

soften the critique of the autopsy and actually vouch for the competence and skill of the pathologists. (Ibid, pgs. 384-385) But this leaves him with a huge problem: If he is right about their competence, then how does one explain why the autopsy was so poor? He mentions the idea -- as Pierre Finck testified to at the trial of Clay Shaw -- that the military controlled the autopsy. He then tries to counteract this powerful testimony by saying that Finck said that there were no generals in charge of the autopsy. But Finck added that he didn't have to take orders from generals "...because there were others, there were Admirals ... and when you are a Lt. Colonel in the Army you just follow orders ..." (James DiEugenio, *Destiny Betrayed*, p. 292)

To further remove the doctors from responsibility for their work product, Bugliosi says that the Kennedy family must have limited the autopsy. This idea has been so completely and repeatedly discredited by writers like the late Harold Weisberg and Gary Aguilar that I was surprised that the author even surfaced it. Both Humes and Boswell said this was not the case before the Assassination Records Review Board. (Aguilar, p. 179) Humes once told a friend that he was ordered not to do a complete autopsy, but the orders were *not* from RFK. (William Law, *In the Eye of History*, p. 150) The HSCA concluded that the Kennedys did not interfere with the autopsy. A very good proof of this being the fact that Robert Kennedy left blank the space marked "restrictions" on the form he signed authorizing the autopsy. (Aguilar, p. 180) The Commanding Officer of the Naval Medical Center, Admiral Galloway, said the same. And he was quite specific: "... no orders were being sent in from outside the autopsy room either by phone or by person." (Aguilar, p. 179) Now, in light of Galloway's words, since the Kennedys were out of the room the interference had to have come from inside. For as Bugliosi argues, if there was no interference, then these eminently qualified doctors would have given the president an excellent and complete autopsy. Rather than, as Harold Weisberg has written, one more suiting to a bowery bum.

File in
Class
Project

To illustrate the lengths Warren Commission stalwarts must go to in order to deny the military limited the post-mortem, consider the following. When Pierre Finck testified at the Clay Shaw trial he recalled Humes being flustered by this interference and asking the question "Who's in charge here?" Finck further testified that an Army General, who was neither a pathologist nor doctor, replied, "I am." (Aguilar, p. 181) This is about as clear as it gets in figuring who was running things that night. When this episode was depicted in Oliver Stone's film *JFK*, it became necessary to construct a cover story to conceal the truth. So Humes now told his friend George Lundberg, the editor of the *Journal of the American Medical Association* the following fairy tale in order to make it go away. Before the autopsy commenced, he saw a man with a camera in the building. He did not want to chase him so he went to the loading dock and saw some generals milling around. He asked, "Who's in charge here?" When he found out, he told the officer to remove the guy with the camera. (Ibid) Bugliosi, predictably and dutifully, repeats this tale. (EN p. 220) But as Gary Aguilar notes, and Bugliosi does not, Finck could not have been referring to this "loading dock" episode at the trial. Why? Because Humes places this incident before the autopsy started. Finck did not arrive until after the autopsy began. Second, Finck testified that this incident happened not before, but while

the autopsy was in progress. (Aguilar, p. 181) This is how desperate the late Jim Humes was to get himself off the hook. It's a painful human predicament that Bugliosi does not seem to understand.

But yet, in the face of all the above, Bugliosi insists that the military did not control the autopsy. Now anyone can read Finck's Shaw trial testimony. It is excerpted at length in my first book, *Destiny Betrayed* (pages 290-309). There, one can see the true answer to this question. Not only were the doctors constrained by the military, but Finck was uncomfortable in admitting to this fact. For instance, when prosecutor Alvin Oser asked him if he saw the autopsy photos in advance of signing either the first autopsy report or the supplementary report of a few days later, it is clearly hard for Finck to admit that he did not. In fact, he actually tried to dance around the fact that he had previously said he *did* see the photos. (p. 293) When Oser had this answer read back to him, Finck actually tried to blame his previous misleading answer on a stenographic error. He finally admitted he did not see the photos until -- get this -- 1967. And then when Oser asks Finck the simple question as to why he did not dissect the track of the back wound, which allegedly exited the neck, well, the colloquy gets almost painful to read. Oser has to ask him this question -- I counted them -- eight times! This posing and repetition of the question is spread out over two pages in my book and much more than that in the transcript. (Ibid, pgs. 301-302) Oser even has to ask the judge to order Finck to answer the question. Finally Finck answers with: "As I recall I was told not to but I don't remember by whom." (Ibid, p. 302)

Question for Mr. Bugliosi: If RFK had told him not to -- or Kennedy's physician George Burkley had done so -- wouldn't Finck have recalled it? And wouldn't he have readily answered the question since it would have gotten him off the hook for his negligence? The answer is obvious. And it renders silly the idea that it was the Kennedys and not the military that limited the autopsy. An autopsy so bad that we still can't figure out what happened to President Kennedy 45 years later.

What makes the above question to Finck so vital today is that, after the work of the ARRB, we can now see that the failure to dissect this wound seems to have a rationale behind it. Because in reading both the interviews conducted by Chief Counsel Jeremy Gunn, along with the declassified interviews of the HSCA, the evidence indicates that this wound did not transit the body. Compelling evidence for this is the new information about the probing of the back wound with a malleable instrument done that night at Bethesda Naval Center. Both pathologist Robert Karnei and photographer Robert Knudsen say that the probing revealed that the back wound was clearly below the throat wound. (Aguilar, p. 228) Further, and even worse for the Warren Commission and SBT advocates, photographer Knudsen, and assistants Paul O'Connor and James Jenkins said the angle of the probe was steeply downward. (*In the Eye of History*, by William Law, p. 41; *Killing Kennedy*, by Harrison Livingstone, p. 215; *Murder in Dealey Plaza*, edited by James Fetzer, p. 241. Hereafter referred to as *MIDP*.) Jenkins actually told William Law that from his observation, the trajectory to connect the two was impossible. (Law, 79) And there were photos taken of this which -- no surprise -- do not exist today. (See *MIDP*, p. 208)