

Use only #2

#1

#2

Going along with this is what Specter claimed they could not find, any contemporaneous quotation of the Dallas doctors when they held a press conference. It was in all the papers, as I cited them in NEVER AGAIN!. The White House taped that press conference and distributed typed copies to the media as soon as it was typed. The media used it around the world. Dr. Malcolm Perry, who made an incision through that wound, was asked if it had been from a shot from the front. He was asked this three times and all three times he referred to it as an entry wound from the front.

So, aside from the photographic proof of the impossibility of that single bullet fabrication that is not even the theory it is called, there is this description of that wound as an entry wound. The confirmation was at that same press conference by the chief of neurosurgery, Dr. Kemp Clark. ??? transcript I have and the media had.

With this, enough on the non-existing magic of that bullet, the Commission said that the second shot missed and struck the curbstone at the diagonally opposite end of Dealey Plaza.

FBI lab agent Lyndal L. Shaneyfelt had that curbstone dug up and taken to the lab for testing. There then was no bullet hole although the hole exists in the contemporaneous pictures some of which the Commission had. It had been patched with a concrete paste, as I established in Case Open (Carroll & Graf/Richard Gallen, 1994, pages 162-165) with the results of a scientific examination of that curbstone made at the National Archives, where ??? with the rest of the Commission's records.

Check  
SMC

As the Commission's own records reflect, the records to which those lawyers all had access and some had to use, in the synopsis of a multi-volume report Dallas FBI case agent Robert P. Gemberling is quite specific in stating that what he referred to as the "mark" rather than the hole left by the bullet that was once here was no longer "visible."

The hole is quite visible in the contemporaneous pictures taken by the media (NEVER AGAIN!, pages 329, 332, and 333). It is much wider than, at least twice the width of the pen pointing to it in the pictures.

S-B Theory

first went into this in *Whitewash* in two related chapters, "The Number of Shots" and "The Doctors and the Autopsy" (*Whitewash*, pages 155-187).

When all the doctors testified that the single-bullet explanation was impossible, Specter asked then a hypothetical question instead about "not this bullet." His question boiled down to whether one bullet could wound two men. They agreed that was possible. But they did not agree it was possible for what was attributed to that bullet. Quite the opposite. Even the autopsy doctors testified that was not possible. But as Specter wrote the Report, quoted in *Whitewash* on page 177, this is what he said:

All the evidence indicated that the bullet found on the Governor's stretcher could have caused all his wounds (R95).

This is an untrue statement that was known to be untrue, yet the entire Report hangs on it.

Other Commission lawyers were involved with that evidence and those doctors and they all had that testimony.

Tests were performed for the Commission at the Army's Aberdeen Proving Grounds to determine whether the shooting attributed to Oswald was possible. Those professional shooters, the best in the country, had vastly improved conditions and the rifle overhauled before they used it. Shims were also placed under the telescopic sight so it would not be as inaccurate. I first reported this, from the Commission's own evidence, in *Whitewash*. I went into it in great detail in *NEVER AGAIN!* (pages 301-305).

Not one of the best shots in the country could duplicate the shooting attributed the Oswald who was officially rated by the Marines as a rather poor 'shot.'" The official marines report to the Commission is reproduced in facsimile in *Whitewash* on page 30.

Those lawyers knew this, too.

The army's top consultant on wounds and the doctor who was to have been called in on all woundings of VIPs was Dr. Joseph Dolce. When he told Specter and others of the Commission staff that



from the Commission files receipts for those notes to the Navy Hospital by the Secret Service, which gave them to the White House physician. Mrs. Elizabeth Neichter, of Louisville, Kentucky, a court-recognized medical-records expert, as I set in detail in *Never Again!* (pages 133-150) this is strictly prohibited.

*Autopsy*

Instead of asking Humes why he destroyed anything at all about the autopsy when he questioned Humes, Specter accepted that as normal. He then showed Humes two files. One was the Commission autopsy file, the other a file on the autopsy. Humes testified his notes were in each of these files.

As of the day he testified.

But they were not printed with that exhibit. So I searched at the Archives. Those autopsy notes that existed as of the time of Humes testimony and were to have been published by the Commission did not exist at the Archives. They were in neither file there.

Aside from all else that is legally, morally, ethically, professionally and administratively wrong with this I asked a then young and bright friend still a student, Howard Roffman, who, when I last heard from him, was an executive of Lucas Films, to go make an independent study of the autopsy protocol to identify how many statements of fact in it do not exist in any disclosed source. Of the eighty-eight statements of fact Howard found in the autopsy protocol, 64 have no source! (*Post Mortem*, page 255). His detailed memo on this is twenty-one pages long.

2.  
*Where  
was  
it?*

If there were, today, a need to validate the autopsy performed on the President by the military whose Commander-in-Chief he was it could not be done.

It cannot be done as a record for history of that great tragedy, that :crime of the century."

If any Commission lawyer had any question at all about the destruction of any part of the autopsy, particularly, the draft of it written before Oswald was killed and it was known that autopsy would have to be presented and examined and cross-examined at trial, as Humes did testify, I am not aware of it.