

Dear Gerry,

2/13/93

We do hope you can make it in May! I don't have to ask Lill, who has been with the same tax client for several hours. She had to cut back and she did but she still does it, is good at it and enjoys it.

Your student Anderson is a credit to you! Good paper for a student. He personal observation on the deforming of bullets even by soft tissue is interesting.

I'm glad the clippings I've been sending in the belief they could be of sociological interest sometimes are. Baltimore, by the way, is experimenting with ~~some~~^{one} of the newer ~~new~~ methods of birth control with students. Some controversy over it.

While I do not know and now do not have a clear enough recollection, I think that some of the changes Stone made in his movie were in reaction to some of my criticisms that reached him.

There was, of course, no chance that Stone or any of his gang would credit my work at all. And I'm just as satisfied not being in any of his crap.

CE 237 is also Odum 1 and it was originally represented by the CIA to be a picture of Oswald. I think it knew better before the Commission got into it.

Your note on 157 is what I was surprised to find in checking what he used of what Garrison said Finck said. Some "research" and some "research assistant." Also says something about their consultants!

Your mention of his citing Tony Summers reminds me, he has finally finished his book on J. Edgar Hoover. The advance publicity got some TV attention but I've seen nothing in the Post or the local paper about it. Claims to have a picture of Hoover in drag and in a homosexual contact with Clyde Tolson.

Tony took a lot of time from me and I'll be surprised if he even sends me a copy of the book. I think he had to do ~~much~~^{much} rewriting but I am not aware if that was the sole cause of ~~some~~ several years of delay in his finishing it.

I doubt very much that here at Ft. Detrick they developed anything at all like the capability of injecting cancer cells and having them take and grow. I've not heard of it and I do recall denials other than from Detrick.

Perhaps the reaction you get from those history majors who have not studied the assassination will interest you. I'm sure they'll have been influenced by Stone and the like and I'm sure most do not believe the Report.

Chip Selby is due here next week with an Unsolved Mysteries crew to do something on the King assassination for about the time of the anniversary. Fox TV did one last month. The local reaction was good but they had some bad stuff in it that most have no way of knowing is bad. Making Lane and Fauntroy look good, for example.

Hope H-T and the kids are well and happy. Our best to you all,

Harold

**The Medical Evidence Regarding the
Assassination of John F. Kennedy:
Not Quite Scientific Precision**

**Noel Anderson Brownlee
Interim Project 309: JFK
January 26, 1993
Paper #2**

Many critics of the Warren Commission's official conclusions most all concur that the expert testimony regarding the autopsy and other medical findings is inaccurate as well as highly deceptive. This paper deals with the medical findings at Parkland Memorial Hospital and the Bethesda Naval Medical Center where the autopsy was conducted on the evening of November 22, 1963. Testimony from members of the staff of these medical facilities often shoots down the official conclusions of the Warren Commission Report which was presented on September 24, 1964 to the American public and the entire world. As will be shown, the information provided by the three military pathologists who conducted the autopsy is faulty and misleading and they sometimes posit different stories. Their official conclusions are so skewed that they often come under attack from members of the medical community outside of the military.

The military pathologists who conducted the autopsy included two navy personnel as well as an army lieutenant colonel. Navy commander J.J. Humes was the chief autopsy surgeon at Bethesda. It is important to note here that no civilian pathologists were invited to attend the autopsy even though Harold Weisberg notes that some of the world's most pre-eminent forensic pathologists lived in the Washington, DC metropolitan area. Testimony given by Commander Humes and J. Thornton Boswell, another Navy pathologist, are here singled out to illustrate their inaccuracies.

Commander J.J. Humes testimony often comes up as an illustration of how the Warren Commission maintains deceptive information. Commander Humes testimony found in the Warren Commission's exhibits and hearings does not add up on one important piece of evidence: the autopsy report. At one point in the Warren Report, Humes says that he burned certain "preliminary draft notes" relating to the autopsy (CE 397, p.47). Later, in a different section of the Warren Report, Humes says that he burned the first draft of the autopsy report (2H, 373). This is just one example of the blatant deception found in the military pathologists' testimony. Many pathologists including the one that I talked to said that the latter would have been very unprofessional: Notes and everything else pertaining to the autopsy are usually maintained and not discarded as a piece of trash like Humes said he did with his preliminary notes. Humes claims that he burned these notes because they were stained with blood, but his actions are not standard practice. At any rate, his official testimony is in contradiction at several points in the Warren Report.

Humes also has trouble when it comes to his testimony regarding the actual wounds that the President received in Dallas by the presumed lone assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald. Evidence found in the Warren Commission Report would indicate that the President had been shot in the shoulder. This alone would have destroyed the single bullet theory. The shirt the President was wearing had a hole in the area of the shoulder

indicating , therefore, that the President had been shot in the shoulder area not the back of the neck. Many witnesses to the crime say they saw the President when he was shot in the shoulder including the police officer following the President's car. Glen A. Bennett, a Secret Service Agent in the President's follow-up car said he too saw the President when he was shot in the shoulder. And lastly, Secret Service Agent Roy Kellerman, in attendance during the autopsy, said that the President had been shot in the back. All of the above is in direct contradiction to the evidence that Humes illustrates during his testimony. Humes had diagrams drawn up which were supposed to represent the actual autopsy photographs, which are still suppressed in the National Archives. However, these diagrams show the bullet entering through the back of the President's neck. Most witnesses say the President was hit in the shoulder, as mentioned. Many pathologists, including the one I spoke to, said that diagrams of a wound would not be a sufficient piece of evidence in any investigation, and that a diagram probably would not be allowed in a court of law. Again this represents not only the unprofessional nature of the Warren Commission investigation, but also of the doctors who performed the autopsy, chief among them Dr. J. J. Humes.

Dr. J. Thornton Boswell, another Naval pathologist, also has a problem in the evidence that he puts forth. His own autopsy face sheet which includes a diagram of the human body shows that the President was indeed hit in the

shoulder. Of course, this would be a legitimate place for the wound since so many of the witnesses have noted that Kennedy was shot in the shoulder. Admiral Burkley, the President's personal physician also shows in his report that the wound was located in the shoulder. Boswell, however, says that his locating the wound in the shoulder was a mistake and that he would have been more careful had he known that his work was going to be a matter of public record. The latter is a totally ridiculous statement because face sheets are used to show as accurately as possible the exact location of all the wounds. In an article in the Journal of the American Medical Association, Boswell notes: " We documented our findings in spades. Its all there in the records."(Vol.267, No.20, p.2795). Boswell still seems to have a problem because what is in the record contradicts what the Warren Commission's official findings were, that a single bullet could have caused seven wounds on the President and the Governor of Texas. On top of this, the pieces of evidence which would locate the wounds conclusively(i.e. X-rays and autopsy photographs) are still under lock and key.

Still more problems arise when it comes to what then Lieutenant Colonel of the Army Pierre Finck says what happened at one of the most important autopsies of the century. Pierre Finck declined to be interviewed in the JAMA article mentioned above with Humes and Boswell. Dr. Finck now lives in Switzerland. In Weisberg's book Post-Mortem, Weisberg characterizes Finck as follows:

"Arrogance, self-importance, a determination to be judge, prosecution, and defense lawyers, and witness - to ask the questions he wanted to answer not the questions asked of him but those he wanted asked - a scarcely hidden and fierce partisanship highly improper in a man of science and an expert witness in forensic medicine in a criminal proceeding - permeate all 269 pages of Colonel Pierre Finck's New Orleans testimony on February 24 and 25, 1969."
(Post-Mortem, p.230)

Weisberg is here referring to the arrogantly given testimony given by Colonel Finck at the trial of Clay Shaw brought up by then New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison. Finck said some things during this testimony that goes against what Humes and Boswell put forth in their relatively recent talk found in the May 27th , 1992 issue of JAMA. During the trial of Clay Shaw, Finck had admitted that the autopsy pathologists were not in charge of the autopsy which took place on the evening of November 22, 1963. Weisberg notes in Post-Mortem that Finck said: " An Army General , I don't remember his name ... was running the show"(p. 234, from testimony given by Finck in New Orleans). Questioned further, Finck notes that this Army General was not a qualified pathologist. When asked if this Army General was a doctor at all, Finck notes that the General was not a doctor. The next day, Finck changed his testimony to say that the General that was in charge was not actually a General, now he had switched military services to become a Naval Admiral; Finck claimed that an Admiral had been in charge. This is in blatant contradiction to what Boswell and Humes concur on what happened during the autopsy. Humes says that neither an

Admiral nor a general was in charge during the autopsy. On page 2797 of the JAMA article from last May, Humes says: " Nobody made any decision in the morgue except ME. Nobody distracted or influenced me in any way, shape, or form." It seems that Finck and Humes were conducting two different autopsies. Finck's claims seem to be more believable due to a memorandum which directed them not to open their mouths, in essence, about the autopsy they conducted. Weisberg claims that the autopsy surgeons were threatened with retaliation if they opened their mouths(Post-Mortem,p.237). And lastly, Finck says that the autopsy performed on Kennedy was not " a complete autopsy under the definition used by the American Board of Pathology."(Post-Mortem,p.236; from testimony given by Finck at New Orleans). Obviously, one or some of these autopsy pathologists is guilty of perjury.

Now for the gymnastic magic bullet that supposedly hit both President Kennedy and Governor Connally. The magic bullet, to have done the amount of damage that it did would have had to pass through at least two bones, the Governor's rib on the right side and the wrist which it broke. However, the bullet the Warren Commission shows(Commissionn Exhibit 399), has not even got a scratch on it. The bullet does not even have a dent in it. From personal experience in the Pathology Department at Spartanburg Regional, a bullet which passed through bone definitely would not look like Exhibit 399. One time, I assisted in pulling a bullet out of a piece of intestine that was removed during surgery

and sent to the pathologist, Dr. C.M. Webb, for examination. This bullet had passed only through muscle, fascia, and lodged in soft tissue, the intestinal tissue. Although not the same kind of ammunition as the magic bullet, the bullet was blunted on the end and had lost several fragments upon impact. The rounded apical surface of this bullet was heavily damaged. As mentioned, this bullet did not have to pass through any bone at all, but it was damaged severely. In this regard then, the Commission's magic bullet could not have caused all of the damage that it supposedly did and not come out with hardly a scratch. In addition, the Spartanburg pathologist noted that the bullet would have also had fibers on it that it picked up as it penetrated through skin as well as clothes. The FBI agent that examined the bullet, Frazier, noted that the only defect that he found was on the flat end of the "magic bullet". The flat end, of course, does not do the striking when a bullet is fired.

Lastly, the medical opinions of the attending physicians at Parkland Memorial Hospital were ignored, and as Weisberg and Meagher note, their initial opinion was coercively changed. One of the chief physicians attending that day was Dr. Malcolm Perry. At an afternoon news conference following the death of Kennedy, Perry had said that the wound received by the President in the neck looked very much like an entrance wound. Of course, this would mean that another gunman had to be involved if a shot came from

the front and entered through the President's neck. Nurses in the emergency room attending the president said that the wound they saw in the President's neck looked very much like an entrance wound to them. According to the pathologist I spoke to a couple of years ago (Dr. Webb), the direction from which a bullet entered into a body could be easily discerned by looking at the perimeter of the wound to see in which direction the skin was pushed upon the impact of the bullet. This anyway would seem to be a matter of common sense. Nevertheless, the Warren Commission chose to ignore the testimony by Perry (his story later was changed, probably changed for him) as well as other doctors attending as well as the attending nurses which supposedly had had a great deal of experience with seeing gunshot wounds. One doctor, Dr. Robert McClelland, a physician at Parkland who came to the emergency room, said, in his report of November 22, 1963, said that the President had a wound in the left side of his head, specifically in the left temple. The autopsy face sheet shows no such wound to coincide with what Dr. McClelland has said was present on the President's left side of his head. Although this was probably a mistake, medical information reporting should try to be as exact as possible.

The problems with the testimony given by the medical "experts" during the investigation of the assassination of the 36th President could go on and on. However, it is

quite obvious that the real medical truth was not actively pursued because it would have interfered with the conclusions that the Warren Commission wanted to put forth. At any rate, this highly unprofessional handling of medical evidence would have never stood up to the scrutiny that it would have to have been subject to if Lee Harvey Oswald had ever had a trial for the murder of President Kennedy, any expert forensic pathologist would agree with the above statement.

Dear Harold,

Feb. 10, 1993

Our Interim session is now over and it is back to the regular and demanding semester teaching load. I may not have mentioned it in my previous letters but I am teaching a special topics course entitled, "The Sociological Wisdom of Martin Luther King, Jr.". It attracted about 15 more students than I anticipated. I am having them read Garrow's biography and a 600 page anthology of his writings, speeches, sermons, and published interviews. I have laid out a pretty ambitious reading and writing schedule, which I hope most will be able to keep up with. Although it has and will require additional preparation on my part, I have enjoyed it so far.

I have also gone back to teaching urban sociology, which I have not had a chance to teach for almost two years. I have saved many of the clippings you have sent me, especially those on Frederick and Baltimore. I hope I will be able to use some of them. Among the new books I am using is an excellent study of the city of Detroit, as it has tried to deal with industrial decline, urban decay, racial tensions, suburbanization over the past 50 years. One of the book's authors is an articulate and intelligent black woman I met 2 years ago, Dr. June Thomas.

There are a couple of additional obligations I have in the coming month. I am giving a presentation at a local conference on multiculturalism and race and ethnic relations. I am working on a 30-40minute speech on the rather grandiose topic, "A Dream of National Unity: A Shared Vision". I plan to use more than a little bit of King in my speech. Also, I got a call from a history professor at nearby college about the size of Wofford to conduct a seminar for a select group of history majors on the JFK assassination. I am looking forward to it. This professor was not at all surprised when I told him how appalling the American Historical Review was in its Oliver Stone forum and how bad the more recent American Journal of History articles were. I will take along a copy of "Abdicated Historians". It is amazing how they can also manage to ignore the work that Dave Wrono has done. I will be sure to get in a few additional licks on old Oliver Stone.

Speaking of Stone, I wrapped up my Interim class a week and a half ago. I wasn't surprised to find some of the students coming to Stone's defense, despite all I had exposed them to. And at least half of the class turned in good papers at the end. I waited until our very last meeting to really unload on Stone and gave my frank assessment of his effort. My remarks were disturbing to some, but others understood my anger and the hard language I used. All in all, the project came out better than I feared when I wrote you in early January.

I am enclosing the best final paper which, as I suspected, was done by the pre-med, sociology major I told you about earlier. Unfortunately, he only got to interview one of the two local doctors he had worked with. But he also incorporated some of his own limited experience with autopsies. None of this is new, of course, especially to you, but I thought he did a competent job, much better than I could probably have done at his age.

Another enclosure is a summary of some of the errors in Stone & Sclar's "documented screenplay". This partial list includes only those that I took the time to check out. I am sure a thorough check would expose many, many more. In my copy I made numerous question marks and comments such as, "I don't believe it."

Hope you and Lillian are well. I imagine Lillian will be getting busy with taxes soon or perhaps already. We are thinking about coming up for a visit and seeing some of the sights in Washington. This would probably be in late May. I hope we can work it out. Take care.

Best Wishes,

Gerry

*filed
Apparent
books*