

Beginning the middle of page 181 WHITEWASH has a lengthy discussion of the photographs and Xrays as an essential ~~part~~ but missing part of the autopsy examination. With all the too-many existing questions about the autopsy, it says, "With this elaborate photographic record, why should there ever have been any questions about the exact location of ~~the~~ each of the wounds?" It points out the photographic evidence ^{is in} ~~was~~ not the Commission's evidence, where it should have been - ~~must~~ have been. It then quotes the testimony of the autopsy doctors in which they practically beg for the use of these photographs and Xrays, saying they are "routine". It further quotes the doctors as knowing they would not have access to these essential pieces of evidence and their ^{substitution of} ~~recourse to~~ artist's representations as the dubious basis of their testimony.

Then, in ~~mid~~ February 1965, almost two years ago, I asked why what lawyers call "best evidence", was not good enough for the autopsy report on a President of the United States and for the "report on the official investigation of his assassination. Since then, for this is not a new question, it has been unanswered.

Despite more polite designation usually applied, this amounts to suppression. Unfortunately, it is not the only suppression of what involves no legitimate question of national security in the ordinary sense, or of good taste or the protection of informants. I have from February 1965 called attention to others. For example, spectrographic examination of the whole bullet and various fragments, discussed at some length in WHITE WASH beginning on page 181 and in the conclusions. ^(p. 190) The spectrographic analysis is not in the record of the Commission. It is not in the bibliography of the Commission's files in the archive. The bullet and the fragments and the various test bullets have not hitherto been in the archive. Unless they are accompanied by a publicly-available ~~is~~ spectrographic analysis, transferring the storage of these important pieces of elements from one department to another has no meaning other than a continuation of what amounts to deception.

The spectrographer was the last witness before the Commission. He appeared a week before its Report. He was not asked about his spectrographic examinations of the bullet and the fragments.

This is a fatal defect in the evidence. It amounts to suppression.

My demand that this evidence be made public goes back to February 1965.

In a letter to J. Edgar Hoover of May 23 of this year, before any of the other books were published and before any ~~others~~ others made such demands, to the best of my knowledge, I called a number of defects in the FBI's reports and testimony to Mr. Hoover's attention. He has not yet responded. Perhaps an excerpt from this letter is now in order:

"In his testimony before the Commission, FBI Agent Robert A. Frazier did not offer into evidence the spectrographic analysis of this bullet and that of the various bullet fragments. Neither ~~the~~ FBI agent John F. Gallagher, the spectrographer. Agent Frazier's testimony is merely that the bullets were lead, which would seem to be considerably less information than spectrographic analysis could reveal. The custodian of the National Archives informs me that this analysis is not included in his archive but is in the possession of the FBI. I call upon you to make it immediately available."

Here I also referred to the strange disinterest of the FBI and the Commission (WHITEWASH 163) in the fact that the bullet had been wiped clean and had never been examined to identify any residues that remained. Residues did remain.

At the same time I wrote Mr. James Rowley, head of the Secret Service, about various items, including access of qualified researchers to the ^{autopsy} picture and Xrays the Archives told me were in the possession of the Secret Service. I wrote the autopsy doctors asking questions and seeking interviews. I wrote members of the Commission between ~~the~~ beginning May 9 and by May 14. One ^{letter} was undelivered. In each case ¹ enclosed a copy of WHITEWASH in which ~~the~~ the questions are asked and the proofs included. Not a single one has answered. Then and earlier I was also in communication with others.

On May 26 I expressed to the archivist my apprehension over "the exclusion of the existing data from the archive, such as the photographs, Xrays and notes of the

autopsy, the spectrographic analysis of the bullets and fragments...Here there is no conceivable element of national security and there is an obvious element of suppression."

On June 14 I again called to his attention "what I have already called to the attention of the interested agencies, that certain of the evidence withheld from the archive, and the unclassified part of it, is improperly withheld. This includes the bullets and the fragments, including test bullets and fragments", etc.

So, these are not new questions. I have asked them from the first, publicly and privately. without adequate response. The new gestures are nothing else and from the accounts in the press mean nothing and make no new evidence available to researchers. They are but an effort to ease the heat the government is feeling from the people. Because these are legitimate demands, because the wrongs that were done should never have happened, these efforts to divert insistent and increasing demands for all and untainted information about the assassination of President Kennedy will not succeed. Indeed, they must not.

Initial publicity serves again to illustrate the lack of forthrightness in public statements on a subject of such national concern that only uninhibited truth can be accepted.

Arlen Specter, the Philadelphia lawyer who was, as assistant counsel, in charge of the autopsy inquiry (he is now that city's district attorney), said in the U.S. News and World Report dated October, in a story optimistically entitled "Truth About Kennedy Assassination", these things:

"The complete set of pictures taken at the autopsy was not made available to me or the Commission. I was shown one picture of the back of a body (my emphasis) which was represented to be the back of the President, although it was not technically authenticated..." (page 53). He also said that "the photographs and X-rays would, in the thinking of the Commission (being here carefully to seek to place his responsibilities upon the members of the Commission), not have been crucial because they would have served only to corroborate what the autopsy surgeons had testified to under oath..." For all his genius, I submit that without intimate examination of all

the pictures and Xrays, Mr. Specter was not in a position to make responsible comment on what they show. In any event, there is nothing more in need of corroboration than this testimony.

However, this is inconsistent with the report in the Washington Post of November 3, 1966, which quotes a Secret Service spokesman as saying that "the Commission staff had examined the photographs when it studied the autopsy procedures and results." It is this study over which Mr. Specter presided. He and the Secret Service cannot both be accurate.

When my new book, WHITEWASH II: WHO DID IT!, is published, ~~there~~ considerable amplification on all of these matters will be publicly available.

Nothing that has happened in any way alters the ~~an~~ unacceptable situation that has existed since the assassination. The whole and uncompromised truth is not known and it must be, regardless of what it says and where it leads.

Until then we must all bear in mind that the autopsy examination can address itself to but a limited aspect of both the assassination and its investigation. Should the pictures and Xrays be authenticated and should they confirm the testimony of the doctors, they can do nothing else and they do not address the great bulk of the tainted evidence and unanswered questions. The best we can expect of them is that they can show where and how many times the President was wounded. Not a thing else, *if that much.*

Among these unanswered questions is why Dr. Humes took it upon himself to burn any of the legally and historically important papers of the autopsy, as he did (WHITE WASH ~~183, 187~~) why the Commission and notably Mr. Specter were without question, and why Mr. Specter told US News Dr. Humes "explained his reasons fully (p.50) before the Commission" when he did not such thing and when Mr. Specter, whose function it was to conduct the hearing, did not even ask him to.

Belatedly placing the pictures and Xrays back in government possession accomplishes nothing because of the restrictions imposed. For 5 years only the government may have access to them; ~~Thereafter~~, for an indefinite but very long time, only pathologists. At that remote time in the future any knowledge that might be gained from examination of this evidence ^{will} be valueless. and it is not pathologists who should examine

this evidence in a vacuum but those familiar with the entire case and all of the evidence the government ~~has let us have~~ *seen fit to make public.*