

117  
Before leaving what is - and is not - in these files, perhaps there should be a word on what an autopsy is and should be. It is, of course, a post mortem examination, with dissection. It is not standard throughout the country. Within any one state, practices can vary, legally. Within Maryland, where the President's body was taken, as elsewhere, state autopsy regulations do not apply to those performed on federal property. Private studies evaluated autopsy practices in some states as entirely inadequate.

Dr. John M. Nichols, University of Kansas Medical Center pathologist informs me that "In a few states the laws are quite loose and the coroner himself can legally do the autopsy even if he is a truck driver in complete ignorance of things medical". On the other hand, in Connecticut, "it is a legal requirement that the pathologist be 'certified'," meaning by the American Board of Pathology. As I also learned, a pathologist experienced in determination of the cause of death from natural causes, may be without the required competence when he probes for the actual cause of death in crimes of violence.

~~From my own local officials~~ When I learned from my own local officials that getting a definitive statement of the State of Maryland minimum autopsy requirements would be impossible or meaningless, on May 24, 1966, I tried the District of Columbia, which is under federal control. A phone call to the coroner's office there was quite informative until it was clear my interest was in what would the autopsy protocol have contained had it been that of a President? Until that moment the requirements were explained with care.

Suppose a man had been shot to death, I was told, and there were two bullets in his body, or two bullet holes. The autopsy examination would include taking his body apart to actually trace the paths of both bullets. If the bullets were fired from different weapons or by different people,

the autopsy would be required to show which had been fatal. When a derelict is shot to death in the District of Columbia, this is what happens. "Just the other day", I was told, there had been a case like this. And, I was assured, there is no body glue to patch flesh rent by bullets.

With a bum in the District of Columbia, where the President lives, this is what happens. With the President, examined <sup>JUST</sup> across the boundary line, in a federal hospital in Maryland, with autopsy surgeons on the federal payroll, it is what didn't happen - but should - and could have.

Dr. Nichols is making a study of the Kennedy autopsy. He has already published a "Special Contribution" in the July 10, 1967, Journal of the American Medical Association. His earlier researches indicate that the President did have Addison's disease, an adrenal deficiency. His medical sleuthing was careful and detailed, extending backward through medical annals and newspapers for a period of 10 years. While he found it "noteworthy" there was no evidence this ailment ever handicapped the President, that, he despite it, "was continuously engaged in strenuous mental and physical activity." Dr. Nichols also felt impelled to comment that "the autopsy protocol is curiously silent" on the Addison's disease "as well as on details of the pituitary, of his vertebral column and sacro-iliac joints".

The reader will recall that the President had survived ~~repeated~~ and almost-fatal spinal surgery.

There is no stigma attached to Addison's disease, Dr. Nichols concluded, and control over it can be maintained more perfectly than, for example, over diabetes. It need never have interfered with his activity as President.

There can be little disagreement with Dr. Nichols' opinion "that the public is entitled to knowledge of the health of their Chief Executive and candidates for this office", One of the possible explanations for

this "strange silence" in the autopsy is "suppression...by relatives, or federal officials, or both". There may be doubt about the inspiration of the suppression but not about the fact of it.

A number of scientists and scientific groups have commented unfavorably about the President's autopsy examination and report, its conspicuous deficiencies and inadequacies and the exclusion of all non-military personnel from the examination. Because Dr. Nichols is of unquestioned medical qualification and is making a study of this particular autopsy, I asked him to comment on the essential requirement of such autopsies. Here are a few excerpts from his response:

"...The prosecutor must approach his legal problem somewhat differently than the usual hospital autopsy...defense counsel may request their own observer..."

Thermofax Fols, as marked

In carefully pointing out that the autopsy protocol is used by coroners <sup>and</sup> or prosecutors "to apprehend and convict the guilty", Dr. Nichols also expresses the corollary purpose, "or acquit the innocent". Among <sup>o</sup> these "cases on record" where autopsies acquitted the innocent, he cites one "where the deceased was shot in the <sup>head</sup> ~~head~~ and chest six times while" presumably asleep in bed. The accused confessed. However, microscopic examination of the heart revealed death occurred four hours prior to shooting. The accused was released because "you cannot kill a dead man."

Nothing like this was involved in the President's murder, but the same principles are, the same scientific and legal requirements - which were not met. When the examination was conducted, there was a live Oswald to be defended in court. After he, in turn, was murdered, a "revised" autopsy report, which would not be subject to cross-examination - for there was then nothing to take to court - was filed. It was suppressed for ten months and then only partly released, with the mass and sensation of the

17

Mr. Harold Weisberg (continued)

- 2 -

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS  
MEDICAL CENTER

be present. The body must be absolutely identified. The protocol of the late President does not indicate that he was identified! The body must be weighed, measured and inspected all over; all orifices must be examined, especially the vagina in the female. Sketches with measurements must be made of any unusual findings together with color and black-white pictures. These photographs should be taken by the pathologist himself so one less person will be subpoenaed for the defense to tangle up at trial. They should also be developed by the pathologist himself. Entry and exit bullet holes must be recorded with precision. The pathologist himself should x-ray the body completely. The films must be developed and inspected prior to starting the autopsy; this may require 15 minutes but knowing the number and position of bullets is important as well as broken bones, tips of knife blades, etc. The pathologist keeps the film negatives himself to use at trial.

The remainder of the autopsy is somewhat like the usual hospital case. Of course, blood must be drawn for subsequent possible examination for poisons - alcohol, barbiturates, etc. All organs must be removed and inspected very carefully and photographs made with sketches of anything unusual. Samples of stomach content, liver, kidney, spleen, and brain must be preserved fresh in plastic sacks and frozen in a deep freeze for possible subsequent study for poisons. Especially urine must be preserved for possible study for barbiturates, etc. Representative sections of all organs must be taken and fixed in formaldehyde, this is whether they appear unusual or normal. Bullets must be kept separate because the deceased may have been shot from two or more guns and one bullet is found in a vital spot while the others are found in a lesser site. The prosecutor must keep the bullets, measure them with calipers, weigh them on an analytical balance, scratch his name on the nose or other place without making marks and give them to a person designated by the coroner and obtain a receipt. (Hair and nail clippings may be taken for arsenic study, etc.) The body must not be released until the prosecutor is satisfied that the cause of death is at hand. He then writes for the coroner a "PAD" or provisional anatomical diagnosis and on this indicates that he is holding, frozen in a deep freeze to which he only has the key, hair, clippings of nails, stomach contents, blood, urine, and various organs, and asks the coroner to advise about the disposition.

After the various tissues, brain, heart, kidneys, liver, spleen, gonads and all other tissues of the body have fixed for a day in formaldehyde they are stripped and given to the "tissue technicians" with the code number of the case. These girls dehydrate the tissues, mount them in paraffin blocks, and cut sections a few thousandths of an inch in thickness. The paraffin is removed, the sections re-hydrated, and stained and mounted on thin glass slides. The sections are studied by the pathologist with the microscope. This is where the major part of pathology enters in the ordinary hospital case, as in diagnosing tumors. The actual dissection of the body in the usual case is of lesser importance. After all tissues have been studied, this may require a month and if bones are involved, two months, a final autopsy protocol is written up completely and nothing omitted, and the pathologist expresses his opinion as to

Report, which submerged it and denied it the close scrutiny it required and thus escaped.

There is nothing right about this autopsy, nothing final, nothing that satisfies the need for definitive, irrefutable fact. It is inadequate, incomplete, incompetent, lacking honesty and objectivity in its report and in every single official use and misuse that was made of it, beginning with suppression and continuing with gutting.

We have as a national record, a final memento of a President, and eviscerated autopsy report in eviscerated files - eviscerated evidence, eviscerated history.

extra space

This, unfortunately, is not untypical. It is the total picture, of all the evidence, all the investigation, all files and records.

119  
For this President the archive is adequately served with nothing closer to original than carbon copies and Xeroxes of them of uncertain generation; altered and incomplete documents; doctored pictures never original, never properly introduced into evidence (none of the vital ones - not a single one - in accordance with the minimum requirements of law), and only those that could not be avoided - then only when they could no longer be avoided; and unstinted, uninhibited suppression, with each of those agencies having a vested interest in suppression exclusively empowered to decide upon and effectuate it.

This archival monument to the President is like the investigation of his murder, for that, too, was of conspicuous incompleteness, designed dishonesty and calculated indefiniteness. Essential ~~was~~ witnesses were neither sought nor called, their evidence denied, <sup>to</sup> the solution of the crime and history. Evidence was destroyed. Its destruction was virtually assured by official inaction and action - in the case of the pictures, as PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH records and documents with the Commission's own until-then suppressed files - and in the case of the landmarks vital to photo intelligence.

Paul Hoch calls my attention to a simple but painfully comprehensible illustration of this point that I first raised in WHITEWASH (p.45). In the Texas State Archives he found a February 24, 1964, letter from General Counsel Rankin to Texas Attorney General Waggoner Carr. A few days longer than three months after the assassination, the federal government found a roundabout way of seeming to ask what it didn't and then almost asking for what it said it didn't want.

Essential in any photographic analysis is background. With the Zapruder film, for example, any single branch of hedge along the concrete work at the eastern edge of Dealey Plaza could be an orientation point, with Zapruder's known position and that object making the end points of a line that would locate what was between them. For serious inquiry, as in locating the President at any specific frame of that movie, such points are vital. Another is in locating Phil Willis, the essentiality of whose fifth picture is that it was taken not where Wesley Liebeler and the Commission wrongly allege, but just before that and just after the President was shot (discussed at length in WHITEWASH, 44-6 and in two chapters of WHITEWASH II, "Willis By A Different Name" and "Willis In His Own Name"). Cropping, or cutting off its sides, destroyed background orientation points in the Willis pictures. Analysis of this fifth Willis picture and the Zapruder frames establishes beyond doubt that the President had been shot before Frame 202, whereas the Commission falsely claims he could not have been until Frame 210 at the earliest. It is not evidence that controlled the Commission's "conclusion," but the distress of its "Oswald-lone assassin" theory, for prior to Frame 210 the President could not have been struck by a shot from that sixth-floor window.

In discussing this in WHITEWASH (p.45), after explaining that any alteration of the landscaping or furnishings of Dealey Plaza amounted to the destruction and mutilation of evidence, I there said, "If the Commission did

not know it sooner, it learned it not later than the testimony of Emmett J. Hudson, groundskeeper of Dealey Plaza (7H564). Hudson said, "...Now they have moved some of those signs...Assistant Counsel Wesley J. Liebeler asked, 'They have? They have moved it?' After Hudson reaffirmed his statement, Liebeler contented himself with explaining, 'That might explain it, because this picture...was taken after the assassination and this one was taken at the time...'"

The sign about which Hudson testified is the one over which Zapruder took his pictures. Moving ~~of~~ that sign, no matter how slightly, distorted or destroyed its relationship to everything on the film, hence mislocated anything oriented with it. This, <sup>exactly</sup> the end served, as the government knew. There is no doubt this was wanted. It also was accomplished. This was a minimum necessity in any phony reconstruction of the crime. Without a phony reconstruction it was not possible to begin to pin a bum rap on the dead accused Oswald.

(120) The file copy of Rankin's February 24~~xxix~~ letter is dated with a stamp and is close to illegible. This is distressingly typical, especially of Rankin's letters. In the upper left-hand corner is the date "2/17/64" and initials indicating the letter was drafted for Rankin's signature by Charles N. Shaffer, Jr., whose involvement in the misuse of the Altgens picture is in WHITEWASH II (p. 187).

Other initials written in the margin indicate the letter was approved by Howard Willens and Rankin 2/20/64.

With the importance of the content, of this letter, delay of a week is an odd circumstance. But lack of mention of its contents - their very real suppression - is more so. In 10,000,000 printed words the Commission found no space for them. This correspondence appears in the appendix, untouched and complete. (pp.000-00). ~~Further~~ Further delay was achieved by the invocation of bureaucracy. Rankin's message was for Dallas, so he

120  
2/21-4

wrote Texas State Attorney General Waggoner Carr, in Austin. Four days later Carr wrote the mayor of Dallas, who, on March 3, acknowledged receipt of the message drafted three months too late by the federal investigators.

By the time he got to the middle of his letter, Rankin said "...the Commission has asked me to request through you that the Dallas authorities make no change or alteration in the physical surroundings of the assassination scene without first advising the Commission of its intention to do so."

The time of the assassination was the time to assure no changes <sup>would</sup> be made. It should not have been necessary to tell any honest and competent police ~~department~~ department to preserve its evidence, but it is proper that the possibility of accidental alteration in Dealey Plaza be prevented. Rankin's letter, however, could have been <sup>interpreted</sup> read as <sup>meaning</sup> changes would not be unwelcome, for it does not say "under no circumstances may changes be made", but only "advise us when you do it". Until after the investigation was completed, no change should have been considered or permitted. That the FBI did not assure this as soon as it took charge of the investigation, or the Secret Service before it, means they were derelict and permits belief they were parties to improper acts and destruction of evidence.

Rankin then did what to any reasonable man should have been entirely unnecessary. He defined and described Dealey Plaza: "In the Commission's view, this would include the area north of Main Street, South of Elm Street West of Houston, and East of the first viaduct..."

This description is of less than half of Dealey Plaza!

It eliminates the entire assassination scene!

It eliminates the alleged source of the shooting!

And it was made too late - after what it pretended to avoid had been accomplished.

*facts will  
be confirmed*

*It also indicates the grassy knoll!*



The assassination was not "south of Elm Street", but on and north of it. The government alleges the shooting came from the Texas School Book Depository building, which <sup>also</sup> is north of Elm. The President was on Elm Street, not "south" of Elm Street. The "grassy knoll" <sup>100' to 150' north of Elm Street, thus</sup> also was defined out of the area to be preserved. Yet, from the very first moment, there was evidence that shots came from there. This is one possible reason for the illegibility of the file copy of the historic hand-lettered memo with which the Zapruder film was flown to Washington assassination night (PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH 15, 138-9). It reports this is what Zapruder told the Secret Service - shooting from the knoll. It is in contradiction to what he was brain-washed into testifying ~~to~~ when Wesley ~~Est~~ Liebeler carefully controlled and led his testimony (WHITEWASH II, "Can Pictures Lie" and "Pictures Do Lie").

(121) A number of Californians, concerned that the murder of their President was not really investigated and was not at all accounted for, have conducted extensive research into the assassination and its investigation. Several of them believe it is possible the storm-sewer system may have been involved, as does a man in Dallas who has phoned and written me about this and sent me pictures showing it, without doubt, was possible. The first person to raise this <sup>question</sup> with me was Mrs. Lillian Castellano of Hollywood, whose photographic analysis has been brilliant. (It is Mrs. Castellano who called <sup>to</sup> my attention how the position of Secret Service Agent Clint Hill's left shoulder is valuable in identifying the time at which the fifth Willia picture was taken and of the first shot in the assassination, as set forth on page 201 of WHITEWASH II.)

Now, in just the series of pictures Liebeler discussed with Grounds-keeper Hudson, I found some suppressed by the Commission - and Liebeler in particular - that place the President's car when the Secret Service said

each of the three shots struck its occupants. This is refutation of the later official story. It also shows immediate Dezley Plaza alteration on the north side of Elm Street. These pictures were taken during the Secret Service reconstruction of December 5, 1963, two weeks after the assassination. Before this, one of the storm sewers had been eliminated, even the curbing with it, as the photographs show (WHITEWASH II,248). The dark bituminous-material patch, visible beginning at the east of the mark placed by the Secret Service to locate the Presidential car at the time the second shot struck, is where the inlet had been.

How can one regard all of these things, none of which should ever have happened, with less than warranted suspicion? How can one regard this official language, drafted by staff members - lawyers of the highest competence - with anything other than the deepest misgivings? Can we assume nothing but the grossest incompetence by the man selected to conduct this investigation, perhaps the most significant/<sup>one</sup>in our history? Aside from his other legal experience, J. Lee Rankin had been Solicitor General of the United States, the government's top lawyer.

And what was J. Edgar Hoover doing besides reveling in the publicity glorifying his FBI and himself? He was, as he told the Commission (WHITEWASH II,223), the man in charge, from the first day!

It is all part of a pattern. Whether or not so designed, deliberate design could no better have misrepresented what really happened when the President was killed and how he was killed - and by whom - and why. No monster conspiracy, such as those who pretend to defend the government say would have been indispensable in whitewashing the assassination, could have ~~been~~succeeded ~~any~~ more admirably.

And we cannot be content with the assurance the work was "sloppy", that everybody involved was incompetent, But if the best the government could employ were incompetent when they investigated and analyzed

and reported on the murder of a President, is there any ground for believing government competence is of higher order when it tells us why it is fighting an undeclared war in Viet Nam (which the murdered President carefully avoided and sought to prevent); or what is at stake in that war; or how we got into it ("blundered"); or how it can end; or how each repetition of a previously unsuccessful policy is the one that will succeed; or when it addresses the problems of the cities and the poor and the denied of our society?

Is our federal government of selective incompetence, wrong, stupid, "sloppy", only when the exalted of our political life and the best men and brains they could assemble "investigate" the murder of the President whose murder made/possible these changes in his policies?

If government can be so monstrously wrong and blindly insist it is right when it investigates the murder of a President, can it ever be trusted? On what can it be right if, on the "crime of the century", it can be so wrong? If it lies when its own legitimacy is at stake, <sup>about</sup> what will it not lie?

If it cannot be trusted to - if it will not - reexamine its own, let us call it, "error" when its and the national honor are so deeply committed and when it is so overwhelmingly and publicly established in "error", is it capable of rectifying or even considering rectification of its error on anything else, especially those policies that can bankrupt us, or, worse, incinerate the world?

(122) Had any official on any level ever at any time suggested there might be the slightest chance of any mistake in the assassination investigation or the Report on it, there might be occasion for faith and trust. The monolithic insistence the naked emperor is in fine raiment is a horrifying atavism in the age of nuclear rocketry.

Examination of the official record is no ground for reassurance. There is nothing in the government's record to show that it ever intended to tell the truth about the assassination, or even to try and learn it.

As I said in the first words of my first book on <sup>this</sup> ~~the~~ ~~subject~~, it sought only, to the degree possible, to achieve acceptability for the fiction of Oswald's singular guilt that ~~had~~, thanks to the parallel - shall we again call it "error"? - of the press, had been widely publicized.

If we are to look for motive, where better to seek than in the record? In this and the earlier sections of my own report on the Warren Report and the extensive documentation cited and printed with them, so much of it previously suppressed, the reader can find his own evidence and attribute motive and intent as he will. There are now close to a million words of my own documented analysis for him to consider and analyze on his own.

There are two quite comprehensible additional measures of purpose and direction in the investigation and Report that ~~here~~ and in this context, I believe, are significant and bear heavily on intent.

If the Commission intended to conduct a serious investigation, to determine all the fact it could, to establish truth, follow leads, question witnesses for the open ~~purpose~~ <sup>purpose</sup> of learning, it required as an absolute minimum the most intimate knowledge of its own evidence and files. Because witnesses are people and people are the source of information and also are those involved in the assassination and observation and knowledge of it, this meant that every scrap of information about every person was required to be immediately available to the whole staff. In turn, this required not less than a complete name index to the files. These files are estimated to total several hundred cubic feet of space, each one of which can store a million words. No photographic mind can retain and spontaneously recall and locate every name in this vast store of data.

The Commission appears to have recognized this and to have begun with a proper name index. It immediately abandoned it, before its hearings were really underway, before even a decent pretense of any investi-

gation had been or could have been made. I found this proof in a February 28, 1964, memo-  
 randum (150 p. 00) from Howard Willens, that Department of Justice lawyer so trusted  
 by the Washington Post. His recommendation found a tuned ear in General  
 Counsel Rankin, who launched his own personal economy wave when the  
 President's murder was investigated. He pinched pennies to the end that  
 there now is and forever more can be no complete photographic record of  
 the assassination and so that the Commission could not have these vital  
 pictures (PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH, "Video' Means 'Unseen'"; pp.26Off.)  
 when ~~it~~ it so urgently required them for knowledge of the fact of the  
 assassination and for evidence.

Once Willens learned that the National Archives would be doing  
 something that could be considered a partial replacement for some of the  
 use of a name index, he recommended dropping it. Not to do this, he  
 said, would be a "waste of our limited manpower".

Perhaps it was not realized before, but when the murder of this  
 President was "investigated", there was a manpower shortage! And penny-  
 pinching! That assassination economy wave! Not enough people to do the  
 minimum, essential work, as there was not enough money to buy the pic-  
 tures - that did not have to be bought, anyway, for they were available,  
 free, under subpoena!

This is another and a pertinent indication of how the Commission  
 investigated - how it intended to investigate. Paralleling it is a  
 series of documents I resurrected from the oblivion of that tremendous  
 cubage of suppression in the files. They disclose there never was any  
 intent to do anything other than charge Oswald with the crime - which  
 means framing him - because it was recorded, even if secretly, before  
 the Commission's investigation was under way!

Here I would like to have it understood that the list of the  
 Commission's files (WHITEWASH II, "Epilogue") that is regarded as a bib-  
 liography is not, is largely meaningless, chiefly in the political ~~ship~~

shibboleths of the FBI (and then with no revelation of content), and is entirely inadequate for any serious work. More, the secret staff memoranda and letters are not included in that. Researchers can find not even such a halt and blind seeing-eye dog to lead their painful step-by-step path through the files of the Commission itself rather than of its sources. Once he learns about it, he has the close-to-meaningless "file classification" described in the Introduction. So there is no way of searching for the things I have rescued from oblivion except by plodding work, instinct and good fortune. These are not enough to insure completeness or success.

Prior to Monday, March 9, 1964, when no real investigation had been conducted and only the federal and local police had done any real work, no testimony about the assassination had been taken. There had been the window-dressing questioning of the Oswald family and what related (like that of James Martin, Marina's business agent), and of Mark Lane, discussed earlier, which had as its intent clobbering the man who alone sought to defend his profession, the law, and the murdered accused assassin.

Beginning 9:10 a.m., March 9, four of the Secret Service agents in the Presidential escort were questioned by the Commission. Roy H. Kellerman was first (2H6lff.). This examination was not the beginning of the investigation. It was, rather, the beginning of the establishment of the background to the assassination and the seeking of the recollections of those who were with the President and, while in the motorcade, <sup>were</sup> unaware of the assassination until it was over. They had not observed it, although they were present.

However, before this, the Report and its basic conclusions had been decided upon!

At the very latest, six days before Kellerman took the stand, the Report had been discussed in detail and an outline of it ordered. If not earlier, at the very latest on Tuesday, March 3, Commission

Editor Alfred Goldberg was directed to draft the outline of the Report on the hearings not yet held! His subsequent memorandum to Rankin on this) accompanying the outline of the Report, is in the eleventh part of the Commission's personal "PC" file (pp. 000-0).

This memo is undated. A handwritten notation, "approx 3/14", has been added.

By the time he got to the seventh and last paragraph, Goldberg said "it is possible to begin drafting" the first four parts! His last sentence is, "I am prepared to begin work on these four sections at your direction."

Assistant Counsel W. David Slawson prepared a commentary on "Dr. Goldberg's Proposed Outline of the Report of the Commission", dated March 23. Here we find further proof of two of the things I have <sup>charged</sup> from my first written word ~~charged~~, that the "investigation" and its Report were a pre-mixed whitewash, and that dominating and controlling all of it was the overriding concern for the protection of St. Edgar's stool-pigeons, more important than ~~est~~ablishing truth and the fact of the truth of the President's murder. In his first paragraph, for example, Slawson told Rankin that in some "situations the (FBI) report may have to be 'sterilized'", i.e., "references to the office or the name of the special agent or a few other sensitive words deleted. A more difficult problem will be the use of those reports which involve statements by informants.!" Immediately after this, as the full text in the appendix shows (pp. 000-0), Slawson reveals that, in the face of a "strong stand", the Commission would back down.

But imagine that when, above all else, the government should have wanted, next to the solution of the crime, acceptance of its Report and no doubt about its authenticity, the Commission of eminences and their topflight lawyers began with the plan to substitute untested FBI and Secret Service reports for sworn evidence, <sup>on top of this</sup> were prepared to delete from

the record not only the names of the agents (whose reports at best could have been hearsay), but even the offices out of which the agents worked; and then, <sup>upon</sup> before St. Edgar blew his horn, to collapse their own wall in submission!

What a way to plan to "investigate" the murder of a President!

If there was any doubt about the given word before Slawson's memo - and in my mind and files there is not - there can remain none as of Monday, March 23. By that time there was no need to investigate. Slawson, at least, knew the truth, all the answers. Only Oswald was the assassin, anything else was a "misconception" requiring refutation. One cited example is one of the most flagrant abuses of public trust of the Commission's many, that of the Altgens-Lovelady picture (WHITEWASH II, inside back cover). Here the Commission dealt with only tainted evidence, delayed attempting to accredit it until late July - FOUR MONTHS AFTER THE SLAWSON MEMO! - and in addition to all its other misfeasances, malfeasances and nonfeasances, atop all its other dishonesties, misrepresentations and suppressions, failed to call as a witness the woman who saw Oswald on the first floor! It suppressed from its Report and 10,000,000 other printed words any reference to it, including the corrupted FBI report on it (PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH, 74-6,210-1)!

Here, as in all cases, the Commission knew the "fact" before investigating and holding hearings - without investigating and taking testimony! How much more authoritative can you be? How much more "right", worthy of trust? Slawson was very worried that Goldberg's outline did not sufficiently emphasize these "factual misconceptions" that "m<sup>y</sup>st be set straight in the public's mind" so that it will "not be misled by wild theories"!

With the benefit of the Slawsons and their Harvard Law Review backgrounds, naturally the Commission knew all the answers before it asked a single question! What is unfortunate is that these geni<sup>u</sup>ses were so modest - that they did not set this forth in the Report they



the record not only the names of the agents (whose reports at best could have been hearsay), but even the offices out of which the agents worked; and then, <sup>later</sup> before St. Edgar blew his horn, to collapse their own wall in submission!

What a way to plan to "investigate" the murder of a President!

If there was any doubt about the given word before Slawson's memo - and in my mind and files there is not - there can remain none as of Monday, March 23. By that time there was no need to investigate. Slawson, at least, knew the truth, all the answers. Only Oswald was the assassin, anything else was a "misconception" requiring refutation. One cited example is one of the most flagrant abuses of public trust of

PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH 27,31,33,38,44,48, 56,65-9,72,74,76-7, 97,109,120,161,189, 191-~~4206~~,198-201,294)

II, inside back cover). Here the Commission dealt with only tainted evidence, delayed attempting to accredit it until late July - FOUR MONTHS AFTER THE SLAWSON MEMO! - and in addition to all its other misfeasances, malfeasances and nonfeasances, atop all its other dishonesties, misrepresentations and suppressions, failed to call as a witness the woman who saw Oswald on the first floor! It suppressed from its Report and 10,000,000 other printed words any reference to it, including the corrupted FBI report on it (PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH, 74-6,210-1)!

Here, as in all cases, the Commission knew the "fact" before investigating and holding hearings - without investigating and taking testimony! How much more authoritative can you be? How much more "right", worthy of trust? Slawson was very worried that Goldberg's outline did not sufficiently emphasize these "factual misconceptions" that "m<sup>y</sup>st be set straight in the public's mind" so that it will "not be misled by wild theories"!

With the benefit of the Slawsons and their Harvard Law Review backgrounds, naturally the Commission knew all the answers before it asked a single question! What is unfortunate is that these geni<sup>uses</sup> were so modest - that they did not set this forth in the Report they

drafted for the signatures of the members of the Commission. Then the "public" would know exactly how the murder of the popular President was "solved" and could be confident its "mind" had been "set straight" and freed from the imprisonment of "factual misconceptions".

So, the outline of the Report that was outlined before the hearings on which it "reported" were held, before the evidence these hearings were to develop was gathered, before the Commission began its work, was ~~revised~~ revised. With that dedication to precision that pervades the Commission's every labor, this revision is undated. I got it from the same series of suppressed files. It is of that approximate date. Here and in the appendix (pp. 660 - 6 ) I present merely that part we should be able to accept as the essence: "THE ASSASSINATION: PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S ACTIVITIES FROM DEPARTURE TO DALLAS THROUGH AUTOPSY." This is broken down into five major divisions, each of which is further subdivided in the five pages of this part of the outline.

Without going into all of it in detail, by now that should be unnecessary - I ~~have~~ <sup>only</sup> note but two parts: "B. The Assassination" has five subsections, the last four of which are on the shots. "Part 2. The first shot" has, under "e. impact on victim", six different categories, including "point of entry", "path", "damage", etc. Under "3. The second shot" and "4. The third shot", we find these words in parentheses, "analysis of all topics set forth under 'first shot'". In short, here in the Report outline prepared not ~~earlier~~ <sup>later</sup> than March, four months after the assassination, before the single-bullet myth had been adopted, the Commission was still acknowledging what everyone else knew, that each of the three shots it admitted had been fired struck a victim. There was still a total dishonesty, the pretense that there had been no "missed" shot. *This was discussed at greater length in Chapter 5.*

NOTE: ~~Here make referende to earlier section on shots and go back to that and refer in only general terms to this.~~

The last part is "F. President Kennedy's autopsy at Bethesda" /  
 Of its six sections, <sup>almost none</sup> ~~only two, the first and the last,~~ can fairly be  
 125 stated to be in the printed Report. Here is that section:

Insert photocopy

Although at the beginning, before the autopsy itself was looked  
 This is understandable, for the Commission could not print the names of not fewer  
 than 23 competent military witnesses plus those of the two FBI agents in attendance  
 without raising eyebrows, if not headlines, for not calling them to resolve the  
 existing, if suppressed, conflicts.

"Visual findings of medical personnel"? That we do not have, only a  
 careful surgery, excising the essentials and leaving the propaganda.

"Details of xrays or tests, if any"? No such details, really. No X-  
 rays at all. They are still suppressed. And note the "if any". What  
 kind of investigation had been going on the previous four months if the  
 staff of the Commission did not in March know the answer to "if any",  
 whether relating to X-rays or tests? The truth, however, is that neither  
 is in the Report or the printed evidence - even the suppressed files!

"Details of analytical operative procedures"? It may be alleged that  
 there were such details. I believe it is fair to declare the opposite.

There is nothing that can be called an autopsy and nothing that  
 can be said, from the evidence, to be either "analytical" or a competent  
 description or reporting of "operative procedures".

Need there have been? Didn't the Commission know all the answers  
 in advance - before its investigation and hearings?

Of course they did. Else how could they have outlined their  
 Report before they investigated?

Are they not honorable men, eminent, trustworthy, incorruptible?  
 Then why not just take their word for it - even if their word is that  
 of their staff, even after what we have seen of some of that staff and  
 its performance?

We do have a choice.

The last part is "F. President Kennedy's autopsy at Bethesda" /  
 Of its six sections, <sup>almost none</sup> ~~only two, the first and the last,~~ can fairly be  
 125 stated to be in the / printed Report. Here is that section:

Insert photocopy

Although at the beginning, before the autopsy itself was looked into, it was clear that there should have been at the least a list of "Personnel in attendance", that is not in the Report. <sup>INSERT</sup> Moreover, it is even suppressed from the so-called evidence and the hearings. Even Admiral Galloway's name is not mentioned once in all the hearings. "Visual findings of medical personnel"? That we do not have, only a careful surgery, excising the essentials and leaving the propaganda. "Details of xrays or tests, if any"? No such details, really. No X-rays at all. They are still suppressed. And note the "if any". What kind of investigation had been going on the previous four months if the staff of the Commission did not in March know the answer to "if any", whether relating to X-rays or tests? The truth, however, is that neither is in the Report or the printed evidence - even the suppressed files! "Details of analytical operative procedures"? It may be alleged that there were such details. I believe it is fair to declare the opposite.

There is nothing that can be called an autopsy and nothing that can be said, from the evidence, to be either "analytical" or a competent description or reporting of "operative procedures".

Need there have been? Didn't the Commission know all the answers in advance - before its investigation and hearings?

Of course they did. Else how could they have outlined their Report <sup>before they investigated?</sup>

Are they not honorable men, eminent, trustworthy, incorruptible? Then why not just take their word for it - even if their word is that of their staff, even after what we have seen of some of that staff and its performance?

We do have a choice.

We can believe that honorable, eminent, trustworthy, incorruptible men are incapable of error; that their staff, even if of incompetents, sloppy workers, liars and geniuses, also blundered through and in the Report was not sloppy, was not incompetent, did not lie, displaying only genius. We can believe that because of the genuine eminence of these eminences and all that jazz there need have been no real investigation; that a little angel or a divine spirit would see to it that, whether or not determined in advance, whether or not the result of avoidance, misrepresentation, mutilation, destruction and manufacture of evidence, whether or not witnesses, pictures and other evidence was suppressed, the eminences and their staff were infallible; that the Report is a statement of divine truth, the real given word.

126 We can believe that all of this is right and proper; that when a President is murdered, in the last half of the 20th century, not the 10th, this is the normal and acceptable functioning of honorable government. Nothing is wrong.

We have been taught to believe that Jesus could err, that he could, mistakenly, trust Judas. Now we are to believe that these political eminences are wiser than Jesus, that, unlike Jesus, they are incapable of error, that for them there ~~is~~ was no Judas.

On no other basis can the Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy and its "solution" of the crime be accepted.

We do have a choice!