

MEMORANDUM

April 19, 1995

To: Jeremy Gunn

cc David Marwell
Tom Samoluk
Tammi Long

From: Joe Freeman

Subject: Possible Questions, re: HSCA Firearms Panel

Questions for HSCA staffers Conzelman and Watriss:

1. Your name is referenced in HSCA Volume 7 as having been involved with the work of the Firearms Panel. Is this correct?
2. During what period of your employment with the HSCA were you involved with the Firearms Panel?
3. What was the nature of your duties in connection with the work of the Firearms Panel?
4. During their testimony before the HSCA on September 8, 1978, the Panel submitted to the Committee a signed 34-page report summarizing their work and making various recommendations in regard to firearms and ballistics issues. Did you assist in the preparation of this report?
5. If so, how?
6. The first recommendation listed by the Panel in the "Recommendations" section of their report (Part VI, p. 33) reads as follows: "A. The white fibrous material adhering to CE 567 (seat fragment) should be subjected to micro-chemical analysis to determine its composition." What can you tell us about the origins and purpose of this recommendation?
7. Was/were any particular Panel member(s) specifically associated with this recommendation?
8. If so, who?
8. What did the panel hope to learn from such a micro-chemical analysis?

Memo to Jeremy Gunn
April 19, 1996
Page 2

9. Did any members of the Panel articulate a theory as to the origins of this white fibrous material?
10. This recommendation was not part of the report published in HSCA Vol. 7. Why?
11. When in the process was this recommendation dropped?
12. Was there any discussion or controversy regarding the dropping of this recommendation?
13. Were Panel members supportive or consulted, re: dropping this recommendation?
14. Do you recall any other substantive differences between the September 8, 1978 signed report and the version of the report published in HSCA Vol. 7?
15. The report submitted by the Panel on September 8th, 1978, was not published. Instead, Volume 7 contained a staff report compiled from the work of the Panel. Do you know why this was?
16. Was this standard procedure, or was it a function of specific circumstances regarding the Firearms Panel?
17. A letter dated March 7, 1979 from Panel member Monty C. Lutz to HSCA Chairman Louis Stokes makes clear that Panel members were dissatisfied with early staff versions of the report which was eventually published in Volume 7. Do you have any information about the nature or substance of these concerns?
18. According to the letter cited in the last question, Panel members traveled to Washington at their own expense on March 1-3, 1979 and spent three days working on a firearms report. According to Lutz's letter, Chief Counsel Robert Blakey was heavily involved in this effort and, by the end of March 3rd, says Lutz, "we were able to turn the report in as it now stands." Can you confirm that the report Lutz refers to in his letter -- the work product of the Panel's 3-day visit to Washington in early March of 1979 -- is the same document published in Volume 7?
19. Were any subsequent changes made to the Panel report after March 3rd?
20. If so, where these changes substantive?
21. Can you recall any such changes, if they occurred?

Memo to Jeremy Gunn
April 19, 1996
Page 3

22. Did any of the changes, if they took place, involve the earlier recommendation from September of 1978 regarding the testing of the fiber in CE 567 (seat fragment)?
23. Who else would you recommend the ARRB contact in connection with these issues?
24. Under our statute, the ARRB is primarily interested in records. Are you aware of any records relating to the work of the Firearms Panel that may not presently be part of the JFK Collection?
25. Do you have any such records from your work with the Panel?
26. The JFK Collection includes the signed Firearms Panel Report dated September 8, 1978. A similar, but not identical, unsigned report is published in HSCA Volume 7. Are you aware of the existence of any intermediary drafts or versions of the report which should be made a part of the Collection?

Questions for Firearms Panel Members:

1. During the Panel's testimony before the HSCA on September 8, 1978, you and the other Panel members submitted a signed 34-page report to the Committee. Which HSCA staffer(s) assisted the Panel in the preparation and writing of this report?
2. What were the respective roles of HSCA staff and Panel members in the preparation and writing of this report?
3. The first recommendation listed by the Panel in the "Recommendations" section of your September 8th, 1978 Report (Part VI, p. 33) reads as follows: "A. The white fibrous material adhering to CE 567 (seat fragment) should be subjected to micro-chemical analysis to determine its composition." What can you tell us about the origins and purpose of this recommendation?

[3a-d. **FOR PANEL MEMBER JOHN BATES ONLY:** This recommendation is an almost verbatim version of a comment you wrote on your worksheet for the examination of CE 567. Can you give us your rationale for this recommendation? What did you believe such a micro-chemical analysis would prove? Did you or do you have a theory for what the white fibrous material might be or where it may have originated? How much importance did you attach to this recommendation?]

4. Do you recall any other substantive differences between the Panel's September 8, 1978 signed Report and the version subsequently published in HSCA Vol. 7?

Memo to Jeremy Gunn
April 19, 1996
Page 4

5. Did you expect that the Panel's signed report would appear in the published HSCA volumes?
6. Were you apprised of -- or can you speculate on -- why it was not?
7. In early March of 1979 you and the other Panelists returned to Washington to work on and revise for publication a HSCA staff version of the Panel's findings. According to a letter subsequently sent to HSCA Chairman Louis Stokes by Panel member Monty Lutz, this visit was necessitated by Panel members' dissatisfaction with the work of the HSCA staffers drafting or editing the report of the Panel's findings. Is this correct?
8. If so, what was the nature of this dissatisfaction?
9. Mr. Lutz's letter also states that after 3 days of work -- including 9 hours with HSCA Chief Counsel Blakey -- the Panel was "able to turn the report in as it now stands." Is the version of the report Lutz refers to in his letter -- the work product of the Panel's 3-day visit to Washington in early March of 1979 -- the same document published in HSCA Volume 7?
10. Do you know if any subsequent changes were made to the Panel report after March 3rd when the Panel concluded its visit to Washington?
11. If so, were these changes substantive?
12. Can you recall any such changes, if they occurred?
13. Did any of the changes, if they took place, involve the earlier recommendation from September of 1978 regarding the testing of the fiber in CE 567 (seat fragment)?
14. Who else would you recommend the ARRB contact with regard to these issues?
15. Under our statute, the ARRB is primarily interested in records. Are you aware of any records relating to the work of the Firearms Panel that may not presently be part of the JFK Collection?
16. Are you in possession of any records, notes, draft reports, etc. dating from your work on the HSCA Firearms Panel?
17. The JFK Collection includes the signed Firearms Panel Report dated September 8, 1978. A similar, but not identical, unsigned report is published in HSCA Volume 7. Are you aware of the

Memo to Jeremy Gunn

April 19, 1996

Page 5

existence of any intermediary drafts or versions of the report which should be made a part of the Collection?

Freeman e:/wp-docs/041896

File 4.0.2 HSCA Firearms Panel