

For Harold-

12/12/69

from Roffman

NOTES ON THE NEW ORLEANS TESTIMONY OF PIERRE A. FINCK:

- 1) From pp. 2 to 8 Finck talks about his qualifications in the field of pathology, ect. This all was so that the court would accept him as an expert in the field of forensic pathology. Note the court's reply: "...and that he can give his opinions in that field." Very interesting! Had this been Humes, who was far from an expert in the field of forensic pathology, would he have been permitted to testify and give his opinions about the wounds? I would certainly at least expect endless debate over this had he gotten to court. Imagine, the man in charge of the President's autopsy not able to give testimony in court. Does this shed any light on why a man like Humes was chosen for the job?
- 2) On page 19 note the court ruling on Finck's reading directly from his notes. The judge is right here and this would be expected. Remember, however, that when Humes testified before the Commission he read directly from the autopsy and supplemental reports. Why was he allowed to do this?
- 3) I will say things about the measurements referred to on page 12 later. Finck mentions the abrasion on page 13 and this is a pretty sure sign of entrance.
- 4) Finck answers a question that, as an expert, he has an opinion on where the bullet exited (p.17) What is it based on? "I have seen the shirt of President Kennedy." First of all, he had no way of substantiating anything about the slits and his bit about "coagulated blood" is sheer fantasy; the whole shirt is drenched in blood so it means nothing. Finck should not have been permitted to testify to this because there was no proof that he ever saw the shirt or that it was the one worn by JFK. Why didn't Oser object before Finck had a chance to shovel this shit down the throats of the jury? He's made some pretty silly objections before like when Dymond called Frazier "Dr. Frazier".
- 5) On page 21, Finck explains CE 385 and points out that on it, the back wound is higher than the neck wound. I say now as I always have, what difference did it make to him. If it was lower, there still could have been a neck path; the position of the wound has no bearing on a through and through path--unless that path must be travelling downward.
- 6) At 22 to 23 Finck says something which is detrimental to his whole case. He says that the great value of the Zapruder film was that it established the sequence of the shots, i.e., the head shot came after the back wound. He says, "I remind you that at the time of the autopsy we stated that we could not determine the sequence of the shots." Now Humes told the Commission a different story-- a story which was the essence of his perjury about the contusion to the apex of the right lung. At 2H367-368, Humes says that the wounds or the incisions on the body showed no evidence of bruise so he assumed they were made at a time when the President's respiration was agonal and his circulation seriously embarrassed so that he could not take bruises. He goes on to say that this is what lead him to think that the bruises to the top of the lung were caused while the heart and lungs were still operating thus permitting a bruise. Thus he concluded the contusion in the neck was not the result of the tracheotomy. Well, he must also have concluded that it was caused before the head wound when the heart and lungs were still functioning in a way to permit a bruise. Thus he must have known the order of the shots. Finck says no. Does this indicate much confusion about the lung bruises? Also note that Humes testified these bruises were photographed (2H363) but the Panel lists no such pictures. Why were they not shown to the qualified Panel? This

gives me tentative reason to suspect that the bruising was indicative of something other than what they make it seem.

2) On page 27 it is quite clear that D-28 is CE 400, not the back of face sheet of 397. Harold seemed to think this but it could not be so.

8) At 34 to 35 he says that the bullet which struck the head "disintegrated." Apparently he came to this conclusion from seeing the many dust-like fragments on the X-rays. If it disintegrated, then how could it have produced an exit wound such as he had just testified to. More on his later.

9) Finck makes a fatal qualification at 38 to 39. He says that his opinion regarding the direction of the projectile is firm (through the head) but then he adds "As far as entry and exit are concerned." How about the rest of the head wounds? At 39, he repeats the word "disintegrated" so that his first use of it was not accidental.

4) Note again on 41 that "When we signed the autopsy report, we did not know the sequence of shots." If so, then they were puzzled by the bruising. This is not to suggest that the force of a bullet did not cause that contusion because it had to for certain reasons, but I wonder if it were consistent with what they say it was.

11) At 47, Finck leaves open the question of whether he actually saw the total body X-rays. He says "...nothing from the radiologist who looked at the whole body X-ray films, I have requested as there was no whole bullet remaining in the cadaver of the President..."

12) On that same page he repeats, "...I have never had any doubt, any question that it was a through-and-through wound of the head with disintegration of the bullet."

13) Page 48 is a beauty! We get Finck's sworn word that he was not "running the show." Who could have put it better? What he reveals about Humes is even more important, a thoroughly persuasive reason to reject the whole autopsy. Humes testified that he was assigned to "conduct and supervise" the autopsy (2H348). When Finck is asked if Humes was running the show, he says, "Well, I heard Dr. Humes stating that--he said 'Who is in charge here?' and I heard an Army General, I don't remember his name, stating, 'I am.' You must understand that in those circumstances, there were law enforcement officers, military people with various ranks, and you have to coordinate the operation according to directions." Well, apparently, Humes wasn't supervising. His saying "who is in charge here" sometime after the thing was in progress, at least after the brain was removed, suggests that Humes was frustrated in that he was not being permitted to do something he wanted to do. On 49 we learn that this Army General was not even a doctor.

14) He admits that he arrived after the brain had been removed. On 50 this is. Then on 51 he says "I made a positive identification of both wounds as wounds of entry." This seems to have been his only function--they should have called him to the Oswald line-ups too, he seems like such an expert in positive identifications that make the gov't happy. Same page, he repeats that they did not know the sequence of the shots. There must be some point in his constant emphasis of this.

15) Same page (51) he admits that the "small autopsy room" was quite crowded." At 52 comes the clincher. He did not feel he had to take orders from the Army General because there were Admirals there as well. When he says this, "...and when you are a Lieutenant Colonel in the Army you just follow orders..." you wonder just what a farce this whole autopsy was. This should have been pressed but I will come back to it later.

71) I am inclined to go along with Finck that the actual wound was higher than depicted on the face sheet--nobody described it that low; all via it was in the soft part of the shoulder. Milt Helpern says in Where Death Delights that this bit with the face sheet is "trivia",

- that these drawings are never meant to be accurate. I partially agree with him. True, the mark is clearly in a body part other than the neck, but it still wouldn't be that low down.
- 17) This exchange is most interesting; I would like to know where he put the mark on Weggman's shirt. The mark was made at p. 11 where he was told to mark the approximate location. I would imagine that he marked an area too high to accent a downward angle. This would explain all his evasion here to avoid testifying that the mark on Weggman was the exact area. Finck here makes a fool out of Oser by seeming to comply with his request but saying "approximate" instead of "exact" and "area" instead of "point."
- 18) On page 76, note how Finck with ruler in hand was forced to say 14cm equals approx. 5 and a half inches(exactly that, in fact). Earlier he had been willing to say only 5 inches. This is minor. At 77, Oser's question is worded wrong. Moving the head left or right would not alter the horizontal plane of the mastoid and thus would not greatly affect the measurement. He should have said "moving the head backward or forward."
- 19) At 91 to 92, Finck says he does not recall making any notes during the autopsy, that Dr. Boswell was making the notes. I think this may be perjury as evidenced later. Will come back to it. Valuable info in Finck's assertion that the the autopsy report was signed in the office of Admiral Galloway on the 24th. He says prior to that he reviewed the draft(which one) with Humes. When was this. It had to have been Sunday since Humes said he wrote the first draft Sunday morning. 92 to 93 is interesting and is evidence of perjury on someone's part. Finck says ~~XXXXXX~~ the final autopsy report was based on a report Humes "had prepared through the night, I should say through Saturday, the 23rd of November, and he worked on this, and he read over to me what he had prepared." Either way, this contradicts what Humes testified to before the WC about writing the first report on Sunday. Does this mean there was even another report?
- 20) Page 96: Here is the perjury. Now Finck's story is that both Humes and Boswell were taking notes--this he makes clear. He adds that he too may have written down measurements. Earlier(p. 92) he said only Boswell was taking notes.
- 21) At 99, Finck says that Galloway was the (or a) source of the "3 shots were heard" bit. Also note that Finck talked to Admiral Burkley at the autopsy--they must have known about anterior neck wound then. At 100 we learn that Galloway was present during the autopsy. As Dick's notes indicate, the sources Finck indicates did not hear 3 shots. Likewise, at 101 to 102, Finck says he knew of Connally's wounds at the time of autopsy because it was reported by the news media--he must also have known about the front neck.
- 22) At 104, Finck again says the head bullet "disintegrated."
- 23) Comments at 107 are sheer fantasy. Finck's non-answer "at times it is done" is true only because his autopsy report set the precedent. "Having not been at the scene I had to get information from somebody else." What kind of info? Come on now, Finckie. It was your job to establish the info. Isn't that the purpose of a medico-legal autopsy? You were supposed to tell them what happened, not the other way around.
- 24) At 114 we get a nice clear statement at last. He personally talked to Burkley--no doubt now. His third source was Galloway who was referring to a third witness. I do not believe this at surface value. If Galloway wanted 3 shots, he would have told Finck so as apparently he did though I doubt he had a witness to substantiate it.
- 25) P. 115 is a lot to swallow but it is welcome food from the man who has so long starved us. He first refuses to disclose why he did not dissect the track in the neck because "This leads us into the disclosure of medical records." WHAT? A refusal to answer because something will be disclosed means that something is covered up. For-

fortunately, Oser was wise enough to pursue this. When Finck was ordered to answer, he did no such thing. Instead of saying why, he says "We didn't remove the organs of the neck." Why not? "For the reason that we were told to examine the head wounds and that the--" "I was told that the family wanted the examination of the head, as I recall, the head and chest..." Oser was obviously inflamed. He says that he knows the organs were not removed but WHY? "I had the cause of death" says the butcher. What? "I examined the wounds but I didn't remove the organs of the neck." WHY, WHY, WHY?!? "From what I recall I looked at the trachea, there was a tracheotomy wound the east I can remember, but I didn't dissect or remove these organs." Oh boy--can't go on all day like this, can we now. Your honor, PLEASE. Oser pleads "Why? I ask you to answer that question. "AS I recall, I was told not to, but I don't remember by whom." Told not to dissect the tract!!! Now Mr. Amnesia of 1969 can't remember who told him not to. And he answers questions so well. Why doesn't he remember who? "Because we were told to examine the head and the chest cavity, and that doesn't include the removal of the organs of the neck." Why, then did it include removal of the brain. No, Dr. Finck, you do not answer questions like you spell "in" and "out."

26) He observed bruising which is entirely ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ compatible with a bullet path. Well, if he was so damned sure about this bruising, why didn't he know the order of the shots as he has so often said and as I have explained. Even if it is compatible with a bullet path, it couldn't give the necessary details about the path such as where it ends especially if two bullets hit the neck.

27) We learn that he used an autopsy room probe in the back at 119. This is good. As for the contraction of the muscles, as Dick says, he could not know this without dissection and by all indications, he was confident that there were no lanes for outlet. Also at 119, "I did not consider a dissection of the path." What prompted the order not to dissect. Did Humes want to dissect and was this when he exclaimed, "Who is in charge here/" It would be extremely important to know just how far in the probe went. Boswell told Fink that the little finger went in up to the first or second knuckle which is a maximum of 1 1/2 inches. Finck says at 120 "The first fraction of an inch."

28) At 121 he says "I made a positive identification of entry in the back of the neck.." Was this his purpose? Or his only purpose? Also at 121 to 122 about the skin slides, Oser's wording is "high velocity". This is good because it brings out the fact that the slides may show evidence of a low velocity missile entering there.

29) At 123 there is a neat trick if it was intended as such. "You didn't burn your notes also, did you?" "No." Well, he must have taken notes when--something which he evaded before.

30) Dick's note at 125 is good "Struck no major bones". Does this mean "it struck minor bones"? It could although Finck says the X-rays showed no evidence of it. He could be lying since he or Humes did about the X-rays showing fragments.

31) Pp. 126-127 reveals a beaut. Finck admits that he didn't see the vocal folds of JFK. Why? "...the wound was outside of the vocal fold area." Is he admitting that there was a wound to the front of the neck? And if he didn't examine this area, no faith whatsoever is to be put in the path through the neck. Parkland docs reported damage in this area (the larynx) so the autopsy docs actually ignored a large area of damage. This is important and should have been seized by Oser. He should have somehow gotten the Parkland testimony in there about the damage there and gotten the judge to rule that Finck could not testify on the neck tract. At least find out if that info was relayed to Humes by Paerry which I doubt. What a spectacle that would ave been!

- 32) At 127 he says that "everything was cleared up" when they learned from Perry about the ant. neck. Shape up, Dr. Finck! you know good and well you couldn't speculate on that wound unless you saw it and /or and reliable info on it. And you did--it was described as a pucture wound, which you know means entrance. Oser should have persued this.
- 33) Finck admits that he saw the incision but not the wound described by Dallas surgeons. (p. 128). Oh, did he see a wound not described by Dallas surgeons?
- 34) more on 128. What puzzled Finck? A definate entry in the ~~666X~~ back, and a bruise in the region of the cavity of the chest. As I have outlined before, I'm sure that bruise puzzled him. If it were in the region of the chest as I know it was and as his sworn test. says, then there was no path. A wound of the right shoulder connected to a bruise in the chest defines a downward course which would exit through the breastbone, not the front neck. Here is Finck's admission that he knew this.
- 35) Page 129 goes into the important area of the position of the body. JFK was apparently on his back when Finck arrived and Finck asked that the body be truned over so that he could examine the skin of the entire cadaver. Was the body turned over before Finck arrived? This may be a good clue as to when he arrived. On 130 I think he makes a real slip. "... it had to be held to take those measurements." How was it held? Another clue from Finck. "We had the measurements taken with the head turned in a generally forward direction." If JFK was on his stomach then, turning the head forward would necessitate pushing it back, thus drastically reducing the distance from the mastoid. Why the hell did Oser stop this line of questioning- he never gets if the cadaver was sitting up when the measurements were taken.
- 36) P. 138 "I don't remember seeing fragments in the area of the neck." Congradulations Mr. Amnesia. This should have been pressed until the truth was squeezed out of the bastard.
- 37) Notice the hedging at 138-139 on who asked him to view the photos and X-rays in Jan., 1967. Finally he blurts out Eardley whose position frankly confounds me. What is "Operation Autopsy"?
- 38) My copy of p. 147 is pratically unreadable. However, I see again that Finck is saying that he did not see the wound described by Dallas docs. Again I say, did he see another wound? P. 149 is important because Finck admits that he examined very closely both edges of the incision. According to descriptions, the top edge bore most of the bullet hole provided ut was not cut away.
- 39) I think 152 is perjury. Questioned about the lack of reference to the wound in the report of Jan, 1967, he says, "I did not see that wound in the front." Oser tries to clarify this and we get a corroboration for my interpretation of Humes' answer to McCloy. "I did not see the wound of exit in the skin..." I still say, did he see a wound of entrance. This may be an odd case of lightning striking twice in the same place but here I am quite persuaded that he saw a wound of entrance. His statement in the question before this was unguarded and panicky and here he jumps in to qualify it. Note how guarded his other testimony was about not seeing the wound described by Dallas docs. I say that he is bluffing by using this deceptive language and this one line is the clincher.
- 40) Afet all this raz-mataz, Finck finally answers whether the front neck wound was smaller than the back wound at p. 159. He says he doesn't know because he had no way of measuring it. Good, good so how can you give any testimony at all on the damned thing. Here again I think Oser had a chance which he blew.
- 41) Finck admits that the head entrance was higher than shown on CE 388 at p. 162. He manages to hem and haw his way out of it

XXX

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
which was to be expected.
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
XXX

which was to be expected.

42) Note Finck's evasion of the question about dissecting the scalp and micro. examination at p. 175. This is very curious and ties in to a suspicion I have as to why there is no record of histological slides from the periphery of the big hole.

43) pp. 179 to 180-Will have to check on this but I think X-rays show things the same sizes that they really are since there is nothing such as lenses to divert the rays. Of course, there were no actual measurements on the cadaver to compare but the 4 inch estimate is sound within at the most $\frac{1}{2}$ inch. Note also at 180 Finck says that a radiologist is the most qualified man to read X-rays. Morgan was a radiologist and I trust his observations. The Panel wasn't about to intentionally release info against the autopsy report and if they could have, they would have toned down that measurement.

44) Finck seems quite insistant that the wound(entrance)on the head was not as high as 4 inches above the EOP. Since he already testified that CE 388 shows the wound too low, it must be somewhere in between. Watch out, however, because if it were 3.99999inches above EOP, he would still be telling the truth that it wasn't 4 inches.

45) Note p. 193 on failure to section the left side of brain. Saying that the most massive lesions were on the right side does not justify failure to section. It does mean that there were lesions to the left because we already know that--they were in the form(presumably) of contrecoup damage.

46) At 196 Finck says he believes that Humes sectioned the brain. If so, Humes perjured on this point. Depends on what he means by sectioning--microscopic sections or coronal sections.

47) At 197 to 198 Finck lets the cat out of the bag. He is trying deperately tot to tell what the rectangular structure is and evades the issue by saying that there were many bone fragments in the head. "There are numerous bone fragments produced by this explosive force in the head leading to many bone fragments and I can't positively identify this structure you are referring to." Then on 198 Oser seizes on this and directly asks if any bone fragments were found in the brain. "I don't recall."

48) At 198 to 199 Finck perjures himself. Speaking of the brain he says, "To the best of my recollection it was not sectioned." On 196 he testified to the exact opposite.

49) P. 199 is something else which I'd like to shove down Specter's throat. Finck admits that he did not do a complete autopsy. Recall Specter's line to USMAR that "We got a thorough, comprehensive, and qualified autopsy report." What better reputation can we give him than Finck's own confession? At 200 he says there were supplemental reports. There was only one and that is incomplete just by using Finck's previous qualifying statements. He said that because the left half of the brain was not examined the autopsy was incomplete. He implies that the left half was examined later but the supp. report says that it wasn't and that coronal sections were not taken.

50) Note once more on p. 208 that Finck uses the word "disintegrated" in reference to the head bullet.

51) Pp. 209 to 210 can be expressed no better than Dick has put it in his notes.

Proceeding for 2/23/69:

- 1) Ah! Here is a good line which I've been waiting to get. See lines 19ff. on p. 3. Finck says "When there are so many fractures in so many directions producing so many lines and fragments in the bone..." This is something I was always pretty sure of. Now look at CEs 861 and 862, the reconstructed skulls. There are hardly no fracture lines on them--just a few long ones--not even the "multiple criss-crossing fractures" Humes describes. And this is on an old brittle skull. I take this as a strong indication the the MC did not produce the head wound.
- 2) Wow!!! On page 4 he reveals that Galloway told him to put in "presumably" in reference to the skull entrance. Continued on 5, he makes this even more explicit. This has much significance but hold it in mind.
- 3) The questioning leading up to revealing the name Kinney on p. 6 suggests that Finck is trying to suppress Kinney's name. Also on 6 Finck repeats Humes' line "Who is in charge here?" with the "I am" from the mysterious General. Finck's cop-out to "over-all supervision" does not make sense to me
- 4) On 7, he says that a Brigadier General of the Air Force was in the room. What was he doing there. Was it a military reunion? Paying his last respects? I seek an explanation for the presence of so much brass in that room.
- 5) Interesting info at 11 to 12. Finck spent several hours with the other two at Bethesda on the 24th. Also on 12 note his response to whether he agrees with everything in the autopsy report--"Essentially I do." Translated--"There are things with which I do not agree." Oser should have pinned Finck down on this point.
- 6) Page 13, Redirect Exam. Did anyone give him orders as to what opinions he should render in the report? "No." Would he have accepted orders as to what professional opinions he should render? "No." Bull, bull, BULL!!! The proof is in the transcript! Remember pp. 4 and 5 where Galloway made him put in "presumably"? He was ordered and he accepted the order. He testified that he was positive that was an entrance wound and the insertion of "presumably" changed his professional opinion and endangers the integrity of his report--especially in a court of law; he must have known this. Apart from the substance of that question, he accepted orders not to dissect--something which he knew he had to do.
- 7) Pages 15 to 16 are great--they reveal too much for poor Finck and they corroborate what I earlier expected from this testimony. First off, he says that he found the wound in the back. This was implied when he says that he first asked for the body to be turned over. Tres important 101. If the body had not been turned over, how the hell could they have seen a bullet hole to the back of the head unless it was at the top of the head. They could lift the head to a very limited degree because of post-mortem rigidity. Observe the answer to did he get the total body X-ray. They waited for them but they were interpreted by the radiologist. He told the docs that there was no bullet in the body. This makes it clear. Finck never saw the total body X-rays. He was told that there was no bullet in the body. Was the radiologist "controlled" like the autopsy surgeons were? This adds weight to my contention that part of the front neck bullet dropped down the trachea. If so, it would not have been visible on the X-rays which Finck saw--only on the ones he didn't see.
- 8) On p. 17 the bit about unnecessary mutilation of the cadaver is nonsense. That is not a concern of the pathologist especially when they are brought in a body with half a head. What about the usual "Y" cut to the thorax. They did this. On to 18, Finck says he did no

extensive dissection along the bullet path. This means he did less than extensive dissection. Note how he even evades defense questioning on the need to dissect. He finally says that he doesn't know if dissection was necessary. This should be enough to make him the laughing stock of every forensic pathologist in the world. The next question is something else. Did he form a firm opinion on the bullet's path? "Oh, yes." Based on what? There was an entrance wound to the back. Best tout! Why do you have a firm opinion? Because it is there. It makes about that much sense.

9) Note p. 23 where Finck says the hole was not 4 inches or 100mm. above ECP. Same objection here. Why wasn't he asked to give the exact distance instead of his revolting "slightly." As for the X-rays and distortion of size, I'll check but I doubt if he's right--at least not to a degree which would salvage his main objection.

10) pp. 26 to 27 have me in a frenzy. "The purpose of the autopsy was to determine the nature of the wounds and the cause of death. When we signed the autopsy report we were satisfied with the nature of the wounds, the direction, and the cause of death. This was the purpose of the autopsy, and in my opinion this autopsy report fulfills this mission." HOGWASH. If Harold ever writes a series on this testimony, he should call it "Hogwash". These men did not dissect a missile path, they ignored a wound to the anterior neck, they examined half a brain, ect. and he has the gall to make this statement. Further on, he is asked if he has any firm opinions. "I have a firm opinion that there was a wound of entry in the back of the neck, a wound of exit in the front of the neck..." Come on now. How can you have a firm opinion on a wound which you did not see, a wound which was described as entrance to you by one who saw it. Oser should have jumped down this bastard's throat when he got up for questioning.

11) Here is the final proof that Finck did not see the total body X-rays. Oser asks him on 28 if he saw all the X-rays. "I had seen them in the--I had seen the X-ray films of the head and the radiologist reviewed the whole body X-rays before we prepared...the autopsy report." His qualification here is skillful, deliberate, and important for the reasons I have outlined before. Oser asks him if he viewed all the X-rays and he evades by saying that the radiologist reviewed them all and told them that there was no bullet in the body.

12) At 32 Oser finally begins to turn the screws. Finck repeats that he was told not to "go into the throat area", a bad choice of words which I'm sure Finck understood as "dissect." At 33 Finck says that his role at the autopsy was to "emphasize the wounds, to examine the wounds.." How mysterious. Also on 33 he repeats that there was a bruise to the top of the chest cavity which is inconsistent with a downward bullet entering the base of the neck and exiting out the front of the throat. On 34 to 35 Oser comes off as the complete fool--he has Finck backed into a corner and he just casually strolls away.

13) Finck's answer to not taking direct orders at p. 36 is of little meaning. "These are not direct orders, these are suggestions and directions." Nevertheless, no matter how he tried to tone them down, no matter what euphemism he chooses to use, he obeyed. If they were merely suggestions and if he were merely interested in determining what happened, he could have "suggested" back that he be allowed to dissect because of its necessity. Alas, "when you are a Lt. Col. in the Army, you just follow orders" or more appropriately, "suggestions."

Thus Finck has slipped through our hands--we may have scratched his Nazi surface and in return received some of his life blood, but we have not yet drained from him the secrets which keep these evil forces alive.

COMMENTS:

Since we have long been forced to work with minimal data containing minimal truth, I suppose that I should not be so dismayed at this testimony. It is useless for me to go on about where Oser's faults lie and the many shortcomings of his questioning. This is a sin; that is all I will say. Nevertheless, the testimony emerges with good information, and, I suppose, much information.

I do not want to repeat things from my notes although I may clear certain points up.

My ideas on the sequence of the shots still hold as far as I can see. Exactly what it means is confusing. It is certain that the bruise to the top of the right lung was the result of a missile's passage although from which direction is uncertain. I hope to question a qualified man on the meaning of the nature of this bruise. Right now, I eliminate it as the result of the rear entering shot because that entered so low that it would have actually penetrated the pleural cavity; the testimony is explicit that it did not. Humes is right in asserting that it was caused when the heart and lungs were working normally. This probably came as an afterthought to justify his perjury on the bruise. Right now, I attribute that bruise to the force of the fragments which made their way to the transverse process from the front. This is anatomically sound.

Overall, I would say without reservation that Finck is positive that a bullet disintegrated in the head. This has been Dick's baby and he deserves much credit. I am looking for a good reference which will confirm Dick's points--something that I can use ~~XXXXXX~~ if I publish (as a source--Dick gets the credit).

The control of the autopsy, the autopsy surgeons, and the radiologist comes out although not in a way which I would like to have seen--too piecemeal. Obviously, Humes' being in charge was a charade--military brass was supervising that autopsy and military brass controlled what went into the report. How much they controlled I don't know. I'd better like to know who controlled them. Finck's Neo-Nazi mind has him kissing the asses of those who could ruin him by what they made him do. His attacks of amnesia, his all too frequent "I don't know"s and "I forget"s can not be regarded as sincere by any reasonable man. This is truly a mockery of justice. I am appalled to see just what lengths Finck will go to to protect his superiors. For instance, the bit about the family wanting an examination of the head and chest only is sheer rubbish as we learn just from the rest of the test. The abdominal organs were also examined and Finck testified that he examined all the skin on the body. I could go on and on with this but it is futile. I fear speculating too much for innocent people could be hurt.

As far as the anterior neck wounds go, I certainly disagree with Harold that the testimony is explicit that it was not there for Finck to see. Notice his guarded words. Twice, he says he did not see the small wound described by Parkland doctors. This could simply mean that he saw a wound which did not fit the description by Parkland docs. There is only one occasion where he blurts out that he did not see that wound at all. This was at 152 where he is obviously fumbling over his words. He is panicking. He adds "I don't know why it is not there." The use of "is" instead of "was" could mean that he does not know why no mention was made of it in the 1967 report, especially since that was the question. Oser seized on this and Finck

jumped back in with an "I did not see the wound of exit in the skin. I saw a hole of exit in the shirt..." This is a sort of self-saving remark, making use of language in a way which is singular to such scoundrals. The whole essence of this area of responses perfectly fits my original notion with the Humes answer to McCloy. Here it is more apparent, less debatable. Finck's second answer after slipping up with his first response implies, if not says, the exit was not in the skin, it was in the shirt; a hole was in the skin therefore that must have been something other than exit. We could play around with this, I suppose, but at the least, it shows that his testimony is not explicit that he did not see a wound to the anterior neck. He did not, as the record stands, see the wound described by Dallas docs (and he got that description from Humes, not directly) or a wound of exit. His wording is careful and deliberate; Humes' might not have been. I vouch that what he is saying, in effect, is that he saw an entrance wound.

The other thing that strikes me as very important is the total body X-rays and the more than obvious fact that, 1) Finck never saw these, or 2) he was especially careful not to let the record show that he had. Either way, they leave open the possibility that a portion of a bullet was seen somewhere in the lung or lower trachea. There is really little more I can say on this because of lack of info.

I must end my comments now although there may be other things which will later come to mind.