Okay.
A: And as I recall, I think Finck used that chrome probe.
Q: But you don't remember the chrome probe being used in the head at all?
A: No, I don't recall seeing that the night during the autopsy. I think Boswell was sort of keeping a record, and probably had this &xc sheet then and everything.
Q: Let's turn to what we've been calling the back wound. When was it – When, during the course of the autopsy, was it first discovered that there was a wound in what you've been calling the back?
A: Well, I don't think it was right at the initial start of the autopsy. I know it was after the original incision was made. But when they raised him up, then they found this back wound. And that's when they started probing with the rubber glove and the finger, and – and also with the chrome probe. And that's just before, of course, I made this call, because they were at a loss to explain what had happened to this bullet. They couldn't find any bullet.
A: And they said, 'There's no exit.' Finck, in particular, said, 'There's no exit.' And they said that you could feel it with the end of the finger - I mean, the depth of this wound.
Q: So, when I made the call and came back, that's when Dr. Humes brought up the possibility of, through cardiac massage, the bullet had worked its way out over there.
Q: Did Dr. Finck offer a suggestion as to what he thought the angle of the bullet was when it entered the body?
A: Humes – it's my recollection – was the one that said it was a 45- to 60-degree downward angle.
Q: I'd like to show you a document that is marked as MD No. 1, and ask you whether you've seen it before?
A: No.
Q: - that you brought with you.
A: And this – this was October the 7th of 1975. And, let's see, that's The Enquirer, I guess.
But this MD 1 which you are showing me must be the same, it has Dr. Burkley's signature here as well as the location of the back scar. So, that's the only other time I saw it in 1975. I don't recall seeing it that night.
Q: Earlier, you said that you recalled Dr. Boswell making drawings. Is that right? These are not the drawings that you're referring to; is that correct?
A: Well, here again, during the course of the autopsy, I think Boswell was sort of keeping a record, and probably had this &xc sheet then and everything.
But whether this was exhibited to me during the autopsy – I think my first recollection is no. The Enquirer article was the first time I've seen that.
Q: In the newspaper article?
A: Right.
Q: Could you turn to the second page of Exhibit No. 1, and tell me whether you recall having seen that on the night of the autopsy?
A: No, I don't recall seeing that the night of the autopsy, or any other time.
Q: Okay. Let me state also for the record that in deposition testimony both Drs. Humes and Boswell have identified this as being the face sheet from President Kennedy's autopsy. And they have identified the wound marked here, on what appears to me to be the upper back, as being the bullet entry wound.
If you could just look at that – the drawing. Again, this is the right side of the face sheet on the first page. Does the location of the – what they've identified as the entrance wound appear to you to be roughly correct?
A: Yes.
Q: Were you aware of any time during the autopsy when the chest cavity of Dr. – excuse me – of President Kennedy was opened in a search for the bullet that went into the back?
A: I don't recall.
Q: So, for example –
A: As I say, they probed it with the finger and the chrome probe. And that was the statement.

Q: Do you remember the chest cavity ever having been opened during the course of the autopsy, so the internal organs would be exposed?

A: No. I do not remember it being opened.

Q: If I'd like to show you a document marked No. MD 156, which is faint, and I apologize, but there's best that we have on that document.

A: Yes, this was on the same date that we dictated the 302. I don't know what was the basis whether there was an inquiry, or a call from headquarters, or what.

Q: Is this a memorandum that you wrote jointly with Agent O'Neill?

A: Yes.

Q: Now, I note on this, in the second paragraph, it states that — what I understand to be the opinion of Dr. Humes — that the bullet was still in the President's body, and could only be extracted through a complete autopsy, which he proposed to do. Do you recall any discussion of that issue?

A: No further than what's stated here. I know that the authority for these autopsy proceedings was, evidently, coming through Burkley and probably from Mrs. Kennedy.

Q: The way — I'd like to characterize this memo. And please correct me if I'm incorrect in any part of this.

A: It's my understanding that, at least at some point, Dr. Humes felt that he was not able to identify what happened to the bullet. And that he then said that he needed to have a more complete autopsy, which presumably would be opening up the chest cavity. And that he requested permission for that, and that permission was subsequently granted.

Q: But the doctors, during the autopsy, didn't do anything with that, that you observed?

A: No. They did not.

Q: Earlier in the deposition, you stated that the first incision was at approximately 8:15. When you say "the first incision", what are you referring to? What's the procedure that you were talking about?

A: I've thought about that, too, whether it was the Y incision. I know, in other autopsies I've witnessed, that's generally the first.

Q: But the doctors, during the autopsy, didn't do anything with that, that you observed?

A: No. They did not.

Q: Earlier in the deposition, you stated that the first incision was at approximately 8:15. When you say "the first incision", what are you referring to? What's the procedure that you were talking about?

A: I've thought about that, too, whether it was the Y incision. I know, in other autopsies I've witnessed, that's generally the first.

Q: But the doctors, during the autopsy, didn't do anything with that, that you observed?

A: No. They did not.

Q: Earlier in the deposition, you stated that the first incision was at approximately 8:15. When you say "the first incision", what are you referring to? What's the procedure that you were talking about?

A: I've thought about that, too, whether it was the Y incision. I know, in other autopsies I've witnessed, that's generally the first.
Q: Oh, I just mean any. Any opening at all in the chest cavity. Did you see a Y incision on President Kennedy?
A: I don’t have a recollection of seeing the Y incision made but I don’t know why I would have put “first incision made” there in my notes, if it hadn’t been there.
Q: Do you remember there being any cutting of the scalp at all, to pull back the scalp to examine the skull?
A: No, I don’t recall any.
Q: What I think I’d like to do now is get some of the autopsy photos, and show them to you, and ask you a few questions about them.
Mr. Gunn: Let’s take a short break.

Mr. Sibert, is that how President Kennedy appeared to you on November 22nd, 1963?
A: Yes, it was that serious a wound. Here, to the best of my recollection, it was like this photo.
Q: I’d like to show you Exhibit No. 188.
A: Much smaller, yes it’s larger than that.
Q: The triangular lines right above the right eye. Do you recall the wound that seems to go right into the forehead, above the right eye. Do you recall the wound having extended that far forward?
A: I don’t recall. As I say, the greater percentage of my time, I think, was back in the position I’m in here now — looking from the rear, rather than from the front. And I don’t — My recollection was that the — I don’t know whether this is a flap down there or —
Q: You’re referring to the part at the top, towards the back of the head?
A: That’s down on the forehead. I’m talking about this part here.
Q: Uh, on the forehead.
A: Yes.
Q: It appears to me that it — the part that points toward the forehead is triangular shaped.

Mr. Sibert, does that photograph correspond to what you observed on the night of the autopsy? Does that seem different from what you recall?
A: I don’t recall. As I say, the greater percentage of my time, I think, was back in the position I’m in here now — looking from the rear, rather than from the front. And I don’t — My recollection was that the — I don’t know whether this is a flap down there or —
Q: You’re referring to the part at the top, towards the back of the head?
A: That’s down on the forehead. I’m talking about this part here.
Q: Uh, on the forehead.
A: Yes.
Q: It appears to me that it — the part that points toward the forehead is triangular shaped.

Q: Okay. Let me ask you about — Do you recall there being a towel under President Kennedy’s head during the course of the autopsy?
A: I don’t have any distinct recollection as to what was under his head.
Q: Okay. Could we look at now Photograph No. 32, which is identified as the third view and the "superior view of head"?
A: I don’t recall. It’s evident that that isn’t the way it was. I don’t recall it from the night of the autopsy.
Q: Mr. Sibert, does that photograph correspond to you to what you observed on the night of the autopsy?
A: Well, to the best of my recollection, it does.
Q: I’d like to show you Exhibit No. 188.
A: Much smaller, yes it’s larger than that.
Q: It was a larger wound than that. I should have made that larger, but I’m not much of an artist.
Q: Okay. Could we now see the fifth view, the "right anterior view of head and upper torso, including tracheotomy wound"? Photograph No. 40.
A: I think it was pretty pronounced like that, yes.
Q: Does that size appear to be — appear to correspond to your recollection? Does that seem larger or smaller?
A: I think that’s approximate.
Q: Okay. If we could now look at the sixth view, which is described as the "wound of entrance in right posterior occipital region". Photograph No. 42.
A: Well, I don’t have a recollection of it being that intact, as compared with these other pictures. I don’t remember seeing anything that was like this photo.
Q: Does that -
A: That's why his head is raised here. It's been elevated; hasn't it? Yes. But still, that -
Q: Why was the wound back here? The hair looks like it's been straightened out and cleaned up more than what it was when we left the autopsy.
A: Do you remember earlier in the deposition when I asked you if - when you observed the body immediately after the photography - photographs had been taken, if the hair had been cleaned or combed in any way?
Q: And as I recall, you said, no; that it still seemed pretty messy.
A: During the rest of the autopsy, it did.
Q: So, does that photograph correspond to what you recall from the autopsy of President Kennedy?
A: From what I can recall, I didn't really see anything that was this "neat" - I guess, is the best word to use - as compared with what I observed that night.
Q: I'm going to show you again the drawing that you made, No. 188 -
A: O.K.
Q: - where you have drawn a wound, which just a moment ago you said was even larger than here.
A: That's true; I'd like to redraw that. That's not large enough.
Q: But do you see anything that corresponds in Photograph No. 42 to what you observed during the night of the autopsy?
A: No. I don't recall anything like this at all during the autopsy. There was much - Well, the wound was more pronounced. And it looks like it could have been reconstructed or something, as compared with what my recollection was and those other photographs.
Q: So, for the - with this photograph -
A: That's true; I'd like to redraw that. That's not large enough.
Q: But do you see anything that corresponds in Photograph No. 42 to what you observed during the night of the autopsy?
A: No. I don't recall anything like this at all during the autopsy. There was much - Well, the wound was more pronounced. And it looks like it could have been reconstructed or something, as compared with what my recollection was and those other photographs.
Q: So, the - with this photograph -
MR. GUNN: Or actually maybe, Steve, if we could look at No. 43, which is a very similar view.
Q: Again, this is a somewhat different exposure but a view of the same thing.

Q: That's why his head is raised here. It's been elevated; hasn't it? Yes. But still, that -
Q: Why was the wound back here? The hair looks like it's been straightened out and cleaned up more than what it was when we left the autopsy.
A: Do you remember earlier in the deposition when I asked you if - when you observed the body immediately after the photography - photographs had been taken, if the hair had been cleaned or combed in any way?
Q: And as I recall, you said, no; that it still seemed pretty messy.
A: During the rest of the autopsy, it did.
Q: So, does that photograph correspond to what you recall from the autopsy of President Kennedy?
A: From what I can recall, I didn't really see anything that was this "neat" - I guess, is the best word to use - as compared with what I observed that night.
Q: I'm going to show you again the drawing that you made, No. 188 -
A: O.K.
Q: - where you have drawn a wound, which just a moment ago you said was even larger than here.
A: That's true; I'd like to redraw that. That's not large enough.
Q: But do you see anything that corresponds in Photograph No. 42 to what you observed during the night of the autopsy?
A: No. I don't recall anything like this at all during the autopsy. There was much - Well, the wound was more pronounced. And it looks like it could have been reconstructed or something, as compared with what my recollection was and those other photographs.
Q: So, for the - with this photograph -
A: That's true; I'd like to redraw that. That's not large enough.
Q: But do you see anything that corresponds in Photograph No. 42 to what you observed during the night of the autopsy?
A: No. I don't recall anything like this at all during the autopsy. There was much - Well, the wound was more pronounced. And it looks like it could have been reconstructed or something, as compared with what my recollection was and those other photographs.
Q: So, the - with this photograph -
MR. GUNN: Or actually maybe, Steve, if we could look at No. 43, which is a very similar view.
Q: Again, this is a somewhat different exposure but a view of the same thing.

A: I'd make the same statements relative to this photograph as I did for the other.
Q: Is this a piece of tape on his ear here?
A: That has been previously identified as a flap from the skull.
Q: Is it? It's overlapping this part of the ear.
Q: So, in conclusion, would it be fair to say that the photograph that we have been looking at - photographs we have been looking at from the sixth view do not correspond with what you observed on the night of the autopsy?
A: Right. These four. Again, I say, I was in error there. That was a much larger wound than that.
Q: Now you're referring to your Exhibit No. 188.
A: Right.
Q: And you think that the wound should have been much larger than the one that you drew.
A: Yes.
Q: As you look at Exhibit No. 188, would you put the location of the wound in any different location? Is it still - You have it - to the right of center.
A: - still, I think, to be to the right.
Q: But much larger than what I've shown there.
A: What I'd like to do is let you make a dotted line of where you would now estimate the size of the wound.

[Discussion off the record.]

BY MR. GUNN:
Q: Mr. Sibert, now does the - do the dotted lines roughly correspond with your best current recollection of the size of the wound?
A: Yes. They do.
Q: Could you go back to the table and look at the photograph that shows what has been described as 'missile wound of entrance in posterior skull, following reflection of scalp'? Photograph No. 44.
A: Now, I should probably tell you that people have had difficulty orienting this.
Q: Does that photograph correspond to what you observed on the night of the autopsy?
A: Yes, I'm having a little problem.
Q: So, if you do, you shouldn't feel unusual.

[Discussion off the record.]
Q: Of the same version.
A: In other words, you mean duplicate copies.
Q: Yes. Did you initial -
A: No. If it was stencil or they run it off on the copy machine, of course, your initials would not show up on copies. But you only initial the original.
Q: Okay. Just a moment ago, you made reference to notes that you took during the autopsy; is that right?
A: Yes.
Q: You did take notes during the autopsy.
A: I did.
Q: I'd like to show you a document that -
A: I'd like to ask you just to focus on one particular issue in it, and talk about other issues later, which is Exhibit 154.
Q: Which file, that's state, on its face, appears to be a memorandum from Arlen Specter, Warren Commission staff, to J. Lee Rankin, who was the general counsel for the Warren Commission, dated March 12th, 1964.
And in this memorandum, it says, "Special Agent Sibert advised that he made no notes during the autopsy." Is that correct?
A: That is absolutely false. There would be no way in the world I'd make a statement that I made no notes during the autopsy.
Q: Okay. I'd now like to show you a document -
A: Did he say anything about - I didn't read that. Did he say neither one of us made notes. He said I didn't. But what did he say about O'Neill?
Q: He said - It says, "Special Agent O'Neill stated that he made only a few notes, which he destroyed after his report was dictated."
A: No. He made many notes.
Q: Do you recall now whether it was you or Special Agent O'Neill who actually dictated the Exhibit No. 151?
A: We both dictated it. This was a joint FD 302. That's the reason for the two initials here.
Otherwise, it would have been separate FD 302s with only one set of initials.
A: And what I said to Frank - That was another thing, going back. I said, "Frank, we want to make sure that we get the names of everybody that comes into this autopsy room, as close as we can come to it."
And there's some misspellings there. Like Halloway, I think, was Galloway. And Burkley was - I had it B-e-r-k, and it's B-u-r-k-l-e-y. But we wanted to know the names of everyone there.
Q: Did you ask for people's names? Did you pass a list around?
A: No. I asked people for their name or maybe someone standing nearby that knew them. I'd say, "And this gentleman's name?" here, and get the name that way. But that's the reason for the misspelling.
By looking at this document, which you’ve just identified as the original, can you tell whether this is – was made pursuant to a stencil process of making 302s you referred to it either as being typed up or putting on a stencil.

And as I recall, the duplicating machines came in later. I don’t know what year they came in, but during the latter part of my career, I used to go into Baltimore, and they would make copies on the duplicating machines, which replaced the old stencil process.

Q: Now, just because we are now living in an age where people may be unfamiliar with what stencils are, could you describe, just very briefly, what a stencil is as opposed to typing?

A: A stencil was a blue impervious plastic like material with a backing. It was placed in the typewriter which was set on the stencil position which did not allow the keys to strike the ribbon. Instead, the keys would cut through the plastic.

After typing each stencil, the backing was removed and the stencil was then fastened on a circular like inked mimeograph machine.

As the stencil made contact with a blank sheet of paper, the ink would come through the typing and appear on the paper. The machine was so constructed that it would feed paper beneath the rotating stencil and then on into a receiving tray, before another sheet of paper would be printed. Thus any number of copies could be made of each stencil page.

A 5 page FD 302 would require 5 separate stencils.

Q: And, so do you know what’s done usually with the inked plastic thing when it’s finished?

A: Throw it away.

Q: Wouldn’t make much sense to keep it. So, the closest that we would have is this one that is in your hand today?

A: That is correct.

Q: I’d like to ask you a couple of questions about this. On page one of the 302, there is – On the third line down, there’s a statement: “Air Force” – then “One” appears to be dropped below the bottom of the line, and then it goes back up, “the President’s jet”.

Do you have any idea what that signifies?

A: I don’t know what that would be, unless it was a typographical error or something that was sent back for a correction.

As it was explained to me by the Colonel, out there at the base in the Presidential Flight Unit, Air Force One is always the President’s plane. If you had One and Two, both of the big jets flying, Air Force One carries the President. Air Force Two carries subordinate individuals.

You could have Air Force One going out with the President on it, but if he stayed out there and somebody else came back with that same plane, it wouldn’t be Air Force One.

I guess, that was for coding, because in your aeronautical lingo, everybody knew Air Force One, Out, they knew that was the President.

Q: Would you look at page three now? It will be a similar sort of question. There’s a gap halfway down –

A: This happened a lot with stencils. In other words, if there was a correction made, they’d just put correction fluid on the stencil, and retype over it, rather than having to type the whole stencil sheet again.

Arrangements were made - for the performance of the autopsy by the U.S. Navy and Secret Service.

Well, now, that was evidently, the way I had it in my notes. And maybe there was something on that stencil when it was typed up that didn’t agree with my notes, and I changed it.

Q: Could you turn to page four? This again will be a similar question. On the first very fine, “during the autopsy” – then there’s a space - “inspection”. Do you have any idea of what came in that space?

A: No, I don’t. But the only ones that would have changed this is the dictating agents. In other words this is joint. If O’Neill or I saw there was something there that wasn’t in his notes, or didn’t agree with my notes, we sent it back to the steno, and the correction would be made before it was run. So, it wouldn’t have been changed at any other time after that.

Q: If we can go back to the first page again, where there was the reference to Air Force One.
A: Here.

Q: Do you recall whether there was anything more specific or different from "Air Force One", such as the number 6970? Would that make any sense?

A: That's the aircraft identification number.

Q: Yeah. Could that be? Or just no idea?

A: During World War II, I was the Commanding Officer of a Four Engine Bomber Squadron and after returning to the States after combat, a Base Operations Officer. Every plane in the Air Force has its own aircraft identification number. This number is used in connection with flight plans, maintenance records, and other pertinent data.

Q: Now, in your original 302, there is reference made to your interviews with Misters Kellerman and Greer at the time of the autopsy. Then a few days later, you interviewed them again as you had mentioned before. Can you tell me what the purpose was for your going back to interview these same people again?

A: All I can recall on that is that we were instructed to do that. It had to emanate from the Bureau, from headquarters.

And I don't remember - I think Baltimore called us. I'm sure Baltimore would have called us, rather than the Bureau. And they probably said, "Look, the Bureau wants these persons interviewed," because there was no real formal interviews that night with Kellerman and Greer.

To give you an idea of what went on during the night of the autopsy, I was with Bill Greer quite a bit. And he kept saying, "If I'd only been moving faster."

He said, "But I'd try to speed it up."

And "The President, he'd say, 'Slow down. You're going too fast.'"

You do that type of conversing but that wasn't a formal interview. But when we went back over, these were regular - formal interviews to talk with them and get a more detailed information.

Q: Now, certainly, one of the differences between the two interviews - as I'm sure you're aware - is, in the first interview, Mr. Kellerman refers to President Kennedy saying something after he was shot the first time in the second interview, there's no mention of that.

[Discussion off the record.]

BY MR. GUNN:

Q: I am corrected. What the utterance was changed between the first and the second time.

A: See, I didn't recall the -

Q: I apologize for that.

A: That's all right.

Q: That mistake. I'm getting old, I guess.

A: No. I have news for you.

Q: Did anyone ask you to try to determine whether Kellerman was certain about having heard something during the first - that you reported in your first description, as to asking Kellerman.

"Did you really hear the President say something?"

A: Do you have a copy of that FD 302?

Because I never saw it.

Q: Yes.

A: I mean, a copy. Of course we dictated it.

Q: You now have Exhibit No. 152.
A: All right.
Q: There is an Admiral Burkley, who -
A: And that's misspelled.
Q: That's misspelled. Later in the
document, you refer to a Dr. George Bakcman, U.S.
Navy. Do you know who that is, or any
recolletion?
A: Let's see. No, I don't.
Q: Now, the person who is the President's
personal physician was Admiral -
A: Admiral Burkley.
Q: Right. Who is also -
A: Navy.
Q: His first name was George, and he was a
doctor. And I'm wondering whether the Bakcman
would be a confusion with the Burkley there, or
whether there was yet another person?
A: I don't know.
Q: Again, Admiral Dr. George Burkley -
A: Doctor.
Q: - was U.S. Navy.
A: Yes, and doctor. You would think if
Bakcman and Burkley were the same person, Bakcman's
rank would be listed as Admiral.
Q: Sure.
A: Or his personal physician.
Q: Do you recall now whether Admiral Burkley
was wearing a uniform?
A: Well, there were so many uniforms there
that night.
Q: Yes. One thing I'm wondering is if -
whether part of this may have been something that
you dictated, and Mr. O'Neill dictated another
part, and that there was a confusion in that way.
A: That could be, but I doubt it. Bakcman
and Burkley, that's not that close.
Q: Do you have any other explanation of who a
Navy -
A: I don't know who that would be.
Q: Okay.
A: Does that name come up anywhere else?
Q: No.
Now I'd like to go back to an issue that
we've discussed previously, and that was your
interview with Arlen Specter.
A: Yes.
Q: Could you tell me about how that interview
came about and what happened in it?
A: Here again, I think this probably emanated
from the Bureau, and they called Baltimore. And in
my entries in my 1964 "Week at a Glance" for March
12th, I had written, "Testify Warren Commission -
at bureau later on."
Baltimore told us that we were to be
interviewed over there by Arlen Specter in
connection with the Warren Commission.
And, so, we got instructions to meet him
at a certain place in Washington. It wasn't at the
Bureau, or it must have been in some government
office building that I can't recall.
Q: Do you recall if it was out by the Capitol
Building?
A: There again. I've tried to think. And
I just don't remember, just downtown Washington.
It wasn't a formal place at all, as I can recall.
And he talked to us, and asked us some
questions. And then we went back to the Bureau and
came back, and interviewed over there. And then
I received any information about that.
Q: Let me say this, too. We didn't dictate
our FD 302 until Tuesday, the 26th. Over at
Bethesda, they waited and then they belatedly
called Parkland on the 23rd. Saturday morning.
Q: And I said, "Well," after I asked him
about the D.F.L. Initials, "You've got the 302 in
front of you." And he asked me a couple other
questions. I said, "And we'll just have to let the
record stand."
Because I didn't know what had happened or
what he was talking about. When this other autopsy
report was developed and published, I never
received any information about that.
Q: Now, if only they would have called the
Bureau, who would have gotten in touch with O'Neill
and I through Baltimore, by the Liaison
Agent assigned to the case there. But then the
findings and conclusions contained in the official
autopsy report were completely different.
And that's when Lifton called me. He
said, "Hey, wait a minute." He said, "We've
got your FD 302." He also evidently had the other
autopsy report, which I had never seen. And he
said something to the effect, "What's going on
here?"
Q: And I said, "Well," after I asked him
about the D.F.L. Initials, "You've got the 302 in
front of you." And he asked me a couple other
questions. I said, "And we'll just have to let the
record stand."
Because I didn't know what had happened or
what he was talking about. When this other autopsy
report was developed and published, I never
received any information about that.
Q: Let me say this, too. We didn't dictate
our FD 302 until Tuesday, the 26th. Over at
Bethesda, they waited and then they belatedly
called Parkland on the 23rd, Saturday morning.
Q: Now, if only they would have called the
Bureau, who would have gotten in touch with O'Neill
and I through Baltimore, by the Liaison
Agent assigned to the case there. But then the
findings and conclusions contained in the official
autopsy report were completely different.
And that's when Lifton called me. He
said, "Hey, wait a minute." He said, "We've
got your FD 302." He also evidently had the other
autopsy report, which I had never seen. And he
said something to the effect, "What's going on
here?"
Q: And I said, "Well," after I asked him
about the D.F.L. Initials, "You've got the 302 in
front of you." And he asked me a couple other
questions. I said, "And we'll just have to let the
record stand."
Because I didn't know what had happened or
what he was talking about. When this other autopsy
report was developed and published, I never
received any information about that.
Q: Let me say this, too. We didn't dictate
our FD 302 until Tuesday, the 26th. Over at
Bethesda, they waited and then they belatedly
called Parkland on the 23rd, Saturday morning.
Q: Now, if only they would have called the
Bureau, who would have gotten in touch with O'Neill
and I through Baltimore, by the Liaison
Agent assigned to the case there. But then the
findings and conclusions contained in the official
autopsy report were completely different.
And that's when Lifton called me. He
said, "Hey, wait a minute." He said, "We've
got your FD 302." He also evidently had the other
autopsy report, which I had never seen. And he
said something to the effect, "What's going on
here?"
Q: And I said, "Well," after I asked him
about the D.F.L. Initials, "You've got the 302 in
front of you." And he asked me a couple other
questions. I said, "And we'll just have to let the
record stand."
Because I didn't know what had happened or
what he was talking about. When this other autopsy
report was developed and published, I never
received any information about that.
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[1] if we had gone back and interviewed Humes and been
[2] given the revised autopsy conclusions. But we had
[3] no word at all of these changes being made relative
[5] So, I come back, and I say, and now it is
[6] hindsight. But I can now see why for many reasons,
[7] that someone thought that it was inadvisable to
[8] bring us before the Warren Commission. Instead we
[9] were interviewed by Specter.
[10] Q: What is the first time that you understood
[12] Commission and your own reports or - Let me
[13] withdraw that and try it again.
[14] The first time you understood a possible
[15] discrepancy between the official autopsy report and
[16] your own reports is when it was told to you by
[17] David Lifton?
[18] A: Yes, in his call to Georgia, on November
[20] Q: And, so, therefore, I assume that it's
[21] fair to say that no one at the FBI ever said
[22] anything to you about this prior to that time.
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[2] Q: Is it surprising to you that someone at
[3] the FBI didn't say something to you in December or
[4] January of 1963 (sic) when the FBI got a copy of
[5] the autopsy report?
[6] A: Well, it was - Now, I'm saying - It
[7] wasn't said to us, O'Neill and I. Now, maybe they
[8] called in to truly, my boss, in Baltimore and said,
[9] "Well, you know, over here at the Bureau, we've got
[10] an entirely different thing from the Commission on
[11] this autopsy report. And there sure is a
[12] discrepancy between what they have and what is in
[14] But that wasn't done. But, I used to get
[15] those calls, "Did you say, is this you saying here
[16] about a tracheotomy and head surgery?" I would
[17] reply, "No, it's Humes. I'm not a doctor."
[18] So, they were, evidently, getting
[19] inquiries or getting other stuff, and pack in
[20] there, regarding different reports and conflicting
[21] statements. But they never mentioned nor did they
[22] ever come out like this and say, "Well, your
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[1] account sure is in contradiction. It doesn't agree
[2] with the other autopsy report.
[3] Q: Let me tell you two or three things that
[4] we have learned. And although I don't testify
[5] about things, just try and put it into a context.
[6] I'd like your best assessment of any
[7] information that you can give, and prefer - you're
[8] not to speculate, but also best reasonable judgment
[9] that you can make.
[10] It appears, to us, fairly clear that the
[11] FBI consistently agreed with your version of the
[13] But subsequent FBI documents stayed with
[14] that. And the FBI never questioned it.
[16] Q: We also know that Dr. Humes wrote notes
[17] during the autopsy, which he subsequently
[18] destroyed.
[20] Q: He -
[22] Q: He also wrote a draft autopsy report.
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[1] which he subsequently destroyed.
[3] Q: He's testified to that under oath now.
[4] So, we have a peculiar situation here, where an
[5] autopsy is being rewritten later; and that there
[6] are, indeed, two versions. What is not clear - I
[7] mean, those all seem to be facts, as far as I
[8] understand.
[10] Q: What is not clear is why the FBI did not
[11] do something more with this?
[12] A: There again, I can't say why on that. But
[13] no one ever sat down with me and I never had a
[14] conference with anybody saying, "Well, look,
[15] here's your FD 302, what-how do you account for
[16] this?"
[17] And my answer would have probably been the
[18] same as I gave to Lifton. "Let's let the record
[19] stand."
[21] A: Well, I thought we had one more on our
[22] side, when I read this in the Fort Myer's paper
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[1] down there.
[2] Q: Yes. And you're referring to a newspaper
[5] What was your reaction when you heard
[6] about this issue?
[7] A: You mean, about him -
[10] that is the answer." Because I couldn't account
[11] for how that wound in the back had been moved up
[12] gradually - up to the base of the neck from down
[14] Q: So, now, based upon what you know from
[15] what you observed at the autopsy, do you have any
[16] assessment on what happened on November 22nd in
[17] Dealey Plaza?
[18] A: Let me say this. And I've said this
[19] before. That I won't go so far as to say there was
[20] a conspiracy, but I have always had trouble
[21] assimilating the single-bullet theory. Seeing
[22] where that back wound was, an eyewitness there -
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[1] inches from it. Seeing them probe that.
[2] And from what I understand, the bullet
[3] holes both in the shirt and coat match the bullet
[4] holes in the back and with the first location that
[5] Humes gave us. And, of course, they tried to say
[6] that if he raised his arm up -
[7] But if you raise your arm up, you're not
[8] going to raise your shirt. It's pinned in there
[9] with your belt. Plus the fact that the President
[10] wore a back brace, I understand, that was pretty
[11] tight, too, which would help to hold down the
[13] And, so, I've always had trouble with the
[14] single bullet or "magic" bullet theory.
[15] I told Hosty that lives down there in
[16] Florida, I think he's been before you, relative to
[17] events in Dallas, I said, "Jim, I can't buy the
[18] single-bullet theory." And he said, well, he
[19] didn't have any problem with it. But he wasn't as
[20] close to that back wound as I was.
[21] Q: Let me try one last question, and ask you
[22] whether there's anything I should have asked you,
but didn't, that you would like to answer?

A: Let me just—there's one thing I've got a pad here somewhere. Here it is.

Q: Well, one of the things I want to point out, of course, is that we had no jurisdiction. I think I mentioned that. That came along in '65.

Q: You mean, the federal government had no jurisdiction over the assassination?

A: That is correct. In other words, there was no statutory authority or law giving any government agency investigative jurisdiction over an attempted assassination or the assassination of a President.

Secret Service had legal authority for protection, but nothing covered assassination, and it seems unreasonable — you think of all the assassinations we've had — why a Federal law hadn't been enacted. So, you weren't in a position where you could offer any guidance or make suggestions.

If that happened now, one of the first things I would have asked Dr. Humes — and I wouldn't have been out of bounds — I would say, "Dr. Humes, have you called Parkland to see what happened there and what was the condition of the body there?"

But, I was in no position to do that. A little, lowly Senior Resident Agent in Hyattsville, if I would have made such a suggestion all it would take was some high-ranking officer calling the Bureau and saying, "You've got an agent over here trying to run the autopsy."

I understand Humes, Boswell, and Finck have never been critical about any interference on the part of the Secret Service or FBI. So, we were at a disadvantage, our hands were tied.

Checking my notes, yes I've cited that other gunshot autopsy — how it started, and then comparing the two, the difference in them.

And let's see. I have prepared a biographical sketch about my own life and what I've done. But we can talk about that off the record.

Missile wounds. We've covered that.

And I've covered what I consider the reasons for the two autopsies was that phone call made on Saturday morning by Humes to Parkland.

MR. HORNE: The two reports?

THE WITNESS: Beg your pardon?

BY MR. GUNN:

Q: When you say the two autopsies, you mean the official autopsy protocol and your version?

A: Yes, our version and the late Navy version.

Q: Right.

A: I think that we've covered it pretty well.

MR. GUNN: Okay. Thank you very much. We appreciate your time.

THE WITNESS: I hope I've been helpful.

MR. GUNN: Yes, thank you.

[Whereupon, at 5:10 p.m., the taking of the deposition concluded.]

[Signature not waived.]
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