

Part 2. Was there a conspiracy?

Page 6

CBS: "The Commission has found no evidence that either Lee Harvey Oswald or Jack Ruby was part of any conspiracy..." And the report also states: "The Commission has found no evidence that anyone assisted Oswald in planning out the assassination..."...contrary to the popular impression, the Commission, by these words, left the door open on the question of conspiracy just a crack...They don't say that the Commission concluded that there was no conspiracy or that Oswald was the sole assassin...." (page 1)

Fact: There was a good point, if CBS had honest intent, to tell its listeners that the Report was designed to give something quotable on almost anything. However, they didn't, and they chose to ignore the very unequivocal statement of just the opposite in the Commission chapter entitled "Summary and Conclusions". There (page 19) under "Conclusions", this is the fourth: "The shots which killed President Kennedy and wounded Governor Connally were fired by Lee Harvey Oswald. This conclusion is based upon the following:" There follow the Commission seven reasons for concluding Oswald was the lone assassin. Identically the same is true of the Tippit murder. This is the Commission's fifth conclusion, on the very next page. Here the report repeats that this conclusion also "upholds the finding that Oswald fired the shots which killed President Kennedy and wounded Governor Connally".

Here CBS lied, not by accident. The Report does conclude exactly the opposite of CBS' misrepresentation of it. It does not "only say that the Commission could find no evidence that others were involved, no evidence that there was a conspiracy", it straightforwardly says that Oswald was the lone and unassisted assassin and murderer of the policeman. At the time of these broadcasts, this lie is no accident, for there was then a concentration of apologies for the government's error, all of which emphasized this same lie, particularly the series by Gavzer and Moody of the Associated Press.

CBS "If there was a conspiracy, it could have taken one of two forms: either Oswald was a sole triggerman for behind-the-scenes manipulators or there were one or more additional gunmen firing at the President" (page 2),
(as assassin)

Fact: The most obvious conspiracy is one not involving Oswald, which CBS does not mention. It in any event is a third possibility and makes another and again a not accidental lie of the CBS statement a conspiracy "could have taken one of two forms", each including Oswald *an assassin*.

CBS: "The single bullet theory has become perhaps the most controversial aspect of the report.. The Commission said it was not essential to its conclusions" (page 2).

Fact: It is not the single-bullet theory that the Commission said was not essential to its conclusions, for it is. The Commission accounted for three shots: one that inflicted seven non-fatal injuries on both men; the ~~six~~ fatal shot, that it said exploded and left fragments inside the car and that damaged the car in two minor places; and one that missed entirely, that J. Edgar Hoover said could not be associated with any bullet or fragment of bullet that struck the car or any of its occupants. ~~But~~ This misrepresentation lays the foundation for the repetition of a lie by Arlen Specter, the man credited with fatherhood of the single-bullet theory, which is in the fourth program. What the Commission said "is not necessary to any essential findings of the Commission" is "to determine just which shot hit Governor Connally" (R19).

And CBS' own position and shows cannot assume a mission of it.

(cont 5/5)

non-fatal shot hit the President

This also is quite false, for the fatal shot is eliminated and the Commission says the ~~fatal shot was fired~~ between frames 210 and 225 of the Zapruder film. Governor Connally was never in a position to have a single bullet inflict all the damage on him after about frame 240, or never when there was time for the firing of it. There likewise is no doubt of the missed shot, for it wounded a bystander, James C. Tague. *CBS had to know this false statement in the report. To do otherwise is highly-contrived.*

CBS: In the same paragraph CBS proves it lied, concluding it this way: "... either three groups of wounds were caused by two bullets, which is the single bullet theory, or all three bullets fired from Oswald's rifle struck ~~the~~ President ~~and~~ Kennedy and Governor Connally, which the Commission rejected in the belief that one bullet missed completely" (page 2).

Fact: There were not three groups of wounds caused by two bullets, and this is not the single-bullet theory. That theory is correctly stated above. There were four groups of wounds. One, in the President's head, by the so-called "fatal" bullet, and the pair of wounds in the President's neck, the wounds in the governor's chest, wrist and thigh, all caused by the "single bullet". *(allegedly)*

in the above paragraph

CBS: "This photograph (Dillard's, of the ~~the~~ Negroes in the fifth floor windows), taken only seconds after the assassination..." *(page 2)*

Fact: Seconds is an abbreviation. CBS suppressed knowledge of the Hughes film or no more complimentary, was ignorant of it. This motion picture, which shows both the entire south face of the TSBD and the motorcade on Elm St., taken at the moment of the assassination, disproves the Commission story and the account of the testimony of these three men that CBS here uses, on the next page. *(PW 21118 125-30, 278-80)*. CBS saw the Hughes film, in Dallas, projected in the presence of an associate of mine.

what is meant

CBS: Holland's "is perhaps the most telling account in favor of the grassy knoll theory." *(page 3)*

Fact: The more accurate formulation is not "grassy-knoll theory" but shot from the front, which includes grassy knoll. And "the most telling" evidence is not eye-witness testimony, important as that is, but the tangible and evidence. ~~And~~ the doctors, who initially saw the President, and the nurses, the only ones who ever saw the wound in the front of the President's neck, then said it was or appeared to be an entrance wound. This statement is still in the autopsy report two days after the assassination and was confirmed to the autopsy doctors the day after the assassination by Dr. Perry (Dep. WW 198). Here is where this belongs, in context. CBS SIMPLY ignored this tangible evidence of a shot from the front. *(S 4114)*

in "THE WASH" 11-70, 150, 188-4, 198

next

CBS: "Mr. Zapruder, when we interviewed him here, tended to agree that the knoll was not involved." Here Zapruder is ~~an~~ interviewed. He says, "... I believe that if there were shots that came from my right ear, I would hear a different sound. I heard the shots coming from -- I wouldn't know which direction to say -- but they were driven from the Texas Book Depository and they all sounded alike..." *(page 4)*

Fact: Zapruder immediately told the Secret Service that the shots had come from the grassy knoll *(PW 15, 138-9)*. He also indicated this at the beginning of his testimony, when the brain washing had not been completed. *(I'm not his nephew)*

CBS Used James W. Altgens to say "...at the time he (JFK) was struck by

PW 203

by this blow to the head, it was so obvious that it came from behind. "t had to come from behind because it caused him to bolt forward..."

Fact: CBS edited Altgens' testimony. For he ~~also~~ testified that the exploded brain matter and other tissue splashed to the left, not consistent with the official account of damage to the right side of the President's head only. More important, ~~it~~ used what it knew to be an incorrect recollection, for it knew the Zapruder pictures show that the President never "bolted", never went forward. *t knew also that the President moved first backward, and then to his left, which is exactly what the Zapruder film, incontrovertible evidence, shows. Later, CBS ~~also~~ ~~discussed~~ ~~it~~ ~~case~~ this in a different context, (Page 5)

On the next page, CBS did admit

CBS: "OFFICER JACKS: The car in which I was driving, which occupied the Vice President, was -- had just completed its turn, and I felt a blast which appeared to be a rifle shot come from behind me. I turned and looked up at the School Book Depository." There could have been no shots from in front, ~~Jacks~~ is led to say, and "I could feel the concussion from all three." (p. 2745)

Fact: Assuming what is improbable, that Jacks felt the concussion of all three shots -- and by the third he ~~was~~ well down Elm Street and away from the Depository Building -- he did not and could not have felt the first "from behind me" if it came from that sixth floor window. The incontrovertible evidence of the Altgens and Zapruder pictures proves this. By ~~Frame~~ Frame 255 his car, the third, was opposite the second of the road-lane stripes (WW 202-3; WWII 244-5). This stripe is roughly parallel with the main entrance to the building (WW 209, WWII 246). If the President had not been struck before ~~Frame~~ Frame 210, as without doubt he had been, as I proved -- and CBS also says -- at that part of the Zapruder film Jacks could not have completed his turn and any concussion he felt from behind him and to his right would have had to come from ~~the Del-Tex building,~~ ~~could~~ not have come from the TSED. ~~elsewhere.~~

Facts

The time of the Altgens picture

CBS: "In Abraham Zapruder's film of the assassination, the fatal shot appears to move the head backward. The critics contend this can only mean the shot came not from the Book Depository, but from somewhere in front. Not for the first time, nor for the last in these reports, we find equally qualified experts in disagreement. We put the question of the President's head movement to an experienced photo analyst and two expert pathologists" (Page 6)

Fact: It is true that some of the critics now contend that the Zapruder film shows the President's head moving backward. However, I know of no book by any critic save my own WWII which so states.

What

The first of the experts CBS here presents is Charles Wyckoff. He is not asked, and ~~he~~ he makes no reference to the motion of the President's head, backward. This is what CBS said they out to him. They did not. Rather says, "...the explosion...occurs forward of the President. Now, wouldn't that indicate the bullet coming from the front?" To this Wyckoff disagreed (Page 6). Rather then engaged in a rather large misrepresentation, of the ~~of~~ critics and CBS's own statement of what the critics hold: "Well, you're aware that some critics say that by the very fact that in the picture you can clearly see the explosion of the bullet on the front side of the President, that that certainly indicates the bullet came from the front." (page 7).

Pan

Said

on the inevitable

Fact: Perhaps CBS dredged up some criticism that it felt it could torture into "some critics say", but it knew and the only book says that the President's head moved backward, not forward, and this argument is based not on the explosion but ~~the~~ head motion. However, Wyckoff's answer is slight comfort to the defenders of the Commission, though presented this way by CBS. Wyckoff showed a series of millionth-of-a-second pictures of ~~a~~ bullet going through a light bulb, with the "explosion" ahead of it. There is a vacuum inside a light bulb, not brains, blood, bone, etc. But in any event, it is not "very similar to the Zapruder-Kennedy assassination films", as Wyckoff says, for in this case, from the Commission's story, the right side of the head exploded, ~~only~~ the explosion was to the front, and the ~~blast~~, according to the witnesses, was to the left. All of this ^{is} summed up by Cronkite in this towering non-sequitur: "That is one explanation from a physicist as to how a head could move backward after being struck from behind", followed by an understatement of similar magnitude, "which seems to many laymen not possible". I re-emphasize, Wyckoff made no reference to head direction.

glash and splatter

and other witnesses

INSERT

CBS: Here CBS ~~contracts~~ ^{contracts} what must have been a much longer interview with Dr. Cyril W. Wecht, a forensic pathologist, of Duquesne University, ^{in a contracted} ~~in~~ to a single short paragraph. The essence is that it is "quite unlikely" that a shot from behind moved the head backward. *(Fact)*

CBS CBS: Here CBS produces the first ~~to~~ two "first appearances" since the assassination by two central doctors, untroubled by the wonder why these doctors, both of whom are under attack, ~~will~~ appear for CBS and not for anyone else. The explanation is obvious: CBS promised a whitewash and that is what it delivered, aided immeasurably by the doctors who, in turn, were assisted by the CBS failure to ask the obvious questions, none of which they had to work hard to conceive, for they are set forth in my published work and some by others. First is Dr. Malcolm Perry, making "his first public statement since the report was published" (Page 7).
A Of the wound "in the front of the President's neck", of which ~~rather~~ asked, Perry said his was "a very cursory examination" because of the need for "immediate action" (page 8) which is true but no answer, for to an experienced man a cursory examination is enough and Dr. Perry himself operated on that very point, hence examined it carefully. Asked, "would you discuss" the front-wound "with me", Perry said what is entirely unrelated, that "the determination of entrance or exit frequently requires the ascertainment (sic) of trajectory. And this, of course, I did not do. "One of us did at the time. There was no time for such things". This he followed with further evasion and falsehood, a paragraph on the difference in size between entrance and exit wounds (with no reference to the specifics in this case), and the statement that with an undeformed military bullet, "the caliber of the bullet on entrance and exit will frequently be the same" and the wounds ~~may~~ "would be very similar" (page 7).

blowing bullets (this case)

Fact: The could be true of diameter but not character, as all the experts, without exception, acknowledged. The direction of the bullet is indicated by the intrusion or extrusion of the pieces of flesh. *Every wound of man - from the smallest, the opposite of what CBS, the Report, and in this case Perry says see below.*

CBS: "Did it occur to you at the time, or did you think, was this an entry wound, or was it an exit wound?" (page 8).

"I didn't give it much thought", Perry replied, going immediately into a restatement that he had to apply his ~~energy~~ ^{own} energies to "the problem ~~was~~ at hand", as did the others present, "and I really didn't concern myself too much with how it happened, or why". *(The Minister)* ~~His~~ paragraph, with a *This*

INSERT FOR
PART 2 PAGE 4

7 There would be less question of CBS' integrity, less of its ^{CERTAINTY} impartiality and intent, if it had not ~~here~~ ^{suppressed} the fact that in publishing the individual frames of the Zapruder ^{film} the Commission had not reversed Frames 31⁴ and 315 (PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH 25, 145), making the motion of the President's head in response to the strike in Frame 313 seem to ^{be forward} ~~go in~~ exactly ~~the~~ opposite ^{the backward} direction than it really ^{went} ~~did~~, and had it not also suppressed the fact that there were nine unpublished frames (PHOTOGRAPHIC WHITEWASH 22, 144). The suppression of this unquestionable evidence - the alternative is CBS ignorance, hardly possible ^{with} ~~if they had~~ minimum journalist ⁱⁿ and research competence, ~~with~~ the investment of a half-million dollars, and a tremendous total of man-hours over a seven-month period - is in itself proof that CBS never intended a fair, both sides presentation but designed the ex parte whitewash ^{it} ~~they~~ presented.

(m 2=4)

1

CBS: Mentions (page 9) the effort of Dr. Rosen to guarantee a Texas autopsy, which it says it got from the Manchester book, mentioned with credit. Fact: However, it earlier read this in WHITEWASH, which earlier pointed out, as CBS conceded, that "The murder had been committed in that state, and there were no laws which gave the federal government jurisdiction". This is not an important point, but it is one of many where properly credit should have gone to first-published sources. In each case, these are my books, and in every case, CBS either failed to mention them or gave public credit to what I first did to others. *on both.*

CBS "...FBI agents submitted a report later disclosed in Edward J. Epstein's book, 'Inquest' which said that they had heard one pathologist say he had found a wound in the President's back, and could not find an exit" (page 9).

Fact: This information had, in paraphrase, been carefully leaked the end of 1963 and early 1964. However, if CBS were to give credit for "disclosure", the first book to "disclose" this was WHITEWASH, which prints facsimile excerpts of the FBI report on page 195. Further, *they* did not rest only on the FBI report, as my books also disclose, for it was in the testimony of Roy H. Kellerman, secret service agent in charge that day in Dallas and an observer of the autopsy.

CBS: "...Captain Humes...has ~~examined~~ re-examined the X-rays and photographs" (page 9).

Fact: This ~~again~~ is a deliberate CBS misstatement of fact, for it knew the truth from my writing. That is that neither Humes nor any of the doctors saw the pictures, not at the time they took them, not as a ~~condition~~ preparation for and part of their testimony, not since then. *The first and only time the doctors examined the pictures was when they were called to the Archives to do in the end of 1966. CBS repeats this lie a number of times during the shows. It is not without point, for it has the effect of saying the doctors authenticate the picture, which they cannot do, and of disguising the fact that they did not have them for the completion of their autopsy report or as a necessary aid at their testimony. It also gives the impression that the doctors "re-examined" them for this show - false - as the press then reported.*

CBS: Returned to Dr. Wecht and the autopsy sketch. When discussing this, Rather misrepresented the fact, saying, "Now, the Commission Report accepted that the bullet entered very near the neck, did it not?" (page 10)

Fact: Basic to the Report is not that the rear, not-fatal wound *is* very near the neck but that it was in the neck and nowhere else.

CBS: Handles the discussion of the Boswell sketch in a way to make it appear that when Wecht is talking about Exhibit 385 he is talking about the Boswell sketch [page 10].

CBS: Again repeats and compounds the lie about the pictures and X-rays: It also repeats its plug for itself, that this is the first appearance or interview granted by Dr. Humes. First *re-examination of the* ~~re-~~ronkite repeats the lie, "re-examined" and then *he* says, just as falsely, "...Have you had a look at the pictures and X-rays from the time of the autopsy since the time that you submitted them to the Warren Commission?" (Page 10).

Fact: *It* Here the lie is more significant for it says what is false, that the Warren Commission had the pictures and X-rays, and that it is Humes, the chief witness on this aspect, who gave them to the Commission, the inference being in his sworn testimony.

or prior to ~~both~~

an autopsy body that showing the fatal wound in the back not the neck (with H 197)

and
~~the~~ deliberate
only 14.5. CBS:

In saying "yes", Humes also tells all the same lies, that he had earlier seen the pictures, which is false, that the Warren Commission, to his knowledge, had them, which is also false, and that he had them and gave them to the Commission, agains false and agains, to the knowledge of all involved, knowingly false. *The choice is between 100% per page with, and some incompetence & ignorance by CBS. Humes's statements are*
CBS: Asked Humes to comment on the disparity between 385 and the Boswell sketch. Of the Boswell sketch, Humes is permitted to say, without any question being asked, "they (meaning such sketches) are never meant to be accurate or precisely to scale". (p. 11) Humes emphasized this absence of need for precision in response to the friendly question, designed for this purpose, "...in preparing autopsy reports" it is "routine" for them "at this stage" not "to be prepared precisely". "No precise measurements are made", he said, and the sketches are "used as an aide memoire, if you will, to the pathologist as he later writes his report." (p. 10-11).

allegedly
has
been

Fact: The autopsy is a medico-legal document. As a physician qualified in forensic medicine, Dr. Humes knows, as certainly CBS did, that there is the utmost in precision required at every stage in an autopsy report on any murder, most particularly when it is the murder of a President. Further, it is the essence of the inexcusable argument made in pretended defense of the Boswell sketch (WW 197), that precise measurements had been made and correctly entered on this chart, where the location of the wound ~~was~~ incorrectly marked by the description of the location ~~is not~~ *allegedly* correctly ~~was~~ indicated with respect to its distance from the mastoid.

CBS: In further attempted self-justification, Humes says, "More importantly, we feel, that the measurements which are noted here at the margins of the drawing are the precise measurements which we took".

Fact: The notes, which are what Dr. Humes says these figures come from and the real basis of the autopsy, are totally missing. They are required to be in the Commission's File 371 and are not in duplicate files in the National Archives. They are required to be in Exhibit 397, and they are not. They have not been burned, as Mark Lane and others says, but were carefully preserved, as my books alone disclose. CBS knew all about this. If their intent was honesty and their purpose the fair exposition and presentation of both sides, at this point there should have been reference to the absence of these very notes Humes says are the most important, and the absence of any exact sketches, precisely locating all of the President's wounds, scars, etc., such as make the Oswald autopsy a model of scientific precision. Failure to ask these obvious and required questions already public in my writing (alone among the books) marks the CBS show as a whitewash, for here they had the man ~~write~~ *write* who ~~suppressed~~ *suppressed* the document and it is vital to authentication of what he is saying, and explains why Humes would appear on CBS but would not answer my letter or comment on the criticism of him and his autopsy in my books. ~~Only~~ *only* because he knew he would be treated in this fashion. He will not dare face anyone who knows the fact and truth and is not partisan like CBS. *Does he only "feel" these*

are
They are
missing, and this
asked him ~~no~~
questions about it.
This

are the right measurements? Why not with a CBS ask if he made any other charts or sketches?

CBS: ~~per~~ permits Humes to "locate" the rear, non-fatal wound as he did in the autopsy report, in the abnormal fashion that "fixes" it by means of only flexible points, "fourteen centimeters from the ~~right~~ tip of the right acromium and fourteen centimeters below the tip of the right mastoid". As I alone among the critics pointed out, each of these fails to locate, each is a variable. The ordinary and inflexible method is not to use the acromium, or shoulder joint, which involves the ~~of~~ *to measure from* width of the body and means nothing, but the spine, which is ~~always~~ *fixed* the

(and does not require)

using

center, regardless of the width of the body, ~~and~~ any measurement from it is precise, ~~without~~ knowledge of the width of the body, ~~of~~ the mastoid, which is an entirely different part of the body, ~~and~~ involves both the length of the neck and the position and angle of the head, neither of which are even remotely indicated in the autopsy. Here normal and accepted practise is for identification with the numbered vertebrae. Failure to do these things, to give inflexible points, puts the whole autopsy in question. CBS failure to seek the truth about it and worse, ~~flagrant~~ whitewashing of it, with active ~~contribution~~ contribution to that whitewashing, raises ~~the~~ questions about CBS integrity and end any possibility of serious belief of the CBS claim that it gave "both sides". Over and above all of this, there is the total absence in the ~~at~~ autopsy report of any diagrams, an essential if the autopsy was to be understood and stand on something other than faith, especially since the doctors knew that their report would not have the pictures and X-rays, didn't know if the pictures were clear; and because the pictures can not show measurements, vital in any criminal proceeding. In fact, the absence of any charts is ample indication the doctors had been told to prepare a general document that would not be closely scrutinized, ~~and~~ a fair indication they had been ordered to whitewash, otherwise, with their forensic training and experience, they would have prepared a report that would be unequivocal and could have gone to court. ~~CBS~~ Doctors with forensic-medical qualifications would not knowingly submit ~~a~~ report on which they could not face cross examination without assurance they would not have to. At the time this report was completed, Oswald had just been murdered. At the time it was drafted, he was still alive. At the time this draft was revised ~~and~~ he had just been murdered. ~~At the time this draft was written and the previous draft burned,~~ There was the possibility of cross examination by his lawyers. ~~Here is the most likely reason for the burning of the first draft of the autopsy.~~ Further, this is an incomplete autopsy, which ~~did not~~ trouble CBS ~~any~~ more than the Commission, ~~for~~ Both were silent about its incompleteness. In short, this is no autopsy, as the American Academy of Forensic Medicine declared at its annual convention.

which they immediately surrendered;

if further suppression of that

CBS:

Humes was asked if Exhibit 385, was "precise". He said it was because "we were trying to be precise, and refer back to our measurements, that we had made and noted in the margins of the other drawing." (page 11).

Fact:

This is inconsistent with his testimony (WW183) and with the certifications executed, including by Admiral Galloway, C.O. of the entire Naval Medical Installation. ~~It~~ is also inconsistent with the subsequent apologia, which are to the effect that these were just rough notes, ~~where~~ accuracy was not essential. In his testimony, Humes swore that he held in his hand "certain notes in long-hand, or rather, ~~copies~~ of various notes in long-hand made by myself, in part during the performance of the examination of the late President, and in part after the examination..." If we give Humes the benefit and assume that all those notes he made after the examination were drafts of the autopsy, which is not likely, there remains those today non-existent "long-hand notes" that he swore were "made by myself..." during the performance of the examination.... "This, of course, is what would be required. All those details in the fifteen pages could not be in his head alone. ~~So~~ these he does not refer, and the reason is obvious: I have publicized the fact that they are not in Exhibit 397, where they were when he was on the stand, or in File 371, where they are also required to be. The notes of the autopsy are the essence of it. There are, officially, no notes to support this one, no notes against which it can be checked for error, and, of course, no notes to be ~~cross~~-examined about.

(WHITEWASH 183)

INCLUDING

same note,

Complicating it even further, the receipts show that the Naval Hospital gave all its records of the autopsy, and every copy of the final draft to the White House. So, unless the Commission gave him materials to work with, from his own testimony he had no basis for preparing the drawings. He also testified (www.181-2) that he gave verbal directions to the illustrator, in part from his memory, and that this method could not be precise. He begged for the photographs at several points in his testimony and said these charts, made months after the autopsy, could not be "true to scale". He also swore that with "the bony prominences...which we used as points of reference, I cannot transmit completely to the illustrator where they are situated." So much for CBS' and Humes' "precision"

CBS: About the head wound, Rather asked, "...there was only one?" Humes replied, "There was only one,, That was posterior, about two and a half" centimeters to the right of the midline, posteriorly." XX About this, he said, "we can" be "very precise" and "absolutely certain", "precisely and incontrovertibly" (Page 12).

Fact: On what basis? There are no such markings on this, pretendedly the only chart - ~~was~~ a rough and inaccurate one never intended to be accurate, from his own telling. There is no head diagram of the fatal wound on which these markings appear. During Col. Pierre Finck's testimony about the head wound (2H379ff) he used " a scheme which I prepared before the 22d of November. It is a teaching scheme". It was entered in evidence as Exhibit # 400 (~~17H50~~ 17H50). Part of exhibit 397 is an unidentified sketch which may be of the President's head wounds but it bears no marking of midline, no indication of 2 1/2 cm and no marking that would locate this "entry" from top to bottom. In any event, Humes told Rather and the world-wide audience only that he had used only this single sketch in preparing the artists conceptions. How "precise", "incontrovertibly" and "absolutely certain" he can be about ~~describing~~ describing to a third person how to locate a wound based on notes he couldn't have, from the testimony, and from a chart that he told CBS he used, when none of the data he needed is on ~~any~~ source, is something that CBS, for all the depth of its "investigation" did not ask the doctor. ~~It does~~ explain his reluctance to be interviewed by anyone other than CBS, though.

however

CBS: How many autopsies have you performed?" Dr. Humes: "I would estimate approximately one thousand" (page 12).

Fact: None of ~~this~~ ^{these} makes any ~~the~~ difference if these were autopsies ~~from~~ natural-causes deaths, stab wounds, blows by various objects, etc. The proper question, ~~was~~ had CBS been intent upon anything but a white-wash, was how many autopsies ~~where~~ there ~~had~~ been murder by gunshot. This CBS did not ask. Had he performed a million autopsies on cancer victims, this would not wualify him for the President autopsy, where the President was murdered with gunshots. (page 12)

CBS: Fact: There is no limit to the number of times CBS was determined to repeat this lie. Cronkite ~~said~~ (page 13) to close the Humes appearance, "So, the chief pathologist at the Kennedy autopsy, after re-examining the X-rays and photographs..." I emphasize the word "lie", for the alternative is perhaps less attractive. That CBS would even pretend to put on such stunts without knowing the simple, basic facts of the case, ^{is inconceivable} and ^{and A-11 E} In the autopsy there is nothing more basic than the unquestionable fact that the undeveloped pictures left the hospital the early morning of November 23, ~~is beyond conception~~.

Comment :All of this has been a buildup for Arlen Specter, self-styled father of the "single-bullet theory". Cronkite's text is a biased recounting of what CBS wants believed. He repeats the Commission's accounting for three bullets through this theory, ~~and the acknowledgment that "one missed entirely"~~. ^{INCLUDING}

CBS: "Could one bullet have wounded both ~~the~~ President Kennedy and Governor Connally" (page 13) C

Fact: This is another whitewashing question. What CBS should have asked is what the Report could not-and did not- face; could a bullet inflict these seven wounds, ~~not struck at all for a rifle bullet~~ and through this spectacular career remain almost 100% intact, almost 100% unutilated, and undeformed? To this all the doctors, in one way or another, said no, so Specter, as ~~commission questioner~~, substituted a hypothetical bullet which, like CBS, eliminated the essential qualifications about the real condition of the real bullet.

CBS: Specter ^{SAY} (page 14) that "the single most convincing piece of evidence, that one bullet hit both men" was a question, not an answer, ~~not even his kind of evidence~~. "Where did the bullet go". His entire chain of reasoning is that this bullet came from the rear, of which he had no evidence, ~~he never considered that it could have come from the front, of which he then had abundant evidence~~. Had he ever considered front entry, he would have known that there was testimony of a bullet hitting the street behind the resident, such as that of Mrs. Donald Baker (WWII 129-31). It is only from the conclusion built-in to the Commission's work that the phoney question ~~raised~~ by Specter exists. It is not an answer. Specter is also consistent: he told nothing to the CBS audience about the condition of the real bullet and the medical testimony that it could not possibly have had the history he attributed to it. ~~For did CBS ask.~~

That was the conclusion, ~~assumed~~ of ~~what~~ ~~was~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~concluded~~ ~~single~~ ~~bullet~~ ~~with~~ ~~the~~ ~~evidence~~.

EQUATED WITH EVIDENCE

CBS: Asks ^{to} Specter to "describe ^{an} us any other theory, besides the single bullet theory, that would support the conclusions in the Report" ~~REPORT~~.

~~FACT~~ Specter said "you could have three separate bullets...the President could have been struck at frame 186...the Governor could have been struck some 42 frames later (he meant not before 42 frames later) and the third shot could have hit President ~~Kennedy~~ Kennedy's head at frame 313...So it is not indispensable to have the single bullet conclusion to come to the basic finding that Oswald was the ~~only~~ sole assassin." (page 14).

Fact: This is quite true, if you present such a specious argument to CBS. It is not otherwise true. Aside from all the many other things disqualifying it, and they are, indeed, many, there is the question of the blood of James C. Tague. He was ~~at that time~~ struck by a fragment of a "missed" bullet or the spray of concrete from it where it struck the curbstone. The Commission and CBS both acknowledge this "missed " bullet. Cronkite ~~on this page requested the Commission~~ on the page before, said the Commission concluded "one missed entirely", ~~and CBS said~~ CBS and Specter have nothing more to say about this "missed" bullet. To make their whitewash work, Tague bled in vain. They have cast him out of history.

-elsewhere-

Comment: Having ~~sw~~ pulled this off without any CBS-man or the former Commission counsel getting ill on camera, CBS rapidly switched to the story of this bullet (15) and its finding. Rather lead, Darrell Tamlinson, the hospital engineer, through a tortured editing of his sworn testimony (he told Specter he'd have trouble sleeping

page

(According to the transcript)

(Page 17 - B Fact)

Fact: It asked Dr. William F. Enos of Northern Virginia Doctors Hospital if "the minute a bullet hits a bone it shatters that bullet". The question is not this at all but whether a bullet hitting bones in not less than three different body parts and shedding fragments in all three can remain intact, unmutated and undeformed. *(Page 17)* When he confronted a direct question by "ather, could this bullet have had the history the Commission and CBS attributed to it, ~~Dr. Enos, it~~ said "I would say it is highly improbable," which he repeated for additional emphasis. *(Page 18).*

Strongly addresses the Report

CBS: Cronkite promoted Governor Connally to "the most persuasive critic of ~~the~~ the single bullet theory" a strange position for a man who has specifically said he has made no study and not read the criticisms that have been published, but CBS saw to it, then and since, that their word would be law. He is a "critic" to CBS liking because "he accepts the Warren Report's conclusion, that Oswald did all the shooting." *(Page 18)*

Fact: If this is a "critic" to CBS, can anything it says be trusted or believed? The kind of "critic" Connally is becomes more transparent when CBS had him promote his wife to "the best witness I know". What does she believe? Exactly what CBS is going to conclude, exactly what it let Specter get away with palming off, that there was no "missed" bullet and the first and third bullets hit the President and the second Connally. How can CBS loose Mrs. Connally dutifully appear on camera to say just this. Unfortunately, CBS, with only four hours, did not have time to ask her what she told LIFE, that she could not get any federal investigators interested in taking the Governor's garments until ~~the~~ ~~destruction~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~human~~ ~~residues~~ ~~on~~ ~~them~~ ~~forced~~ ~~her~~ ~~to~~ ~~clean~~ ~~the~~, which, in turn, destroyed any evidence on them or evidentiary value in such things as the direction of the shots and the kind of ammunition used. *(pages 18-9).*

after they were cleaned

CBS: There is public agony: "on the evidence meaning on what CBS choses to say and what it calls evidence and pretends is all the evidence, which is 100% false) it is difficult to believe the single bullet theory. But, to believe the other theories is even more difficult". The viewer has no choice but to agree, for CBS present ~~not~~ other "theory" ~~presented~~ by any "critic" for his consideration. It does pretend to consider "a second assassin" but discards this on the fanciful ground that "his bullet travels miraculously a trajectory identical with Oswald's" From this the viewer is to believe that there is such a thing as an established trajectory back from the bodies, which is 100% false. All the doctors, who were wrong in this also, ever could be enticed into saying of these "trajectories" is that the bullets originated "above and behind". Since it sets up its own straw men, CBS does not have to knock them down. It builds them so they cannot stand, which is more foolproof

CBS: "There is not a single item of hard evidence for a second assassin" *(Page 20)*

Fact: There is no "hard evidence" of any other kind. CBS sought none any more than the Commission did. Nonetheless, its own fake tests and its one phoney reconstruction still proved that ~~it~~ it was impossible for the best marksmen they could get, under greatly improved circumstance, to have committed the assassination. More, ~~it~~ also proved this rifle was incapable of it except under the greatest possible stroke of luck, luck that didn't come to its own implicated "tests" With no one to gainsay him, no child to cry "naked", Cronkite, without problems with his own ignorance, for he is reading someone else's copy, can keep a straight face and silent conscience when he said "The Governor's objections, which were the most troubling of all, now disappear."

