Gary Shaw
305 N. Main St.,
Vlebu rne, TX 76033-0722

5/24/94

Dear Gary,

As I wrote you yesterday before I grew too tired, up early this morning I finished reading the amended complaint and its attachments. As a defense against the charges made against him what Dr. Crenshaw did, as reflected in the exhibits, is more than adequate, I think. But I write this because I think that in court your lawyers may not want to content themselves with defening him and may want to do the job that is possible on those attacking him and on those used to attack him. And I am talking about their integrity, their honesty, their saying other than they knew to be true. And how they knew it.

Please excuse my not taking the time to sit down and think this through, to outline and organize it, because I have to leave soon - at 3 a.m. your time and it is almost 3 a.m. our time now. So I just put down some things I think they may want to know. If any of it is of interest to them for what follows I can then cite the proof that in almost all instances will be the official proof.

My belief, by the way, is that after NEVER AGAIN! is published Specter will not run for any public office again.

And the conjectures he asked the Dallas doctors to make when he deposed them (Crenshaw was) are far from all. All his questions relating to that bastard of his, the single-bullet theory, are more, worse than conjectures. He asked them not to have 399 in mind at all and then used that testimony as relating to it.

Carrico was the only doctor to see the President before his clothing was removed. He twice testified to the WC that the front neck wound was above the shirt collar. That alone ends the single-bullet theory. He and two nurses indicate that the clothing was removed in the usual manner. That means cut off. In Post Mortem I got into his personal demonstration to me of how that was done and that demonstrated to me how the damage-all the damage to the tie and to the front of the shirt collar was caused by a scalpel used by Hencheliffe or Bowron. No bullet at all!

Dr. Crenshaw said in what he wrote that he did not go into the wound on the President's back and for his purpose he had no need to. But with no visible damage to the front of the shirt from an exiting bullet, your lawyers may want to have the field day they can have over it. I go into that often and in different kinds of detail in the book and all from the official evidence I drew together. The end result would be to prove that without question the shot from the front was higher than the shirt collar, the shot in the back, rather the wound, was lower by much than the autopsy and the Commission say and ~~between the two~~ all involved knew, as the ~~forensic~~ pathologist Lundberg should have known. This means that they knew they were contriving a false case. There is much that relates to this

in the book. Moreover, if Lundberg is to be questioned in court, what your lawyers can do to him on this, including with demonstrations on his body of on another body with him asked to testify to what he observes. This is only one of the ways he can be utterly ruined as a pathologist and as a medical editor.

There is no real question about it, Humes knew as early as 10 p.m. DC time the night of the assassination and before 11 what Perry had seen and said at his press conference. I have that in unknown official records as well as from other sources in the book. What everybody missed but is in the WC testimony is that because Perry knew that Humes knew and more, what Humes was going to say in the autopsy, he ducked out of the press conference scheduled for 11/23/63 and asked Clark to take it for him. It is in Clark's WC testimony. You can find in through the index to my first book. You can find the Carrico testimony I refer to above in Post Mortem, through its index. And I think you may want to read there what I say that Perry told me the day I interviewed both him and Carrico.

Humes also knew from the newspaper he cited in his autopsy procotcol that Perry had said the shot was from the front on 11/22. They could have known that at the hospital easily before 10 p.m., the early edition of that paper is out that early the night before. It was in fact reported in all the papers. I cite also that day's New York Times' use of the AP story reporting it. So, obviously, it was all over radio and TV.

Humes may be a decent man who was under great pressure or he may be another kind of man but there is no question about his not behaving as a medical man, as a pathologist, as an autopsy prosector. He knew exactly what he was doing when he did it and what I refer to above is not all of that. Note that all of this was available to JAMA before it wrote a word if it had been interested in learning and telling the truth.

In writing you yesterday I said that Humes swore in contradiction to himself about what certainly seems to be material. Before the Commission he testified that what he burned, and this was as soon as he knew Oswald had been killed, was the holograph of the first autopsy report he had just finished writing. What he swore to before HSCA is that what he burned was his notes. He did not burn his notes. He turned them in and I have the receipts for them. Specter had them when he questioned witnesses and identified where they were in the commission file the number of which he gave and the exhibits in which they would appear-and of course do not. They also are not, or were not when I examined it, in that commission file. I had Howard Roffman go over the proctocol and list all the specific data for which there is no source in the commission's record and obviously had to come from those notes. The only possible explanation is that the notes had to disappear because they destroy the official "solution." (They may have been hidden, as the official certificate of death was hidden and I got it by accident. I think your lawyers should know that it locates the wound in the back at the level of the third thoracic vertebra, not in the neck at all.

Bearing on the shot or shots to the head, there is, as with all else, very much of which Mr. Crenshaw reflected no knowledge when he wrote his defenses. You may remember that I used the autopsy proctocol's account of it to show that all the damage to the head could not have been done by a shot from Oswald's rifle, referring to those 40 dust-like particles. Impossible for military ammo. I now have two to have that in an official record in NEVER AGAIN! More than one such record. Humes had to know. It was discussed there.

Referring to that wound, I think your lawyers may want to know the changes made in the autopsy report on it. What I have on this 7th page in facsimile in PM shows it. I made that copy from the original holograph at the Archives when I found that, also hidden. What the xerox does not show is that he used ruled white paper, the ruling a thin blue.

I think the book leaves no reputation at all for Humes, Boswell or Finck. The same for Lundberg and Breo.

I do not know what will yet happen in court or what your lawyers believe they want to happen or to be able to do there but I can see this as of incredible potential, of results and importances they probably cannot imagine. It can be a way of ending the official assassination mythology once and for all and not in books but in court, where our judicial system, our system of justice can work. Beyond belief to me, really, what can be possible!

If you read NEVER AGAIN!? and so far as I am concerned you are welcome to do that, and see what I do in the book that, remember, was triggered and made possible for me, both, by the dishonesty of what JAMA did, you will see what I mean because you can use all of it. And you'll leave nothing of JAMA's reputation, either. Which is at it should be. I am confident they 'd have to fire Lundberg and not use Breo again. Or fire him is he is staff. Those awful people just whored with out history!

I think I'll still be able to mail this today. I hope to be able to read and correc correct it when I'm home and then to mail it when I leave for a morning medical appointment.

By the way, you and your lawyers should realize, with all the other side yapping a about conspiracies theorized, the official account is nothing else and all defenses of it also are theories. No more. Not a bit more. Except that they were known to be impossible when they were made up.

I'll read the transcripts when I can, as soon as I can, and thanks for them. They will be part of the deposit of all my records in a permanent free archive.

Best wishes,

Harold

In writing the foregoing in haste I may not have made clear that I was thinking in terms of testimony and cross-examination. I assume there will be that. Your lawyers can legitimately try the case while not seeming to do that. Doing that would be objected to and the objection would probably be sustained. It would not be that but the end product of the proper examination, of what they published, ~~would be that~~.

Especially with Humes the witness.

I have little-known if not unknown <u>official</u> records reflecting that in the middle of the autopsy the Secret Service and the FBI agents there recognized that the ammo that cause those many dust-like fragments could not have come from the kind of bullet that could have caused the wounds to Connnally as they little understood that and the other injuries to Kennedy in particular. It was the Secret Service that had the second set of X-rays taken and the FBI that phoned the FBI Lab to get an opinion on what kind of bullet could have had all that fragmentation. Under the Geneva convention that is impossible for the kind Oswald is said to have used.

All FBI interest in that ended what the Lab told I think it was Sibert that a bullet had been found, as I recall an entire bullet, at the hospital. It, obviously, had not fragmented at all!

What fun it would be to question the expert/editor/pathologist ~~Humes~~ Lundberg on that, in addition to Humes. In the course of examining him on what he published.

And show and introduce the documents.

I can see the potential of destroying the official farce of a solution once and for all and in open court in questioning Humes in particular of what he told JAMA and the JAMA phonies on what they published-without doing any checking at all.

I think Humes would go to pieces in being questioned about his sworn testimony that he did not call Perry until Saturday with all the proof that he did that before he finished with the body. And I have that under oath, from someone at the autopsy examination, the late Dr. Ebersole, the radiologist.

My there is so much, so very much, and I think it is relevant in establishing that Dr. Crenshaw was damaged and why.

#