

Hi memo under F's N.O. text

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 rap in N.O.

139-Bardley. 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 Helleck's court, responses to John in his suit. It is his Helleck 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 sup. 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 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 sup. 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 COUP 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 Lumes' testimony on this in FM III)... t 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/Bardley gave them. Next e.a.p.4, note Galloway in Pa in Specter memo. The added significance of this is that it is in contradiction with Lumes, I am pretty certain, and it places Finck at the hospital for a rather long period Sunday...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, how when you see Hurry's book, if you haven't already seen the head autopsy photo, you'll get it....23: Definitely here is deception. as f

37. Or 3 3/4? Both invalidate report. both "definitely are not 4"....28 compare with names again as in MILL-R saying the radiologist read them while they all looked at them, so they all read them, including Finck and even Bellemen)....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 or two 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.