

11. From Whitewash Through Post Mortem Into ^{the} AREP's
Super whitewash

As we have seen, Humes' explanations for his destructions of any of the papers of the autopsy ^{which} is entirely improper if not criminal, and ~~with~~ his alleged reasons make no sense at all. He ~~said~~ he did not want any misuse of the President's blood but he was not able to control a greater volume of that blood than his autopsy report and his notes could have held. He also did not dare destroy the official Navy Autopsy Descriptive Sheet, which held ^{some of} Boswell's notes, and although they have disappeared, he did not testify to having destroyed the notes that Finck testified he gave Humes at the end of their examination of the body. Humes' explanation ~~at~~ collapses when it is recall^{ed} that he had not control over the casket, its lining or the shroud. All he had washed was the sheets in which the Dallas nurses wrapped the body an, with an extra protection on its head.

There was ~~of~~ the ~~the~~ President blood and more were all over the limousine in which he was riding and Humes could do nothing about that.

It was all over the clothing and uniforms of the others in the car and the four Dallas motorcycle policemen who were closest to ~~g~~ him, two on each side of him when his head was exploded.

An FBI account that was suppressed until the board forced its disclosure places the blood and other body matter even under the visors of the limousine and ~~on~~ on its hood, ^{neither reported earlier.}

While there is no way of knowing how ^u much of the President's blood remained at the Dallas hospital, the sheets in which he was wrapped were clean when he was wrapped in them after ~~been~~ he was washed. It is reasonable to assume that his blood was on the sheet and mattress of the ^{gurney} stretcher on which he was rushed from the limousine to the emergency room, and it is probably that some of his

Area to
Blood stain

Frazier



2.

remained on those ~~at~~ who rushed him in. It also is likely that some remained on some if not all of the ~~at~~ ^{do}ctors and nurses who attended him and on the equipment they used in their unsuccessful effort to save ~~the President's~~ ^{his} life.

There were pieces of his head found in the street and one ~~hat~~ ^{that} was ~~thrown~~ ^{thrown} onto ~~the~~ ^{the} grassy knoll was recovered ~~and~~ ^{and} turned in.

There is no need to explore other possibility. These known to exist are more than enough to establish beyond question that the excuse ^Humes made up for his destruction of irreplaceable evidence in this most terrible of crimes makes no sense at all. Not a word of it has any credibility. Yet all to whom he fed that made-up explanation accepted it or even loved it, ranging from those subject-matter ignoramuses of JAMA ~~to~~ ^{to} all the official investigations ~~to which he gave~~ ^{to which he gave} it.

Blood stain
↓

If there had ever ^{been} been any real official investigation, if there had ~~never~~ ^{never} been any official investigation that was determined to establish the actual fact of the assassination and its so-called "investigation," once ^Humes gave that absolutely incredible explanation for his wrong-doing in destroying any autopsy records of any kind at all, he would have been grilled mercilessly about this senseless explanation he made up out of nothing. He would have had more than the conclusions stated above thrown at him with vigor and he would have been a sorry spectacle when his made-up ~~was~~ ^{was} impossibility of an explanation was exposed as the fake it was and he as the faker.

↓
All - make
Pursue
conclusion
↓

However,

But he was never really grilled, he was never really disputed, not even really questioned in any official investigation ^{so} he was secure in giving Gunn the same disgraceful fiction.

As we have seen, Humes gave different accounts of what he destroyed and the one he stuck with ~~is~~ ^{is} solidly refuted by the official ^{of} evidence, the official initial "certification" he signed ^S and all records of ~~receipts~~ ^{receiving} and them and the receipts for what he handed it and was passed up, ending in The White House ^{that weekend}.

U

3.

As we saw, initially Humes attested to the destruction of his first draft of his autopsy proctocol only. By the time he testified to the Commission and to what he held in his hands, when he referred to his notes he referred to "copies" of them. About this, as about ~~the destruction of the notes~~ which else Arlen Specter had no questions.

*note(s)
destruction*

Although Humes later started fudging on it, as we also saw in his Commission testimony ^{he} Humes placed the time of his destruction at when he heard that Oswald had been killed. He and all other's involved knew then that there would be no trial at which their records could be examined, at which they could be called on to testify and about which they would be questionned with the most determined vigor by ~~the~~ defense counsel.

It is impossible to believe that all those who did question ^{Humes} Humes in all official proceedings were nincompoops, legal nullities who lacked the knowledge to ask him the very obvious questions he was not asked or who were dopes who *really* believed the pap he fed them.

What is much more likely is that with Oswald dead and with no trial and no need to produce those records at a trial and no cross-examination by any determined and competent lawyer, the proctocol had its content changed. The stuff that Humes had in what he handed in would have led to his being pilloried on the witness stand. What he did and did not do would have been examined closely and the relevant ^u rules, regulations and laws would have been read to him- and to the jury.

Humes would have been ruined if he had faced examination in a trial in which ^{proctocol} ~~the revision he handed in~~ the autopsy/he ended up with was the basis for examination of him. Even the ^(the revision, are substantial) ~~changes made in it, visible in the original of the second~~, his revised ~~handwri~~ handwritten copy published in Post Mortem (pages 509-23) with the substantive changes in fact ^{testified he} he was ordered to make, ^{and} ~~he testified, but in his own~~ handwriting, would have been ruinous to him and to any prosecution.

What ~~in~~ ^{the} Humes had originally in his proctocol and what was included in the ^{s/e} missing nites had to have been what they ~~could~~ ^{have been} examined on in the trial that was expected at the time those notes were made and that first proctocol was written.

But as any imparical ⁺ examination of the actual evidence, aside from the medical evidence, leaves without any question at all - what the evidence means and says rather than the ^{official} (interpretation of it, of what was not ignored ^{actual} by the Co^mmission- the medical evidence is not what Humes wound up with when he revised his proctocol ^{knowing it} that would not have to withstand close examination into one that supported the official determination to state the crime was by a single assassin. This official determination, ~~made~~ ^{also} which began to be formulated ~~as~~ ^{also} as soon as Oswald was dead and those officials knew there would be no trial. ^o The formulation of it that Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenback put on paper at about the time Humes did his revised proctocol had the same purpose ^{as Humes'} of the revised version of the autopsy.

*Katz
Humes
Tie these
together*

That original version could not be permitted to exist or disaster ~~could~~ result.

It is ^{ay} because this also was true of those notes that Humes originally made no mention of ~~them~~ and then ~~stated that he~~ testified that he had burned them, too ^o ~~that~~ he did have reason to burn them when he burned the ~~proct~~ ^{proct} proctocol, neither of ^{because} which could have supported that lone-assassin, ^{that was made up when it was known there} no conspiracy fiction, and both ^{would be n} ~~of which~~ ^{+ risks} had to withstand close examination at the expected trial.

he original

(The ~~open~~ ^m official documentation of the official decision to pin it all on the killed Oswald and to have a Presidential Commission ^{is reported} formulate it is at the beginning of NEVER AGAIN! It is fully documented ^{it}, even with the handwritten draft prepared by Katzenbach when he had ~~no~~ ^{no} typist available on a sunday afternoon. That and the retyped version are from the Justice Department file 129-11 and the other copies are from the FBI headquarters main assassination file, 62-109060.)

What ~~the~~ ^HHumes had originally in his protocol and what was included in the ^Smissing notes had to have been what they ~~know~~ ^{have been} could be examined on in the trial that was expected at the time those notes were made and that first protocol was written.

But as any impar^tial examination of the actual evidence, aside from the medical evidence, leaves without any question at all - what the evidence means and says rather than the ^{official}(interpretation of it, of what was not ig-
nored ^{actual} by the Commission- the medical evidence is not what Humes wound up with when he revised his protocol ^{knowing it} that would not have to withstand close examination into one that supported the official determination to state the crime was by a single assassin. This official determination, ~~made~~ ^{also} which began to be formulated ~~as~~ ^{also} as soon as Oswald was dead and those officials knew there would be no trial. ^GThe formulation of it that Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenback put on paper at about the time "Humes did his revised protocol" had the same purpose ^{as Humes'} of the revised version of the autopsy.

That original version could not be permitted to exist or disaster ~~it~~ could result.

It is ^{ay} because this also was true of those notes that Humes originally made no mention of ~~them~~ and then ~~stated that he~~ testified that he had burned them, too. ~~that~~ he did have reason to burn them when he burned the ~~proct~~ ^{because} protocol neither of which could have supported that lone-assassin, ^{that was made up when it was known there} no conspiracy fiction) and both ^{would be in} ~~of which~~ ^{trials} had to withstand close examination at the expected trial.

(The ~~depu~~ ^m official documentation of the official decision to pin it all on ~~the~~ ^{is reported} killed Oswald and to have a Presidential Commission ~~formulate~~ ^{it is} at the beginning of NEVER AGAIN! It is fully documented, ^{ff} even with the handwritten draft prepared by Ka^tzenbach when he had ~~no~~ ^{no} typist available on a sunday afternoon. That and the retyped version are from the Justice Department file 129-11 and the other copies are from the FBI headquarters main assassination file, 62-109060.)

6-

Secret Service records and the disclosed transcripts of the taping of ~~the~~ ^{some} conversation, especially with Johnson and J. Edgar Hoover, ~~later conversations about this also confirm it.~~ ^{this.}

But then there was no Freedom of Information Act under which I obtained those many records, including those here cited.

So there can be no doubt about the official record on this and about what Gunn knew in his deposing of Humes, the original, the official copies of them, the copies that had been hidden and were not used by the Warren Commission in its

report, are appropriate. I reprint the copies I had published in Post Mortem, 1975. ^{These are} copies made from those originally suppressed, ~~official~~ ^{which} copies the Commission had ~~and~~ ^{did not have on} used. I ~~added~~ ^{and include the} footnotes to them ~~and include the~~ ^{my}, ~~reproducing~~ ^{is reproduced exactly as} each page as it was printed in 1975, each page that Gunn had and he did not ^{really} use in his questioning of Humes.

In
The first, from page 524, Humes certified that he burned his protocol and turned all other papers in. Admiral Burkley "accepted and approved" this.

Hynes could not have been more unequivocal in his second certification. He cb
"certified" that ~~"the~~ the "Autopsy notes and the holograph draft of the final ~~of~~
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"
that autopsy "remained in my custody at all times." Again, Burkley "accepted
and approved" this "certification." Hynes' [^]commanding officer acknowledge receipt of those ^{"working papers"}
Gunn also had this and about this ^{als} he ^{rec}asked no questions. [^]Of, he accepted
it, too, for the board.

158

NATIONAL NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER
BETHESDA 14, MARYLAND

25 November 1963

To: Commanding Officer, National Naval Medical Center
The White House Physician

Subj: Autopsy protocol in the case of John F. Kennedy, Late President
of the United States

1. Transmitted herewith by hand is the sole remaining copy (number eight) of the completed protocol in the case of John F. Kennedy. Attached are the work papers used by the Prosecutor and his assistants.
2. This command holds no additional documents in connection with this case.
3. Please acknowledge receipt.

C. E. GALLOWAY

This letter and the receipt which follows are from CD 371, although neither appears in the Commission's published evidence. When Specter introduced the autopsy papers, CE 397, into evidence, he stated for the record that CE 397 "is the identical document" marked CD 371 "for our internal purposes." (2H373). However, the two documents are not the same because the printed exhibit omits these two pages. Suppression accomplished many purposes, among them making it impossible to trace the chain of possession of the vital autopsy notes.

Many pages of notes made by all three pathologists during the autopsy were preserved and must have been delivered to Dr. Burkley on November 25. Dr. Humes transmitted all papers in his possession to Admiral Galloway on November 24, and here Galloway claims to transmit all papers he has, retaining none. Burkley in turn gave everything he got from Galloway to the Secret Service on November 26, as the following receipt executed that day reveals. And there the trail ends. The Commission's records include but one sheet (two sides) of notes, none of which were made by Humes. See pp. 102-5, 247-8, 251-6. The one sheet published directly contradicts the autopsy findings on a quintessential point, the location of the back wound. One can only guess what the suppressed notes reveal. And one cannot avoid asking why the Commission, charged with evaluating all facts relating to the assassination, did not obtain or publish the missing autopsy notes, and suppressed the receipts documenting their chain of possession. See p. 50.

56

In reply refer to

1963

destroyed by
to Naval
officially
report to

his draft

*written
by C. W. B.N.*

the handwriting

draft of the autopsy report.
448, which does not include
said when the President's
of evidence in the crime!

en Specter, that Humes
ld U.S. News and world
en by Dr. Humes at the
destroyed." Specter
ey endorsement) into evi-
cate on the next page
burned he alternately
ft" of the autopsy report

the autopsy report had been
estion, not even the simple,
ord is barren. Specter,
w claims Humes "explained
his testimony.



U. S. NAVAL MEDICAL SCHOOL
NATIONAL NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER
BETHESDA, MARYLAND 20014

In reply refer to

9

24 November 1963

C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E

I, James J. Humes, certify that all working papers
associated with Naval Medical School Autopsy Report A63-272
have remained in my personal custody at all times. Autopsy
notes and the holograph draft of the final report were handed
to Commanding Officer, U. S. Naval Medical School, at 1700,
24 November 1963. No papers relating to this case remain in
my possession.

*Sourced in
MS 10*

J. J. Humes
J. J. HUMES
CDR, MC, USN

Received above working papers this date.

J. H. Stover, Jr.
J. H. STOVER, JR.
CAPT, MC, USN
Commanding Officer, U.S. Naval Medical School
National Naval Medical Center

Accepted and approved this date

George S. Burkley
Rear Adm USN

Physician to the President

This, an original copy, also bears the endorsement of Dr. Burkley absent from the copy published by the Commission. Here Humes makes explicit that he never burned any notes made during the autopsy. "Autopsy notes and the holograph draft of the final report" were preserved and given to Capt. Stover on November 24. Stover must have received all autopsy notes because Humes specifies that "all working papers" of the autopsy were in his possession until the transfer to Stover, after which "no papers relating to this case remain in my possession." With this transmittal, the mysterious story of the missing autopsy notes begins. See pp. 145, 261.

The next day Admiral Galloway sent Burkley the remaining retyped copye of 10
 the autopsy proctocol, the one not given Burkley the evening before by Humes.
 Galloway also states that he also sent the work papers used by the Prosector and
 his associates." He could not have sent what had been burned.

As I ^{said} stated in the footnote, Specter did not tell the truth when he stated
 while questioning Humes that Exhibit 397 abd CD 371 were "identical" beca^use I
 found two documents in the Commission's files , in CD 371, that were not published
 in Exhibit 397 and were not in the files copy of it.

*autopsy evidence
 not in CE 397 -
 - Had from him in
 CD 371*

12

In another receipt that was in CD371 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 ^aquites^d 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 receipts that were also suppressed serve as a background for ^{little} what Gunn asked about ^{what little those} that 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:

indent
right
page

A Yes, I took some. And--yes. That's the answer to your question.

Q How many pages of notes did you take, approximately?

A Oh, I can't tell you now. Maybe two or three.

Q Did you see anyone else taking notes during the autopsy?

A Dr. Boswell.

Q Do you recall anyone else having written anything?

A No.

Q Specifically, do you remember Dr. Finck having written any notes?

A No, I do not. I don't say he didn't, but I don't recall that he did (pages 116-7),

Gunn should have known from ~~the~~ Finck's New Orleans testimony, which he should have used in any real preparation for questioning Humes, and if not from it, from Post Mortem, ^(and used) which he had and read, that Finck swore he took notes and handed them to Humes as he left the autopsy room.

Humes then admitted that although on occasion autopsies were tape recorded, that was not done with this autopsy. Then: _____

cont
ingly
back

Q Were there any minutes taken of the autopsy?

A I don't know what you mean by minutes, but other than the notes that I or Dr. Boswell made, I don't believe there were any such, no.

Q There wasn't any person responsible for--

A No.

Q --taking down minutes of the autopsy?

A No.

Q What other kinds of records were typically created in the course of an autopsy? For example, would there be any log that would have recorded the receipt of the body?

A Yes (pages 118-9).

16

It was only the President so why should there have been anyone with the responsibility of seeing to it that there were complete records made during the autopsy?

That was not because of any shortage of help because that autopsy was in the massive Navy medical complex at Bethesda, in suburban Washington, and Washington also held many competent and experience Navy medical people. To ^asy nothing of ^{missive} Walter Reed Army ~~h~~ hospital and the Armed Forces ~~of~~ Institute of Pathology.

If the receipt of the body was made public I did not see it and I do not recall seeing in all the time I spent in the Archives.

There was not even any kind of record-keeping of what kinds of tests or sections were made" (page 119).

There was no record-keeping ...used to help identify which tests have been ^aent where and when they've been returned" (page 120).

^{there were} After additional admissions of what was usually done at autopsies and was not done in the autopsy of the President (pages 121-4).

Asked to "describe the process you went through in drafting the protocol," Humes launched into his fabrication about his alleged horror of any of the President's blood being commercialized (page 125-9) he ran on and on, for more than four pages of transcript in which he was never once interrupted as he rehashed his fabrication that, as we have seen, had no basis in fact of any kind.

It was just made up in an effort to cover the highly improper, if not also illegal destruction of evidence, destruction of the basic ^{evidence} source material of the autopsy which was really the basic evidence in what is a de facto coup d'etat, or of the overthrow of the government, which any presidential assassination is.

From one of ^{Humes'} his long and self-righteous speeches about this obviously false explanation of his wrong-doing, with a little pretended indignation thrown in, Gunn finally get to those notes and their destruction. It was cream-puff questioning,

especially

when Humes said what is ridiculous, when he testified contrary to what he had already testified and when he was clearly a perjurer. The pages quoted from are 128-42:

nt
ll
ll

And when I noticed that these bloodstains were on this document that I had prepared, I said nobody's going to ever get these documents. I'm not going to keep them, and nobody else is ever going to get them.

So I copied them--and you probably have a copy in my longhand of what I wrote. It's made from the original. And I then burned the original notes in the fireplace of my family room to prevent them from ever falling into the hands of what I consider inappropriate people.

And there's been a lot of flack about this, that they're all part of a big conspiracy that I did this because I was involved in I don't know what I was involved. Ludicrous. That is what I did.

Q When you made reference to the notes that you copied out, were you referring to the document that's marked Exhibit 2, or is that something different?

A Now, this is the product of--yeah. It's the product of those notes.

Danzyer's

Gunn's failure to identify the records he used in this poor apology for ^{Humes'} ~~an~~ interrogation makes it more difficult to keep up with ^{Hume} his poor pretense ~~for~~ of ^{Hume} doing the job expected of him. Exhibit 2, for example, is ^{Hume} the revised autopsy ^{photograph} and Exhibit 1 is the Autopsy Descriptive Sheet.

Humes is explicit in testifying that "I burned the original notes" of the autopsy. He is also explicit in testifying that he copied the ^m first. And later he denies this. He actually has the gall to say that any questioning of his grossly and knowingly improper, if not also his criminal acts ~~was part of~~ has him "part of a big conspiracy." ^{He then} ~~also~~ ^{enough} has the gall to castigate that as "ludicrous."

He then testified that ^{when} he produced the revised autopsy protocol "It's the ^{product} ~~product~~ of those notes." (pages 128-9). *The non-existing notes.*

Gunn continues with what has to be at the least vague to those reading his deposition-taking:

*with
might
of*

Q The question would be whether there were notes that you copied down as one document and then you used the notes in order to draft the document that's in your hand.

A The only thing that was retained was this.

Q Exhibit 2?

A Right.

Q Now, I presume that the notes that you took during the autopsy did not resemble in any way the document that you have in your hand now, Exhibit 2.

A Well, they did, yes. I mean, I didn't dream this up out of whole cloth.

Q Certainly I understand the content but

dent
n gl
the

I'm just referring to the text that is written in Exhibit 2 tracks reasonably closely the language of the final report. And what I'm interested in is what the two to three pages of notes looked like.

A I can't recall. I mean, I--they would have been my shorthand version of what you're looking at here, basically, in my own shorthand manner, whatever it may have been (pages 129-30).

In fact - and Gunn knew this from Post Mortem, too - the retyped final autopsy report was identical with the Humes holograph of it except where changes were ordered in Admiral Galloway's office just before the retyping. Comparing word for word the two, as I did, ~~makes this~~ leaves this without any question, at all.

~~Humes then~~ Gunn then concedes what he ~~has~~ has no way of knowing and no rational way of believing, that the content of the destroyed notes is in the revised holograph of the protocol. He then accepts that Humes can't recall "what those two to three pages of notes looked like." And in all of this ^{Gunn} ~~he~~ concedes

As Gunn resumed the questioning Humes admits what is stated above, that the retyped autopst protocol is virtually identical to what he wrote:

That the fifteen pages of detailed medical reporting in that revised ^{autopsy report} Humes draft came from a mere two pages of ^{notes that} ~~notes~~, which is not possible. The extent of the impossibility Gunn knew from the summary of Howard Roffman's work for me reported above. He should have known it on his own.

ent
ngls
m

Q You would agree, I assume, that the document you're holding in your hand, Exhibit 2, is a basically completed autopsy protocol that tracks the language of the final autopsy protocol that's Exhibit 1?

A Yes.

Q And I assume that the notes that you made while you were at Bethesda during the autopsy were not written in sentence and paragraph form.

A No. They were shorthand.

Q So what kinds of things, then, were written on it? Measurements?

A Measurements, yeah, sure. Primarily measurements. That's where these measurements came

mc
idw
mgl
pku

21
#31

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

from.

Q So when you drafted--well, first, was there any other draft of the autopsy protocol other than the one that you're holding in your hand now--

A No.

Q --Exhibit 2?

A No. There was not.

Q So when you wrote down the information-- well, when you were drafting what is now Exhibit 2, would it be fair to say that you had in your hand two or three pages, approximately--

A Right.

Q --of handwritten notes--

A And I converted the shorthand information there to that document.

Q When you say "that document," you're referring to Exhibit 2?

A Yes, exactly.

Q Was there any information that was contained on the handwritten notes that was not included in the document that's now Exhibit 2--

A I don't believe so. (pages 130 - 1)

Wyness
Lynch
K...?

In this ~~of~~ Gunn makes no reference to the notes Boswell and Finck gave Humes on which was recorded ^{autopsy} information ^{besides Humes' own} not in ~~his~~ notes and used in the protocol. ~~He~~ ^{Gunn} knew that Finck had testified that he made his notes on small pieces of paper, as Boswell did, and that he gave them to Humes as he left the autopsy room;

*vertical
margin
note*

Q Did you ever make a copy that--a copy of the notes that contained the same information as was on the original handwritten notes that was in any form other than the form that appears in Exhibit 2?

A No.

Q Have you ever observed that the document now marked Exhibit 1 in the original appears to have bloodstains on it as well?

A Yes, I do notice it now. These were J's. I'm sure I gave these back to J. I presume I did. I don't know where they came from.

Q Did you ever have any concern about the President's blood being on the document that's now marked Exhibit 1?

A I can't recall; to tell you the truth.

Q Do you see any inconsistency at all between destroying some handwritten notes that contained blood on them but preserving other handwritten notes that also had blood on them?

A Well, only that the others were of my own making. I didn't--wouldn't have the habit of

destroying something someone else prepared. That's
 the only difference that I can conceive of. I
 don't know where these went. I don't know if they
 went back to J or where they went. I have no idea.
 I certainly didn't keep them. I kept nothing, as a
 matter of fact (132-3).

Here Gunn lets Humes get away with his baseless, made-up ~~or~~ excuse for his
 burning of autopsy information he was not permitted to burn by not questions ^{ing}
 Humes' authority for pretending that all autopsy information is the personal
 property of the doctor who puts that information on paper.

Not only should Gunn pressed Humes ^{what} for any authority for what ^{actually} he made up
 out of nothing at all and in violation of all he learned in his education and
 his experience, which included many autopsies, ^{Gunn} he knows that ~~Humes~~ Humes is
 lying in the end of this quotation.

That ~~Autopsy~~ ^{See} Descriptive Sheet is a required part of every Navy
 autopsy and, like all ^{the doctor's} such information, is never ^{personal} property. In saying
 he has no idea where that sheet went Humes is obviously lying. It was in many
 books, including my first, ~~of~~ which I sent him a copy that he did read and
 comment on to the ~~Baltimore~~ ^{Sun}'s Richard Levine. It appeared in many ~~news~~ news
 stories Humes could not have avoided. And in every use it was identified as what
 Humes knew it was and just lies about, part of the autopsy records ^{none} ~~not~~ of which
 he had any right to dispose of ^{to} or keep.

The distinction that the autopsy records he destroyed allegedly to prevent
 commercialization and misuse of the President's blood collapses when he admits
 that was the only paper with the President's blood on it that he burned. As we
 saw above, there remained a much larger quantity of the President's blood on
 other object about which Humes could do nothing about and about which he did

not try to do anything about. *Beside's Boswell's notes,*

28

Gunn does not ask Humes why he did not convey his alleged apprehension to his friend and associate, Boswell, when, as Humes alleges ~~fa, si~~ falsely, he hertuned that ^{le} ~~at~~ Autopsy/Descriptive Sheet to him ^{And this} ~~that~~ according to Humes ~~own~~ ^{another} cerifications is ~~a~~ lie.

Humes lying and his evasiveness continue with th Gunn's cream-puff questioning:

*admit
right
rule*

Q I'd like to show you the testimony that you offered before the Warren Commission. This is in Exhibit 11 to this deposition. I'd like you to take a look at pages 372 to the top of 373, and then I'll ask you a question.

A All right.

Q I'll read that into that record while you're reading it yourself. Mr. Specter asked the question: "And what do those consist of?" The question is referring to some notes. "Answer: In privacy of my own home, early in the morning of Sunday, November 24, I made a draft of this report, which I later revised and of which this represents the revision. That draft I personally burned in the fireplace of my recreation room."

Do you see Mr. Specter's question and your

should have
on bushy
front
up question
you only
would have
in shown
that he had
if he had in
a hand those
this - and
u receipts
in them

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

answer?

A Yes.

Q Does that help refresh your recollection of what was burned in your home?

A Whatever I had, as far as I know, that was burned was everything exclusive of the finished draft that you have as Exhibit--whatever it is.

Q My question will go to the issue of whether it was a draft of the report that was burned or whether it was--

A I think it was--

Q --handwritten notes--

A It was handwritten notes and the first draft that was burned.

Q Do you mean to use the expression handwritten notes as being the equivalent of draft of the report?

A I don't know. Again, it's a hair-splitting affair that I can't understand. Everything that I personally prepared until I got to the status of the handwritten document that later was transcribed was destroyed. You can call

26
Gun^{m/} also made this clear, particularly to Humes, in not quoting that testimony fully because, as we saw earlier, "Humes ^{then} testified to holding this notes in his hand ~~months~~ when he testified. And that was months after his alleged burning spree about which he is suddenly so vague and uncertain.

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

27

it anything you want, whether it was the notes or what, I don't know. But whatever I had, I didn't want anything else to remain, period.

This business, I don't know when J got that back or what.

Q When you say "this business," you're referring to Exhibit 1?

A Exhibit 1, right (pages 133-5)

Although there ~~was~~ was an abundance of earlier indications of it, this alone is proof positive that the ^{board's} intentions were not what it was mandated to do and was not what the people expect of it but instead was still another and

an even thicker coat of official whitewash. This is a deliberate prostitution of the board's mission, ^{and} of the procedures with which Gunn was abundantly familiar from ^{ly} his ~~ed~~ education in the law and from his personal legal ~~experience~~, what he had to know to have been ~~employed~~ employed by the ~~prest~~ prestigious law firm of Covington Burling, one of the most reknowned in the country. Moreover, Gunn knew ~~from~~ from repetitious proofs that this was a deliberate lie because he had with him irrefutable proof that Humes was lying and lying deliberately.

No lawyer tolerates that in ^{serious} any legal proceeding, ^s not if he is to meet his responsibilities and serve the interests of his client - in this case both the board and the government.

He thus not ^{only} assumes, he demonstrates ⁱⁿ ~~that~~ what he did and did not do, letting Humes get away with this most blatant of lies, was what his client wanted. 173A here

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

I, James J. Humes, certify that all working ~~papers~~ papers associated with Naval Medical School Autopsy Report A63-272 [the President's] have ~~been~~

ndint
Lynch
Halle

W
custody
have remained in my personal possession at all times. ~~Autopsy notes and the~~
~~working papers~~

28

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 ~~or~~ Humes could not have been a more elaborate or a bigger liar than in saying swearing, as he did, that "I do not know when I 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 and that it was one of those "working papers" ^{then} he also handed in; that had never been out of his possession; and that once it was given to "higher authority," neither of them would 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

This alone confirmed to ^{me} Humes what he had plenty of reason to know, that there was nothing at all he ~~was~~ could not get away with in that perjury deposition that, ^{seeking information,} instead 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 ~~of~~ that was burned." But as Gunn knew, Humes had just certified that he had turned in "all other papers relating to this report" and in his second certification Humes certified that ~~"Autopsy notes"~~ "All working papers," including "autopsy notes,"

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

including Humes' own,

he, personally, gave to his commanding office at five o'clock that after evening.

Although he was getting away with murder and knew it, Humes had gotten so flustered because he knew ~~it was a criminal~~ what he was doing was a criminal violation, when Gunn asked him is he sued "the expression handwritten notes as being the equivalent of draft of the report," Humes ~~first~~ said, "I don't know," which he did ^{know} unless he forgot his lies, and added that this ~~is a~~ proper question, given the befuddlement with which ~~Humes~~ was filling the record, he certainly did know. The ~~without being interu interrupted~~ Humes condemned this proper question as "a hair-splitting affair that I can't understand." ^{to} Then he limited 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.

M5A here
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 ^{they} government that had elected was overthrown.

All of this is what Jerry McKnight spotted as an official attempt to refute what I had published in Post Mortem, including all those documents. It does not succeed but the effort is more than visible. Gunn ^{and even encouraged!} took all these lies as part of that, too.