Gary Shaw
805 N. Main St.,
Cleburne, TX 76033-0722

5/29/94

Dear Gary,

I've now finished with the transcripts for which I again thank you. My impression of Kizza is even more that of an able and extraordinarily patient man. Breo is an arrogant, insufferably self-important dope. I think that at trial Kizza will make a spectacle of him and that he'll come apart, with more a prospect that he will than that Lundberg will. His testimony is a man of bluster and bull and for a supposedly experienced reporter he was remarkably ignorant of the subject matter.

They did get away with what I think may be a serious misrepresentation in referring to the WC Report as its "summary volume." It is not that at all and was not presented as that. Rather is it, among other things, the Commission's conclusions. It is not in any sense a "summary" of anything, particularly not of the medical evidence.

I'm glad that Kizzia finally did get into the record that all that JAMA did was in answer to Oliver Stone, hardly a medical or scientific purpose. I say finally. This was before Lundberg. I read Lundberg first.

Perhaps Kizza did not care about it but another point I think he may want to be clear on is Humes' notes. Breo said that Humes said he destroyed them to get rid of the blood on them so that nobody in the future could exploit that blood and that before destroying them he copied them. In all aspects this is false. It is an area I referred to earlier as Humes perjury. He swore on two different occasions to different destructions. More than in Post Mortem I go into this in NEVER AGAIN! Because Kizza did refer to is it CD 392 he should know the truth. Another aspect of this is the way I begin NEVER AGAIN!

Humes did not destroy his notes. He used them in writing the proctocol. The facsimile reproduction of the holography in Post Mortem is from the original. I've mislaid the 35mm pictures I have of it but the xerox I used in the book was xeroxed for me from the original. Humes wrote it on a white pad that had thin blue lines. I had Howard Roffman check the sources of measurements in the proctocol from known existing sources. What he did and I reflect in Post Mortem extablishes that there is no source for much in the proctocol in the known existing records. Humes' notes were his source. He did not destroy them. I have receipts for them to the Navy from the Secret Service/Burkley. What Humes destroyed is the original proctocol holograph. And he did that as soon as he knew that Oswald was dead and there would be no trial. The existing holograph of the proctocal was edited in Admiral Galloway's office the evening of 11/24/63. I think Kizzia should read the original of the existing holograph on its page 7 with regard to the entry of the head wound and the correction of it to eliminate that Humes described it as a penetrating wound tangeantial to the surface of the scalp. (Post Mortem 516)

These notes at the least, and it is many years so I can't be firm in my recollection,

were said by Specter to be among what is in the CD to which Kizzia referred, as I now recall CD 392, and in that questioning Specter also said that it was identical to as I now recall and my be wrong; about, Exhibit 387. The notes and probably other things I now do not recall are in neither. I went through that CD and the exhibit is published. I do recall going into this is some detail in NEVER AGAIN!

Coinciding with Humes's destruction of the original autopsy holography as soon as he knew that Oswald was dead is what I regard and refer to as a de facto government conspiracy not to investigate the crime itself at almost the same instant, as soon as downtown they knew Oswald was dead and there would be no trial. That conspiracy involved at the least Hoover and Katzenbach. I have the documents on this, too. I also have documentation that the White House was involved and approved it that night. In the book. Not literally the White House then because LBJ was not yet in it. So it was as the least Bill Moyers and LBJ personally.

I do not know of you or Kizzia wrote the publisher and asked for a copy but if you should come here or send someone I have the documentation for each chapter in the file folder in which I have the draft of that chapter.

And as I said earlier, as best a nonlawyer can have such an opinion, I think that in his questioning Kizzia asked what got responses that can be used as what I think would be a proper means of getting this kind of thing before the jury. "Did you testify on deposition that....? I show you.....and ask you....."

If I did not tell you I also have on the head wound from new information what means that Sibert and O'Neill knew the head X-rays proved JFK was hit there by what could not have been one of those Mannlicher-Carcanno military bullets. I had indicated this earlier in Post Mortem, as I recall, in referring to those "40 dust-like fragments." On seeing that Sibert I think phoned the FBI Lab about them to ask what kind of bullet could have acted that way, not his exact words that I do have. The Lab closed that off in telling him that a bullet had been found at the hospital.

If Kizzia wants to use it for possible effect on the jury, on any on it who might resent the effort to ~~make~~ blame the family/Jackie for what was not done in the autopsy that should have been done, I now have that, with official documents, that it was the Navy, Galloway, without contact with anyone else outside the autopsy room. Also in the Afterword in which I included this new evidence, and from of all people, Finck!

Are you beginning to see that NEVER AGAIN! can once and for all be the end of the official assassination mythology? I am disturbed that its publication has been delayed so long and I do wonder why, but immobile as I am can't do much, having no alternative for publication. I think that Kizzia can do that in open court with what I have.

Whether or not he uses it there is something regard the head wound I think he should know. I'll tell you the story so he can see how this is unknown and how I discovered it. My source is the original Zapruder film and it shows no wound on the back of the head

after Z313. And to me clearly. It was when Crazy Harry Livingstone asked me what he should study when he went to the Archives for the first time to study the film and I told him he would not like what I'd suggest and he insisted and he saw it for himself, That he decided I had to be an agent and that the film was doctored.

When I exposed in Whitewash II that the commission did not publish all the frames it was to have published and the government ~~as~~ was embarrassed the Archives apologized to me. I was invited to examine them and they were added to the then one tray of thoe slides, made by LIFE, not the FBI. The FBI made black and whites from those color slides for publication but the last nine that were to have been published were not. My recollection is of a game with numbers that I discovered. They were to have publisher through Z343 and instead published through Z334. You and Kizzia can see this on any VCR of a clear version of the film. I have some prints made for me from one but that does not permit great enlargement without rectangles taking over. My clear copy of the Z film I've given to Hood College. A decent enlargement can be made from any good print.

As after the fatal shot JFK starts to fall over onto Jackie he begins by turning toward her. I first saw this at the Archives enlarged to about four feet wide. I should say that the print I gave Hood was from Groden and made from his best copy. We were once friends. Lil and I are the godparents of his first-born. He did his original work for me.

As JFK turns to his left, toward Jackie, for several frames the back of his head is clearly visible. There is no sign of any bullethole on it, not trace of any blood, and there is no blood on the back of his short collar, which ~~that~~ is clearly visible, or on the jacket. This is more than 20 frames after the fatal shot impacted. It is several frames after Z 334.

If Kizzia anticipates they may use some of Posner on the single-bullet theory I have that adequately taken care of in the part of Case Open that was not used. They did not use 75-80 of it, why I do not know.

In his questioning of Breo Kizzia referred to and showed him pictures of the front of the shirt collar and of the tie. I presume he had in mind what I have in Post Mortem. You/he are welcome to the clear prints I have of the front of the shirt collar that I use in that book and of some recent work done for me on the official-evidence pictures of the knot of the tie. That picture is among those the FBI gave the Commission the Archives photogtapher told me were so poor the FBI had to use all its not inconsiderable skills to make it that poor. It does not even show the tie's pattern. I had that raised to visibility for me at of all places The Pentagon. And there are very good and clear pictures of the tie, not the knot, which the FBI had taken apart (and put together for HSCA again!), taken for me but copies not given to me by oder of a federal court. The pattern is clearly visible in FBI Exhibit 60 to CD1. It also is in Post Mortem.

Particularly if Kizzia believes they may produce Carrico as a witness he should

know what I wrote about Carrico in Post Mortem. Perry too.

On this, again from the Afterword of NEVER AGAIN! I have what was long suppressed, the sworn testimony of Ebersole who was there when it happened, that Perry was phoned by Humes on 11/22, not after daylight on 11/23, for the first time. Ebersole timed it at after 10 and before 11, or before the examination was completed. More Humes perjury?

This, of course confirms Crenshaw who reported (do you recall the page? I do not) that Perry looked worn out when he got to the hospital 11/23 because calls had kept him up who he should have been asleep, calls from the navy hospital as I recall he quoted a nurse as saying Perry told her.

Breo is a whore who ~~reflect~~ reflects no standards as a reporter or as what he calls himself, as a journalist. While my reporting days are of many years ago, I know enough about recognized standards. I think that any competent professor of journalism could go over his deposition and testify that, assuming Kizzia wants to show irresponsibility and departure from recognized standards, Breo testified to the abandonment of recognized standards from just what he testified he did not look at, what he ignored. Ditto for Lundberg as an editor.

The same for all the literature he said he did not look at. It is not all conspiracy-theory literature. Mine, for example, isn't. And I wrote more about the medical evidence (as distinguished from theories) than anyone else.

I have much more on Boswell's interviews JAMA said he did not give in NEVER AGAIN! than Kizzia used. And I made no effort to be exhaustive. There were those I did not use.

I refer above to Humes' lying about getting rid of all that had JFK's blood on it and of Breo's testimony on this. The body chart was not copied. I held it in my hands. I mean the original. It is a ~~mimeographed~~ Navy form used in autopsies, not what Boswell told Breo as I recall it, and the stains of JFK's body fluids are clear on it. Boswell did not copy that, or Humes did not, rather, and it was made by Boswell.

The deposition testimony Kizzia got on peer ~~revel~~ reviews are not of authentic peer reviews at all. Among the ~~xxx~~ reasons is that pathologists alone cannot give an authentic peer review to such artifiles. Not in a crime of violence.

NEVER AGAIN! has had ~~two~~ complete professional peer reviews and several other not complete. It was retyped on his computer by one of my peer reviewers, Prof. David Wrone. The other is Prof. Gerald McKnight, here at Hood. Both are professional historians and each teaches a course in the assassination and thus are subject experts, too. The partial ones are by a sociologist who also teaches criminalistics and an assassination course and by a lawyer who is seeking to perfect the archive of Warren Commission Member Senator John Sherman Cooper and whose wife is a medical-records expert who helped me.

No outgoing mail for two days so I'll let reading and correcting this wait a little while so I may not miss as many corrections and perhaps remember more that might be of some use to you. Best, Harold