

THE JFK FILES: ASSESSING OVER 60 YEARS  
OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S  
OBSTRUCTION, OBFUSCATION,  
AND DECEPTION

---

HEARING

BEFORE THE  
TASK FORCE ON THE DECLASSIFICATION  
OF FEDERAL SECRETS  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT  
AND GOVERNMENT REFORM  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

MAY 20, 2025

**Serial No. 119-27**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform



Available on: *govinfo.gov*  
*oversight.house.gov* or  
*docs.house.gov*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

60-449 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2025

## COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia, <i>Ranking</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	<i>Minority Member</i>
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	Columbia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
GARY PALMER, Alabama	RO KHANNA, California
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	ROBERT GARCIA, California
PAT FALLON, Texas	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	GREG CASAR, Texas
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	EMILY RANDALL, Washington
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia	SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	YASSAMIN ANSARI, Arizona
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	WESLEY BELL, Missouri
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	LATEEFAH SIMON, California
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	DAVE MIN, California
ELI CRANE, Arizona	AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
JOHN MCGUIRE, Virginia	
BRANDON GILL, Texas	

---

MARK MARIN, Staff Director  
JAMES RUST, Deputy Staff Director  
MITCH BENZINE, General Counsel  
JAKE GREENBERG, Chief Counsel for Investigations  
CLARK ABOURISK, Deputy Chief Counsel for Investigations  
MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JAMIE SMITH, Minority Staff Director

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

## TASK FORCE ON THE DECLASSIFICATION OF FEDERAL SECRETS

ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida, Chairwoman	
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	ROBERT GARCIA, California, <i>Ranking Minority</i>
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	<i>Member</i>
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
ELI CRANE, Arizona	DAVE MIN, California
BRANDON GILL, Texas	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas

# C O N T E N T S

---

	Page
Hearing held on May 20, 2025 .....	1

## WITNESSES

---

Dr. Don Curtis, Doctor of Dental Surgery, Oral and Maxillofacial Specialist, Amarillo, TX	
Oral Statement .....	5
Mr. Abraham Bolden, Former U.S. Secret Service Agent	
Oral Statement .....	8
Mr. Dan Hardway, Former Researcher for the Select Committee on Assassinations (HSCA), U.S. House of Representatives	
Oral Statement .....	10
The Honorable John Tunheim, Senior Judge, U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota	
Oral Statement .....	12
Mr. Douglas Horne, Former Staffer, Assassinations Records Review Board	
Oral Statement .....	16
Ms. Alexis Coe (Minority Witness), Presidential Historian, Senior Fellow, New America	
Oral Statement .....	19
<i>Written opening statements and bios are available on the U.S. House of Representatives Document Repository at: docs.house.gov.</i>	

## INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

---

- \* Letter, May 16, 2025, to Majority Leader, re: Witness; submitted by Rep. Luna.
  - \* Letter, May 19, 2025, from Scalise, re: Witness; submitted by Rep. Luna.
- The documents listed above are available at: docs.house.gov.*



# **THE JFK FILES: ASSESSING OVER 60 YEARS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S OBSTRUCTION, OBFUSCATION, AND DECEPTION**

---

**Tuesday, May 20, 2025**

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM  
TASK FORCE ON THE DECLASSIFICATION OF FEDERAL SECRETS  
*Washington, D.C.*

The Task Force met, pursuant to notice, at 2:20 p.m., in room HVC-210, U.S. Capitol Visitor Center, Hon. Anna Paulina Luna [Chairwoman of the Task Force] presiding.

Present: Representatives Luna, Mace, Burchett, Burlison, Crane, Garcia, and Lee.

Also present: Representatives Biggs and Ogles.

Mrs. LUNA. The Task Force on the Declassification of Federal Secrets will come to order. Welcome everyone. I request unanimous consent that Mr. Biggs of Arizona and Mr. Ogles of Tennessee are waived on into this hearing for purposes of questioning.

Without objection, so ordered.

Further, without objection, the Chair may declare a recess at any time. Pursuant to the House rules and regulations for the remote participation of committee witnesses, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record a letter from Chairman Comer to Majority Leader Scalise requesting Mr. Bolden testify removed and a letter from Scalise granting this request.

Without objection, so ordered.

I now recognize myself for the purpose of making an opening statement. Good afternoon, everyone, and thank you for being here today. I wanted thank our witnesses, especially those who have traveled far to be here.

In the past 60 years, on a crowded street in Dallas, Texas, the President of the United States was assassinated in front of a horrified crowd, his Secret Service protection, and his wife. The death of President Kennedy was a monumentous and tragic day for the entire Nation, as well as the Kennedy family. The country has never been the same since.

Compounding that tragedy, however, has been over 60 years of half-truths, deception and outright lies that the Federal Government has offered regarding the details of that day and the events surrounding it. I want to thank the National Archives for their co-

operation with this Task Force. The Archives has provided these posters behind us that had were allegedly produced for the CIA to show President Johnson on the days following the assassination. They are, of course, images of the Zapruder film that Americans have come to know as capturing the final moments of President Kennedy's life. But Americans have come to understand about the assassination of President Kennedy has mostly been controlled and filtered through the ascent and watchful gaze of Federal agencies who have often resisted efforts to reveal the truth.

They have done this, at best, because of their own embarrassment about their failures to protect President Kennedy that day. At worst, they have resisted for more nefarious reasons, such as failing to acknowledge the extent of power and reach that the CIA in the 1960s had and beyond to the point of deceiving even the U.S. Congress. That is why we are here today. We are here to listen to the witnesses who have waited, in some cases, decades to tell their stories.

I want to be clear, the Task Force on Declassification of Federal Secrets is not here to provide the definitive account of what happened on November 22, 1963. Instead, the Task Force is meant to root up the hidden pockets of Federal Government that has for too long remained in the shadows out of reach for even good-faith investigators to reach.

I also want to thank President Trump for committing to the principles of transparency and holding the government accountable to the people. His executive order regarding the declassification of documents related to the assassination of President Kennedy, Senator Robert F. Kennedy, and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. is a step forward in the right direction.

The job of the Task Force is to ensure that the Federal agencies follow that order because in the past, a President's order for transparency has not always been heeded by the most secretive portions of our government. The objective of this Task Force is not to indulge in conspiracy theories, but to push forward the release of information so these theories could be put to bed and so the American people can finally have truth.

It is the Federal agencies that lack transparency for 60 years that have led to the people's distrust in their government and it is time to restore that. I would also like to provide for those who have been closely following this to include researchers an update on several documents that are outstanding. To date, the Joannides file has not been located, a whistleblower report from CIA alleging the CIA's implication has also not been located. Lee Harvey Oswald's travel records have not been located and the DS-201 file, who was a plausible suspect for the Delaney Plaza shooter and then as well as the MAA documents concerning CIA penetration of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Last week, for an update, I did speak to the CIA directly, not in a SCIF so I can talk about it publicly, and they did notify me that four of these five documents will be publicly released in the coming weeks, but there was one that was outstanding, and I do believe that that one outstanding document is the Joannides file.

Without further ado, I would like to yield this next portion to Ranking Member Garcia and then also prior to that we also had

requested footage from NBC. They gave us something like 20 hours of footage, all of which is not the Wegman footage that we had asked for, so we are kindly asking NBC to reassess their archives and produce that documentation.

Without further ado, Ranking Chairman Garcia.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Chairwoman Luna, I wanted to note—first, thank you to the witnesses that are here. Now, as the Task Force continues its work, we need to continue to follow the facts and provide transparency for the American people.

I think we can all agree that this Task Force was not set up to chase conspiracy theories, and I am glad, of course, to have Chairwoman Luna reiterate that.

It is responsible, though, for us, to focus on declassification of historical records and that allows, as we all know, the public to gain a better understanding of the past, can restore trust and restitutions, and ensures accountability in our shared government.

Now, on March 18, 2025, the National Archives and Records released more than 77,000 pages related, of course, to the November 22, 1963, assassination of President Kennedy. Now, we know that many of these documents, most in fact, were already in the public record, but continued work to make the documents more accessible is important and valuable.

Now, over the past several decades, our government has collected and released almost 6 million pages of documents consistent with President John F. Kennedy and the Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992.

Now, together, we should push back on decades of overclassification relating not to just the JFK assassination, but a variety of subjects. We should be very clear, and it should be done in a bipartisan way, that the FBI and the CIA of the 1960s were deeply flawed institutions. And while they have taken lessons from their past trespasses, there is no question that they continue to opt in overclassified information often out of an unnecessary abundance of caution. And it is also important to note that the FBI and CIA did harm in numerous areas, over the few decades, particularly when you look at the time of the civil rights movement.

Now, transparency is how we ensure accountability and trust. The American people have the right to know as much as possible about what our government does and how our tax dollars are spent in a way that does not, of course, interfere with national security.

Now, I understand the interest in the second hearing on President Kennedy's assassination. But I hope we, on our Task Force, can continue to work in a bipartisan way on the many other topics under its purview as they are also important to the public.

Now, as we hear testimony from our witnesses today, I want to make sure that we remember that President Kennedy's assassination is more than a historical event; it was also a human tragedy. President Kennedy was a husband, a father, a brother, and a son. Revisiting and relitigating the tragic killing is also painful for the real people that were impacted and for the family. And I think it is important to uplift that.

We should be respectful and responsible as we work to address the public's questions about this tragedy. And we know that President Kennedy's legacy has made America the country that it is

today. Now, at a time when we are looking, of course, for—and the Majority is pushing for tax cuts, oftentimes for the wealthiest, we need to remember that President Kennedy believed in a society where Americans took care of one another. He fought to expand and lay the groundwork for the program which, of course, became Medicare, which was enacted under President Johnson. He, of course, was a huge proponent of advancing civil rights. And President Kennedy proposed the Civil Rights Act, which became a landmark law in 1964. He supported the courts and the rule of law, which we know that President Kennedy worked tirelessly to enforce, of course, courts, support courts and orders, even sending U.S. marshals and the National Guard to desegregate the University of Mississippi.

Social Security was also critical to President Kennedy. He worked to expand Social Security to increase benefits and cover more people with disabilities.

President Kennedy, over and over again, of course believed that government could do big things. He invested in scientific discovery and challenged us to put a man on the moon. We know, and he knew, that our country was strongest as a global leader fighting for freedom and democracy. He believed in working through our alliances.

And I want to make sure that the family also knows that we will work and always work to uplift President Kennedy's legacy and what he left for this country and his community.

It is important that we follow the facts and that we work to continue and declassify, oftentimes, things that have been overclassified by, particularly, the FBI and the CIA in the past.

Thank you. And I yield back.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you, Chairman Garcia [sic].

And if it is OK with the Chairman [sic], I would like to allow our witnesses to give more detail in their testimony if they go over the 5 minutes. So, how it works typically is, with the opening statements, you are usually allotted a certain amount of time. But given the nature and context of this hearing, take your time, no one is in trouble, we want to hear your story for historical purposes and significance. So, just take your time, you are not under any pressure.

Our witnesses here today are pretty historical. Joining us via Zoom, we actually have Mr. Abraham Bolden. Mr. Bolden was an agent with the U.S. Secret Service appointed by President Kennedy in 1961. And, sir, we want to thank you very much for attending today. We are very happy that you are here.

We also have Dr. Don Curtis. Dr. Curtis was a resident in oral and facial surgery at Parkland Hospital in Dallas. And at 12:45 p.m. on November 22, 1963, he was actually in the trauma room one attempting to save President Kennedy's life. He is joining us today in person.

Dr. Judge Tunheim. Mr. Tunheim is currently a Federal district judge in Minnesota, but previously served as President Bill Clinton's Chair of the Assassination Record Review Board. As well as Mr. Hardway. Mr. Hardway was an investigator with the Select Committee on Assassinations of the House of Representatives. As well as Mr. Douglas Horne. Mr. Horne was a staffer at the Assas-



sination Record Review Board. And then as well as Ms. Alexis Coe. Ms. Coe is a Presidential historian and senior fellow at New America.

Pursuant to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Rule 9, the witnesses will please stand and raise your right hand.

Dr. Curtis, you can sit, but please raise your right hand, sir.

Do you so solemnly swear and affirm that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

[Chorus of ayes.]

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you. Let the record show that the witnesses have answered in the affirmative.

The Task Force certainly appreciates you for being here and we look forward to hearing your testimony. Let me remind you and the witnesses that we have read your written statements, and that they will appear in record in full. And it is an accommodation, because of the historic nature of this testimony, please also be ensured that you will not be rushed for your opening statements, but try to keep it around 10 minutes, if possible.

As a reminder, please press the button on the microphone in front of you so that it is on and the Members can hear you. When you begin to speak, the light in front of you will turn green. After 9 minutes the light will turn yellow. And when the red light comes on that means your time is up, but we will not be gaveling you out, so please take your time.

I now recognize Mr. Bolden to give an opening statement.

Mr. BOLDEN. [Audio malfunction.]

Mrs. LUNA. Sir, we cannot hear you. Is your microphone on?

We still cannot hear him.

Mr. BOLDEN. [Audio malfunction.]

Mrs. LUNA. OK, we are going move to Dr. Curtis while you guys work through the mic issue. But Mr. Bolden, please be assured we will be coming back to you, so we will just pass. We will be coming back, though.

Dr. Curtis, if you can.

**STATEMENT OF DR. DON CURTIS  
DOCTOR OF DENTAL SURGERY  
ORAL AND MAXILLOFACIAL SPECIALIST**

Dr. CURTIS. Thank you. My story begins when I left my office to go to get something to eat before I did surgery. And to do that, I had to go by the emergency room. And when I went by the emergency room, a policeman came of the door into the emergency room. Right over my shoulder and he said, "Are you a doctor?"

Can everybody hear?

Mrs. LUNA. Yes. I am sorry, Dr. Curtis.

Mr. Bolden, we can hear you now. Your microphone is working, but Dr. Curtis is doing the opening statement. And so, if you could just pause real quick and then put yourself on mute, thank you.

Dr. Curtis, please continue.

Dr. CURTIS. All right. So, the policeman asked me if I was a doctor, and I said, yes. And he grabbed me by the arm and pulled me into the emergency room and took me to the trauma room. And

when I looked in the trauma room, there were three people in the room. One was the President, and he was laying on the gurney, and extremist, and the other was Dr. Carrico, James Carrico, and one nurse. And the reason Dr. Carrico was on his own is because the Governor Connally was brought in before him, and he was very seriously ill. And the staff, all the staff in the emergency room, went to help him. And then Dr. Carrico was left to take care of President by himself. So, I walked in and he had just placed an endotracheal tube.

And then I walked up and held the tube so he could connect the Bird machine to it. The Bird machine is an intermittent positive pressure respiratory help. And it works by filling the lungs and then letting the air come back out. And the way it works is that the inspiration continues to a certain pressure and then the expiration continues to another low pressure. And therefore, that spaces the breathing. Normally, that is about 10 or 15 minutes, 10 or 15 times during a minute. But in this case, it was going about 100 to 125 conversions in a minute. So, it was rat-a-tat-tat-tat.

I knew the machine, Dr. Carrico knew the machine. We used it a lot. And so, the question was is, the machine not working or is the tube blocked or what? And he had placed the tube in. If you place endotracheal tube, you place it between the cords and then you know you are in the trachea and have got an airway. But in this case, apparently we did not have an airway. It was a question, is it the machine or what is it?

And so finally, it got to a point where I said, "Jimmy, what do you want to do?" And he had already made the decision, he said, tracheostomy, we need do a trach. So, if there was going to be a trach, well, I knew that shirt would be in the way. So, I moved around to take the shirt off and the nurse was way ahead of me with her scissors and we took the shirt off.

And in the meantime, Dr. Malcolm Perry came in, and he was on the medical staff. He is a professor in the medical school, senior to Dr. Carrico. So, he decided to do the tracheostomy. And then Dr. Carrico said to me, "Don, why don't you go ahead and do a cut down on that left leg? And so, I went and did that. A cut down is a very small operation, but it is a very important thing to do. The reason for doing it, is that most people come into the emergency room as bled out where their blood volume is low. If the blood volume is low, well, then, the heart does not have anything to pump, and that is basically a cause of death

Well, if you can replenish the blood volume quickly, well then that causes a better chance of survival. So, a cut down is to put a catheter in a vein so that you can get the fluid in earlier, faster. And the operation is to make an incision across the front of the shin and dissect out the saphenous vein, which is the vein that goes right up the front of the leg, make a little hole in the catheter, put a catheter in that, then put a stitch around the vein to close it off and hold the catheter in place

The nurse, at the meantime, has the bag hanging without any fluid and 500 CCs in a collar that she can pump up and when she does that, where she forces the fluid into the vein. So, that is what I did.

Then after I did that, then Dr. Perry had already completed the tracheostomy, and I looked up and then the President's heart had stopped or it was not running. They put a monitor on the President, they found his heart was not beating. And so, the external cardiac massage was being done by Kemp Clark, the chief of neurosurgery. Somebody relieved him and Kemp Clark went and picked up the head and stopped the resuscitation. This wound is not compatible with life. It got dead quiet; nobody knew what to say, nobody said anything for the longest time.

Then he said, "OK," and he looked at—by that time the chiefs of all the social services were against the wall across the room from me and all in white coats. And they had responded to the call that they needed to help. And so, he said—pointed them out, "I need to tell each of you individually what the wound is so that you can say that later on."

And then he described the wound as about a 3-or 4-inch hole in the posterior cranium. And then there was a bullet hole in the right temple. So, he described it as the bullet came through the temple into the cranial vault, created a huge pressure in the cranial vault. And when the bullet finally tumbled into the posterior wall, it blew it out. And he explained all that, individually, to these five doctors, six, seven doctors. And those doctors knew what was happening and what happened to the President and the wound that killed him and they never were called by the Warren Commission. So, that did not work.

And so, after that, I stood there and I could not leave because Mrs. Kenny was to my right, and I could not get past her. So, I had to just stay there for a while, but then eventually everybody left. And I went around to look at the wound and I could not see it, it was laying on the pillow but I could see where it was.

Then I left there and went into an adjacent room, the X-ray waiting room, a large room. And right in the middle of the room was Lyndon Johnson and he was telling people to go talk on the phone and he was, obviously, he set the government up and had taken control.

And then I looked around and I could not see a single person that I thought looked like Secret Service. I could not see any weapons that were protecting him. I was a little uncomfortable being there myself, because at that time, we had no idea what was going on in our government. We did not know if the government would be intact or not. But it made me feel good to know that he was right in the middle of the room and he was the President. He was absolutely fearless.

Then I wondered, why is he so absolutely fearless? I mean if it is a coup, he would be the next one to go. So, with that, I left, and that is what I learned in the emergency—in the trauma room.

Then later, we found out that the residents and the interns should not talk to each other about this, and so, we did not. And Dr. Carrico and I would have lunch together many times, often just him and me, and we never mentioned it to each other.

And so, one thing I would like to get started today is that the magic bullet was a product of the Warren Commission that does not make any sense. And I could go through these bullets that fell, but I think I am out of time.

Mrs. LUNA. Well, so just so you know, we will be giving you opportunity to go back to that because we are very interested in that, and thank you for that.

Dr. CURTIS. OK.

Mrs. LUNA. Because of previous technical issues, Mr. Bolden, if you can, please give your opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM BOLDEN  
FORMER U.S. SECRET SERVICE AGENT**

Mr. BOLDEN. Chairman Luna, and all of the senior Members of the Committee. My name is Abraham Bolden. And I am an ex Secret Service agent from 1960 to the 1964. I helped protect President Kennedy, and also Bud Eisenhower, and LBJ Johnson. Now, we have a document here that all Americans should respect. And it says, we hold these truths to be evidence, that all men are created equal, that are endowed with the Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Now, that should apply to all with the courageous evidence that we support what the Forefathers wrote.

Now, growing up in east St. Louis, Illinois, my father, Daniel Bolden, and my mother, Ophelia, I noticed that there were quite a bit of trauma and things that were going on. I wanted to get to the bottom of, criminal activity, hate, racism, lack of respect.

So, after I graduated from Lincoln University in Jefferson City, Missouri, I became the first African American after having a choice between becoming a music teacher in Kentucky and a Pinkerton agent. I chose the Pinkerton agent because I wanted to find a solution to the problems that we were having in America and that became my goal in life.

Now, when I became a Secret Service agent in 1960, I was surprised at what I found, the racism, the inequality of job assignments. Now, everything that I will tell you today, none of it came from research. I am not a researcher. Each fact that I give you today are from my specific actions. No one has prompted me to say anything. I have been waiting for this opportunity since 1964.

Now, as it so happened, that God made it possible for me to answer one of my dreams first, and that was to meet President Kennedy. The President came to Chicago after he won the election. By me being a Secret Service agent, the Secret Service disrespected me as an agent by replacing a position near President Kennedy, and putting a fireman in my position. And they placed me by the bathroom at McCormick Place, there were lots of jokes about it in the Office of the United States Secret Service.

All I wanted to do was carry out my duties, to God and my country and the President of the United States. But they took my position, my position which should have been near the President, and placed me by the washroom at McCormick Place, two flights down from the convention hall.

Now, when the motorcade stopped in front of the McCormick Place, the President the first thing he wanted to do was use the washroom and there I stood. Now, the President walked up to me and we shook hands. He asked me if I was one of Mayor Daley's finest or a Secret Service agent. I answered the question notifying him that I was a Secret Service agent. Then he asked me, he in-

vited me to come to Washington, DC. and become the first African American appointed as a Secret Service agent, which I thought was very great.

But in becoming an agent, I found that there was so many cracks in this petition. The agents were drinking on duty, some of them were smoking weed. They were going around with prostitutes when they were supposed to be on duty, and they were particularly racist against President and Robert Kennedy. There were some who were also worried about the fact that they thought that President Kennedy and his family were trying to form a dynasty. I heard a lot of talk about them forming a dynasty, that President Kennedy would be first, then Robert Kennedy, and then Kennedy, Kennedy, Kennedy. And then, when that happened, then the Catholics would run America for the next 100 years and that had to be stopped.

Now, on the detail, as I said, there was a lot of drinking, a lot of smoke, and I became against it. I warned them about it.

Now, when President Kennedy was coming to Chicago in March in 1963, we got a call from the Federal Bureau of Investigation who had a meeting, because President Kennedy was due in Chicago, this was in March. We received a call from the Federal Bureau of Investigation here in Chicago from a person who the FBI identified only as Lee. And this man, Lee, said that President Kennedy was going to be assassinated between O'Hare Airport and the Conrad Hilton hotel. So, in order to protect him, we had the airplanes land, and then we brought him by helicopter to a medics field, which was not being used at the time, which I thought and recommended that they do that. That was my recommendation how to get the President there.

Now, during the President's trip in March, I noticed one thing that every time the photographers would take our pictures together, where I was concerned, that they had an agent assigned to remove all of the negatives. They took them and I do not know what they did with them. But we have not been able to find suitable pictures yet.

Now, as I said, I was one of the strong agents who was on their tail about their conduct and they did not like it and I did not like their conduct. So, we were even-steven. So, we had an opportunity, with President Kennedy's invitation, to go with the President to Massachusetts to Hyannis Port. They were very disrespectful to me, calling me nigger and different terms such as that moolie, and they made it miserable for me as an agent of the United States Secret Service.

So, the President invited me on July 2 to arrive on Nantucket Sound on his yacht, the Marlin. The President did that. And I was seated next to the Chief of the United States Secret Service, Rowley. While we were on the yacht, Marlin, the President sent to me lunch, clam chowder, and said to the fellow who brought me lunch—I am going into this to tell you what type of person, what a wonderful person that President Kennedy was. And he made intentions, had me placed on Air Force One and also on the Marine One which is the helicopter with all his staff.

But this type of habitual drinking and wild life continued, even after the 4th of July in Hyannis Port. When we were on Air Force One, I mentioned that to Rowley. I told him there was too much

drinking going on. He told me just enjoy the yacht ride, we will discuss that later on.

Now, we get back to Washington, DC. Now, one incident I want to make clear, is that I was standing outside the Oval Office on June 29 about 7 o'clock in the evening. A big, chauffeured limousine pulled up in front of the White House door, the other agents had left for lunch. President Johnson exited the chauffeured limousine and slammed the door as hard as he could. He walked straight to the Oval Office where I had interdicted him and I was standing by the door first. I walked before he did because I figured where he had to be going and I was the only agent there to take control of the situation.

President Johnson, the first thing that he said as he passed me and walked into the Oval Office, he said "you bastards ain't trying to send me to jail over some goddamn cotton." And after that particular time, an argument ensued between the President and Bobby Kennedy that was so violent, or lots of violent words about Bobby, about cotton—I could not distinguish every word that they said, but when Johnson left the Oval Office, he first wanted to know who I was standing by the Oval Office door. His chauffeur told him he must be Secret Service or FBI, or he could not be standing there.

Now, as Johnson exited the office, he looked back, told the President and Bobby Kennedy, "You bastards are going to get enough of fucking with me." Those were exact words. And he was in such a temper, violent mood, that I reported it to the then-head of my shift, Harvey Henderson. Harvey Henderson's thought was I would kill the motherfucker myself if I had a chance.

Now, some of these facts are in "The Echo from Dealey Plaza", for the book that I wrote. Some are not and I left them out simply because I felt that my life would be in danger if I included it.

Mrs. LUNA. Mr. Bolden, if you can for a moment, we actually have some questions in regard to your testimony. So, is it OK if we move to some of the other witnesses for opening and then come back to you with specifics on your experience?

Mr. BOLDEN. Yes.

Mrs. LUNA. And also, too, both the Ranking Member, Mr. Garcia, and I would like to thank you for your service to this country, especially as the first African American Secret Service officer. Your sacrifice for this country and your service to this country does not go unnoticed so we applaud you, sir.

Mr. BOLDEN. Thank you.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, sir.

Mrs. LUNA. Now, I would like to recognize Mr. Hardway for an opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF DAN HARDWAY  
FORMER RESEARCHER FOR THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON  
ASSASSINATIONS (HSCA)  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Mr. HARDWAY. Thank you. For the past 62 years, the Central Intelligence Agency has actively and continuously obstructed the investigation of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy with no consequences for their actions.

Ten years ago, the CIA's official historian admitted that the CIA had hidden information from the Warren Commission during its investigation. The CIA stonewalled the Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with respect to intelligence activities, the Church Committee.

The CIA was not forthcoming with the Rockefeller Commission. The CIA misled and slow-walked the Assassination Records Review Board. James Angleton's preferred method in dealing with the Warren Commission was to, quote, "wait them out." The first CIA officer I ever interviewed looked at me and said, "You represent Congress, what the F is that to the CIA? You will be gone in 2 years, and we will still be here."

In 1978, the CIA ran an illegal, domestic covert operation involving an undercover officer to subvert and obstruct the House Select Committee on Assassinations. That officer served undercover, that terminology is the terminology the CIA used to describe his assignment working with the select committee in a statement that their representative made under the penalties of perjury in a lawsuit in 2005.

I personally experienced the CIA's obstruction of the HSC investigation and can testify firsthand about what happened. In 1977 and 1978, I was employed as a researcher by the Select Committee and I have submitted a detailed 17-page description of what happened then and since then, which I hope you will read.

Briefly, my primary area of responsibility was Lee Harvey Oswald's activities in Mexico City in the fall of 1963, and the performance of the CIA in monitoring and reporting those activities, as well as other issues related to the possibility of CIA knowledge of or involvement in the assassination of President Kennedy and the cover-up of information relevant to the investigation of the assassination.

In that capacity, I had a top-secret security clearance, and during the major portion of my employment had access to unredacted CIA records, requested for review from the CIA by the Select Committee. Implicit in the focus of my work was the issue of whether the evidence from Mexico indicated any operational connection between Oswald and the CIA. Ed Lopez and I authored the report, "The CIA, Oswald, and Mexico City."

In the spring of 1978, among other things, I was looking hard into back-channel communication methods used by the Mexico City Station; the use of an impulse camera to photograph the Cuban consulate in Mexico City; missing production from that impulse camera, and from one of the photographic installations that covered the Soviet embassy in Mexico City; and David Atlee Phillips anti-Castro propaganda operations, including his connections to stories about Oswald that rapidly appeared after the assassination of John Kennedy.

In May 1978, the CIA assigned an officer working in an undercover capacity to work with me and Mr. Lopez. That man was George Joannides. When Joannides was introduced to the investigation, we were told that he had no connection of any kind with any aspect of the Kennedy case that we would be investigating.

In addition to that, the CIA assured us that they had no working relationship with an anti-Castro Cuban group known as DRE. They

had no relationship with the DRE when representatives of that group had an encounter with Oswald in the summer of 1963, which they turned into quite a propaganda coup.

The DRE was responsible for the first-ever conspiracy theory about the assassination when the day after the assassination, they published in their newspapers the story about Oswald's pro Castro activities in New Orleans, and proposed that Castro was behind the assassination, a story that is was picked up the next day by the *Washington Post* and the *Miami Herald*. Thanks to the work of the Assassination Records Review Board though, we now know that not only was DRE still a CIA operation all the way through 1963 and all the way up to April 1964, its controlling case officer, who oversaw the activities of the DRE and directed the DRE's activities, was no one other than George Joannides.

I believe we were close to some major discoveries in 1978, and then the CIA ran an undercover operation against us. They assigned us a man who knew exactly how to keep us from finding what we were looking for, and he proceeded to do just that. Reasonable inferences may be drawn about what they did not want us to find from the substantial circumstantial evidence that has come to light by our efforts and those of the Assassination Records Review Board, and the journalist, Jefferson Morley.

I am a witness to these events. And as such, I have a civic duty to testify. I wish I were just here—actually I wish I were not here—but I wish I were just here to talk about a cover-up, but I am not. I am here to talk about a CIA covert operation, directed against the Select Committee on Assassinations, that was illegal and a violation of the CIA's charter, as well as being a felonious obstruction of a congressional investigation. That operation was and continues to be successful.

Despite our testimony, and by that, I mean mine, Ed Lopez's, and G. Robert Blakey, and the clear record, no one has ever done anything about it. I have copies of the sworn testimony and exhibits of all three of us in D.C. district court case number 17-CV-1433. I have those records with me if any of the Members of this Task Force would like to see them.

The question for this Task Force is whether anyone in this new generation of leaders has the backbone, the courage, the gumption to try to do something even at this late date. It is easy to admit and air the sins of our ancestors, it is much harder to admit that we built their tombs and endorse their actions by our inaction. I am here to testify again, which is all that I can do. What will you do?

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you, Mr. Hardway.

I now recognize Judge Tunheim for an opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN TUNHEIM  
SENIOR JUDGE  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Judge TUNHEIM. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member. I appreciate this opportunity to speak today.

My name is John Tunheim. I am a Federal District Court judge for the District of Minnesota. I am in my thirtieth year as a Federal judge. I served as Chief Judge of our district from 2015 until



2022, and as a member of the U.S. Judicial Conference from 2020 to 2024. I was originally nominated by President Clinton in 1995 after serving 10 years as the Minnesota's Chief Deputy Attorney General.

I was Chair of the Assassination Records Review Board during its entire existence from 1994 through 1998. The review board was an independent Federal agency. Its five board members were confirmed by the U.S. Senate after being nominated by President Clinton.

Congress created the review board for the express purpose of reviewing all of the still secret records of tragic assassination of President John Kennedy, and declassifying as much information as could be publicly released.

The impetus for the law which was enacted in October 1992 was Oliver Stone's movie, JFK. The President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 provided for a five-member decision-making board which would make decisions on agency-requested redactions of classified documents. We had declassification authority. The first time, and maybe the only time, an outside group had that authority.

The board members were, by law, to be recommended for appointment by professional organizations—two national historical associations, an archivist association, and the American Bar Association. Besides me, the members included a renowned provost from a major university, later university president; two distinguished history professors; and a senior archivist at Princeton. We were confirmed in 1994 and began our work with no appropriation or offices. We worked out of the National Archives for a time until I was able to secure some funding from the White House to get us started before Congress could provide an appropriation.

The Agency's presentation of records was seriously delayed because of the delay in the appointments. We were ready to begin review with our staff by early 1995. The statute did not require us to reach any conclusions about prior investigations or what happened on November 22. Rather, our task was to conduct a wide-ranging search for records to create the largest possible collection of assassination-related records as open to the public as possible. The goal was to allow the interested public to make up their own minds about what happened and based on an open and transparent and complete record.

The congressional mandate, and this is important, it stated that the records relating to the assassination would, quote, "carry a presumption of immediate disclosure." And quote, "only in the rarest of cases is there any legitimate need for continued protection." This is Congress in 1992.

Congress defined the term assassination records broadly and indicated that the review board could further define the term "assassination record," which we did. So, in June 1995, our definition was that any record that was reasonably related to the assassination would be an assassination record subject to the board's jurisdiction. And we included all records collected by government agencies in conjunction with any investigation or analysis of, or inquiry into, the assassination of President Kennedy.

We developed detailed guidelines for agencies to follow. And agencies did have the right to appeal our decisions directly to the President. We were authorized to redact words. We did not ever redact entire documents that the agency proved by clear and convincing evidence, that was the standard, that the harm of disclosure outweighed the public interest in the document in four categories: national security, intelligence-gathering methods, personal privacy, or methods of protecting the President. That was it.

We held many public hearings, experts' conferences around the country, in addition to our private meetings to discuss our decision-making. We also tried to clarify unclear evidence where we could. Digitalizing autopsy materials and analyzing them and deposing the autopsy physicians. We also gathered artifacts, including photographs and film and clothing and other artifacts.

We have limited time to do our work, which was not enough time. We were granted just 1 more year by Congress, so we had a total of 3 years. We began to lose staff as we approached the end of our mandate.

In all, the board issued over 27,000 individual rulings. These were decisions on requests by agencies to protect information. Most redacted information had release dates attached to them. It made it easy for the researchers to determine whether a redacted name appeared in different locations so that they would know it was the same person.

There was further 33,000 consent releases, which essentially means that the agency saw the handwriting on the wall and released the documents directly since we were likely to order release.

When we finished, there were nearly 5 million pages at the National Archives. We made the decision early that we would not protect any information directly related to the assassination because of the high level of public interest.

By 2017, when the last records were to be released under the Act, there were probably not more than 1,500 review board redactions that were remaining. The Act was clear in stating that despite the review board wrapping up its work in 1998, the Act was to continue in effect, which meant that agencies had the obligation to continue to present information.

Most of the redactions now in the documents are within documents never shown to the review board but were transferred to NARA at a later time. Agencies largely complied with the mandate to present records to the review board. However, there are many delays and denials with records that we specifically requested. And there were many skirmishes along the way. It does not take a rocket scientist to realize that agencies were awaiting the end of our 3-year mandate.

The first 500 or so adverse disclosure decisions we made in FBI records were appealed to the President. And the appeals were dropped when White House counsel, former judge and representative, Abner Mikva, told the FBI to drop the appeals because President Clinton would deny all of them. FBI staff was helpful to us, but I am now seeing records in the new releases that were not disclosed to the review board.

The CIA was cooperative and processed many documents with us, but we never received much of what we specifically asked for.

When asked, for example, for documents involving James Angleton that we had not seen, I was told the documents were no longer maintained as a collection. We received only three memoranda that incorporated the agency's review of Angleton's counterintelligence files. Not the files themselves, just the review by someone else of the files. We were told that all the other documents had been destroyed. I am now seeing a flood of documents that clearly meet the definition of assassination records involving Angleton and others that were not submitted to us for review.

When CIA analysts would not tell us the details of their secret operations, our response was, "OK, we will release the record in 10 days." We then heard the details and could make a reasonable decision.

We had in our hands a small file on George Joannides that disclosed nothing really so it was returned. We did not know the details of his work at the time. We now know much more about Joannides and his file should be immediately disclosed. There is no reason anymore for protecting those files. Clearly, we were misled. I actually wrote to President Biden asking that he order the CIA to release the Joannides file and I never received a response.

The Secret Service was very difficult. They were the only agency that we were aware of that tried to reclassify assassination records after we were in office. They attempted to classify documents that had already been released publicly, and fought us over 1963 threat sheets that were still in process when we left office.

The Department of State was less than helpful, although they released records in their possession. When we negotiated with Russian officials over the Oswald files in Moscow, they did not lift a finger to help us—not even allowing us access to United States Embassy. When we tried to get access to Belarusian records in Oswald, they did not help. When we planned meetings with Mexican and Cuban officials, they stopped us from direct contacts. The Act specifically required the Department of State to help us find foreign records.

The National Archives was very helpful to us when we did our work, a very dedicated staff member, Steven Tilley, was instrumental in getting our work done. But since we left office, I have been disappointed the Archives has not devoted more personnel to the records. We had planned that the Archives would continue our work to the extent possible. For the most part, that has not happened and the agency has never been in contact with me.

So, there are other files that should be released. We came close to an agreement to copy the entire KGB file on Lee Harvey Oswald that is maintained in Minsk, Belarus. Last-minute disputes prevented the agreement from moving forward. Copies of the files are in Moscow.

I just have a little bit more here.

We were particularly interested in the files of Walter Sheridan, an investigator for Robert Kennedy. When we took office, he removed the files from the Kennedy library where we had access to them and gave them to NBC for safekeeping. I do not think those files have been released.

The William Manchester taped interviews of Jacqueline and Robert Kennedy are protected by a 1967 legal agreement, now con-

trolled by Caroline Kennedy. We encouraged her to release the files, and she finally responded in August 1998 that she would not agree to their release or even let us listen to the recordings.

And out there somewhere are files on Jack Ruby. We cannot find them other than the files maintained by the earlier investigations. The final report of the board, a copy of which I will give to Madam Chair today, we made 10 recommendations that are relevant today still. I will not go through them all, but they deal with the problems of excessive government secrecy, which has plagued the public's understanding of the Kennedy assassination for decades.

We strongly endorse the method selected for independent declassification of executive branch records that was used in our case but also detailed the problems inherent in the review board's legislation. Most important to deal with massive overclassification, we recommended a Federal classification policy be developed that substantially one, limits the number of those in government who can actually classify Federal documents; two, restricts the number of categories by which documents might be classified; three, reduces the time period for which documents might be classified; four, encourages the use of substitute language to immediately open material that might otherwise be classified; and five, increases the resources available to agencies and thereof declassifying Federal records.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you very much. And just so everyone knows, we are going to be following up on getting that file, the KGB file in Minsk. I am interested in seeing that. And I think that with peace talks right now it might be prime time for that, so we will be following up on that.

Judge TUNHEIM. It stands about 5 feet high. It is a lot of records.

Mrs. LUNA. Well, we might have to bring you back out of retirement and what you are currently doing and have you help go through it.

With that, I would like to now recognize Mr. Horne for an opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF DOUGLAS HORNE  
FORMER STAFFER  
ASSASSINATIONS RECORDS REVIEW BOARD**

Mr. HORNE. Chairwoman Luna, Ranking Member Garcia, and Members of the Committee, thank you for the invitation to appear and testify today.

I served on the staff of the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Review Board for the final 3 years of its 4-year lifespan, from August 1995 through September 1998. I was hired as a senior analyst on the Military Records Team and was promoted early in 1997 to head the Military Records Team, serving as Chief Analyst for Military Records until the ARRB shutdown on September 30, 1998.

During my time on the staff, in addition to securing the declassification and public release of military records related to Cuba and Vietnam policy, I was privileged to work extensively in the medical evidence arena and to serve as the Review Board's point man on

issues related to the Zapruder film of President Kennedy's assassination.

Although the Review Board was not empowered to reinvestigate the assassination or generate conclusions or findings of fact, the Board did choose to attempt to clarify the record of certain aspects of the assassination by taking the depositions of 10 persons who participated in or who were present at the autopsy on President John F. Kennedy, and by later taking one additional joint deposition of five of the Dallas treating physicians.

I served as the principal research assistant to the Review Board's general counsel, Jeremy Gunn, in preparing for and conducting our 10 depositions of the participants and witnesses to JFK's autopsy and was present at all 10 of those depositions. The sworn testimony of our 10 deponents, as well as numerous written interview reports of additional unsworn medical witnesses, were all deposited in the National Archives in the JFK Records Collection without comment or endorsement.

In subsequent years, I wrote a five-volume memoir about my own personal conclusions regarding the medical evidence and explained the substantial ways in which the work of the ARRB staff significantly enhanced the totality of the medical evidence and our understanding of how President Kennedy was killed. Some outstanding questions were resolved, but many other questions were raised by the information we gathered, questions that remain unresolved today.

Now, this is the heart of my oral testimony here.

Many Americans remain troubled today by the many conflicts within the JFK medical evidence and what they might mean, and they remain unsatisfied with the official conclusions offered up by both the Warren Commission in 1964 and the HSCA Forensic Pathology Panel in 1979.

Based on my work as an analyst at the ARRB and as an independent researcher, I have concluded that there are ample reasons for the disquiet of so many of the American people, to wit:

First, eight different sets of photographs known with confidence to have been taken during the autopsy on JFK are not in the official collection today and never have been.

Some autopsy photos in the official collection at the National Archives are in gross disagreement with the head and neck wounds universally observed on November 22, 1963, by the treating physicians at Parkland Hospital, which they recorded in precise detail in their treatment notes that day and in their subsequent 1964 testimony.

At least two, and possibly three, JFK skull x-rays exposed at Bethesda Naval Hospital are missing today and have never been in the official collection.

The science of optical densitometry reveals that all three surviving skull x-rays are not originals but, rather, are altered copy films.

Two highly qualified and respected MDs who were granted repeated access by the Kennedy family to the autopsy photographs and x-rays in the deed-of-gift collection at the Archives both agree that the extant JFK skull x-rays reveal unambiguous and clear evidence of two head shots fired from in front of the President, con-

trary to the findings of the Warren Commission and the HSCA. The JFK skull x-rays actually reveal a total of three head shots, one from behind and two from the front.

The so-called Harper Fragment of skull bone, a crucial item of evidence signed for by the President's military physician and photographed and x-rayed by the FBI, has been missing since late in 1963.

Many bullet fragments known to have been removed from President Kennedy's body at Bethesda Naval Hospital were never placed into the official record and are missing today.

The remains of President Kennedy's brain following its examination were placed in a stainless steel container in 1963, but the brain is missing today, as many people know already. That stainless steel container and an original signed autopsy report were among materials transferred from the Secret Service to Senator Robert F. Kennedy in April 1965. Those materials and others were not among the materials returned to the U.S. Government by RFK on October 31, 1966, via a deed of gift to the National Archives. The Kennedy family attorney, Burke Marshall, told the HSCA that Robert F. Kennedy had made those materials permanently inaccessible, without providing details.

The 14 brain photographs in the National Archives today cannot be and are not photographs of John F. Kennedy's brain. They have been impugned by the official photographer at the brain examination and by one of the FBI agents present at JFK's autopsy.

The chain of custody of President Kennedy's body prior to the start of the autopsy shortly after 8 p.m. on November 22, 1963, clearly appears to have been broken, casting even more doubt upon the reliability of the official autopsy report.

And finally, Navy pathologists arrived at four sets of differing conclusions about President Kennedy's wounds and how he died within the 2 weeks after his death. The official autopsy report that is now in the National Archives represents only the fourth and final set of conclusions. This fact, perhaps more than any of the others above, is patently unacceptable in the Nation that prides itself as the world's greatest democracy.

Moving on to a new subject. The existing deed of gift dated October 29, 1966, that sets severe restrictions upon who can view the JFK autopsy materials and how they can be used, needs to be reexamined and lifted. It has resulted in de facto suppression of these materials. Only by having free and unlimited access to the autopsy photographs and skull x-rays can troubling and persistent questions about their authenticity be definitively and finally resolved by qualified experts.

In my concluding paragraph, I wish to make a short statement about the Zapruder film of the assassination. Studies in Hollywood of the individual film frames—that is, state-of-the-art digital scans of extremely high resolution—appear to show the use of visual effects, that is, animation or artwork, to crudely and blatantly alter the image content in some key frames. To state the problem simply, the digitized Zapruder film studied by professionals in Hollywood does not show the massive exit wound in the rear of the head seen at Parkland Hospital and by many witnesses at Bethesda dur-

ing the autopsy because it has been blacked out, and yet the film does appear to show head wounds not seen at Parkland Hospital.

We now know that rather than spending the entire weekend following the assassination in Chicago at the LIFE printing plant, as was originally claimed, the Zapruder film actually spent most of the weekend in the custody of the CIA in Washington, DC, and at Kodak's main research and development laboratory in Rochester, New York.

The attitude of one National Archives official, expressed in writing circa 2009, was that they, quote, "do not ever intend to take the film out of the freezer again," end quote. This decision should be overturned, and the so-called purported original film should be made available for appropriate inspection by qualified film professionals from the motion picture industry and academia—and by that, I mean film schools—so that questions of authenticity can be definitively resolved.

I have provided many additional details in my written testimony, and I request that they be included in the Congressional Record. Thank you very much.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you, Mr. Horne. And they will.

Ms. Coe, if you can please provide opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF ALEXIS COE  
PRESIDENTIAL HISTORIAN  
SENIOR FELLOW, NEW AMERICA**

Ms. COE. Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Ranking Member Garcia. It is an honor to address the Committee today.

Historians are time travelers. I was just in 1947 when John F. Kennedy was in his first term in the House. And now I find myself here, speaking to people who sit where he once sat, doing the kind of work he once did.

During JFK's 11 years in Congress, he questioned everything, not to impress but to understand. And he listened. He changed. And that took courage. Not the kind that earned him a Purple Heart in World War II. Political courage is slower. It is quieter. And it has the power to reshape a country.

His public service deepened from there. He wrote a Pulitzer Prize-winning book, established the Peace Corps. He governed in the crucible of the cold war, civil rights, and the space race. He made mistakes, and he learned from them. The Bay of Pigs taught him restraint, the value of failure, the strength in stepping back. And Americans noticed. By 1963, his approval rating peaked at 82 percent.

None of that was inevitable. He chose discipline over drama, substance over show.

And do not get me wrong; Jack Kennedy understood the power of media. He courted the press. He worked the spotlight. He shaped the moment. But only after he had done the work, after he had earned it.

And that is why his name endures as a standard of greatness. The JFK Library's Profiles in Courage Award carries that legacy forward. It has honored George H.W. Bush, the heroes of 9/11, and

just last month, Mike Pence, for what history always notices: putting country first when it matters most.

Of course, JFK was not perfect. I have never studied a saint, and I have not met one either. I see history's boldface names on their best days and on their worst. But complexity is not a liability unless you are cherry-picking with an agenda, which brings me to today's hearing.

The title uses charged words: obstruction, obfuscation, deception. But in the 132 days since the JFK assassination records were released, not even conspiracy theorists can claim that it upended the Warren Commission.

There is something unprecedented in these files, that is true: unredacted Social Security numbers and private information of living Americans. I have never seen anything like it. And given that most quality control has been fired, like the State Department's Historical Advisory Committee, I am afraid it will become the new normal.

But as far as the files, no hidden truths. No real disclosures. No shocking revelations. This was not history disrupted; it was history remastered, a 60th anniversary re-release with better resolution, the same ending.

And surely this resonates with a Congress that vigilantly protects its own records. You have preserved the right to classify your office's documents as private property. They will never be public if you do not want them to.

I hope we can talk about public trust today and what happens and how this appears to fit into a larger pattern. The Kennedy Center is no longer bipartisan. The Rose Garden has been stripped of its historic character. USAID was gutted. Taken together, it is hard not to see this as an attempt to reduce a consequential leader to a grotesque spectacle, his legacy defined by how he died and not what he did.

On November 22, 1963, America lost John F. Kennedy, and with him, a sense of possibility. That is how I think of the Archives too. They are crammed with untold stories, ones we truly do not know about. What an opportunity for the President—by default, our historian in chief—and by great good luck in office as America approaches its 250th anniversary. But instead, tragedy begets tragedy.

In 1953, JFK entered the Senate. A year later, his colleagues censured Joseph McCarthy. Kennedy rose as McCarthy fell, a reminder that Americans tire of reckless spectacle, division, demagogues. They seek substance, accountability, and authentic commitment to the public good.

I began by saying that historians are time travelers. We study the past to understand the present. And these records make me wonder how this moment will be remembered. When future historians ask whether we met it with the courage it demanded, how will they answer? JFK understood how much depends on that. The real question is, do we?

Thank you.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you.

I would like to now recognize the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Biggs, for 5 minutes.



Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Madam Chair. And I thank the witnesses on the panel for being here today.

So, I have questions, I think, for most of you, and I need a quick response, if I can. But, first, I will ask ultimately of all of you the question, why? Why did this move the way it did?

So, Dr. Curtis, you observed the back of President Kennedy's head. You saw an exit wound. And you said that it did not align with the theory that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in shooting President Kennedy. Is that fair to say?

Dr. CURTIS. I wish I could hear you.

Mr. BIGGS. Oh, I am sorry. I will speak up. I will try to be louder.

You indicated that you had no doubt that the wound that you observed to the back of President Kennedy's head was an exit gunshot wound. Is that fair?

Dr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. And you concluded, after review, that it did not align—his wound did not align with the theory that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in shooting President Kennedy. Is that true?

Dr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. And I guess you struggle to this day to understand the Warren Commission's theory about the President's shooter and how it seems to have discord with what you actually observed that day. Is that fair to say?

Dr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you.

Mr. Hardway, so, you have indicated that you essentially were the subject of a covert operation as you served on the House Select Committee on Assassinations. Is that fair to say?

Mr. HARDWAY. The CIA called it a covert assignment.

Mr. BIGGS. And that was from—and I cannot get his—I cannot—Mr. Joannides?

Mr. HARDWAY. Joannides, yes.

Mr. BIGGS. Joannides. And you have called on the release of Mr. Joannides' file to the public. Is that fair to say?

Mr. HARDWAY. That is fair.

Mr. BIGGS. And so, I would actually echo that call as well to the Chair, that we see if we can get Mr. Joannides' file released.

And I would like to continue on—I only have two and a half minutes. But I have to get to the ultimate question: Why? Why, why did the CIA intervene with Mr. Hardway's review? Why were documents altered? Why was the Zapruder film removed and not brought back in its original documented form? Why?

And so that is what I am going to ask you. If you can answer that, you would probably solve what Ms. Coe referred to as trust. There is a massive amount of skepticism about our Federal Government, and I think you can directly trace it back to this event.

And so, I want to know why. And I think that is what all of America wants to know. We can kind of get a feeling for what happened. But we all want to know why it happened the way it did. Why was there this mastering, this control of all of this operation?

So, I am going to start with you, Mr. Horne, and then go down to each one of you. And then I have a list of documents that I think need to be released, Madam Chair.

Mr. Horne?

Mr. HORNE. There is so much medical evidence that is tainted or missing or destroyed.

Mr. BIGGS. But why did that happen?

Mr. HORNE. Or altered. There is no reason to have confidence in the autopsy report. Those things—I am going to get there, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. OK.

Mr. HORNE. Those things would not have happened if a lone nut had killed the President. If a lone nut killed the President, there is no reason to do all those things, to destroy x-rays, to possibly alter autopsy photos—although that has not yet been determined. It is a question that remains outstanding—to alter the existing skull x-rays.

So, you do not do those things. And you do not change the autopsy conclusions four different times within 2 weeks after the President's death if a lone nut killed the President.

So, it is clear to me that the government—these are my conclusions after years of study. It is clear to me that the government was trying to manage what story it could sell to the American people. That is what was going on. And that is why the autopsy conclusions change four times in the first 2 weeks.

Have I come close to answering your question or not?

Mr. BIGGS. Yes, Mr. Horne, you have. I do not have time to ask and get a response from all of you because my time has expired.

But I would say, I took some notes on what they were saying, Madam Chair—

Mr. BURCHETT. Chairlady, would it be all right if I yield half my time to Representative Biggs? Would that be OK with the Ranking Member?

Mrs. LUNA. Yup. That is fine.

Mr. BURCHETT. All right.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you.

So, then—

Mr. BURCHETT. That is two and a half minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. I needed the math. Thank you.

And so, we will just go down to Judge Tunheim.

Mr. TUNHEIM. Yes. I think it is an interesting question you pose as to why. I mean, I think that, clearly, if you look at the history of all this, there were cover-ups by both the FBI and the CIA, perhaps other organizations in part because they had a lot of contact with Oswald in advance of the assassination, and there is no evidence that they alerted the Secret Service to the erratic behavior of Oswald. Oswald was in New Orleans. There was CIA contact with him then when he was a volunteer for this Fair Play for Cuba Committee. I mean, they knew all about his visit to Mexico City. Both the FBI and the CIA knew about it. The FBI was following him in Dallas because he was a suspect in another shooting.

All of this suggests that they had a lot of contact with him ahead of time, and the—I do not know what that suggests other than the fact that they wanted to cover that up, the fact that they knew a lot about him ahead of time and did not do much about it.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you.

And, Mr. Hardway, do you subscribe to that as part of the explanation as well as the not a lone gunman-theory of Mr. Horne?

Mr. HARDWAY. I have no opinion on Mr. Horne's because I do not know anything about the medical evidence.

Mr. BIGGS. OK.

Mr. HARDWAY. In regard to why the CIA would go to the length of running an operation against us, they obviously had something that they were very desperate about hiding. And I go into that in my written statement. To do it, you have to get into the weeds of the details. But basically, just to summarize it, they were using Oswald operationally in Mexico City.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you.

And since I am going to be out of time—that two and a half minutes. Let me just go real quick. I ask that we obtain a copy of Mr. Hardway's report—at least I do not have it—regarding Oswald in Mexico. Release the Joannides file, the JFK files in Belarus and Moscow, the files on Jack Ruby, and also the Manchester interview of Jacqueline Kennedy and Robert Kennedy. And also, Madam Chair, finally—

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you, Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS [continuing]. The Zapruder film.

Mrs. LUNA. We will be taking a look at that.

And then also referencing the Joannides file, so everyone is tracking, we are actively trying to track that down. I believe that that is the one outstanding document that the CIA will not be able to find. So, isn't that interesting?

I would like to now recognize Mr. Garcia for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. Coe, I wanted to start—thank you. I know you are an experienced historian. You have written a biography, of course, of President Kennedy. You know, for me, I am always interested—I am a big believer in the notion that the FBI and the CIA, particularly in earlier versions, have been and over-classified an enormous amount of information, not just on the topic of President Kennedy's assassination but just throughout the government. And there is a lot, I think, to criticize those agencies, and a lot that the American public should be concerned with in the way they have influenced and tried to influence American policy in world events throughout the decades. I think that part is clear.

I also think it is important—before taking this job, I was a long-time educator, was on the faculty, done an enormous amount of research. For me, following facts and ensuring that we are sticking to facts is really important, even as we seek to gain more clarity about historical events. And so, I appreciate that.

As it relates to the March 18 release of documents, which I think has brought, certainly, more color and more information to the historical record, you had said earlier in your testimony that there was not necessarily, you know, an enormous amount of new information, but there certainly was some additional kind of color to what we already know.

Do you want to talk about that and what as far as how important was that declassification of additional records to the broader picture of President Kennedy?

Ms. COE. Thank you. And thank you for this time and these questions.

I have to say that I am a little bit concerned about the way certain theories represented as facts on the panel, and that there is a lot of demand for more information, which is always good, but it is based on the pretense that what has been found has radically changed everything. And I do not see that as true. I think we are still finding things. I am not convinced that some of the details were not already out there. There have been leaks. There has been access.

So, I do think that this idea of a grand conspiracy—I do think that—and I am glad that we can all agree that there was incredible overreach in the mid-20th century and for some time. And there is—there are wonderful books on Hoover that give greater color to that and background that have made contributions. And, in particular, I think last year or the year before there was a biography called “G-Man” by a professor named Beverly Gage, and that was excellent.

What I find to be an interesting disconnect here is that there is so much concern about cover-ups with the CIA when it comes to Kennedy, and I do not see that same concern being translated to Martin Luther King and to his records. It feels like Hoover 2.0.

And in that case, in the case of MLK, we do know that there is actually a historical precedent. The FBI mounted illegal surveillance. There was character assassination.

Mr. GARCIA. And, Ms. Coe—and I think just to, for time, and just so you know, there also is a lot of interest, I know, from Members of the Committee on both sides of the aisle on what you are discussing.

I want to go to, before I go to Judge Tunheim, because I also am in a similar place where I feel that, you know, my researcher brain is very much—I agree. I do not know that the release of the documents presented any sort of groundbreaking new information. Certainly, added color and more—rounded out kind of what we already know. But I do, I want to just caution us in not using what was released as a kind of jumping-off point to additional conspiracies, right?

Now, I think there are valuable questions, and I respect Members of this Committee that are looking to get certain questions answered, that there is a lot of concern in the public. There is public interest in this. I mean, there is no question in that. So, I do, I respect that. But I also value that we stick to what we know. Certainly going—if there are questions that lead us in a different direction, we will follow those, but I think that is really important.

Judge Tunheim, I just also want to ask you just, similar to what I asked Ms. Coe, do you think that this release of the records that just happened has added any substantial new information to what we already know?

Mr. TUNHEIM. You know, I think any release of records gives you more color, more pieces of the puzzle, so to speak. And I think this has been a very interesting—I have not had a chance to look through a lot of the materials, but a lot of the materials that have redactions in were materials we never saw. So, they were not shown to us before. So, I think that is significant, that there are documents being released there.

I do not see any answers, any new answers to any of the old questions here. But it is filling out the record more.

And I would like to see a time when everything has been released, unredacted. It is 60-some years since the assassination. The assassination was closer to World War I than we are to the assassination. Let us release the materials. And that is my plea here, is just get everything out. Let people decide what they want.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you.

And with that, I yield back.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you, Rep. Garcia.

The Chair would now like to recognize Mr. Burchett for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Chairlady.

Dr. Curtis, what happened when the Warren Commission called you to testify about what you knew about the JFK wounds? Dr. Curtis?

Dr. CURTIS. Could you say that again?

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes, sir. I am sorry. I have got hearing aids too, so do not worry about it, brother.

What happened when the Warren Commission called you to testify about what you knew about JFK's wounds?

Dr. CURTIS. Well, the Warren Commission has not called me to testify at all.

Mr. BURCHETT. Not at all?

Dr. CURTIS. Huh-uh.

Mr. BURCHETT. OK.

Dr. CURTIS. I did not use up all my time, and I would like to make some additional comments regarding—

Mrs. LUNA. Sir, you have the time that you need, so please proceed.

Dr. CURTIS. OK. Well, let me know when I can do it.

Mrs. LUNA. Well, now, sir. I believe Mr. Burchett has a line of questions for you, so you are free to talk to Mr. Burchett.

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes, sir.

Can you explain what condition—when President Kennedy arrived in the emergency room, what was his condition at that point?

Dr. CURTIS. He had already died.

Mr. BURCHETT. OK. How many wounds did you observe on President Kennedy?

Dr. CURTIS. How many wounds? President Kennedy had a wound to, of course, the big wound to his head.

Mr. BURCHETT. Right.

Dr. CURTIS. But he also had a wound to his throat. And I have got a little diagram here. I can point that out, how that worked, if you would like me to.

Mr. BURCHETT. And that would not have been a single bullet wound, though, right? They talk about this magical bullet that traveled. That would have been more than one bullet, you think?

Dr. CURTIS. Magic bullet was not—did not strike the President at all.

Mr. BURCHETT. OK. That was a clean bullet. I saw the picture.

Oh. Yes. Please show the diagram.

Dr. CURTIS. OK. The bullets that were fired—the blue bullet was the bullet that arrived first. And you can see it started from—prob-

ably from the railroad trestle, which is to the southwest, and came up and first struck President Kennedy before he got out from under the tree that prevented the window shooter from shooting. And we know that because of the Zapruder film showed President Kennedy holding his throat in real distress when the Zapruder film started.

And he had already been shot, and that wound to his throat would have killed him. It did kill him because we know from the tracheostomy that we had to do that the bullet to his throat obstructed the trachea. And so, he had taken his last breath before that.

Also, the bullet that struck President Kennedy in the temple killed him also because it just removed about a third of his brain. And the part of the brain that it removed was in the posterior part of the brain, and that is the area of the brain that controls the parasympathetic and the autonomic nervous system.

And so, the two bullets that came from the window, one struck Connally. And the only thing that it did—it went in Connally's shoulder, went through his chest, came out of his chest, into his left wrist, into his left leg. And that indicates that the bullet was coming from the north going southwest. And that bullet was only for Governor Connally.

The other bullet that came out was this other one here. That would have been the magic bullet. That is the one that went in the President's back. And the Warren Commission then wanted to choose that bullet to be the magic bullet which went through the top of his head.

Now, the—that is essentially what I wanted to say.

Mr. BURCHETT. OK. And that was how many bullets, did you say? Three or four?

Dr. CURTIS. That were fired?

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes, sir.

Dr. CURTIS. Four.

Mr. BURCHETT. OK. And that was a bolt action, Italian carbine that the magic bullet came from?

Dr. CURTIS. Well, two of the bullets came from the front.

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes, sir. Yes, sir, I know, but they were trying to tell us Lee Harvey Oswald was the only one.

Dr. CURTIS. Only bullets that came from the window were two bullets and—three bullets came from the window. One hit the curb, the other hit Connally. And the other one went in the President's back. And that is well documented.

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes, sir. Thank you.

And I yield no time.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you.

The Chair would like to now recognize Mr. Burlison for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you for your testimony.

Mr. Hardway, it is clear that you faced firsthand the obstruction by the CIA. Would that be accurate to say? In your investigations.

Mr. HARDWAY. Yes.

Mr. BURLISON. And specifically, they used methods like use of sealed envelopes, redactions that violated the 1977 Memorandum of Understanding. My question really is about what seems to be

evident is that they were very much obstructing any information about Oswald's interactions in Mexico City. Is that accurate?

Mr. HARDWAY. That is correct.

Mr. BURLISON. Why do you think that is?

Mr. HARDWAY. I believe that we can draw reasonable inferences from the evidence that is of record and that is very persuasive and clearly of record that are facts and not theories that clearly point to the fact that Lee Harvey Oswald was being used in an operation in Mexico City in September 1963 and early October 1963.

The nature of the operation was a dangle and a propaganda operation designed to discredit the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. It was designed and ran by George Joannides, under the supervision of David Atlee Phillips, who had been leading the CIA's anti-FPCC efforts since 1958. And it was a very successful operation. The Cuban consulate had just recently opened. The operation allowed them to observe, from a distance, the interactions and reactions of the—not just the Cuban consulate but the Soviet embassy to Oswald's presenting himself. And it also went a real long way to discrediting the FPCC.

In addition to that, you can see the exact same pattern of operation was conducted using Oswald in New Orleans in August 1963 in which he encountered the DRE, also encountered student groups. It is almost the exact—it is a shadow of what they then did in Mexico City.

Now, the fact that, in my opinion, the fact that they ran Oswald operationally in Mexico City does not mean necessarily, or even inferentially, that they were involved in the actual assassination. It is entirely possible that on November 22, two of the most surprised men in the world were David Atlee Phillips and George Joannides.

And consequently, the one does not necessarily lead to the other in any way, shape, or form. But stop and think about it. If they were running an operation in which the accused shooter was involved as an asset, either witting or unwitting, think about the motivation for cover-up. It had to be something extraordinary that they were covering up in order to violate their charter and in spite of the Houston Agreement that agrees not to prosecute CIA officers for crimes committed in the furtherance of their duties in the United States, in spite of that, they feloniously obstructed a congressional investigation.

There had to be something significant that they were covering up. And what that significance was, and basically, David Robarge, the CIA historian, has in a backhanded way admitted that in things he has written, was the use of Oswald in an operation in Mexico City.

Mr. BURLISON. So, you think that it was—if you had to be pressed on it—it sounds like there is two scenarios. One is that Oswald—I mean, both scenarios, Oswald had some involvement in connection with the CIA. But in one scenario, he is being directed by individuals in the CIA to commit the assassination, and then the other scenario is that he did it and they just flubbed. They did not pick up on the fact that he was planning this assassination.

Mr. HARDWAY. I do not think we can draw any inference from the evidence on any of that. As to whether or not he was being directed in the assassination, I do not think that David Phillips and

George Joannides were directing him in the assassination. I do not think they would have been using him in Mexico if they did.

Mr. BURLISON. Some of the documentation indicates recently, from the 2017 release, that he was not alone when he went to Mexico City.

Mr. HARDWAY. I cannot say that he was not alone, from the research we did in Mexico City. What we could not rule out was that he was imitated, or that another person was there pretending to be Oswald, or that some of the telephone conversations that were recorded on the taps at Russian and Cuban facilities were actually Oswald speaking. In fact, it is pretty clear that some of the calls that claimed to be Oswald were not Oswald.

Mr. BURLISON. Wow. Thank you.

My time has expired.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you.

The Chair would like to now recognize Mr. Crane for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you, Ms. Chairwoman. Thank you guys for coming today.

I want to start with you, Dr. Curtis. As a dental surgeon who was present in the hospital room the day President Kennedy was shot, you were able to observe his wounds and maybe some of his medical records. Is that correct?

Can you not hear me, Dr. Curtis?

Dr. CURTIS. I am sorry, I could not hear what you said.

Mr. CRANE. So, you were there in the emergency room the day that the President was brought in?

Dr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. CRANE. How old were you, sir?

Dr. CURTIS. How old was I?

Mr. CRANE. Yes.

Dr. CURTIS. 26.

Mr. CRANE. 26? And what did you observe when they brought the President in?

Dr. CURTIS. The President was already in the room before I arrived. And what I observed about him, that he had probably already deceased.

Mr. CRANE. Since you were a dental surgeon, why did they bring you into the operation room?

Dr. CURTIS. That is one thing that Arlen Specter asked me, "What is a dentist doing operating on the President?" Then I had to qualify myself. The training that I have encompassed those particular procedures, and that is a simple procedure and I did it well, and I just knew how to do it. There was nobody else there to do it, and I did it because Dr. Carrico asked me to do it.

Mr. CRANE. Can you tell us about the wounds that you observed on the President and how they differ from what came out in some of the reporting?

Dr. CURTIS. The wounds on the President were to his throat and to his head and to his back. The wound to his throat would have killed him. The wound to his head definitely would have killed him. The wound to his back would not have killed him.

Mr. CRANE. Did the wounds to his throat and his head look like completely separate wounds?



Dr. CURTIS. They were two separate wounds. One—let me show it to you.

The blue wound was sent from the railroad trestle all the way over to kill him right here, and that went to his throat. And the way that killed him is that it obstructed the trachea and he could not breathe. So, he would have been dead before he reached the hospital just simply because of that wound.

The other wound that he had to his head would have killed him instantly because it removed about a third of his brain.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you.

Mr. HARDWAY, I want to move to you next. You talked about the obstruction of a Federal investigation that you, yourself, witnessed. You were on the House Select Committee for Assassination. Is that correct?

Mr. HARDWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRANE. What year would that have been?

Mr. HARDWAY. 1977 and 1978. The obstruction occurred entirely in 1978.

Mr. CRANE. What was your role in that investigation?

Mr. HARDWAY. My role was a researcher, with primary responsibility for researching Lee Harvey Oswald's activities in Mexico City and the CIA response to that.

Mr. CRANE. We have heard about some of the administrative roadblocks that the CIA put up for you. Did you have any direct verbal communication with anybody at the CIA?

Mr. HARDWAY. Oh, yes. Frequently.

Mr. CRANE. Can you tell us about some of those conversation and how it might have been conceived as obstruction?

Mr. HARDWAY. Well, when we first started, we had unlimited unexpurgated access. We had two clerks assigned to us. We had our office at the CIA. Pretty much went to work out there every morning. We would ask for a file, they would go get it, we would review it. It was unredacted and given to us in its original state.

After they brought George Joannides in, he began slowly tightening down the process. We were no longer working with two clerks who went and got us our files. We had to file formally, request, through him, to get the files, and we started experiencing significant delays in the files that we would get.

We started noticing that the files we would get would have obvious things missing from them. Then he went so far as to actually start putting parts of the files in envelopes and leaving them in the files so that what we would get is we would sign that we would have seen the files, but we were not allowed to open the stuff that he had placed in envelopes.

That came back to haunt us later in dealing with the final report and some of the things we were trying to get out of them. When they would tell the chairman of the committee, he has seen that, here is where he signed for the file. And I would have to explain to Chairman Stokes that, no, that was not in the file when I saw it because that was what I was looking for and it was not there. It must have been in one of the envelopes. And so, he eventually just shut us down.

It culminated on one file that I really wanted to see. When it was presented to me, Mr. Joannides showed up, himself, to give it to

me. He was actually bouncing on his toes. He was—him and Scott Breckinridge brought the file to me at the CIA, called me back out there to see it. It had not just been redacted; it had been retyped with the redactions in white space as it had been retyped. It was a report on a debriefing of a certain person.

I exploded. I acted like a very angry 24-year-old and had choice words for both of them and stormed out of the office and went back to the headquarters.

I, subsequently, thanks to Judge Tunheim's work, saw the memorandum to the record that Mr. Breckinridge wrote. And the memorandum for the record says that the file was shown to me and, quote, "no objections were recorded," close quote.

Notice the way, see, you have to watch what the CIA says. He did not say that I did not make any, which is what everyone infers from what he said. What he said was none were recorded, and that is because he made the record.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you. I yield back.

Mrs. LUNA. The Chair would now like to recognize Representative Mace.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for your leadership on this Committee.

For decades, elements in our government have engaged in an extensive cover-up to subvert the will of Congress and to keep the American public in the dark relating to the assassination of John F. Kennedy. No matter how ugly it is or how inconvenient it is to elites, organized crime, or deep state bureaucrats, the American people deserve the truth, and they can handle the truth.

While the American public still may be in the dark, poll after poll made clear the cover-up has failed. Approximately two-thirds of Americans still do not buy the official narrative from our government that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone. Cover-ups and a failure to be transparent has rightfully bred distrust, so much distrust nearly 40 percent of Americans believe the U.S. Government was involved in the assassination of JFK. Let that sink in—nearly 40 percent.

This Task Force, working alongside President Trump, is working to use sunshine as a disinfectant and give the American people the pure, unvarnished truth they deserve.

Mr. Hardway—thank you for being here, to all of our witnesses today—you worked for the House Select Committee on Assassinations which investigated the assassination of JFK. You had first-hand interactions with the CIA as you worked to get the truth. Based on what you witnessed, do you believe the CIA engaged in a concerted effort to cover up certain facts related to the assassination of President Kennedy?

Mr. HARDWAY. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Do you believe the efforts to obstruct congressional investigations into the assassination of President Kennedy by the CIA you have described violated Federal law?

Mr. HARDWAY. People more expert in Federal criminal law than I am have expressed that opinion to me and have expressed that opinion under oath.

Ms. MACE. Based on what you know, what relationship, if any, did the CIA have with Lee Harvey Oswald prior to the assassination of President Kennedy?

Mr. HARDWAY. Based upon the circumstantial evidence of record—and it is overwhelming—they had an either used him as either a witting or an unwitting agent of influence.

Ms. MACE. Seems that way, doesn't it?

Do you believe there is evidence to suggest the CIA was using Lee Harvey Oswald in active intelligence operations shortly before the assassination of President Kennedy?

Mr. HARDWAY. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Dr. Curtis.

Dr. CURTIS. Yes.

Ms. MACE. Good afternoon, sir.

Dr. CURTIS. Good afternoon.

Ms. MACE. You were one of the physicians who treated President Kennedy at Parkland Memorial Hospital after he was shot. You were better situated than almost anyone to see President Kennedy's physical condition when he arrived at the hospital, and yet you have said, "I cannot reconcile my knowledge of what I saw with the findings of the government," is what you said at the time.

Dr. CURTIS. Yes.

Ms. MACE. In your medical opinion, what do you attribute as the cause of President Kennedy's wounds?

Dr. CURTIS. The cause of his death?

Mr. MACE. Mm-hmm.

Dr. CURTIS. The two bullets that were fired from the front caused his death. And either one of them would have, the blue and the green—

Ms. MACE. Yes, sir.

Dr. CURTIS [continuing]. Bullets.

Ms. MACE. And in your medical, you know, in your opinion, how does this differ from the findings of the government as to the cause of the wounds to the President? How did this differ?

Dr. CURTIS. Could you say that again? I am sorry.

Ms. MACE. How are your findings, that you saw, of his condition when he died—how are your findings different from the government?

How did what the government said happened to JFK, how did your medical findings of his death—how are they different?

Dr. CURTIS. The government wanted the President to have died from the window—from the bullets fired from the window because that would have caused Harvey Oswald to have done it. And they went to great lengths to make those two bullets do the job. Those two bullets did not do the job. One went in the President's back, and the other went into Governor Connally. So, those two bullets did not do anything to kill President Kennedy.

Ms. MACE. OK. My last question, Dr. Curtis. You ready? Are the wounds you observed consistent with the government's conclusion Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone?

Dr. CURTIS. No.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, sir.

We thank all of our witnesses who are here today.

Chairwoman, thank you, and I yield back.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you, Representative Mace.

I now recognize myself for probably more than 5 minutes, so.

My first question goes to Judge Tunheim. Why did you tell President Biden that the CIA had deliberately misled your board about the Joannides file?

Mr. TUNHEIM. I did that because the CIA misled us. I mean, we had asked—I mean, we are picking up names all along, and people were telling us about other people to ask about. And we have been after the Joannides file for a while, and what we got was something very small. It looked like just a personnel file. You know, what he got paid and, you know, when he separated and that sort of thing.

And the staff looked at it and thought it was not significant and sent it back. In retrospect, we should not have done that. We should have asked for more. But they were told, the staff was told, that was all they had on Joannides, which is clearly incorrect.

So, that is why I had said that we had been deliberately misled by the CIA as to the nature of the Joannides files that were there. And I think the files likely are still there and can be released and should be released.

Mrs. LUNA. Yes. I would like to actually note for the public that is tuning in that we have been in talks with Director Ratcliffe. And although he has been supportive, there has, in my opinion, been an orchestrated effort previously to hide this information. And so, they are, while actively searching for it, also having issues locating it. So, we are trying on our end.

But you are correct, sir, in that observation. And I thank you for being here today to testify to that.

My next question is actually for Dr. Curtis. Was there anyone specifically on the Warren Commission that made the attempted effort or that you felt you were being pressured to either be silenced on what you saw and/or bullied and/or threatened into not speaking the truth?

Dr. CURTIS. I was never pressured to be silent. But I did have action with Arlen Specter that was not good.

Mrs. LUNA. What happened, sir?

Dr. CURTIS. He did a deposition for me and had not told me about it ahead of time.

The nurse leaned in the operating room that morning and said, the Warren Commission is in town. If you have time, go down and talk to them. So, I finished my cases and went down and talked to Arlen Specter.

He was friendly and nice and was very well-groomed, in a beautiful suit, shiny shoes. And I had my hair all messed up, in a scrub suit, dirty shoes. So, it was definitely top down. And he was friendly and nice.

And then started asking me biographical questions that made it obvious to me that he knew the answers to the question before he asked it. And so, that made me wonder, why on Earth does he know all that about me?

Then he said, "What did you see about the exit wound?"

Well, there was not one.

"Really?"

No, there was not one.

And then, so, he asked me three or four more times about the exit wound. And the last time he asked me is, "Dr. Curtis, every other doctor has suggested and testified that there was an exit wound. And you did not see it?"

No, I did not.

And so, during this—the visit I had with him was maybe about 20 to 30 minutes. And during that time, he made me feel that I had a reason for being in the trauma room, to be sure the President died.

Now, I had a wife and two babies at home that were completely dependent on me. If I lost my residency, it would be terribly, a big problem for me. So, he gave me—he said, "OK, now, I need you to wait right here for a little bit before we do your deposition." And I said, deposition? He said, "Yes, you are having your deposition today." And I said, well, I did not know that. He said, "Well, I sent you a letter." Which I did not get. He said, "Do you want a lawyer?" And I said, do I need a lawyer? He said, "Fella, you are the only one in this room that knows if you need a lawyer. Do you want me to get you one?" I said, I do not think so.

But he asked me over and over again about the exit wound. Then we got in on the—he got the committee together, nobody that I had ever seen before, sitting behind the table, and put me on a high stool, uncomfortably. And I remember my foot kept slipping off that bottom rung. And then started asking me questions.

He never did bring up the exit wound. He never did say a thing about it. Till at the last, he said, "Dr. Curtis, did you see anything that was like a puncture or an opening in the trachea? Or the throat?" And I said no. And he said, but then I thought, well, the blood was right over that, so I could not have seen it. So, I said, but that does not mean it was not there.

Thank you for Dr. Curtis. That is what he wanted.

Mrs. LUNA. Would it be fair to say that other doctors that you worked with that were in the room that day that were responding to President Kennedy's wounds had the same observations as you? Yes or no.

Dr. CURTIS. There were only two of us that saw the throat before the tracheostomy was done.

Mrs. LUNA. OK.

Dr. CURTIS. Is that the answer?

Mrs. LUNA. Whatever you would like to share with Congress, sir.

Dr. CURTIS. So, I saw it, and I do not—there was no exit wounds. That is what Arlen Specter wanted, was an exit wound, because the magic bullet had to exit the throat to go into Governor Connally, which could not have happened. The magic bullet would have had to make three fine 90-degree turns to do what it did. It was coming down from the window, would have had to turn right angle to be horizontal through the neck, would have had to turn right again to go over to wherever Governor Connally was. Would have to turn right again to go into Governor Connally. That does not work.

Mrs. LUNA. Yes, I can speak for myself. I do not believe in the magic bullet theory.

Dr. CURTIS. Do not do that.

Mrs. LUNA. No, I do not, sir.

My next question is for Mr. Douglas Horne. To your knowledge, did even the Dallas Police Department or the FBI subject Lee Harvey Oswald to a paraffin test to determine whether he had fired the gun on November 22, 1963?

Mr. HORNE. I am going from memory, but I believe the FBI did, and he tested negative for firing a rifle.

Mrs. LUNA. So, he—

Mr. HORNE. The paraffin test on his face shows he did not fire a bolt-action rifle, especially not a lousy rifle like the Mannlicher-Carcano, which was an 1894 design or something.

Mrs. LUNA. What is the status of the record interview the author William Manchester conducted with Jacqueline Kennedy. Mr. Horne?

Mr. HORNE. Well, my understanding is that—well, first of all, the Kennedy family liked William Manchester initially, because he had written a campaign book in 1960 about the campaign. So, they said, "OK, why don't you write the book about the death of Jack, about the death of President Kennedy?" When the book was reviewed by Jacqueline and Robert F. Kennedy, apparently Robert F. Kennedy had many objections. And so, the Kennedy family sued Mr. Manchester when the books were in galley form, and they required that he take out certain portions of the text. So, the lawsuit, what the lawsuit did, was it said, the portions of the text that you removed will be sequestered until 2067. And the interviews you did with Jacqueline Kennedy and Robert F. Kennedy will be sequestered, withheld until 2067. So, that was the result of that lawsuit. And so, what we read today when we read Manchester's book is a sanitized or redacted version of his book. And we do not know what was removed until 2067. That is just very unfortunate. And I know Chairman Tunheim really made an effort to get Caroline Kennedy to agree to lift that court seal and she did not want to.

Mrs. LUNA. Also, to your knowledge, which autopsy photos are missing?

Mr. HORNE. OK, I would be glad to answer that question. I have a list here and it is reasonably succinct, so bear with me.

Mrs. LUNA. Well, you have me and Garcia here, so I think we are at your disposal.

Mr. HORNE. Here we go, here we go. I mentioned eight sets that I know with confidence from studying the evidence as an analyst are missing. First, an overhead wide shot of JFK's body taken from the stepladder, taken by John Stringer, the Navy photographer. He testified under oath to that.

Second, a large bruise atop the right lung, taken from inside the interior of the chest after the lungs were removed. So, this is a large blood clot up above where the apical portion of the lung was. And that has been testified to by both Dr. Humes and Stringer that they took those photographs. So, they are not in the record.

Third, an entrance wound in the lower right of the skull, with the scalp reflected, taken from outside the skull. And next, that same entrance wound in the lower right of the skull with the photo taken from inside the cranium after the brain was removed. So, what is the issue with these two photos being missing is they would have determined definitively where was the entrance wound in the back of the head.

Mrs. LUNA. Well, that would have been one of the Harper frag—

Mr. HORNE. No.

Mrs. LUNA. Separate.

Mr. HORNE. No, separate issue.

Mrs. LUNA. OK.

Mr. HORNE. The condition of the back of the—here is another missing photo—the condition of the back of the head after embalming and reconstruction was completed, which still showed an exit defect that could not be closed. The witness that claims that was Sandra Spencer, a Navy photographer's mate, who our general counsel, Jeremy Gunn, considered our most reliable medical witness. And so, what she did was she developed color negatives, and then prints of the President's body. Postmortem photographs, but she said, when we deposed her, she said, "Oh, these pictures in the Archives are horrible. We see open body cavities and a lot of blood, and the President looks really bad." She said, the photographs that I developed, he had been cleaned up, the head had been reconstructed, but there was still a hole in the back of the head, even after the head was reconstructed.

Mrs. LUNA. So, you have witness testimony that the Archives photographs do not reflect what—

Mr. HORNE. Yes, yes. She testified under oath to that fact.

Another missing photograph is a series, is that Robert Knudsen was a White House social photographer. He was involved with developing photography the weekend after the assassination by the President's military physician, Dr. Burkley. So, Knudsen testified to the HSCA that "I developed a black and white film pack, negatives, black and white negatives, showing numerous probes in the President's body." And, of course, probes are important because they determine bullet tracks, where the bullets go in, where they come out, if they come out. And he remembered developing them and holding them up to the light in a darkroom after they were developed. And he remembered seeing probes in the body in this black and white film pack. And in the official autopsy collection, there was no black and white film pack used in photographs of the body. They are 4 by 5-inch duplex film. They are not black and white film packs. And there are no photographs of probes in the body in the official collection.

And one of the people we interviewed was Dr. Karnei who was a resident at Bethesda, and when we told him, Jeremy Gunn and I, when we told him that there were no photographs of probes in the body in the official autopsy photo collection, he became physically agitated and his face turned bright pink. And he said, "I came in and out of the morgue many times as the resident on duty that night, but I saw flashbulbs going off when there were probes in the body. And you are telling me there is no photos in the collection?" We said, that is right. So, two more that are missing and that concludes my answer.

Black and white prints were seen by numerous people showing a large exit defect in the rear of JFK's head. So, Mr. Knudsen, the White House photographer, Navy Chief Knudsen, showed such photos to another White House photographer, Joe O'Donnell, the week after the President died, black and white prints showing a big

exit wound in the back of the head. There are no such photos in the collection, but Joe O'Donnell said there were and another witness that saw those photos was Navy Corpsman Dennis David. And he was shown those photographs by the Bethesda Naval hospital audio visual department head, Lieutenant Commander Pitzer.

The last type of photo that is missing, black and white prints of an entry wound high on the forehead up here, not in the temple, but high in the forehead, before the right eye. Black and white prints showing that were shown by Mr. Knudsen, by Chief Knudsen to Mr. O'Donnell. They were also seen by Dennis David when the Lieutenant Commander Pitzer showed him autopsy photographs. And a third witness surfaced in the year 2010, Quentin Schwinn, who lives in Cleveland. And he, during a Federal job interview believe it or not, during a Federal job interview with an intelligence agency when he was at the Rochester Institute of Technology, majoring in photography, he was shown a color positive transparency showing an entry wound high on the forehead of JFK. So, that is my kind of lengthy answer on which photographers am I confident are missing.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you very much. And then real quickly, because my last line of questioning is for Mr. Bolden.

What is the evidence that you refer to about an interruption of chain of custody of President Kennedy's body prior to the start of the autopsy shortly after 8 p.m.

Mr. HORNE. Right. Because of this venue and this format, I will have to give you a streamlined answer. I am sure everyone will appreciate that. We know for a fact that the motorcade from Andrews Air Force Base with a bronze Dallas casket in it arrived in front of Bethesda at 6:55 p.m. Remember that time. That is documented by the Secret Service report of Agent Clint Hill, and by newspapers reporters. But the review board obtained an extremely important document written by a Marine Corps noncommissioned officer, Sergeant Boijin, of the United States Marine Corps. He led a team of Marines from the Marine barracks in Washington, DC. to provide physical security at the autopsy. This was not the honor guard in dress uniforms, these were Marines from the Marine barracks to provide physical security.

He wrote a report of what happened that night and he wrote, in his report, dated November 26, 1963, he wrote that—and he is only talking about what happened with the President, because that was his job was to guard the President's body during the autopsy—he wrote that the casket arrived at 18:35 hours. 18:35 hours, that is 6:35 p.m., 20 minutes before the motorcade from Andrews arrived. And there is a considerable amount of evidence, a wide range of evidence that the President's body really arrived by helicopter before the motorcade from Andrews. That is the broken chain of custody. And the issue here, it is a very important one, a very important issue, the issue here is if Sergeant Boijin's report is correct, and he authenticated that to the review board staff. He authenticated that to me with a written letter and with a telephone interview. If his report is correct, then what was happening with the President's body between 6:35 p.m. and 8 o'clock when the autopsy of record started? That is almost an hour and a half. And the simple answer, the streamlined answer, appears to be that many metal



fragments were removed from President Kennedy's body before the autopsy of record began. We have witnesses for this.

Mrs. LUNA. Those would be the bullet fragments, correct.

Mr. HORNE. Yes. Tom Robinson of Gawler's Funeral Home saw a vial full of 10 tiny fragments, which he saw picked out of President Kennedy's brain. They were never placed in the record.

Dennis David, HM-1 Corpsman Dennis David, typed a receipt for a Federal agent of four large bullet fragments. He thought it would be mass, larger than one bullet and less mass than two bullets. Somewhere between one and two bullets, four large fragments. He typed the receipt. He was allowed to handle the fragments by the Federal agent. We would not do that today. And the agent took the receipt, the typewriter ribbon and the fragments and they were never introduced in the record.

We also have two witnesses, to make a long story short, we have two witnesses to surgery on the cranium to get this evidence out. And Dr. Humes, the chief pathologist, said under oath to Arlen Specter, Dr. Humes said, under oath, that I never had to perform a craniotomy, I never had to saw the skull open to get the brain out.

And when Dr. Fink arrived late for the autopsy—he was the outsider, the Army guy who arrived at 8:30—Humes told Dr. Fink, no sawing of the skull was necessary.

So, the end of my response here is that we have two witnesses, X-ray technician, Ed Reed, under oath to the review board, and Tom Robinson to both the House Committee and the review board, Tom Robinson told the same account to both the HSCA and to us that he saw Dr. Hume saw the skull open.

So, I think bullet fragments were removed from the President's body before the autopsy of record began and that is why we should have no confidence whatsoever in the autopsy.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you very much.

My next question is for you, Mr. Bolden.

Mr. Bolden, can you hear me?

Mr. BOLDEN. Yes, I can.

Mrs. LUNA. OK, sir. Thank you for sticking with us so long. I know it has been kind of long. But if you can, real quick, what did he observe about the Secret Service investigation of President Kennedy's assassination.

Mr. BOLDEN. It was one of the greatest cover-ups of a crime. Now, the Secret Service initiated so many cover-ups. No. 1, the number of bullet fragments that were found in the car. Harry Gagline (ph), on November the 26, looked at the car, the assassination automobile, and he found two cartridges laying on the front floor, floorboard. They were very damaged. And he also observed a bullet hole in the windshield. And he was told not to let the FBI know about any of this and to get the car to Michigan somewhere where they could put a new windshield in and clean the car up.

Now, the biggest thing that I was talking about was the violations of constitutional rights that followed, especially in my case, simply because I would not be quiet. I was framed, I was arrested. They attempted to declare me insane.

And I was put in Springfield, Missouri, forced to take drugs, mind-boggling drugs. Now, that stemmed from the fact that on the

18 of November 1964, I was called to Washington, DC, and they told me they were going to give me another name, change my identity, and that I would become another individual. And that, in fact, did happen. And I think that they were setting me up for assassination myself. I think that that was what was going on. Because when they sent me to the penitentiary, they made it clear that it was a case of my being so agitated about the assassination that I would not keep quiet.

And so, they gave me two trials. They had two convicts that I had arrested. And they put me on trial twice in 1 month. And that was never heard. They kidnapped me out of Washington, DC, a violation of my constitutional rights. Denied me an attorney, simply because they said I was not a team player. I would not keep my mouth shut.

And so, when they did that to me, they sent me to Springfield and put me in a camp there where I was threatened by one of the inmates. And they used that as an excuse that on July the 7, 1967 two guards came to the camp and got me and took me to what they call 2-1 east. And they undressed me, got me naked, threw me in a cell.

And the next thing I know, they were forcing medication on me. The guard came by, he says, we have medication. Told him, I said, I have not been before a court. No court has said that I was insane. You are supposed to take me to the court. But they did not do that. They forced me into take these drugs. One of them knocked me out. I fell on the floor. I had to go into the hospital to have it looked at. And this is how they treated me.

Now, I was kidnapped out of Washington, DC, brought to Chicago. Denied an attorney by the United States Attorney. I was then not given any food on that night, which was May the 18, 1964. They did not let me eat anything because they kept talking about I was not a team player and I did not keep my mouth shut.

And this is how they control the cover-up, agents became afraid. They did not want to talk. And there were so many cover-ups, Chief Rowley put out a memo that said any agent that gave information other than the information that he would provide would be censored severely.

Well, when they found out that I wanted to go to the Warren Commission, who was investigating the case appointed by President Johnson, I asked to go testify to the Warren Commission about what the Secret Service was doing and the type of protection that President Kennedy was receiving. And so, they brought me to Washington, DC, denied me an attorney, every constitutional right was violated, and forced me to take medical drugs, stripped me naked, removed me to such prisons. Now, here I was, an ex-Secret Service agent. They locked me up with people who I might have put in jail myself. I was threatened by these people. And it really affected me and my wife, Barbara Bolden, who stuck with me throughout this ordeal.

And to anybody who is listening, if you have a good wife, like Barbara was, keep her. Keep her, because that is—the scripture says a double band is not easily broke and they were talking about people like my dear wife who passed away in 2005.

So, I just want people to know that constitutional rights when I was on trial on July the 12, the jury was debating whether or not on a verdict. The judge called the jury forward and told the jury, "In my opinion, Bolden is guilty on all the counts in the indictment," which was three counts. That jury did not find me guilty.

So, the judge set another trial for 2 weeks later. For 2 weeks now, a second trial. And we asked for a new judge. The judge himself, in violation Federal procedure, heard the motion himself. And the law says that if a complainant files a motion for a change of judge, that the judge who the complaint is against, shall not make the decision as to the prejudicial action.

So, here I am now. It took me 90 years, 90 years for him to look into it. It broke my heart, because America is supposed to be the leader in constitutional rights. It is supposed to be a leader in democracy. Yet, I felt so abandoned by the system. But I am glad I did. And I would do it again, because the American people need to know the truth. And the truth will set you free.

Mrs. LUNA. Well, thank you, Mr. Bolden. And again, thank you for your—

Mr. NIXON. Madam Chairman.

Mrs. LUNA. Yes.

Mr. BOLDEN. Madam Chairwoman, I am Tyler Nixon. I am counsel for Mr. Bolden. And I can just give a minute of clarification here.

Mr. Bolden was in fact prosecuted on what—I have delved into this case very deeply, this was one of the most rigged—you want to talk about weaponization of the judicial system and justice system. This man was railroaded. He had a judge, as he said, who told the jury that he believed that he was guilty. He set a new trial. And the two accusing witnesses were two men that he had arrested previously as counterfeiters. And the main witness who purportedly, you know, out of the goodness of his heart went to be head of the Secret Service, Maurice Martineau, to report the supposed solicitation of a bribe, which was the accusation, admitted in his trial about 2 months, 4 months later that he perjured himself in Mr. Bolden's trial.

Mrs. LUNA. Yes, Mr. Nixon. We actually would be happy to collect all the information off record. But just due to the process—

Mr. NIXON. Sure.

Mrs. LUNA [continuing]. As you are not a stated witness, we just have to be careful.

Mr. NIXON. Yes.

Mrs. LUNA. So, I will say, at least I speak for myself, I do the not believe that Mr. Bolden was actually guilty of a crime. I do believe that he was falsely, if you will, framed. And so, on behalf of the U.S. Government, we would like to apologize to him and his family, because obviously that is not how we are supposed to treat people in this country. And so, you have our sympathy, as well as our apology, for the treatment of that. But we will be happy to follow up on that, because as stated, we would like to collect and make sure that this does not happen to future individuals. And that requires changing of laws and also putting protections in place.

But I would like to thank all of you. We have gone way over our time today, but the fact that you all travelled in and were willing to come testify, especially you, Dr. Curtis. Mr. Bolden, Judge Tunheim, Mr. Hardway, Mr. Horne, and Ms. Coe, thank you so much for coming here today.

If you do have any other information you would like to submit to the Task Force, we will happily accept that. And we will be following up on some of these suggestions that you have all made today.

And with that, and without objection, all Members will have 5 legislative days in which to submit materials and additional written questions for the witnesses, which will be forwarded to the witnesses for their responses as well. If you would like to submit anything else are the record, we would be happily accepting of that.

If there is no further business, without objection, the Task Force stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:46 p.m., the Task Force was adjourned.]

