

Chick 17

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
Foreword	ii
Introduction	xx
1. The Assassinations Records Review Board -- Another Whitewash	1
2. Great Expectations	11
3. About the ARRB -- Members and Staff	31
4. Proving It Wrong Makes the Warren Commission Right	49
5. The Board's Self-Characterization in its Depositions	63
6. Centering on the Autopsy	72
7. Board Ignored Reasons To Suspect a Military Conspiracy	85
8. The Almost Sourceless Autopsy -- Was It Made Up?	99
9. Everybody Lies -- Except Humes	108
10. An Honest Account of the Assassination Was Never Officially Intended	123
11. From <i>Whitewash</i> Through <i>Post Mortem</i> into the ARRB's Super-Whitewash	137
12. Boswell Contradicts Humes and Both Are Not Truthful	155
Bibliography	166

transfer to inside



Oswald was seen by Dallas policeman Marrion Baker in the second floor lunchroom although the building manager, Roy Truly was running up the stairs ahead of him and did not see Oswald coming down. For that to have been possible, which it was not, Oswald had to have fired those shots from the sixth floor window hidden the rifle with extraordinary care, descended those stairs from the sixth to the second floor, and then entered that lunchroom through a door with a slow-acting automatic closer on it. That closer had to close that door before Truly ran past it.

He did not see it close that door.

Each and every bit of the official evidence relating to this also proved it to have been impossible.

So, on the day of the assassination – and from much more than this – it was known that the history was set up by the unknown real assassins. It was grabbed by both the Dallas police and the FBI and then by the entire federal government and its Commission. Knowing nothing else, they all grabbed that bait.

At the beginning of *Whitewash*, in the chapter "The Set-Up for the Assassination," (pp. 12 ff) I include all the official evidence on Oswald's alleged carrying of that rifle into that building that morning. All the official evidence itself proves that the package Oswald did carry was much too small to have held the rifle. The only person who saw Oswald enter the building swore that he then had nothing in his hands. And when a bag made of wrapping paper was found belatedly, it was not in the police pictures of that place taken early in the search. That sack held not a single- Oswald fingerprint were he had to have held it in carrying that rifle. All official witnesses swore to the impossibility of what the Commission concluded. Concluding the opposite of its own official evidence, this and other official evidence, was essential to the Commission's preconception that it converted into its conclusion, that Oswald was the assassin.

Here are some excerpts from that first-day evidence from the first book on the subject.

About 1:22 P.M., Deputy Sheriff Eugene Boone and Constable Seymour Weitzman simultaneously saw the rifle. At a moment less precisely fixed the "bag" was identified as an important piece of evidence . . .

It was about a half-hour after the assassination before the chief of the crime laboratory, Lieutenant J. C. Day (4H249-278; 7H402), was ordered to the scene. By the time he got there, newsmen were already on the sixth floor (4H263). He and his assistants took about 50 pictures, but not one showing the bag in the place where it was found. No question is raised about this in the Report, especially regrettable because of the importance this bag assumes in the Commission's reconstruction. All sorts of pictures were taken, but not that one. Instead, there is a picture of the blank floor showing where the bag allegedly had been (Exhibit 729). Yet Day had immediately recognized the importance of this evidence, for "at the time the sack was found", he wrote on it, "Found next to the sixth-floor window gun fired from. May have been used to carry gun" (4H266-267). A number of pictures were taken with the police photographer standing on the very spot where that bag was found. There were no fingerprints on the outside, although it had been moved by Day's assistant, Robert Lee Studebaker (7H137-149). Studebaker testified that he had not taken any pictures first and that the bag does not show in any other pictures (7H144). He was not asked why (Whitewash, p. 32).

Although Lieutenant Day did state that the sack was "Found next to the sixth-floor window gun was fired from," there was no person who saw that gun fired.

That it was fired from that window is also made up and made up in direct violation of the official evidence, which proves it could not have been.

With all the major-media propaganda in support of the Report and in the absence of many major-media questioning of the Report, this truthful statement has little prospect of being believed but it is the truth. The Commission merely ignored and misrepresented its own evidence.

Also the exact opposite of the Commission's evidence is testimony it got from Weitzman and Baker, here excerpted from pp. 36 ff. We begin with, the discovery of the rifle:

p. 36

. . . Two men appear to have found it at the same time. The Commission saw fit to call only one to Washington. He is Eugene Boone, a deputy sheriff (3H291ff.). The other was Seymour Weitzman, a constable and one of the rare college graduates in the various police agencies. He had a degree in engineering. Weitzman gave a deposition to the Commission staff in Dallas on April 1 1964 (7H105-9).

* * * * *

. . . he went to the sixth floor where he worked with Boone on the search. With Weitzman on the floor looking under the flats of boxes and Boone looking over the top,

But when I interviewed his parents, Philip's father left us and came back with a shoe box of records relating to his son. Among them was a series of signed receipts Bringuier wrote out in longhand for the small number of Cuban Student Directorate "bonds" Philip sold for fifty cents each.

When Philip came to the interview he brought me a Xerox of one of Bringuier's later receipts to Philip. It was dated in June. The raid was the end of July.

So, Bringuier was a liar if not also a perjurer when he testified before the Commission.

That was not Bringuier's only deception and dishonesty. He and Philip IV had long been friends. Some time before the assassination, the son ran away from home over not getting along with his father. When he did return to New Orleans he did not go to his home. He went to Bringuier's store. Bringuier did not send him home and did not phone Philip's worried parents to tell them not to worry, that their son was back, safe and sound.

There is more but this enough to get Bringuier and Marrs both to portray themselves.

These are a couple of "particularly suspicious" listings in Marr's monument to towering ignorance and stupidity, what would ordinarily not be suspected of a former news reporter, which Marrs was. He has this headline over that last section: "The Church Committee investigation." We are left to wonder which of those investigations Marrs may have had in mind. But without trying, to resolve that, what should not exist, we can address the first four, all marked with that "particularly suspicious" asterisk and not one is in any way relevant except that all lived in the United States, if that constitutes relevance. Not one was connected with the Church Committee in any way and that is also true of almost all of the next page.

First is Hale Boggs. Marrs identifies him as "House majority leader." That should have told Marrs that Boggs was not a Senator. But on the other hand, Marrs also does not say that Church was a Senator and that his committee necessarily, was limited to Senators.

However, Marrs has cause of death correct: "Disappeared on Alaska plane flight." How that could possibly have meant something in the JFK assassination or to the Church Committee Marrs does

With this abbreviated view of some of those on whom Stone drew for the supposed information in the script of his movie, we have a peek at Stone's qualifications to be the spearhead of representations to the Congress about what the government should still be doing about the assassination.

When after I wrote him with understated truthfulness that it would not be possible to tell the people who killed their President, why and how, or to write their history for them. I enclosed a bit of confirmation, offered to answer any questions he had, to do that in writing and to attach whatever documentation he asked for. Two months passed and I heard nothing from Stone. Meanwhile, in order to recruit actors, to arrange financing and for other needs, Stone had to distribute many copies of his script. One of those copies was given to me. Later Stone was to claim that I stole it and was some two hundred CIA hawks circling over him to destroy him.

Knowing nothing about movie scripts, when I read that one it struck me as childish in many ways but whether or not that is a legitimate criticism, judging by the reaction I was very wrong. It was a super spectacular success, a big hit. It also struck me as profoundly ignorant, which it was, without damage to its commercial success. Some of it was really shocking in its ignorance because it indicated that neither Stone nor Sklar had done any real research in other than assassination mythologies. A simply astounding example is part of what Stone had in his movie about David W. Ferrie – who was never, in any way, ever connected with the assassination. There were rumors that he had known Oswald when Oswald was a boy and was, briefly, in the Civil Air Patrol, in which, from time to time, Ferrie was an instructor.

My *Whitewash II*, a 1966 book, introduced David Ferrie into assassination literature, real and made up. In what I wrote about Ferrie I limited myself to the official records, with two exceptions that I can remember after three decades.

Ferrie was a strange man, sick in the head and, at the time of the assassination, was under New Orleans charges of offenses against minor boys. In some ways he was bright and competent. But he also imagined that he was a brilliant scientist. He was the successful defense investigator in the unsuccessful

Wells 30-47

If what Sibert and O'Neill reported of the medical evidence is true, the Report had to be a fake. And, the main FBI summary report, CD 1, medically based on Sibert and O'Neill, failed to account for all the shooting or all the wounds. Hoover at his legal, scientific, investigative best.

The receipt accounts for the existence of some of this missing medical evidence as of the time it reached the White House. Added to the sworn attestation to its subsequent existence as of the time of the Commission's hearings, it had to be obvious that evidence was suppressed, destroyed or both.

To this day, the existence of these autopsy notes is denied, although every source stipulates their existence, from Doctor Humes' Commission testimony to that of Doctor Finck in New Orleans -- he expanded knowledge in admitting that all the autopsy doctors had made notes and he had turned his in before leaving -- to Admiral Galloway's covering letter with which he sent them to the White House and Doctor Burkley's receipt for them to the Secret Service.

But after years of trying, and I mean "years" literally, I have finally obtained some of this missing evidence. After July 6, 1966, certification by the Archivist, then Dr. Robert H. Bahmer, that it was not in the Commission's files -- not one item of it.

...

Some of what follows may seem to not to be relevant to the Board's mandate but if these depositions are, then almost anything is. It does reflect government policy of that time and what was done to withhold what ought not have been withheld and, under the law, could not be withheld. Also, what was leads to assassination information to me was leads for the Board:

My first direct effort with the [Secret Service] also was on May 23, 1966. It drew no response from Director James J. Rowley. After a little more than a year, I renewed the correspondence, this time invoking the Attorney General's executive order. Rowley insisted that "the Secret Service never did withhold any evidence" from the Commission, subsequently amplified in a manner that can explain the absence from the Commission's files of what the Secret Service did have and the Commission should have "... the information available to the Secret Service relating to the assassination of President Kennedy was made available to the Warren Commission and its staff." Based on those items of suppressed evidence where I can make an evaluation, I am prepared to believe that the Commission, or, more likely, some of the staff, declined to have what it did not use and was not in its files, not that Rowley hid it from them.

It was at this point that Thomas J. Kelley, by then promoted to Assistant Director in Charge of Protective Service, took over the correspondence that grew to an extensive file.

Inherently, writers make judgments, whether or not so realizing or intending. I prefer to make mine explicit. The Secret Service was part of a cover-up, the specific charge of my second book. It was silent when it should not have been, and it remains silent when the course of honor and really dedicated public service requires that it and its



Commander HUMES. Yes, air; with the exception of the certification to the fact that I, in fact, detailed [sic] them in my custody, and a certification that I had destroyed certain preliminary draft notes.

Mr. SPECTER. And these represent all the notes except those you have already described which you destroyed?

Commander HUMES. That is correct, sir (pages 372-3).



Specter, the experienced prosecutor, would never have dared pull this kind of shysterism in a court of law with opposing counsel to expose him.

Page 106A here

Why? It seems not to belong here. No reference to Ruffman here

As we see in this verbatim quotation of Humes' actual testimony, he did not testify that he had destroyed any "notes". He limited his testimony to saying that he burned the draft of the autopsy.

Consistent with his deliberate deception about Humes destroying his notes is Specter's referring to Exhibit 397 as "a group of documents." It appears in Volume XVI on pages 29-48.

The first page is Humes notes of a phone conversation with Perry in Dallas. That page consists of but three brief medical references and of Perry's home and office addresses and phone numbers.

One of those brief medical notes Specter made raises the most substantial doubt about the story he was making up for his magic bullet if in fact it does not disprove it. Perry told Specter that the wound in the front of the President's neck was only three by five millimeters. That is smaller than the diameter of the bullets supposedly fired in the assassination, and it is not usual for an exit wound to be smaller than an entrance wound. With this bullet allegedly tumbling in the story Specter made up out of need, not out of any evidence at all, the bullet was allegedly tumbling, and that eliminates entirely the possibility that the exit wound was so small because by the time it traveled the short distance not much more than a foot to Governor Connally's back, it made a hole about an inch in his back.

(If the board made any searches in the files of the agencies dealing with ballistics and testing for any relevant records, I recall no mention if it.)

Pages 30-44 are the handwritten revised autopsy protocol, not any "notes."

Humes could not have been more unequivocal in his second certification. He "certified" that the "Autopsy notes and the holograph draft of the final report were handed to Commanding Officer" [sic]. And rather than saying he burned anything at all he certified that all the autopsy "working papers associated with" the autopsy "remained in my custody at all times." Again, Burkley "accepted and approved" this "certification." Humes' commanding officer acknowledged receipt of those "working papers."

Gunn also had this and about this he also asked no real questions. Or, he accepted it, too, for the board.

In another receipt that was in CD 371 and was to have been published in Exhibit 397 and was not, the head of the White House Secret Service acknowledged getting from Burkley the "notes of the examining doctor," Humes. He could not have had what Humes burned but he did get Humes' notes from Burkley. I could not find those notes in an intensive search in the Archives. It was not with this receipt in CD 371.

This series of covering letters and receipts leave it without question that what was believed to be Humes' notes did exist after his conflagration. It is also apparent that all copies were hidden and have never been made public.

The line in the left margin opposite the item quoted was on the copy I found at the Archives. It attracted some official attention before I resurrected it.

These once-suppressed original forwarding letters and receipt that were also suppressed serve as a background for what little Gunn asked about those notes and what Humes responded, if what he said can be considered a response in all cases.

When Gunn asked Humes "about records that were created during the course of the autopsy through the time that the autopsy protocol was completed" and "did you yourself take any notes during the autopsy." Humes replied:

*The exhibit follows 145, which
was continued on 145, Exhibit?
Perhaps at the end, with a note saying this is perhaps*

Commission No. 371

TREASURY DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON 25, D. C. 50-2-34030



Protective Research Section
November 26, 1963

Receipt is acknowledged this date, Nov. 26, 1963, of the following items from Dr. George G. Burkley:

One piece of bronze colored material inadvertently broken in transit from casket in which body was brought from Dallas.

One letter - Certificate of Death of John F. Kennedy - State of Texas - dated Nov. 22, 1963.

One carbon copy of letter dated November 26 from Commanding Officer, U. S. Medical School, concerning law and regulations regarding confidential nature of the events.

One receipt dated Nov. 22, 1963, for bed sheet, surgical drapes, and shroud used to cover the body in transit.

One receipt dated Nov. 22, 1963, regarding a carton of photographic film, undeveloped except for X-rays, delivered to PRS for safekeeping.

An original and six pink copies of Certificate of Death (Nav. Med. N)

One receipt from FBI for a missile removed during the examination of the body.

One letter from University of Texas South West Medical School including report from Dr. Clark and summary of their findings of treatment and examination of the President in the Dallas County Hospital. Said letter of transmittal states that three carbon copies have been retained in that area.

One copy of autopsy report and notes of the examining doctor which is described in letter of transmittal Nov. 25, 1963 by Dr. Galloway.

Transmitted letter and 7 copies of the above item (autopsy report)

Authorization for post mortem examination signed by the Attorney General and dated Nov. 22, 1963.

Robert I. Boyce

The Commission failed to publish this receipt even though it is supposed to be included as part of a published exhibit, CE 397. The reason is obvious: had it been published, questions would immediately have arisen as to why none of the items included in the list are a part of the Commission's evidence. That the Commission did not obtain these items, readily available to it, is proof that it did not seek the most basic evidence of the crime. The Navy death certificate alone is destructive of the entire official solution to that crime. See pp. 102, 307-8.

Then there are the official records I published in facsimile in *Post Mortem*.

The first sentence of one of Humes' December 24 certification is:

I, James J. Humes, certify that all working Papers associated with Naval Medical School Autopsy Report A63-272 [the President's] have remained in my personal custody at all times.

His other certification of that evening states that other than what he burned he "officially transmitted all other papers related this autopsy to higher authority."

We also saw that Admiral Galloway also recorded sending all those "work papers" to the White House. The Secret Service receipt to Burkley is limited to the notes in those "working papers," but it acknowledges receipt of what Galloway sent.


Aside from other proofs Humes could not have been a more deliberate or a bigger liar than in swearing, as he did, that "I do not know when J got that back or what " when he does know that it was never out of his own personal possession until he handed the autopsy protocol in. It was one of those "working papers" he then also handed in; that had never been out of his possession; and that once it was given to "higher authority," neither of them could lay hands on it. Or, Humes knew very well that he alone had possession of the Autopsy Descriptive Sheet from the time that Boswell gave it to him during or at the end of the autopsy and that he alone gave it to "higher authority," not to Boswell.

Gunn questions and his tolerance of blatant lies confirmed to Humes what he had plenty of reason to know, that there was nothing at all he could not away with in that phony deposition that instead of seeking information was still more of an official whitewash.

Gunn then lets him get away with still another whopper. Gunn read him his commission testimony in which all he testified he destroyed was the first version of the autopsy report he prepared. When Gunn asks what it was that Humes destroyed, Humes testified "It was handwritten notes and the first draft that was burned." But as Gunn knew, Humes had certified that he had turned in "all other

papers relating to his report" and in his second certification Humes certified that "All working papers," including "autopsy notes," he personally, gave to his commanding office at five o'clock that evening.

Although he was getting away with murder and knew it, Humes had gotten so flustered because he knew what he was doing was a criminal violation, when Gunn asked him is he used "the expression handwritten notes as being the equivalent of draft of the report," Humes said, "I don't know." He did know unless he forgot his lies.

The without being interrupted Humes condemned this proper question as "a hair-splitting affair ^{sm/} that I can't understand." He then limits what he destroyed to "Everything that I personally prepared." That does not include the autopsy notes that Finck and Boswell gave him on small slips of paper and thus there is no accounting of them, unless Humes also burned them. But if he engaged in this wholesale conflagration, what working papers remained for him to have handed in and to have been so thoroughly receipted? 

Humes then extends this to "everything I had," or there were no working papers to be handed in and so thoroughly receipted.

And in all of this Gunn never once hands Humes any of the official documentation,, including Humes' own, of his endless lying in which he even testified in contradiction to himself.

While we have not gone into all of Humes' endless lies, this is a heavy enough dose of them to stop and think about them and about what they and their acceptance mean.

Aside from meaning that the Board would accept any lie he gave it and any number of them, it also means that the Board was determined to misuse the depositions as another of the many coats of whitewash applied officially to keep the people from knowing what really happened when their President was assassinated, when there was that de facto coup d'etat, when the government they had elected was overthrown.