I want to make a chifage on page 9 of the chapter "Into and Fartly out of the memory Hole." I hope this reaches you before you can get to that.

and yes, when - finish this I'll put a new ribbon on!

lirs. Heichter had been more than helpful, including with xevoxes of additional authorities. You may recall that when you were here again you might want to go over the files she has provided.

Copy OK to 4 lines up. Beginning there it should read:

Originals," she told me, "except by drawing a single line through and error without obliteration to the original text, making the appropriate change, signing it and dating it; or by attaching an amendment to the original dicument. Originals should not be destroyed." (Citation below, forgot here)

Yest destroying originals is precisely what Humes did and boasted about in attributing his destruction of evidence to high motive.

and Specter and Cornwell and their Commission and committee and the staffs of both are ptul accorded the destruction of evidence in the assassination of President Kennedy as normal and proper.

Except for the quote this is as it was.

The quote from her at the top of 10 she says is OK. How I want to add what follows after the second graf on 10:

One of her **EXECUTE** authorities for saying that original autopsy materials should never be destroyed is Dr. Bernard Knight, his <u>Forensic Pathology</u>Oxford University Press, New York, 1991, page 12. Knight is also a British barrister.

Another is Ear W Emanuel Hayt, author of Medicolegal Aspects of Mospital Records.

(Physicians Record Company, Berwyn, III.) Hayt goes even farthur, saying that "A physician who participates in improperly altering a record may be deemed guilty of unprofessional conduct and be subjected to disciplinary action or suspension of license." (Page 36)

evidence is improper. Or, as lawyers and pathologists should have known and if they did not know they certainly should have learned. Hayt also confirms what I said about the impossibility of trying Oswald is these records had been toyed with in any way.

He says, citing what is known to lawyers as "the best evidence rule," that it requires that where it becomes necesary to prove the contents of a paper, the original must be produced or its absence accounted for. The rule was adopted to prevent fraud or mistakes as to the contents...

(This will have added pertinence when we get to the numerous changes Mumes made in the second handwritten draft of the proctocol, sysbtantive changes.)

except when they boast of their diligence and conscientiousness, as all the Warren for Many 30,1992.

Commission's assistant counsels recently did (add-eitation) in coast-to-coast press

coferences, there are so many in private practise who also preserved silence on knowing of these gross and inexeua intolerable improprieties.

and now Lundberg, pathologist and editor, and JANA, which involves the American decical Association in it, primactually primes and Bosnelly English En

Lundberg and Alia were not con tent to phony up their medical "news" in their politicization of the JFK assassination. They even held that press conference to get even more attention to their defense of the indefensible, hunes and Boswell and the warren Report.

all these doctors and lawyers, then pathologists and many medical writers, with tongues (clamped for 28 years in the face of this destruction of evidence when the President was assassinated!

and still clamped, save for the one noted, when they learned about Lundberg's praise of medicolegal wrongdoing by Humes and Boswell from JAIA and Fo from the Lundberg press conference.

All these years, all those doctors, lawyers and medical writers, and total silence in the face of terrible wrong.

What has become of us?

Extra space

and then the rest of 10 follows. The sleep apnea caught up with me when I'd barely started.

I'll map and then read and corect this. Best,