

14  
13 *Recapulation of autopsy improprieties*

How very ~~wrog~~<sup>wrog</sup> wrong, how criminal destroying the autopsy report was, how wrong and criminal any alteration of any other autopsy records were I learned <sup>M</sup>10<sup>M</sup>g after Post Mortem was published.

That be<sup>c</sup>ame a chapter in NEVER AGAIN!

All tha was so wrog<sup>M</sup>, so criminal even though it ~~was~~<sup>was</sup> by government. <sup>It</sup>and was, publicly, accepted by government, <sup>e</sup>It was what was accepted by the ~~ne~~ nation's media, no major voice of which raised a ~~sigl~~ single question about it or undertook to tell the people ~~3~~ how wrong it was and why <sup>it was so very wrong. Illegal, criminal.</sup> <sup>about the assassination.</sup>

Although a few in the Congress had a few questions, as soon as Johnson appointed his Warren Commission, no more v<sup>o</sup>ices in the Congress.

Most of all the lawyers knew all this was criminal. very, very wrong, but the nation got<sup>t</sup> no guidance, no advice, no reason not to continue accepting wh<sup>t</sup> <sup>a was</sup>totally unacceptable, the protection of a great subversion.

The scholars, particularly the professors of law and of history, likewise failed them<sup>selves</sup>~~selves~~ and the nation with their silence, which means with their acceptance when they should have been alerting <sup>t</sup> the people and the nation that at the very least ~~it~~<sup>we</sup> had had a de facto coup d'etat, which the assassination of any president is, but with this assassination, of <sup>y'</sup>this President, the President whose policies had changed so radically, there was the <sup>additional</sup> question, was this a real, not a de facto coup d'etat?

None of the nation who should have been heard was heard.

Except in unquestioning support of the Warrren Report and in critical comments and attacks ~~non~~ those ~~of~~ few who did raise those questions.

Incredible as it still seems, the first book on the Warren Commission and on the assassination, what in the past it would have been expected to be <sup>sought</sup> ~~grabbed~~ by publishers, received more than a hundred rejections internationally, without a single adverse editorial comment.

That subject is not worth a book? *When a President is assassinated.*

While the books supposedly on the murder of O.J. Simpson's former wife were sought by publishers and grabbed by readers.

There was not a word of objection or complaint when the Warren Commission decided to proceed in total secrecy. But my was there loud and insistent objection when the judge in the <sup>Simpson</sup> ~~case~~ brought ~~against Simpson~~ as his ex-wife's murderer, restricted the media to a team that would report all news to the rest of the media.

The media <sup>got a lawyer to go</sup> ~~went~~ to court to defeat the judge in <sup>the slight restraint</sup> ~~what~~ he believed was necessary.

But with the assassination of the President, there was not a single objection to a star chamber proceeding which pursued a fake invented by the government, as we saw, for example in the conspiracy set forth in that Katzenbach memorandum to not investigate <sup>officially or</sup> the crime itself and to anoint Oswald (the lone and unassisted assassin and to claim that in two days it had all that was needed to convict him when after more than three decades it has no such information.

All the institutions of our society failed the nation when the nation had what was, at the least, a de facto coup d'etat. In failing the nation all those / many who should have been heard and who had clamped tongues, then and since then, also failed themselves.

To provide some <sup>my</sup> understanding of how all that was so wrong was so wrong, I ~~repeat~~ <sup>Chapter</sup> the NEVER AGAIN! ~~Chapter~~ was titled, "If It Isn't Written Down, It Wasn't Done."

*244A follows*

That chapter, which also raises the question, "was there a military conspiracy?" <sup>includes</sup> there ~~is~~ a recapulation, with commenatary, on the highly improper ~~dis~~ disappearance of so many <sup>autopsy</sup> medical records, of my efforts to obtain them, especially the originals, which had been kept secret and some still are, all that had been withheld without any ~~need~~, legitimate need or bases for it, records that, had there been a trial would have been made public.

This is unseemly, unprecedented and can be explained only by the need to hide the truth, to keep fact secret, in order to protect the illegal and very improper conspiracies, by the Navy, which was implimented the night of the assassination, and that under the Katzenbach memorandum, which was approved by the new President at approximately 9 p.m. Sunday, November 224, two days after the assassination and the day before the assassinated President was interred.

245 follows

245

To Not  
include

## ~~Chapter 13~~

### If It Isn't Written Down, It Wasn't Done

THE NARRATIVE ACCOUNT OF MY INVESTIGATION, WHAT IT DISCLOSED and of official impediments it had to overcome, continues in the next chapter of *Post Mortem*. Here again it contains information that two of JAMA's gang of four were well aware of and withheld from the two who were not aware of it.

Today the destruction of the autopsy protocol should be considered in the light of the expert opinion of Mrs. Elizabeth Neichter, experienced professional medical records consultant. At the time I wrote *Post Mortem*, I did not have this expertise available to me. She said, "the rule of thumb for all medical records is—if it isn't written down it wasn't done" and "it is unacceptable to revise originals . . . or to destroy them for any reason."

Despite this standard Humes et al. did destroy the original of the autopsy protocol, did revise it at least twice, changing its meaning, as we shall see, all with official approval. Could anything more strongly suggest a military conspiracy, with executive-agency involvement? In all the years of my inquiry into the assassination, that I think is not unfairly described as intensive, in all the hundreds of thousands of pages of withheld official records I rescued from their official oblivion, there is not a single explanation for the destruction of the autopsy protocol, no claim to any legitimate need for it. Yet it was done.

The *Post Mortem* narrative continues:

As delivered to the archives with a covering letter by Rowley, what I had decided to investigate further is described as:

Handwritten notes by Dr. J. J. Humes which include the holographic draft of the autopsy report; the autopsy description sheet;

two certificates dated November 24 by Dr. Humes (Commission Exhibit 397); and the official autopsy report (Commission Exhibit 387).

The self-serving comment that follows is both accurate and deceptive:

Copies of these documents, as you know, were furnished to the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy and are Commission exhibits which have been widely reproduced.

Had it been Rowley's intention to persuade scholars of the future that it would be a waste of time even to look at these seeming duplications of the published, he could not have phrased it better. But, the very opening sentence of his letter makes all of this false and dishonest. It refers to 'the following *original documents . . .*' (emphasis added), and the Commission *never* had copies of these 'original documents,' which are *different* from the copies the Commission did have, those made from *copies*, not the originals.

I had no trouble getting a Xerox of what Rowley then gave the archives under my persistent prodding. But it was some time before, by accident, I located the actual originals. Had I not been lulled by Rowley's clever phrasing, this would not have been the case, for what was added to his attached receipt should have led me to it.

For some reason not immediately apparent, this required two *different* receipts. And, again without explanation, the receipts for this imperishable national treasure are not signed by the archivist or his numerous top assistants who do act in his name, nor are they signed by the man in immediate charge of this archive, Marion Johnson. For this purpose, the lowest man on the bureaucratic totem pole, John F. Simmons, known as 'Mike,' Johnson's friendly and conscientious assistant, was used. No title is included. Neither receipt even says 'National Archives.'

The first is on a Secret Service letterhead form used for communications to be filed by their file identification—not Rowley's letterhead. The second is a carbon copy of another receipt.

The first reads, 'Received from the United States Secret Service the following material—Commission Exhibit #387,' followed by this, indented: '(A) Original Autopsy Protocol dated 22 November 1963 signed by Cmdr. J. J. Humes—standard Form 503, six (6)

pages. Countersigned by Cmdr. J. Thornton Boswell and Lt. Col. Pierre A. Finck' [*sic*]. (The supplemental autopsy report, forwarded by the Navy December 6, was not included.)

The second, a two-page work of propaganda and rather carefully drawn, not an objective receipt, was copied for me with 1-5/8 inches of the top of each page missing. (The same amount of copying was eliminated from Rowley's letter and the first receipt.) The bottom of what seems to be the seven capital letters possibly spelling RECEIPT barely shows at the top of the first. [Now about what was supplied to me:]

With regard to '(A),' that is *not* 'the original holographic draft of the Autopsy Protocol' for, as consultation with the cited source shows, it is the original of the *revision* of the 'draft' (2H373).

This misrepresentation may give even more point to the totally unnecessary fate of the original, the sworn word of then-Commander Humes from the same paragraph: 'That draft I personally burned in the fireplace of my recreation room.'

From Specter's and the Commission members' total lack of interest or reaction, no question being asked, no eyebrow raised—no consternation or concern—the proper place for the autopsy protocol of an assassinated President is a 'recreation room,' not a hospital, and the proper disposition is Orwell's, to be 'personally burned' by the prosecutor. Sure as hell, *that* burned draft, the *original* that was *not* destroyed until it was known that there would be *no* trial, Oswald also having been put away, is not going to be quoted now by some devil like me loving scripture!

The reader might want to consider why some unnamed bureaucrat had to lie. Why any lie is necessary or acceptable about anything connected with the assassination of a president or its investigation.

(In this, Simmons is innocent, for the nature of his multitudinous duties precluded his having made the study of this verbal enormity that I have. That cannot be true of the writer of this false, propagandizing 'receipt')

This is not the only lie—should one mince words on such a subject?—in this paragraph. The parenthetical conclusion is deliberately false. It is not '*these* sixteen (16) pages' that are on 'pages 29 through 44, Volume XVII' of the hearings. Had they been, the international uproar would still be echoing after seven years. Shortly the difference will become apparent.

Nor is '(B)' not similarly false. This is *not* the same 'Original Autopsy Descriptive Sheet' that is 'on pages 45 and 46, Volume

248

XVII' of the hearings. The words 'autopsy descriptive sheet' are *not* on page 373 or anywhere else in Humes's testimony. Nor can these possibly be that for which I had for so long made repeated requests, *all* of the 'notes actually made in the room where the examination was taking place.' We have not only [Lieutenant] Colonel Finck's sworn word that he, personally, made notes and handed them in before he left and that all three doctors made notes on pieces of paper. Moreover, on the page prior to that cited in the deceptive argument, hardly appropriate in what is guised as no more than a 'receipt,' Humes had sworn, in describing what he held in his hand, *not* an 'autopsy descriptive sheet' nor 'Form NMS Path,' both being headings on that required Navy Medical Service form, nor did he cite the identification of the autopsy by the number that appears on it, 'A 63 #272.' He could not identify it by the name of the President, for this autopsy was performed with such tender care, with such regard for precision, history, and the legal aspects of medicine, that the blanks required to be filled in for a number of entries, including name, date, and hour expired, diagnosis and physical description, are all blank.

Humes's under-oath description of what he held, what was then and there placed into evidence, is 'these are various notes in long-hand, or copies, rather, of various notes in longhand made by myself, in part during the performance of the examination of the late President and in part after the examination when I was preparing to have a typewritten report made.'

However his cited testimony from page 373 is interpreted—and it is hardly the function of simply a receipt to make interpretations—it cannot be limited to this autopsy descriptive sheet, for in the testimony he describes handwriting that 'in some instances is not my own.' Humes is blessed (as I see it) with a distinctive, backhand style, and *none* of the entries—these are not notes but entries on a form—is in his handwriting.

Besides, Boswell told reporter Richard Levine that he had filled out this form. From the original I now have, it is easily discernible that two different implements were used, one by Finck and one by Boswell. In neither case is it by Humes, so *any* notes he made 'during the performance of the examination of the late President' *are not here—or anywhere else.*

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

249

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 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 only the head.)

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 twenty-six volumes became available, my wife and I had made a word-by-word comparison of the fifteen 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 included 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 that no writer, using passionate language, can approximate.

Howard's factual listing is fifteen 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 [was omitted]. However, it is obvious, with only these so-called notes as sources, unless some notes had

sheet' are  
Nor can  
e repeated  
where the  
[lieutenant]  
notes and  
ctors made  
that cited  
guised as  
bing what  
nor 'Form  
y Medical  
utopsy by  
ot identify  
performed  
istory, and  
o be filled  
ur expired,  
  
it was then  
es in long-  
l made by  
tion of the  
was prepar-  
  
reted—and  
interpreta-  
e sheet, for  
e instances  
distinctive,  
it notes but  
  
e had filled  
discernible  
ck and one  
es he made  
e President'  
  
of the most  
writing lies  
ing the files  
did, which

been destroyed at some point, there could have been no other sources for the two much later panels to draw upon.

Howard's study shows a statement of a total of eighty-eight facts. Of these, *only twenty-four 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.

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 the color of the President's eyes and hair. This cannot be true in most cases, for of these unrecorded sixty-four facts, fifty 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 fifteen 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.

They no longer exist.

The destruction of such records of any murder, particularly the assassination of a president, and false swearing about it or them, are criminal. When the government that has to be the prosecutor and alone can make the charges is itself criminally responsible, neither charging nor prosecution is likely. However, I have repeatedly invited those I accuse to file charges against me and seek a judicial determination of fact. None has—or will.

'(C)' is relatively innocuous—that is, compared with the foregoing only. It is sufficiently serious to deceive in this affair. It is undoubtedly true that, as Humes certified, he had turned in to Captain J. H. Stover everything he had not already destroyed. Stover's countersigning means no more than that Humes had done this. It does not mean that neither he nor his command nor the Navy then had no other records. Somebody had the missing X rays. Again this is not identical with what is 'on page 47, Volume XVII' of the hearings. There is no deviation. '(D)' is identically represented as exactly what is 'on page 48.' Whoever cooked up this deliberate deceit sought to hide behind the use of 'portrayed.' That is a semantic 'Emperor's clothes' for there is a vital difference, a difference not simply that Humes and the Commission had Xeroxes, whereas what I had finally forced out of suppression in secret files are the originals.

The difference is what was added, *by Admiral Burkley, by hand, to each.\**

The Warren Report and Burkley's notations cannot coexist. It is impossible.

Thus, this Commission, all of its members were lawyers, including the Chief Justice, and its competent, large legal staff, dominated and headed by the former solicitor general of the United States, the government's lawyer, went out of their way to accept what should not have been accepted in the most blighted backland jerkwater court: secondhand evidence when

\*See *Post Mortem* page 262. What distinguishes this and what follows from all other copies of all versions in all files and published—what was so carefully suppressed—is Burkley's personal, handwritten approval.

252

the originals were available, were known to be available, and could have been obtained for a phone call.

There is no other reason for avoiding the originals, no other reason for their being hidden, none for its taking so much dogged effort to obtain them.

Now that I do have them—color pictures and Xeroxes, both made from originals—let us consider them in the sequence of the longer receipt. Let us see what they say, understand what this means.

First is the original of Humes's rewritten draft of the autopsy report, the closest thing to the original, that having been burned, not in innocence but *after* it was known that, with the only accused himself assassinated, there would be no court in which any evidence had to be produced and subjected to cross-examination.

Admiral Burkley countersigned and approved the handwritten autopsy report, as he also approved the retyped version. To be certain that there was no question, he initialed the first page, 'GGB,' as he did the last. Humes, it will be remembered, personally delivered everything to Burkley, and Burkley had been with the body when it was being treated and examined in Dallas and during the autopsy in Bethesda, the one medical man in the world and, except for a few Secret Service men, the *only* man in the world of whom this is true.

The *substantive* changes, changes of fact, not opinion—not all of those made after Oswald was killed but only those made in what was not removed from the draft that was burned—are incredible and *all*, we now for the first time know, were *approved by the President's own physician!* The unknown, the conjectured and invented, none of which belong in a medico-legal document, least of all in the autopsy report on a president, they also were approved. To cite what in context is minor but in fact is major, the first page is typical. Where, in his version, Humes had the car 'moving at approximately twenty miles per hour,' something neither he nor anyone else knew or could know and twice as fast as it was, that was crossed out and changed to 'moving at a slow rate of speed,' something none of the signatories had any way of knowing and certainly not.

by their own observation. Also unknown to the signatories, the last sentence began with an argument, not fact: 'Three shots were heard and the President fell face down to the floor of the vehicle.' This was completely false, a fabrication. The 'correction' was no less an invention, an invention entirely consistent with every argument and change in the autopsy, to make it seem that all the shots had come from the back and that the accused Oswald was the lone assassin. After this change, the autopsy report reads: "Three shots were heard and the President fell *forward*" [Emphasis added].

He did not.

'Puncture' in describing the nonfatal bullet wound means entrance. It had been used repeatedly in what survived the recreation room burning. In every case but one, it was removed, including those cases where, without doubt, it was meant. One example is on page 4, a point on which the entire autopsy, the entire 'solution' to the crime and the Warren Report itself all hang. The last full sentence, in describing what has come to be known as the rear, nonfatal wound, said to have been in the neck, the description of 'a 7x4 mm oval puncture wound,' with the elimination of 'puncture,' became 'a 7x4 mm wound.'

On page 7, in a single sentence where there are *seven changes of fact about the head wound*, the description 'puncture' is *twice* eliminated, although in later testimony it was, with Specter's deftness in the absence of any adversary, reintroduced. In one of these cases nothing replaced it; in the other, a word that is anything but synonymous, 'lacerated.' And, on pages 8 and 9, 'puncture' is stricken through, replaced by nothing on page 8 and by 'occipital,' which is entirely different, on page 9.

On the other side of the same coin, where the wound that it was later decided, contrary to the existing evidence, had to be an exit wound or there could be no single-assassin, nonconspiracy Report, the qualification 'presumably' was inserted on pages 8, 9, and 10.

Other factual changes are to *opposites*. One of the most readily comprehended is on page 5, where 'left' was changed to 'right.' On page 14, where the rear wound was related to the plane of the body and thus not dependent upon what was un-

known, the position of the body, the change was to what amounts to a deliberate, unscientific and unwarranted attempt to frame the accused and the solution. As altered, this reads: 'The projectiles were fired from a point behind and somewhat above the level of the deceased.' Without knowing the position of the body in three different ways, this could not be said. Was the President at the time of each shot vertical, bolt erect? Was he turned in either direction from at right angles to the length of the car? Or, was he, while erect in a vertical plane as compared with the car or the seat, leaning to either side?

At best, these changes reflect such uncertainty as to disqualify the autopsy report in its entirety. At worst, they are, because agreed to by so many, a deliberate conspiracy to frame the then-dead accused, to corrupt history, and to vindicate any assassin or assassins.

But what is most incredible of all in this rewriting of fact to ordain falsehood as truth is a failure by all. Neither Admiral Galloway, who dominated and ordered changes made, nor Admiral Burkley, who was everywhere and approved, nor any of the three surgeons themselves caught the one slip-up. *Five* medical military officers are involved in this, each culpably.

In a single place they neglected to murder truth. In a single place an accurate description of a wound remained. And say what they now may or will, it is an uncontested fact that all five did agree on it. It is the one vital fact to escape that recreation room assassination of the medical truth.

The fourth paragraph of the holographic autopsy report begins:

Dr. Perry noted the massive wound of the head and second *puncture* wound of the low anterior neck in approximately the midline [Emphasis added].

This is entirely in accord with everything, fact and all the initial medical statements, *all* of which had the President shot in the *front* of the neck.

There is *no* change here in the *holograph*. Nobody, at any time—Humes or anyone else—noted *any* alteration here in what he wrote on his blue-lined, white, letter-sized pad.

But somebody in the military's butcher shop of history at Bethesda did eliminate this truth before the report was typed. In the typed version, the word 'puncture' was eliminated. In its stead there appears 'much smaller.' The dramatic representation, that the Dallas doctors said the President had been shot from the *front*, fell victim to those in the military determined to rewrite what happened when the President was gunned down in cold blood in broad daylight on the streets of a major American city.

If we today cannot pinpoint what person did this, absent confession, there is no possibility of doubt about where it was done. All the evidence is that Humes turned in his draft to his superiors at Bethesda, and that all of this was supervised by the commander of that military installation, Admiral Galloway.

And this, too, was verified by another admiral, the President's personal physician. Burkley approved the original truth saying that the President's wound in the front of the neck was caused by a shot from the front, and he approved the mysterious change which attempts to hide this fact.

I have no doubt that Humes intended to change this. I do not know if he was ordered to, and, if so, by whom. But my first accusation of perjury, in *Whitewash*, is on this point and to this day remains undisputed.

The day *after* the autopsy examination, Humes called Perry twice. The Report acknowledges but a single call. Perry personally confirmed to me when I interviewed him that he had received two calls from Humes, both the same day. He had, prior to these calls, scheduled a press conference.

Perry is a man deserving of both pity and sympathy. He is friendly, personable, conscientious, and, without doubt, dedicated to his calling and justifiably proud of his skill in it. A bizarre touch in what he told me is that, although he knew the President to be irreversibly dead the moment he saw him, when he performed the surgical process then called a 'tracheotomy' and since retitled 'tracheostomy' he made it in the most cosmetic manner. Instead of the usual vertical incision, he made a transverse one, a cut from side to side. His purpose—and he had, he told me, done this several hundred times—was so that, upon healing, the incision would be made invisible by the natural folds of the skin.

But he was forced into perjurious testimony by national policy, his personal situation, and above all, by Arlen Specter.

As I have repeatedly charged, including in public appearances in Philadelphia announced to and covered by the press, Specter suborned perjury, a crime.

256

Knowing full well that Perry and the other quoted Dallas doctors had said immediately that the President had been shot from the front—and that Oswald could not possibly have fired that shot, proving there had been a conspiracy—Specter pretended to the Commission that the TV tapes and radio recordings were not available (3H377 ff.). And he pretended there was no printed press at all in the United States! In an embarrassed, bumbling, and hesitant effort to circumvent this obstacle to the writing of the Report of the predetermined conclusions, he said, for all the world, as though he, not Perry, were the witness:

We have been trying diligently to get the tape recordings of the television interviews, and we were unsuccessful . . . our efforts at CBS, NBC, and ABC and everywhere including New York, Dallas, and other cities were to no avail . . . The problem is they have not yet catalogued all the footage they have . . .

Picture of the American electronic media come apart, unable to operate!

It is Specter's picture, not the reality, as I discovered later in ransacking the files on this point, too. One inventory of one Dallas station alone is more than one hundred pages long. And restricting this solely to Dallas and TV, only one station, located outside of Dallas, KTVT-TV, had no video tape. Three others in that area, WFAA, WBAP, and KRLD, *all* offered to duplicate for the Commission *all* of their tapes. This is set forth in elaborate detail in one of a number of Commission files on this subject, Number 962, which also suggests that the Commission had delayed its inquiry for inventories, and so late, that some were about to be erased for reuse.

Specter was not under oath, so he did not commit perjury. But he lied in telling the members of the Commission that 'the problem is they have not yet catalogued all the footage.' (And suppose, were cataloguing the real question, that all but one of the stations had catalogued, or 99 percent of the footage had been catalogued, 'all the footage' still would not have been, would it?) But the Commission's needs and purposes did not require 'catalogues'; they required Perry's words, and they *then* were readily available, including in the Commission's own files.

This is the way Specter 'gandy-danced' his way past the disaster Perry presented. Before the Commission, he led Humes into testi-

257

allas doc-  
shot from  
that shot,  
led to the  
not avail-  
d press at  
id hesitant  
Report of  
as though

ordings  
sful ...  
includ-  
vail ...  
footage

art, unable

ed later in  
one Dallas  
restricting  
outside of  
that area,  
r the Com-  
te detail in  
t, Number  
delayed its  
about to be

erjury. But  
he problem  
id suppose,  
the stations  
catalogued,  
t?) But the  
catalogues';  
y available,

the disaster  
s into testi-

fyng to making but a *single* 'redundant' phone call to Perry (2H371). Questioned twice and separately (6H16 and 3H380, the earlier testimony in the later volume), Perry told Specter of *two*. He said of the second of these two calls Humes placed to him that 'he told me, of course, that he could not talk to me about any of it and asked that I keep it in confidence, which I did' and 'he advised me that he could not discuss with me the findings of the necropsy.' On all counts, according to other and probative testimony and what Perry told me, this is false.

There was no legal need for secrecy; only an urgent need for public information that was truthful. The entire world was in turmoil. Humes *did* 'discuss' with Perry 'the findings,' based on which, as Perry later told me, he knew the wound officially described as in the back of the President's neck was actually in his back. And, although he said he did not tell anyone, Perry had to and he did.

He did have an announced and scheduled press conference on the medical evidence for that very day, undoubtedly the real purpose of Humes's call. Had it been for information, he would have telephoned Perry the night before, while he was examining the body and could check it, not after the body had been surrendered and long after the embalming and reconstruction had been completed and the corpse was in the White House.

It is Dr. Kemp Clark who first pulled the plug on this perjury (6H23):

Dr. Perry stated that he had talked to the Bethesda Naval Hospital on two occasions that morning and that he knew what the autopsy findings had shown and that he did not wish to be questioned by the press as he had been advised by Bethesda to confine his remarks to what he knew from having examined the President, and suggested that the major part of this press conference be conducted by me [*Post Mortem*, pages 252-60].

[Humes, under oath, had testified to only a single, late morning phone call to Perry. Perry and Dr. Kemp Clark, under oath, testified to two calls from Humes. Specter conducted the questionings before the Commission. He made no effort to reconcile the two versions, both under oath, and no member of the Commission did. Specter and all the Commissioners were lawyers and knew the significance of

the contradiction in terms of the rest of Humes's testimony. William Manchester's semi-official *The Death of a President*, a work distinguished by its author's lack of interest in evidence and fact about the crime while devoting himself and his book to the tinsel as well as to the schmalz, gives the lie on this to Humes and significantly, to the charade he and Specter played.]

Bethesda's physicians had heard reports of Mac Perry's medical briefing of the press . . . an entrance wound in the throat. . . . They were positive that Perry had seen an exit wound. . . . Humes telephoned Perry in Dallas shortly after midnight. . . . [*The Death of a President*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967, pages 423-24]. Having already told the world that the President had been shot from the front, could Perry the next day say the opposite? Or can anyone blame him for going on an unannounced vacation—translation: into attempted hiding?

Clark, also under oath, named two other witnesses to this conversation. Need it be added that Specter and the Commission had no interest and questioned neither these two nor any others about it? These were the hospital administrator and Dr. George T. Shires, both of whom *Specter* interviewed on other matters.

So, especially with the reports that only one bullet was expected to be recovered from the body, and that possible only from the wound in the front of the neck, there is great point in Burkley's affirmation of Humes's quotation of Perry's statement that the anterior neck wound, which he did see clearly and through which he made the tracheostomy incision, was caused by a shot from the front.

It is doubtful if there ever has been any proceeding of the importance of this assassination investigation in which there was as much perjury, except for the Reichstag fire trial. And there the falsely accused was acquitted, not killed.

The difference between the original autopsy descriptive sheet that had been suppressed until I forced it out—that had never been seen by the Commission—is a difference that, were the official conclusions at all tenable, would in itself entirely destroy them.

The reader will recall that when I first published a copy of the Commission's copy, this exposure and reporter Richard Levine's needling led to the fantasyland 'explanation' that Boswell had merely been a bit careless in marking the back wound, never for a moment dreaming that in the autopsy of a president there is any

259  
 testimony. William  
 a work distin-  
 and fact about  
 the tinsel as well  
 and significantly,

Herry's medical  
 report. . . . They  
 . . . Humes tele-  
 [The Death of  
 pages 423-24].  
 had been shot  
 opposite? Or  
 ced vacation—

ses to this con-  
 'ommission had  
 ny others about  
 eorge T. Shires,  
 rs.

et was expected  
 only from the  
 int in Burkley's  
 tement that the  
 d through which  
 by a shot from

ceeding of the  
 which there was  
 al. And there the

descriptive sheet  
 it had never been  
 were the official  
 y destroy them.  
 ed a copy of the  
 Richard Levine's  
 hat Boswell had  
 wound, never for  
 ident there is any

need for care or accuracy. (What better qualification for a Navy chief of pathology?)

The wound *was* in the *back*, not the neck, as all official observers testified. Only when Specter went to work to rescript the assassination into a fake solution consistent with the official predetermination of what would be called truth and fact was there ever any question. Until then all the evidence was of a back wound. This includes Specter's own suppressed notes of his own interviews with the autopsy witnesses before their testimony.

Now we know that Admiral Burkley placed it there, too. And Burkley certainly knew. For the moment we shall restrict ourselves to this first rescue from oblivion. In the lower left-hand corner of the front of the form he wrote, 'Verified GGBurkley,' all run together.

He did not just initial it. He did not just sign his name. He used a word that cannot be fudged as Boswell fooled the press. The meaning of 'verified' is not subject to argument. Webster could not be more precise and limiting:

1. To prove to be true; to conform; substantiate.
2. To check or test the accuracy or exactness of.
3. To authenticate; specif., *Law*, to confirm or substantiate by oath or proof; also to add a verification . . .

Those who instinctively grasp at evidentiary straws to support the official mythology would do well to restrain themselves, for there will be more on this point in what follows. I here make this comment so that those who think they see invisible straws and grab at them do not imagine that a medical man who rises to be an admiral in the Navy and physician to the President does not know the meaning of simple words and here, for no reason at all, just got 'careless' and threw in an extra and a wrong word.

Burkley's additions to both of the originals of the certifications are word for word identical.

The one that says Humes turned in 'all working papers associated with' the autopsy, including the 'autopsy notes,' at 5 P.M., Burkley endorsed with 'Accepted and approved this date,' signing it with his full name, 'George G. Burkley,' and as 'Rear Adm MC USN Physician to the President.'\*

\*Cites page 526 of *Post Mortem*, on which this is reproduced from the original in facsimile. Galloway's words are, "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 assistant."

260

This constitutes Burkley's certification that those now-missing autopsy notes at that moment did exist and, when added to the receipt and letter so carefully omitted by Specter in publishing File 371 as Exhibit 397, were in his possession. That receipt, the item marked in both margins and the only item in it marked in any way, reads, 'One copy of autopsy report and notes of the examining doctor which is described in letter of transmittal Nov. 25, 1963 by Dr. Galloway.' And the next day Burkley gave all these items to the Secret Service, which gave him the receipt from which I have quoted.

When Burkley noted 'accepted and approved' to Humes's other certification, what he actually did is mind-boggling. This admiral 'accepted and approved' what Humes admitted, 'that I have destroyed by burning' his first draft of the autopsy report on the President!\*\*

Aside from what I have already established beyond peradventure, that this revision and conflagration was not until *after* Humes and everyone else knew that nobody would have to face examination of his records and cross-examination by defense counsel in a trial of Oswald, by then safely murdered, can anyone conceive of any *good* reason for the destruction of *any* record in a crime of this nature? Or its acceptance and approval by the President's physician—an admiral?

When the nature of the changes now known to have been made are considered, and with the until-now suppressed confirmation that the Commission's medical evidence in its entirety is dubious and in all essential elements false, can even the most tolerant put any but the most disturbing interpretation on, first, the unpunished destruction of imperishable, irreplaceable evidence by a man qualified in forensic pathology and, second, the unhesitating acceptance and approval by the physician to the President himself?

When all the experts were military men, when all civilians were kept out of the autopsy room by military guard, when the military destroyed the evidence and the military approved the

\*\*Cites page 523 of *Post Mortem*, on which this is reproduced from the original in facsimile.

261

destruction of the evidence, and when this new evidence proves the testimony about the wounds was perjurious, criminal, and all of this criminality, this false swearing, was also by the military, is not a question of some kind of military conspiracy unavoidable?

And must I not again ask, is there anything like this in our history or that of any other land considering itself free and civilized? [*Post Mortem*, pages 260-62]

Footnote like on 148 are not what I wrote obviously, and I do not remember seeing them on the proof. This suggests the angles mentioned to me after I went over and OK'd proofs and that was account for errors in index that I did not see until after the book was printed without it.

now-miss-  
n added to  
in publish-  
hat receipt,  
1 it marked  
id notes of  
transmittal  
ay Burkley  
ve him the

o Humes's  
gling. This  
ted, 'that I  
opsy report

l peradven-  
until after  
ave to face  
by defense  
d, can any-  
ion of any  
id approval

have been  
essed con-  
its entirety  
n the most  
n on, first,  
ceable evi-  
second, the  
cian to the

ll civilians  
l, when the  
proved the

duced from

Almost all of this was published a quarter of a century before the assassination bug bit Fetzer and he brought his two books out, with almost none of this in any of the essays in both of his books.

All of this, like all of my books, comes from the official records and involves no conjecturing. In this it is unlike the Fetzerize criticism almost <sup>more</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>based on</sup> of which is the official evidence. <sup>Of</sup>

*which most of them are ignorant*

I repeat still again, there has been as much as <sup>more than</sup> thirty-five years since the first critical commentary on the medical and other official evidence was published in the first book on the Warren Commission and the assassination, with severe criticism, <sup>s/</sup> by name, of so many who had done so much that was wrong, with emphasis on the gross medical improprieties; and it has been a quarter of a century since more of those criticisms were published in Post Mortem; and in ~~all~~ that time I have not had a single letter or a single phone call from any of those named in ~~that criticism~~ those criticisms ~~in~~ ~~whizzzanzz~~ with any claim ~~that~~ <sup>about what</sup> that I had been unfair or inaccurate in what I wrote ~~that~~ was so seriously wrong, sometimes illegal, *that they had done.*

Studying the enormous volume of official records that were public because others used the Freedom of Information Act to spring them from official captivity was too much for all the Fetzers and so many others, it was much easier, with or without the recognition of it, to play Perry Mason.