

11/29/69

Dick's Finck commentary (5-10)

We agree on Finck, his capabilities, character and non-medical skills. You also read his evasions as I do, giving them the meaning I also give them. I do not regard them as merely evasions, but as indications of what was evaded, always with the worry of a perjury rep in N.O.

139-Eardley. This apparently is the man in charge of Operation Autopsy. He figures in all suits also. He is an Assistant A.G. and probably was in charge of defense in Halleck's court, responses to John in his suit. It is his Halleck afternoon I am trying to get without paying court reporter's fees. 152. I am more than half-inclined to believe he saw no existing evidence of anterior neck wound because ~~xxxxxxx~~ sample should have been removed for microscopic examination....Is it possible that without tracing back what N.O. exhibit was the basis of questions you have (162ff) confused head drawing and body sketch/back? ...175: Is it possible he knew he had reason to avoid all association with all microscopic examinations? While it is true ~~xxxxxx~~ times did the supp. rpt, Finck was there and should at least have asked, if they were not taken in his presence, what samples were to be studied? He had to disassociate from all of that...176: I've understood that generally entrance wounds are less ragged than exits. What is there tending to make them more ragged with underlying bone?...197 Quite right, and more, he avoids any estimate of scale of X-rays. There is a means of comparison, the other wound, and there is a general practise (3/4). Compared with the other wound, this is close to life-like and he knew it. Here is one of Oser's major slips. He should have asked the official measurement-then asked why there was none, then the standards of forensic pathology, and put Finck in defense of his rep.... 193: Cyril's Washington testimony on failure to examine left side of brain is quite good. With the comparison "More massive", of lesions in the right side, this failure is culpable, no less so with no removal of the "structure", because all agree all read and understood head X-rays. They ever explained them to feebees... 197 is as close to perjury as he dared go. and he did get away with it-so far. Second reference: I do not recall other testimony on bone fragments. Above: did a the structure show in pictures rather than X-rays? If so, this means it was also visible to naked eye, my recollection....207 What times did with the brain was study it after fixing. This was unrelated to other studies, as with X-rays, but Finck had already laid his trail backward on this by pretending to be no more than a ballistics consultant. The fact is that aside from sectioning, he was in on all that part. The sections were studied after fixation. Boswell also is not signed to supp. rpt...209. I not only spotted it but share your admiration for the skill of the bastard and in my note have what I'll probably use in the text. If it is skilled it is also marvelous self-characterization, Finck casting himself as villain. Your help on bullets in SOUP made me better able to fully appreciate this....214: I disagree. By the time of his N.O. testimony, to say "don't recall" about fragments in the neck, when he has written his own 1967 report and read the panel's is perjury. It is worse than evasion. and he had to have seen them the night of the autopsy. Note my citation of Humes' testimony on this in FM III)...at this point I also disagree with your opinion the panel will have to repudiate what it said of these fragments. They dare not. Their play is silence behind the existing official protection. It was built into the charge Clark/Eardley gave them. Next a.m.p.4, note Galloway in FM in Specter memo. The added significance of this is that it is in contradiction with Humes, I am pretty certain, and it places Fine at the hospital for a rather long period "unday...I refer to my previous comments on the General and suggest Finck was still doing a job here to protect those really needing protection, not the general but the admirals....Certain I do have name of radiologist, perhaps in FM...18: when you consider what they did do to the body you can best understand the flippancy of this "answer" about the neck. Oser didn't make the Y-cut clear, but when you see Curry's book, if you haven't already seen the Oswald autopsy photo, you'll get it....23: Definitely here is deception. as it

3". Or 3 3/4"? Both invalidate Report. both "definitely" are not 4"....28 compare with Humes (again as in MILL-H saying the radiologist read them while they all looked at them, so they all read them, including Finck and even Kellerman)....31: the interesting thing is I recall no reference to the rect. structure from the X-ray readings, only from the pictures. My recall can be wrong, but this it is. I have been pursuing this by other means. I presume any "structure" would show in the X-rays, but I do not suppose there could not have been an "oversight" or that one of the X-rays or more might not have been present. This is one of the reasons I have been pressing on the correct number from the first.

Real Orwell, no?

After reading it, can you believe it could have happened?

It's Dr. Fincklove. Who appears to have his own strange loves.

However, I also think it can be enough to measure him for a cell, whether or not it ever puts him there.

- pl25(10ff): "...did not strike major bones". I suggest that by analogy this be compared to the autopsy report's gambit about there being no "major" portion of a bullet in the neck area (although we know that there were minor portions, which is a startling piece of knowledge). Consider the possibility that bullet struck "minor bones" in the neck area-- whatever "minor# may mean. In this same matter, see p. 137 (17ff): "It is possible this bullet produced an entry and exit, as I testified, without producing gross evidence of bone damage."
- pl27(15f): Again, the "no bullets in the cadaver" gambit.
- pl28(5ff): Here F says he examined incision in the front of the neck, but did not see the missile wound that was evident in the Panel photo and (in the flesh) to Dr Akin at Parkland. Akin saw the missile wound after the traceotomy had been performed. Either Finck is lying, or somebody cut out evidence of that wound ~~after~~ before Finck saw it. Either way, it indicates that somebody there knew of the wound and knew that it was an entrance wound.
- pl28(14ff): F expresses puzzlement about outlet for back wound. This puzzlement is justification for the dissection that was never performed. If there was puzzlement, I think it was puzzlement over how best to conceal the truth.
- pl30(12): "from the acromion down" should be "from the acromion (sk) down"; the word here should be "mastoid".
- pl30(22): "generally forward direction": this is hedging. I think JFK was forced into a position that gave them the measurements they wanted, not those that were relevant.
- pl32(20ff): This is not an answer (The question is at lines 10ff)
- pl38(1ff): "don't remember" fragments in neck: evasion of the worst sort. I'll bet my sweet ass that the bastard remembers more than he would like to-- and that he knows what the fragments mean.
- pl38(24): Note: no reply at all to the question, not even a phony non-answer.
- ~~pl38~~ pl39 (12ff): Not an answer.
- pl39 (25): Finally we get the name Eardley-- another name to go after.
- pl48(5ff): Further info that Finck made close examination of the edges of the front neck wound: "very close gross examination". Each such reference is a sword we can flay ~~that~~ them with. Anybody who looked even casually at that wound cannot have avoided seeing the missile wound.
- pl52(20): F insists he did not see the missile wound in the front neck. I am half inclined to believe him. If what he says is true, then there can be no doubt that somebody cut out the missile wound. It was there and it was visible when the Panel photo was taken.
- pl60(19): Wound at the back of head "slightly above" EOP. The same formulaic expression.
- pl61(12): Same thing; "slightly higher" than EOP.
- pl62(5ff and 12); Notice F's statement that Humes' drawing is incorrect.

- pl66(14f): I repeat (from previous note) that it seems absurd that the wound in the back can have been higher than the position indicated in Humes' drawing. (regard this note with care-- I am not sure now what Ex.68 depicts).
- pl67(21ff): same as above. Notice again the information that drawing is not accurate.
- pl69(2f): This is not an answer. But even as a non-answer, it is a damaging bit of information.
- pl71(11ff): More reference that drawing not accurate; Followed by classic Finckian non sequitur, that no one photo shows both front and back wounds together,
- pl72(19ff): It seems absurd that he should first notice the discrepancy when he saw the photos, and not before, when he first saw the drawing. Finck has previously cited his memory of the corpse as his source-- it was likely to be functioning better when he first saw the drawing than later.
- pl75(12ff): Finck tries to duck questions related to microscopic exam of section from margin of scalp wound. At line22 he indicates he did not make micro exam, but depended on Humes' report. In this matter, too, that makes Humes the man to go after. There is further discussion related to this on p.176, but it adds nothing to this.
- pl76(21ff): The "ragged" character of the wound in the back of the head is not necessarily indicative of direction, exit or entry. ~~Wounds~~ Entrance wounds on skin where there is immediately underlying bone (as on the skull) often have ragged edges, moreso than entrance wounds in skin where soft flesh is underlying. If you want an explanation, ask for it and I'll elaborate. For the time being, do not regard the "ragged" edges as significant of anything at all, for that feature alone does not bear on the question of entrance or exit. The really important consideration is the cratering at the inner table of the skull; this can mean only one thing: entrance from the smaller end of the crater.
- pl97(10ff): F's answer is evasive. "This measurement (of 100mm) refers to X-ray films", and other similar statements diminishing the relevance of that measurement must be considered in light of the knowledge that no other measurement exists in the published record.
- See especiall the statement that begins on line 23 of this page:"So there was a difference between measurements made on the X-ray films and photographs or photograph and the actual measurements on the cadaver". There exists no "actual measurement" of the cadaver indication the height of this wound above the EOP. We know the lateral distance to the right of the EOP, but from Finck in the N.O. testimony, from Humes, and from the autopsy report all we know is that it is "slightly" above the EOP, which is not a measurement.
- This particular evasion has been used with such consistent regularity that I am sure it will be used again, so be careful of it.
- 180(20f): Notice Oser's "slightly above"; He's gobbled up the bait that Finck laid out for him. The spider and the fly-- guess who's the fly!*

- p180(22ff): Evasive non-answer. Hi,ho,the merry-o, the spider eats the fly.
- p183(25) and the discussion on p184: Again, all F wants to tell is the "approximate" location of the wound at back ~~and~~ of head. The regularity with which he evades this matter is indicative of its importance.
- p184(8ff): More reference to "approximate" location and to non-measurements ("slightly above"; that old refrain.)
- p186(17ff): More evasion over the same matter. Apparent explanation for reticence is not an explanation.
- p190(18ff): (The Court's instruction to the witness): It's about time. The fault is Oser's, not the Court's, for letting Finck duck questions. ~~XX~~ If Oser is willing to put up with it, why should the Court intervene without prompting?
- 192(6ff): "The wound as seen at the time of the autopsy was not as high as that (depicted on Exhibit 68)"-- Didn't F say previously that the wound as depicted on the drawing was too low? I think so. If so, his statement here contradicts what he said before.
- 193(19-22): ~~XXXXXX~~ Notice failure to examine left side of brain. I think this very, very important, and strongly suspect that the left side of the brain says things that Finck et al. do not want to hear-- or do not want us to here. That area of the brain has to contain important information-- indicated by the consistency with which they ignored it, though it could not rightly be ignored.
- 193(25): "The most massive lesions were on the right side (of the brain)": The reference to "most massive" lesions on the right side suggest (to me) that there may have been lesions on the left side which ~~are characterized~~ perhaps we can characterize as "less than most massive". Again I repeat that there has to be something very important about the left side of the brain-- something they have not told us about.
- p195(18ff): Not an answer (still with reference to left side of brain).
- p196(8f) : (Re possibility of fragments in left side of brain)
Not an answer.
- p197(3): (Rectangular structure in brain): "I don't know what it means" is not an answer, but indicates that Finck saw the evidence of it. There is no excuse for ignoring it.
- 197(23): Not an answer, but the info he gives is interesting.
~~XXXXXX~~ That there were many bone fragments in the head is new information, and important. The bone that separated from the cratered part at the back of the skull cannot have produced "many" fragments (if I understand "many" rightly), and such bone fragments as may have resulted from that source would not have moved far from their point of origin. Bone fragments in the head that come from any other source than the crater at the back can only have ~~XXXX~~ resulted from bones being pushed inward by shot from the front. According to WC version, all the matter was cast outward by rear shot.
- On the top of p.198, the word "positively" may be a form of ducking the question. It may mean that he can make a good guess at what the rectangular structure is; as an expert he has the warrant for such conjecture (and in this case the duty, whatever meaning that has to these people).

- p.198(20f); The wording is odd, so maybe here I'm making more than the situation deserves. "I don't remember a fragment from the brain...". My next question would be: Do you remember a fragment in the brain. Maybe there is not much here, just odd phraseology.
- p199(passim) : Notice the information (confession?) that there was no complete autopsy-- or at least that F ~~xxx~~ did not do a complete autopsy. That's not news, of course, but it's good to have information from the horse's (snake's?) mouth.
- p200(13ff): Not an answer.
- p207(3ff) : Notice: Humes responsible for the "study" of the brain. It may be that those in control simply felt it best to have Finck be as little informed as possible. His testimony in N.O. indicates the usefulness to "them" of an uninformed "expert".
- p207(10): Not an answer. As I recall, F has not yet been asked (or at least never answered) whether he saw the rectangular structure. Here he only says he didn't read about it. Big deal.
- p207(9ff): Notice info re disintegration into numerous fragments; this type of disintegration incompatible with a bullet like 399, as I explained before.
- p209(20,24): Spider and the fly again. Finck really has Oser by the balls, and Oser doesn't even know it. In line 15 ~~xx~~ Oser refers to a copper jacketed bullet. Line 20: Finck rephrases: "Can a bullet disintegrate...". Oser urges him on: "Yes, yes" (The spider now has his meal; yum, yum, delicious!" Finck's answer to the rephrased question is correct, 100%, ippsy, pippsy: ~~XXXXXX~~ "...a bullet can disintegrate.." Hurrah for the spider!
- Do you follow that exchange? Finck is marvelous, and I can't help but admire his skill. It's ~~really~~ really amazing. He can now nibble his fly at leisure, as he does on the next page.
- p210(7): "A bullet...". Nibble, nibble, nibble; yum, yum, yum.
- p214(10): No answer. "Don't recall" is evasion of matters related to metal fragments in neck. The significance of these fragments is so clear, so unequivocal, that the mere acknowledgement of their existence is tantamount to acknowledgement that 399 did not damage to JFK.
- One way or another, sooner or later, the Panel is going to be forced to repudiate what they said about these fragments. I don't know how it will come about, but it is something that supporters of the WR cannot live with.
- p211(2): Not an answer.
- p226(21ff): Not an answer.
- p229(2ff): The Courts account is pure gobby-gook; you can imagine what the jury must have made of all this testimony.

more to come

(The following page references pertain to the PROCEEDINGS of Tuesday, Feb. 25, 1969)

- p2(22ff) and p3(1ff): This is a good point that Oser makes. Too bad Dymond cut him off.
- p4(21f): Notice: Adm. Galloway ordered the insertion of "presumably" for entry of back wound.
- p6(passim): Notice the plethora on military brass. It would be bad enough merely that they should be present, but that ant should intervene and give instructions to the docs is interference in a civil case-- indeed, one in which the suspect is alive and in custody. Many of F's remarks also indicate chaos in a situation that should have been conducted in calm.
- p6(11ff): This General in charge is somebody to go after. Wish we knew who he is.
- p7(4ff): Not an answer. The General doesn't have to have anything to do with the signing of the report in order to influence it-- and greatly. "Signing" has nothing to do with the question.
- p12(16-20):(Finck as an expert in spelling): The Court's remark here must have had them rolling in the aisles. If you write a bit on Finck's spelling, you have got to make this the coup de grâce.
- 15f: All references to "no bullet" in the body are means not only of ducking the fragments in the neck, but also of making it appear that there is no evidence of any bullet or fragments in the body. This is, of course, a continuation of the autopsy report gambit about "no major part of a bullet" in the body. On line 4:"no bullet in some part of the body"; lines 88f: "X-rays will reveal the presence of a bullet"; p.16(5ff): "but he (the radiologist) stated that there was no entire bullet remaining in the cadaver...no bullet in that cadaver". Finck's statement "there were fragments, metallic fragments in the head" sandwiched in between the references ~~xxxxxx~~ to "no entire bullet" in the cadaver indicates to me that he knows goddamned well what he is hiding.
- Finck had indicated in previous testimony that the docs got "nothing" from the radiologist. Here he says he got a report that there was no entire bullet.
- It is important, as I mentioned earlier, to learn the name of the radiologist.
- 17(19ff): Re failure to dissect because it produces "a great deal of mutilation". What a lot of bullshit crap.
- 18(2): "I did not do any extensive dissection along the bullet path": This may imply (in the use of "extensive") that ~~there~~ there was some dissection-- maybe just enough to learn what important truth it was necessary to hide.
- p18(9): Not an answer. Anyway, somebody must have considered dissection, for what else would have motivated the General to order no dissection of the neck. There had to be some impulse for that order, and it had to be that somebody suggested (threatened?) dissection.

(Finck--N.O.)

- p20(3): This is good to hear from the mout of Finck, but it's no different from his WC testimony.
- p21(13): "Bullet often disintegrates..": Not true of a bullet like 399.
- p23(9ff): I repeat for emphasis: there is no record of any measurement made "on photos" or "on the skull itself". All we have from the autopsy docs is "slightly above" the EOP, which is not a measurement, and is not even a reliable approximation.
Lines 13f: "slightly above"; same refrain.
- p23(15f): "definitely not 4 inches or 100mm above it"; atleast a definite statement, but it does not tell us all that much.
- p24(8f): Oser agin has taken Finck's bait; what a sucker! This time it's Oser who is talking about "measurements from the actual cadaver itself"
- p25(15ff): Not an answer.
- p28(6f): Same as p23(15f), above)
- p28(18ff): This is interesting. F say the head X-rays but not the body X-rays. He relied on the radiologist's report. Or was it the radiologist's non-report?
Repeat: go after the radiologist.
- p29 (1ff): Same as above. The radiologist gave info that there was no bullet remaining in the body; he must have been the first to know that there were fragments in the neck and he must have reported about those fragments.
- p31(1ff): This is crap. F cites the Panel Report regarding the rectangular structure, although he himself had seen the X-rays (and consequentlt the rectangular structure) and could have discussed it on the basis of his own ~~know~~ observation.
- p31(24): How can he not know what the rectangular structure refers to?
- p32(4): Not an answer. I suspect that "I don't remember" could more truthfully be rendered as " I would like to forget".
- p32(17-20): Ich war gezwungen.
- p36(5ff): Ich wär gezwungen.

The End