

~~at the highest level, including the new President, the Sunday night after the assassination, the night before the assassinated President was buried.~~

~~Blakey's committee had a larger appropriation of money ~~to it~~ than , as of then, had ever been appropriate to any committee. But nobody familiar with its records could believe that. It adds no real fact to what was available on both crimes and it went out of its way, as Blakey saw to it, that it would not charge the perjurious testimony taken about the Kennedy assassination and its prior official investigation. ~~It also accepted perjury.~~~~

~~Of all the ^a that can be said, ~~of that committee, ARRB~~ and it would be possible for a ^a large number of ~~books~~ books to be written reporting the factual errors and other committee mistakes. ^(I made 100) I mention just one that I ~~gued~~ ^{found} in NEVER AGAIN! ~~By the way it is IL US~~ because it illustrates, ^{it} ~~is~~ typical and is repeated ~~endlessly~~.~~

The illustration I pick makes it clear that to the degree it could hope to get away with, the Assassination Records Release Board created ~~by~~ by a 1992 Act of the Congress, was another Blakey.

That the autopsy prosecutors lied under oath about the medical evidence in the JFK assassination I proved ^{this} in ⁱ the first book on ~~the JFK assassination~~ ^{subject published} in 1965. That ^e lying is under ^y ~~oath~~ ^{oath} and because it was material, very material, it was perjury ^a felony.

But ^M more than most perjuries, that was to continue to ~~prevent~~ ^{prevent important} assassination information from being known. Not just withholding it, which did happen. Not just hiding it, which also did happen, ~~which also did happen.~~ But by literally destroying ^{it} that. If that act was not a serious crime it should have been. The perjury about it also was serious but it was more serious because the perjury was ^a about information in the official ^s investigation of the

~~about the~~ crime itself, irreplaceable information on the wounds and that means on ~~the~~ cause of death, *and who was responsible.*

We do not go into that ~~the~~ ~~there~~ because we do later. But there is ^u much on this that I published in my earlier books and especially in the most recent one, NEVER AGAIN: But the basic information is in hm 1975 POST MORTEM where what it holds on ^{it} this, in the text and in the large appending of about two hundred pages of facsimile reproduction of evidence ^{mostly of} what had been withheld. It can be located through ^{the} ~~its~~ large and ~~rdetailed~~ index.

The one illustration I decide to limit myself to when books after book can be written to expose what Blakey and his committee did and did ^d not do in what was, in reality, an official investigation of a coup d'~~etat~~ - which the assassination of any President is, whether or not that it is the intent of the assassin or assassins.

~~Sprague and no much more,~~ [#] Blakey, saw to it that their non-investigation was another Whitewash.

~~xxxxxx~~ ^{IT} ~~xxxxxx~~ that one illustration is the sworn testimony ~~of~~ of the Navy ^d hospital radiologist who had ~~been~~ the radiologist of that Navy autopsy, Dr. John Ebersole. ^{the} HSCA took sworn testimony from him, in secret. It had and suppressed the stenographic transcript of Ebersole's secret testimony ~~and~~ and when under no law was it properly secret, Blakey et al made and kept it secret because it ~~proved~~ ^{proved} that the one of the basic stories of that ^u autopsy was perjury. And when Blakey's HSCA panel of medical experts ^{tried hard} ~~rue~~ to persuade Ebersole to ^u change his testimony, he would not and he did not.

Another possible reason for Blakey's withholding it is ^{also} because it ~~also~~ proved that Blakey and his committee protected an earlier perjury by ^{Navy} the (chief prosecutor, Captain (doctor) James Humes. It did that by, without question, taking and also perjurious explanation

from Humss and others. *It really encouraged their phjnyry.*

It is an incredible and disgusting and let us hope Unprecedented outrage that ^{*and so subvertive*} in so serious ^{*(an event)*} a crime that nullified our system of society, a crime that was, at least ^{*of facts*} ~~de facto~~ a coup d'état. ~~(eyay,~~ there was so much official effort to keep dirty secrets, to see to it that the people were given only information that was not true, that had the effect of protecting the actual assassins. There was so much overt dishonesty, so long-lasting an effort to see to it that the truth would not be known or even learned ^{*in the the*} a ~~that in the hazzozz~~ land of the free and the home of the brave.

In the anthem if not, as we have seen while seeing so much less than is known.

The Assassination Records ^{*Review*} Board ~~(ARRB)~~ (ARRB) was created in response to the very successful Oliver ^{*JFK*} Stone movie, in which Stone ~~de~~ deceived and misled the people in every way, including by hiding the real truth of the assassination. So, there was a great clamor for all those records, which did not exist, to be disclosed, made public.

^{*The ARRB's*} ~~Its~~ responsibility was to see to it ^{*assassination*} that all existing records that had not been released by the executive agencies would be released, placed in the National Archive, and there ^{*be*} ~~to~~ available to anyone. Millions of pages were. ^{*that others had suppressed*} And some, a very small minority of them did hold worthwhile information.

One ^{*d*} immediate problem was finding a ~~single~~ page when it was buried in at least four million, the lowest official figure, in the official announcement. All of those ^{*pages*} plus what was already there from earlier disclosures.

My few contacts with that board began before it got started.

A young woman I knew through friends of hers who were also friends of mine brought a lawyer who was with one of the most prestigious ^{Washington} ~~of~~ law firms. He wanted to know a little about the assassination and what was disclosed. T. Jeremy Gunn had applied for the chief counsel's job. He did not get that but he did get to be that chief counsel's assistant and later, ^{when} ~~when~~ John Tunheim was appointed ~~to the federal bar~~ to be a federal judge, Gunn moved up and remained chief counsel until he took another ^{just} job before the ARRB ended its work.

The way the board was structured it left ~~most of~~ the work to its staff. The members spent about two days a month conferring with the staff. ^{They} ~~It~~ also held hearings all around the country. It listened to the assassination nuts who tried to get it going in nutty ways. I do not remember a real assassination expert or any witnesses who were not ~~already~~ ^{were, to a limited degree.} nutty but I am confident that a low number ~~did~~. From the transcript ^s that I read, there was little the board got that it could not have gotten on its own or that its staff would not have learned.

~~Many~~ Many used appearance before the board for promoting themselves and they gave the board no valuable information, which all pretended they did.

For the board ~~these~~ those hearings gave the country the impression it was learning from those who could inform it but the reality is that the board was making a phony record of hearing all who could inform it and all who wanted to be heard.

The latter only is true.

The law required that the board preserve every page that it received and that all its papers be made public.

Some of was pretty nutty, some stupid some wild, and none of ~~the~~ what I read in the transcripts was of any real value ~~for~~ for a body like the board. Those hearings were part of its public relations, to give the impression that it would be getting all the withheld information out as, from what was public, it did try to do.

It is interesting that neither the members nor the staff were to know anything about the assassination or its prior investigations/. One member, (Kermit Hall,) actually boasted that his ignorance was his greatest asset.

He was the dean of the Ohio State University at Columbus. That seemed to me ~~to be~~ ^{to be} stupid, particularly for a university dean. As, in time, he did learn. We come to this later.

There was an abundance of perjury in the several supposed JFK assassination investigation, none of which ^{really} was that. That there ~~was~~ would be, would have to be all that perjury was inevitable ~~begin~~ because there was the initial policy decision ^{made} in the Katzenbach memo we saw earlier. That policy, laid down as soon as Oswald was killed ^{it was known} and there would be no trial, ~~that memo~~ made national policy that very night at about nine o'clock when Johnson approved it by phone and by phone, immediately, conveyed that approval to both the FBI's Hoover and the Justice Department's Katzenbach. ^{if} was ~~made~~ based on an obvious falsehood, that they already had enough to convict Oswald. Despite the fabrications and other untruths in the Warren Report, they never had any ^{real} case at all against Oswald, as my printed books and many of these written as a record for history prove repetitiously ~~at~~ with the official ^{only} ~~reviewers and even~~ ^{most of which had been} withheld official records ^{if that took much time}

and laborious work.

It took a...

when
as I came to them ~~was~~, laboriously and after much time, the
great amount of time ~~required~~ to make even a dent is a third
of a million pages.

The one perjury in particular referred to above was one of
the basic, the more important perjuries by the chief autopsy
prosector, Humes, ~~and~~ It also became the perjury of his assistants,
Boswell and Finck when, in their ~~great~~ Commission testimony,
they swore to the truth of Humes' Commission testimony.

The policy of that Katzenbach memo, that Oswald was the
lone assassin, ~~xxxxxxx~~ which was the policy of the Navy two days
before that Katzenbach memo was written, required that a shot that
was known to be from the front ^{said to be} was from the back. That was
because, obviously, Oswald could not have been at the sixth-
floor window (where the ^{actual} evidence is that he was not, by the way)
and have shot the President from the front. If it were established
that there had been a shot from the front then it is obvious
that there was a conspiracy.

And, before he wrote his autopsy report, Humes knew that
there had been a shot from the front, as ~~Dr Perry~~ doctor Perry,
confirmed by Clark, had told the media at the first press conference.
^{Johnson administration}

I have had a copy for decades, thanks to my friend Roger Feinman,
former CBS newsman. He got it from the LBJ Library. In addition,
the report of those doctors, with this fact always mentioned,
was carried by all the media. Humes quoted in his autopsy r

report from the Washington Post ~~autopsy story~~ that carried this
information but he left that shot from the front ^{out}. He knew the truth
at that time and because Perry had told him. before he wrote his
first autopsy report, the one he destroyed and testified ^{to destroy} (that to
the Commission that it was what he burned in his rec room fireplace.

the HSCA and ARRB

He had to tell ⁽the lie, which was material and thus was perjury, that he had not spoken to Perry until the next day and that lie is insisted on upon ^{legally} in his Commission testimony.

The House assassins committee knew it was a lie. It learned that in the sworn testimony it took from another member of the Navy's autopsy team, its radiologist. *which it suppressed*

HSCA, that ~~prized~~ prized prime source for these subject-matter ~~ignoramuses~~, particularly those who are doctors and consider them experts, as the also ignorant, really the much more ignorant, Fetzer, boast they all are, those he referred as ^{frail blazers} pathfinders, the pioneers, and as

When I obtained that suppressed HSCA transcript, required to be disclosed by the ARRB's 1992 Act that required full disclosure, I wrote about it in ~~some~~ ^{length} ⁱⁿ NEVER AGAIN! TO record here the deliberate dishonesty of the ~~ARRB~~ ARRB, another of the assassination pioneers to Fetzer and the other Fetzers, so that along with the false defenses of the HSCA and the ARRB ~~it~~ will be available to scholars of the future.

~~But~~ That the HSCA had taken this perjury was also known to its medical panel, which took the testimony, and to all the staff who read the transcript or knew about it—and were silent.

In the pages before this excerpt from NEVER AGAIN! the Gary who sent me this transcript is Dr. Gary Aguilar. He obtained it from Anna Marie Kuhns Walko, ^{she} ~~who~~ had been and was doing diligent research in recently disclosed records. In what also immediately prior to this includes is a discussion of the claims that the Zapruder film had been altered. Immediately ahead on the prior pages is that in Zapruder "The back of the head is quite clear in a number of frames... ~~the~~ the back of the head is intact and that there is not even ⁽except follows)

Clay interview

177

the suggestion of any blood on it, or on what else is quite clear in those frames immediately following the fatal shot, the back of his shirt collar and his jacket in that area. And, with all the duplicates of the original of Zapruder's film known to have been made, any faking of that film would require that the original and all prints also would have to be changed identically. Not only was that impossible, but by then many people had already examined the film closely.

While this belatedly disclosed new evidence from the secret records of the HSCA does not address any faking, it does bear on the impossibility of it and it does provide explanations for what was so widely interpreted as a faking of the possible autopsy X rays.

This "new" evidence was suppressed as part of the government's conspiracy not to investigate the crime itself, whether or not that was the intent of any of the members of that committee. It was suppressed for fifteen years of the most intense controversy. No member of the staff, all of whom had been required to sign pledges of eternal secrecy, leaked any of this information. While there is no way of knowing all the staff members who had this information, there is the certainty that those I will name did have it.

And as will become clear, despite Blakey's sanctimony and endless assurances of his purest of motives and factual accuracy in the official report for which he was responsible and over which he exercised the tightest of control, had he not suppressed this information, he would not have dared issue that report.

It was not consideration of space that caused him to keep this information secret. His report is as bulky as that of the Commission. His appendix runs twelve volumes. Five are of transcripts of testimony, seven are of exhibits.

His report concludes other than this suppressed evidence says and means. This new information destroys much of his report in any impartial examination of it.

Blakey was more careful than the Commission's counsel in avoiding publication of what he had that contradicted his report.

The nature of this evidence makes it apparent that whether or not it is worthwhile is not a legitimate consideration. All information is worthwhile in any quest for truth.

What Gary sent me is the stenographic transcript of one day of sworn testimony taken by the HSCA's medical panel plus a number

of staff memoranda on their investigations, several accompanied by affidavits. All of it relates to the medical evidence.

The day of this testimony was Saturday, March 11, 1978. It was in room 503 of the National Archives, which is the repository of the autopsy pictures and X rays. The witnesses were Dr. John Ebersole, the radiologist at the Naval Hospital who took the autopsy X rays, and Dr. Pierre Finck, who was, as we have seen, one of the autopsy prosecutors. From the transcript, those also present at 10:20 A.M. when the questioning began were: "Marion Johnson, Archivist; D.A. [Andy] Purdy and F. Mark Flanagan, Staff; Michael Baden, M.D., Charles S. Petty, M.D., Werner U. Spitz, M.D., George L. Loquvam, M.D., Cyril H. Wecht, M.D., John I. Coe, M.D., Earl F. Rose, M.D., James T. Weston, M.D., and Joseph H. Davis, M.D."

Blakey's committee called not a single one of the people, whose testimony and what they told the committee staff are included in the records that Gary sent to me. Finck, as we have seen, testified to the Warren Commission and was a defense witness in the Clay Shaw trial.

Ebersole, the autopsy radiologist, was never a witness whose testimony should have been taken in public and published? Or, in private by the Commission to be published later? He should have been.

The photographers, John T. Stringer and Floyd Riebe, neither a witness, in secret or published?

Important as the X rays and pictures are and always have been? Blakey, it is appropriate to remember, is a professor of law at Notre Dame University after the committee's life ended. What kind of lawyers does he turn out when this is his practice—suppression at all levels? Not taking the only possible firsthand testimony, important as the autopsy film is in any investigation?

There should be no misunderstanding of my purposes in this Afterword. I am bringing guilty knowledge to light. Guilty knowledge and the deliberate suppression of vital evidence in the assassination. This official suppression is what absolutely destroys the official mythology that was palmed off on the people of this country and of the world.

As we shall see, that guilty knowledge was not limited to Blakey. In addition to those of Blakey's staff identified above, other names appear in these records.

There also should have been what was not done.

Both the president's committee of the House and the responsibility of full disclosure of the assassination or the photographs taken during the Commission's investigation of the radiologist or the panel of outside experts. The questioning was much to be desired. Along with the information of others who should have been included, the information invalidates the Commission's findings.

This book also reveals the truth.

Some of this new information is that belief.

The autopsy was a tragedy. The sorrowful return of the widow the child, the Walter Reed and the other hospitals, but neither the autopsy—the best of the serious murder pathology of Pathology expert, Pierre Finck, and the radiologists available. Thank you to them.

At least two such names should have been at Betts' testimony. Dr. Russell and the author of texts used in the trial. Dr. Cyril Wecht, the Forensic Sciences, and the plenty of time, it is a pity that I got to the autopsy. It could easily have been done.

Instead the m

There also should be no misunderstanding of the magnitude of what was not done.

Both the presidential Commission and the specially empowered committee of the House of Representatives had the neigh to sacred responsibility of fully investigating that most subversive of crimes, the assassination of a President. Important the X rays and photographs taken during the autopsy are, in any such inquiries neither the Commission nor the committee heard any testimony from the radiologist or the photographers. Where the committee's medical panel of outside experts did take the radiologist's testimony, the questioning was much too limited and was not in that committee's report. Along with the information that follows, which was obtained from others who should have been witnesses and were not, this new information invalidates all official "solutions."

This book also raises the question; was there a military conspiracy?

Some of this new information does bear on that. It strengthens that belief.

The autopsy was entirely a military matter, from the moment on the sorrowful return trip of *Air Force One* that Admiral Burkley gave the widow the choice between two military hospitals, the Army's Walter Reed and the Navy's Bethesda. Both are fine institutions as hospitals, but neither offered what is the prime consideration in an autopsy—the best possible *forensic* pathology, this being the most serious murder possible in our country. Even the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology could not provide this, as we have seen from its expert, Pierre Finck. What was needed was the best forensic pathologists available. The military did not have them. And it did not get them.

At least two such eminent experts, had there been the desire, could have been at Bethesda by the time the body was there for examination. Dr. Russell Fisher, Maryland's chief medical examiner and the author of texts used in the field, was only minutes away by helicopter. Dr. Cyril Wecht, former head of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, could have reached Bethesda from Pittsburgh in plenty of time, if the military had desired that. By the time Finck got to the autopsy room, a large number of other forensic pathologists could easily have arrived. *If* the military had wanted it.

Instead the military at Bethesda, as one of its first acts, removed

all but military personnel from the autopsy room and then mounted a guard to prevent any civilians or unauthorized military personnel from entering (*Post Mortem*, pages 532-33).

Then, as soon as the autopsy was completed, all the military personnel present were ordered into perpetual silence about it. First this was verbal and then it was given to each one present in written form (*Post Mortem*, page 303).

Anyone who ever opened his mouth would be court-martialed, that notice warned, really threatened.

The military, which had complete control, not only did not see to it that the best forensic pathologists performed the autopsy—it is not really unfair to say that they saw to it that the best forensic pathologists did *not*. They also failed, which again can be interpreted as meaning saw to it, that the autopsy prosecutors would not have the best assistance in the other areas of expertise required for the best autopsy examination.

One of the innocent victims, of whom more was asked than he could deliver, is the fine radiologist Dr. John Ebersole. Asked at the very end of his testimony to the HSCA's medical panel what they ought recommend for the future, his advice was that the government "have a team of forensic pathologists when this happens again, God help us" [transcript, page 65].

In the absence of the hospital's chief radiologist, Ebersole that night was the acting chief.

They asked the extent of his experience, "How many gunshot cases" he had X-rayed or read the X rays. He replied that in his entire professional life, "during my residency and subsequent to that, in perhaps twenty to twenty-five cases," and they were largely "shot-gun wounds to self-inflicted revolver wounds and so on" [transcript, page 15].

His understanding of the forensic requirements was so limited he wanted to "emphasize . . . these X rays were taken solely for the purpose of finding what at that time was thought to be a bullet that had entered the body and had not exited. If we were looking for fine bone detail, the type of diagnostic exquisite detail we want in life, we'd have taken the pictures in the X-ray department, made the films there, but we felt that the portable X-ray equipment was adequate

for the purpose, i.e., 6-7].

At several points taking the X rays believed had entered

(At one of these best X-ray equipment qualifications for the expertise that night, I was asked of my transcript, page 28].

When no bullet asked them to try by the Secret Service" [transcript page

Throughout Ebersole, he refers to available X-ray equipment various kinds distributed

There is much Specter's keeping key's keeping his

Where both located his neck, an individual tried to be perpetuated in the "back to the right of the upper scapula"

The scapula anywhere that visible body and arms as two inches high (He was X-rayed which has the of the wound that it was in the neck.

Ebersole also

for the purpose, i.e., locating a metallic fragment'' [transcript, pages 6-7].

At several points Ebersole emphasized that their sole purpose in taking the X rays was to locate the bullet he said the prosecutors believed had entered the back or neck.

(At one of these points, not referring to the use of less than the best X-ray equipment there and available for use, he refers to his qualifications for this particular job of X-raying, "As far as my expertise that night, I don't think it should be questioned because what was asked of my expertise was, is there a slug in the body" [transcript, page 28].

When no bullet or fragment was found, it was not a doctor who asked them to try again. When no bullet showed "we were asked by the Secret Service agents present to repeat the film, and we did so" [transcript pages 4, 51, and elsewhere].

Throughout Ebersole's so long delayed and then kept secret testimony, he refers to other consequences of use of other than the best available X-ray equipment, inferior X rays that had "artifacts" of various kinds distorting them and their meaning.

There is much else in Ebersole's testimony that can explain Arlen Specter's keeping him away from the Warren Commission and Blakey's keeping him away from his committee's members.

Where both locate the rear, nonfatal wound the President had at his neck, an indispensibility for that single-bullet fraud to have been tried to be perpetrated, Ebersole testified it was ever so much lower, in the "back to the right of the midline, three or four centimeters to the right of the midline, just perhaps inside the medial board to the upper scapula" [transcript, page 3].

The scapula is the shoulder bone, and as nobody ever testified anywhere that very moveable bone, depending on the position of the body and arms when X-rayed, could have placed that wound as much as two inches higher than it was as inflicted on the sitting President. (He was X-rayed and photographed prone, his hands placed upward, which has the effect automatically, of moving the seeming location of the wound higher than it was. Yet Ebersole even then testified that it was in the back, not as Specter stated so misleadingly, in the neck.

Ebersole also gave an entirely different point of entry of a bullet

in the President's head. With what he had not said asked of him as a question by Dr. Weston, Ebersole corrected Weston, saying "that the wound of entrance was somewhere to the side or to the posterior quadrant" of the head [transcript, page 28].

Medical panel chairman Baden, at whom we earlier took a look, had asked Ebersole, "where the wound of entrance was in the head radiologically." Ebersole's reply was, "In my opinion it would have come from the side . . ." [transcript, page 18].

Thus, Ebersole, one of the doctors closest to the corpse, the working radiologist at the autopsy, under oath, testified contrary to what the government says and has always said about both of the President's admitted wounds. He saw both and for his X-raying *had* to examine them. His testimony contradicts what the government says about both. He placed the back wound much lower. That creates a number of questions never asked. With regard to the official mythology, it eliminates any possibility at all of the single-bullet theory on which the Report is based. That also precludes any exit where the bullet hole in the front of the neck was. In short, this refutes the Report entirely. (As we see below, so did FBI Special Agent Francis X. O'Neill.)

The government says the entrance of the only officially admitted head wound was in the back of the head. Its "solution" requires this. Ebersole's testimony does exactly the same with the bullet said to have caused death: he says it was of side entrance, not a bullet that entered the back of the head. And that, too, destroys the official "solution."

As we have seen, some of the unofficial evidence makes a liar of Humes in his fanciful account of not knowing there had been a bullet wound in the President's anterior neck. Humes both read and quoted the newspapers which reported on the Perry news conference, at which, shortly after the President was pronounced dead, he said three different times in response to reporters' questions that the bullet impacting there was from the front. Yet Humes's sworn-to account is that he had no knowledge of this until the next morning he phoned Perry. Humes swore that was the earliest he ever spoke to Perry, during the *morning* of the day after the assassination.

We also recalled Dr. Clark's testimony, that because Humes had

told Perry what the autopsy report would say, Perry asked Clark to handle that day's scheduled news conference for him.

At several points Ebersole attested that *in his presence Humes phoned Perry during the autopsy!* His first of these several references to this is: "I believe by 10, to 10:30, approximately a communication was established with Dallas . . ." [transcript, page 5].

Baden hoisted himself and his committee on their own petard in questioning Ebersole about this, saying, "and it was your impression that before the autopsy was finished, at 10:30 at night, contact had been made between Dr. Humes and—" Here Ebersole interrupted, saying, "I must say these times are approximate, but I would say in the range of 10 to 11 P.M., Dr. Humes had determined that a procedure had been carried out in the anterior neck covering the wound of exit" [transcript, page 20].

Humes had "determined" nothing. The best that it can be called is a conjecture. Closer to the truth is that he just made up that it was an exit wound because that was wanted of him, because that made it possible for the government to claim there had been only the one assassin, Oswald.

But Ebersole insisted that Humes phoned Perry *during* the autopsy. *And he was there!*

Dr. Weston returned to this later, when he correctly cited what Ebersole had testified to and Ebersole gave him the same answer [transcript, page 47].

If we assume that all the other members of the HSCA's medical panel were asleep or daydreaming, without question its chairman, Baden, and the prestigious Weston, author of a JFK assassination book, knew the truth, knew very well what Ebersole swore to repeatedly and of personal knowledge and with that destroyed Humes's integrity, if he did not also prove that Humes had sworn falsely, a felony. Ebersole's testimony also proved the official "solution" was impossible and was known to be impossible.

But they preserved in that awful crime of silence when men should speak out, should be heard, and should demand to be heard.

As we have seen, because no proof was ever offered of it and because it makes the Kennedy family responsible for the awful mess of that autopsy, it was from the first—and often thereafter—the official party line that what was wrong with the autopsy, what was not

done in it that should have been done, was in response to alleged family demands. Finck pulled it off often enough in New Orleans.

Ebersole, who testified that he was almost always in that autopsy room and after the autopsy was with the prosecutors and the body until 3 A.M. the next morning, testified that no such thing ever happened. He attested to this over and over again. Baden tried to put these words in Ebersole's mouth when arguing with him:

Dr. Baden. 'But there was no clear implication you had that somebody in that [autopsy] room was giving orders as to how the autopsy should be done?'

Ebersole's response was "absolutely not" [transcript, page 15].

Knowing full well what was expected of them, as professional experts usually do, Baden and Weston returned to this at the end of that morning session. It is, I believe, explicit and important enough to be quoted at length.

Dr. Baden. 'Some question has been raised to the autopsy personnel being aware of and perhaps concerned about the wishes of the family as to rapidity in which the autopsy would be done and as to the extent of the autopsy. Was the impression you had at the time of the autopsy that there was any such consideration?'

Dr. Ebersole. 'I had no contact with the family nor did I hear the family mention that that night.'

Dr. Baden. 'More specifically do you think in any way, shape or form there was any specific consideration given to the wishes of the family in any manner in which the autopsy was conducted, both as to the extent and as to rapidity of being performed?'

Dr. Ebersole. 'I am aware of no such strictures on the autopsy protocol.'

Dr. Weston. 'I would like to be more specific. Did the President's personal physician actually indicate any instructions to either Dr. Humes or—'

Dr. Ebersole. 'Not that I heard, no, sir.'

Dr. Weston. 'And you were there about 80 to 90 percent of the time, would you say?'

Dr. Ebersole. 'Yes, sir.'

Dr. Weston. 'And you never heard him say that you ought to do this or you ought not to do that?'

Dr. Ebersole. 'I
Dr. Weston. 'Y
Dr. Ebersole. 'I
Dr. Wecht. 'Jir
Dr. Weston. 'Y
Dr. Wecht. 'I t
I just wanted to c
Dr. Ebersole.
you have already
or Secret Service
physicians or to
of requests or in
else that any par
that the autopsy
have said?'

Dr. Ebersole.
tions that we wer

Dr. Baden. 'N
ceived pressures c
we have all here
where for one rea
members (a) not
it partially, and v

Dr. Ebersole.

Dr. Baden. 'C
to one person tel
pattern. Apart fro
it your impressio
Humes and Dr. I
for whatever the
doing the autops
the adrenal glar
rapidity in whic
been raised here
on any of your f
not be examine
limited in any v

Dr. Ebersole
am aware that t

Dr. Baden. 'I

Dr. Ebersole
such pressure o

Dr. Ebersole. 'No, sir.'

Dr. Weston. 'You didn't?'

Dr. Ebersole. 'No.'

Dr. Wecht. 'Jim, are you referring to Admiral Berkley [sic]?'
7

Dr. Weston. 'Yes ...'

Dr. Wecht. 'I think Dr. Ebersole's answer makes it clear, but I just wanted to complete it as a corollary to Jim's question.'

Dr. Ebersole. 'You don't recall them, I assume, from what you have already said having heard any other admiral or general or Secret Service or FBI agent to any of the three autopsy physicians or to anybody else in the autopsy room that because of requests or instructions from the family or from somebody else that any particular procedure will or will not be done or that the autopsy will in any way be limited? Is that what you have said?' *Baden?*

Dr. Ebersole. 'That is correct. I was not aware of any limitations that we were held to ...'

Dr. Baden. 'Now relative to the other discussion about perceived pressures or potential perceived pressures by the prosectors, we have all here been in the position of doing official autopsies where for one reason or another we are aware of desires by family members (a) not to do an autopsy or (b) to do it rapidly or to do it partially, and we have all been in that position.'

Dr. Ebersole. 'Yes.'

Dr. Baden. 'Often this kind of awareness can't be pinpointed to one person telling another person but just to a general behavior pattern. Apart from that did anybody say anything to anybody? Is it your impression as a physician your role was different from Dr. Humes and Dr. Boswell or Dr. Finck, that there was a perception, for whatever the reason, real or imaginary, on the part of anybody doing the autopsy, especially in the light of what you raised about the adrenal glands in particular and other considerations about rapidity in which the examination would be done that have not been raised here that there was any feeling from your impression on any of your four doctors' parts that any part of the body should not be examined or it should be done quickly or it should be limited in any way, shape or form?'

Dr. Ebersole. 'I was not then aware of any such pressures. I am aware that they can occur in the course of an autopsy.'

Dr. Baden. 'But to the best of your recollection—'

Dr. Ebersole. 'But to the best of my recollection there was no such pressure on us' [transcript, pages 42-45].

Still again, this is not in the Warren Report or that of the HSCA. But both bodies knew these truths kept secret, until a law was finally passed requiring its disclosure.

And now; as we see still again, those upon whom we depend for the information our society requires in order to function as it should, have failed us and themselves with their total silence.

This was obviously more accessible to the media than to immobile me.

The papers and TV abounded in pictures of reporters going over the boxes of these belatedly disclosed official records.

But what I here report, in a book so long in the writing and so delayed in its being published, is reported for the very first time!

While the same media with the same bent seeks to contrive criticisms of another supposedly liberal White House and in doing that ignores so much that requires public attention and understanding.

There is no need at this point in so long and detailed a book to repeat what can be said about that atrocity of a phony autopsy and what it says about the government's responsibility for it, particularly that part played by the military.

But I think that it was just plain ugliness that the government blamed the President's family for what the government itself conspired to do as soon as Oswald was dead and it was known there would be no trial. In many ways this is the greatest indecency and outrage of all.

That afternoon Finck was the only witness. He had learned in New Orleans that a witness, no matter how highly he may think of himself and how little he may think of the judge and all others in a lawsuit, does not run the proceedings and does not lecture all, including the judge.

He also learned that the safest responses were those he used most often: "I do not remember" or "I do not know."

But when he got to the very end, after jockeying and parrying about it, this is what he testified to about the source of that pressure applied with such care that Ebersole did not detect it. It is the very last thing before the panel bid him adieu with the words, "You are among lots of good friends. It is good to see you again." In reading this testimony, Finck has testified throughout that the Kennedy family prevented a complete autopsy, to which Ebersole had just sworn to

the exact opposite, n
tion, nor did any one
is so obviously self-s
to the contrary:

Dr. Weston. 'I
the time this exam
there was going to l
as a forensic pathc
autopsy in face of c
of anybody else?'

Dr. Finck. 'Wha
to the recommenda'

Dr. Weston. 'Ne
if it is not accepted
criminal prosecution'

Dr. Finck. 'Yes.

Dr. Weston. 'O
complete examinati
correct?'

Dr. Finck. 'Yes,
limiting our actions'

Dr. Weston. 'Bu
is this not physical
standing the wishes
nal prosecution?'

Dr. Finck. 'Of c
are told to do certa
certain things. It is'

Dr. Weston. 'The
be the personal cons
of the team had yo
and not complete the
of the restrictions
that time?'

Dr. Finck. 'No. I'

Dr. Weston. 'I
situation.'

Dr. Finck. 'We v'

Dr. Weston. 'Ok
you remember now,

Dr. Finck. 'Who'

Here again, another of the innumerable proofs that the House assassins, as ~~we~~ from the first ^I called them, were exactly that, assassinating truth and corrupting our tragic history and protecting the actual ^a assassins. ~~As~~ Still another of the truly innumerable proofs that it cannot be truthed, that it cannot safely be used as a source without strong corroboration.

Still another of the truly innumerable proofs that those who believe themselves to be authentic assassination critics could not be that and still use the unconfirmed HSCA as a source to be truthed and whose word taken as ^{fact} truth.

t the exact opposite, not a member of the panel noted this contradiction nor did any one of them ask Finck to justify his statement that is so obviously self-serving when the panel had just heard testimony to the contrary (page 481).

An added perjury should be noted. It was by Finck when he swore to what he knew was a lie and a material lie, that the restrictions in the autopsy which kept it from being a real autopsy: "the restrictions from the family as the reason for limiting our ^{my} fact^{ion}" (page 481).

Finck not only knew that was not true ^{in New Orleans} he testified, as a Shaw witness, provided free by the government, when pressed by the New Orleans prosecutor, that those restrictions were imposed, ordered, by the top Navy medical admirals. 187A here

Quote ^{and} the few pages before and after the Ebersole testimony disclosed a bit more about the official determination on all levels, here mostly the HSCA, to prevent a real investigation, and that ~~is~~ the most subversive possible crimes in our country, the crime that is also a de facto coup d'etat.

This is never mentioned by anyone, particularly not by the media, the government or anyone in any of the branches of the government but it is a fact, very real and dangerous.

Aside from which, it also assured that the actual assassins would be forever free. we emphasize,

9 We have learned more about the HSCA and its acceptance and protection of perjury, even by suppression of the proof-when it was trusted to investigate the assassination of the President.

And

ARRB
Not a word about any of this from the ~~HSCA~~ HSCA or ~~is~~
the HSCA of the ~~W~~Ebersole suppression, Not a word about the
federal government, meaning the tax-payer, paying some of the
cost of the Shaw defense in sending Finck down to New Orleans
to be part of the Shaw defense and, what was also ~~unk~~ known *after*
~~and~~ I brought ^{it} to light in Post Mortem- which both the HSCA
and the ARRB had - about ~~then~~ ^{it also} sending Boswell to back Finckup
or, if necessary, to replace him.

And both had the duty to expose all.

188 follows

This is what he phoned me about. The Howard Roffman, then a high school brilliant student, on graduation from law school was clerk to a federal appeals court judge, then a lawyer in a major law firm and then was recruited by Lucas films. When last I heard from him he was in charge of several parts of that major film corporation.

The Archivist of the United States, the custodian of the most precious documents in our national heritage, kept busy writing lies to me and arguing. Instead, he should have been searching the files and demanding those he did not have from those who did, which is his official responsibility. I decided to do what had not been done: compare this lie, earlier written to me, that these are all the notes and those to the holding of which Humes swore, with the finished report itself, to see if it has descriptions or measurements not in this autopsy descriptive sheet. To assure true impartiality, I asked Howard Roffman, a brilliant young student, then in high school and then writing his own book on this assassination, to make this comparison for me. He found, as I was confident had to be the case, what is required for even a lousy pretense of medico-legal science such as this, much more than is noted on this single sheet. (The second side holds only four brief notations and five measurements, all related to the head only.)

From my own checking in 1964, I knew the autopsy report held facts not contained anywhere in any of the published evidence. As soon as the 26 volumes became available, my wife and I had made a word-by-word comparison of the 15 pages of holograph with the typed autopsy report and had found substantive changes, some to diametric opposites. So, I knew in advance what Howard's study would show. What surprised me is the extent, much greater even than I had expected.

What I asked of Howard was much work. He compared everything available: the two versions of the autopsy report; the notes printed in CE397, said to be all the notes, whereas none are properly described as notes and none meet Finck's New Orleans descriptions of those all the doctors made; and the reports of the two panels made public by the Department of Justice so long after they were completed and when the government was in distress. These two panels, of course, conducted their studies long after the Report was issued and from the existing evidence only. The 1968 panel report includes an inventory of what it examined. Both panels are silent on the contradictions and omissions. This silence is a remarkable self-exposure and a self-condemnation, an attack on the integrity of both panels and of the Department of Justice no writer, no passionate language, can approximate.

Howard's factual listing is 15 single-spaced typewritten pages. To make this study and comparison, he isolated every single statement of fact in the typed autopsy report. He then sought for each fact or even an approximation of it in each of the other sources, the so-called notes. This leaning-over-backwards is an effort to be as fair as possible by including all that any carping critic might later complain should have been. However, it is obvious, with only these so-called notes as sources, unless some notes had been destroyed at some point, there could have been no other sources for the holograph than there were for its typed version and no other sources for the two much-later panels to draw upon.

Howard's study shows a statement of a total of 88 facts. Of these, only 24 are in the "notes". Sixty-four statements of facts in the autopsy report are not in any of these "notes"!

Because this is the autopsy of a President, because the credibility of the official Report on his assassination, that of all the Commission and its staff, the Department of Justice, all those medico-legal eminences and, indeed, of the military, too, hangs on this alone, let me express these shocking figures in two other ways.

Of the "facts" stated in the autopsy report, almost three out of four have no existing source. The percentage is just under 73 - 72.7 percent.

indent
single
page

*Malins
Angelo
Garcia*

Or, putting it the other way, of what is represented as fact in this autopsy report, only one in four exists in any existing written source!

It can, of course, be argued that some of the doctors might have remembered, such as the color of the President's eyes and hair. This cannot be true in most cases, for of these unrecorded 64 facts, 59 include or are solely of physical characteristics. Most of these are of parts of the body and their condition. Often they relate to the bullet wounds.

And of these, the startling number of 15 involve numbers and figures. These are essentials it just cannot be believed the doctors carried in their heads. Many of these are of measurements referring directly to the wounds - their size, their distances from other parts of the body.

This is complex data, often of minute measurements, and those had to have been the most emotional days in the lives of all the doctors. They simply could not have carried all this in their heads.

And more incredible still, a third of this number is of cases where figures are used that conflict with the final autopsy report! These range from what Howard, more tolerant than I, regards as possible "minor misquoting" - I regard no error in this autopsy as tolerable - to the size of the missing piece of scalp. The figure of the report, 13 cm, exists nowhere in any notes and actually appears to be in contradiction to what is recorded in them.

This is but a brief summary of the great labor Howard undertook for me, countless hours of detailed work.

No matter how generously one regards it, no matter how much apologists may prefer to discount, I do not believe that reasonable men can conceive that three-quarters of the fact of anything as complicated as the autopsy performed on a human body, especially that of a President, can possibly have been reported except from written notes. (Pages 255-6).

Or, there was no end ~~to~~ ^{what I} official dishonesty and falsification, beginning ~~from~~ ^{from} ~~was~~ ^{was} able to obtain, the very evening of the day of the assassination.

Once again, those who consider themselves critics, must know these ~~things~~ ^{things}, of which there is a multitude, or he ~~is~~ ^{they are} an amateur, whatever ~~his~~ ^{their} profession ^{of} ~~his~~ ^{be their} status in ~~that~~ ^{their} profession.

There is no indication of either knowledge or understanding of the actuality of the ~~independability~~ ^{independability} of the official word or interpretation of records ^{official} in any of the essays Fetzer gathered for either of these books, nor is there in anything he wrote.

The actualities ^{are} ~~is~~ not within what they ⁱ write and what they write reflectes no understanding of this, despite their allegations of alterations.

There is ever so much more but there is no room for it here.

HSCA

There is ever so much more but there is no room for it here. The actual record of the actual performance of the ~~ARRB~~ ^{ARRB and the} ~~was~~ ^{was} so much the opposite of the virtual a ecstasy over ~~it~~ ^{them} by those who ~~are~~ ^{are} not subject experts and of them, in particular these Fetzer's ~~whose~~ ^{whose} adulation we have quoted from Fetzer. Among his glorifications of these ~~defaulted~~ ^{who} ~~in which~~ ^{when} the country placed ~~its~~ ^{in them} trust and its hope, as we have seen, is ~~his~~ ^{Fetzer's} reference to them as "trailblazers"

While the ~~could not avoiding~~ ^{ARRB} ~~hat~~ ^u the ~~agencies were~~ ^{it was} compelled to disclose by the Act, it did make a little more public and it even extended its authority for more whitewashing and covering up. Most of all that I know of, trying to wipe out the very clear record of ~~Humes' perjuries~~.

He testified to the Warren Commission that what he burned was the first draft of his autopsy protocol. He testified to the HSCA that what he burned was his notes. Gunn's painful, shameful and not ~~an~~ ^{less than} successful effort was to make ~~what~~ ^{less than perjury and} Humes had lied about earlier ~~les~~ ^{to testify} s of a national disgrace. Then ~~he~~ ^{he} got Humes, still again under oath, that he had burned both ~~the protocol and his notes!~~

This Gunn knew was false, still another perjury. If he did not know this from any other source or sources, as I ~~am~~ ^{am} confident he did, he knew it from my 1975 Post Mortem. He got that from me before he became part of the ARRB. He phoned me about ~~the~~ ^{chief counsel, running it} small part of that book when he was ~~in~~ the ARRB. And that phone call was about Humes' perjury, not this one but one related to it to which we come.

188A new

Gunn's deliberate effort to wipe out ^{Humes'} serious felonies- and with regard to that most awful and most subversive of crimes, the assassination of the President - were assisted by Boswell.

(Hall's expressions of thanks strongly indicate that he had most of the work done from him by OSU people who had been under him, especially in the library.)

Q About this astounding situation in such an inquiry I did write a separate book. I've ^o forgotten its title. It draws heavily on ~~the~~ the official transcript of what ⁿⁿ Gunn did, with a little help from ^{Gunn in Humes,} Boswell. Neither ~~even~~ once mentioned the Katzenbach memo so neither could have learned if that -hopefully unique in our history- drew in any detail or any other way- from the Navy's illegal and ~~so~~ awful and ~~improper~~ order to the autopsists that they not do a complete autopsy, particularly not if it could disclose more about the shooting. Or to learn more about what ^{military doctors} the Navy had done and not done under orders. ^{no mention of Finck's forced confession of it in New Orleans, either, or of which Gunn knew-}

The book that Kermit Hall's ignorance and dishonesties, particularly his lies, followed on his ^{first} making a ^{speech} ~~speech~~ that is prestigious in Maryland law and then putting it in ~~book~~ the form in which it was published by the Martland Law Review. After I completed that book I sent a copy to the dean of the Maryland law school and to the ARRB which, by law, was required to preserve it at the Archives, where it is. Or at least was. ^{1894 here}

I wrote about

Not word from the Law school dean and ~~no more~~ from the OSU dean when he was on the ARRB. ^{not a word} ^{of Hall was silent completely silent about that exposure of his ignorance and his underhanded attack on critics in general.}

It is the literal truth that despite their ^{important} dropping us some crumbs in forcing ~~disclosure~~ disclosure of the relative few documents still withheld, the ARRB continued to ~~preserve~~, in what it did and did not do, said and did not say, the most disgraceful acts of the government and its sycophants in their lies about that most subversive of crime, ^{the} the assassination of the President.

^{And to these truths about the} And of all the official investigations of the crime ^{or of any} of the information produced in the FOIA lawsuits against the government of which I alone filed at least twelve, some individual affidavits in them of book length and ~~are~~ heavily documented.

All of this was available but those who considered themselves critics and who made up their "solutions" ^{to} ~~care~~ ^{carrying} ^{ought} not about fact nor about what was readily available to them that they should have wanted ^{and understand} to know. But just as there is no mention, not a word, about that infamous Katzenbach memo in any of the essays or of Fetzner's observations in his two books, so also in most of what calls itself critical literature no mention of that Katzenbach memo ^{or} and of the slight indication herein of what had been ^e exposed and had been entirely ignored by those who consider themselves experts solely on the basis of what they made up that is not relevant, at its best. Where there is what is relevant, it is not new, except sometimes in ~~the~~ form, and it duplicates what had been known and published except in its form.

A few ~~of~~ things in this book illustrate this.