

Richard Harrell  
78-23 73rd Place  
Glendale, NY 11385

5/10/95

Dear Russell,

I'm deep into writing about Mailer and can't take much time.

NEVER AGAIN! is in the stor<sup>es</sup>. The index was omitted by accident. <sup>It</sup> was an accident.

If there was no brain how could those 40 dust-like ffragments have been in the x rays of it?

If there was any substitution of copies of the autopsy Humes was not <sup>t</sup> in a position to do it. He turned it in Sunday and it <sup>was</sup> receipted at the White House that evening. Besides, if there had been changes after that do you think they'd still have had meaning <sup>ful</sup> handwritten changes visible?

If you see anything on any Mailer appearance I'll appreciate a copy. <sup>He</sup> says crazy things often when he opens his mouth. <sup>Like</sup> his crack, <sup>do</sup> not have on Larry King on CNN week before last. *About widenas I'm told*

Best,

5-7-95

Harold Weisberg  
7627 Old Receiver Rd.  
Frederick, Maryland 21702

Dear Harold:

In my last couple of letters to you, I alluded to forthcoming evidence without stating what it was. I did not have any specific O.K. from the author to reveal it, and he has now stated that I may, since I have agreed that I have no intention of publishing it. He does so intend, and it is his story.

The news is that both Sibert & O'Neill now state that there was no brain. That statement has to be qualified a bit. Originally, O'Neill was "quite vociferous" about it. On the topic he was questioned at length by a politician in Texas. At first he was quite open about it, but then, apparently becoming aware that he had cast himself into deep waters, he partially backtracked. Sibert reportedly is still quite open about it.

This opens so many doors, one does not know where to begin. It partially confirms Lifton's sources among the enlisted men who witnessed the autopsy, while making useless much speculation regarding the genesis of conflicting autopsy reports. For myself, I have reached the conclusion that Humes' Warren Commission autopsy report is so deliberately ironic that it amounts to a confirmation of what Sibert & O'Neill now say:

- 1-A brain severed at the peduncles. Forensically impossible.
- 2-The implicit message that the brain stem was also severed. Forensically impossible.
- 3-A parasagittal slice the length of the brain. Totally unexplainable and forensically impossible in light of the way bullets and bullet fragments behave.
- 4-No weight listed for the brain on the autopsy inventory sheet.
- 5- Subsequent statements that the brain weighed 600 grams and 1500 grams. Either figure is forensically impossible.
- 6-Statement that brain was not sectioned for examination of bullet tracks.
- 7-Though not a part of autopsy report, statement that brain is now missing.

All of this says to me that Humes, through the employment of irony, intended to convey that there was no brain, that he was describing the non-existent.

The above 7 items constitute a forensic house of cards, one that collapses with the breeze of one or two honest questions. Whether or not Humes knew that the Warren Commissioners would not ask the questions makes for extremely interesting conjecture. Conceivably a purpose for writing an autopsy report so internally inconsistent would be to rope in the Commission as co-conspirators in such a way as to make it impossible to later claim that they had been victimized. I consider the failure of the Comm. to ask the questions that here begged to be asked the very touchstone of their culpability, and even more important than the failed absurdity of the magic bullet. Most interesting to me is the fact that none of the prosecutors would support the magic bullet scenario, even after they had agreed to move a wound up in order to give the theory some plausibility. Only the Bethesda doctors knew why the govt. wanted the single-bullet scenario, since they had agreed to move up a wound in order to make it seem possible. All of this indicates that Specter had to go over the heads of the prosecutors to get some pressure applied to them. If Humes, et al. had simply agreed to cooperate with Specter, it follows that they would have supported the single bullet. Humes had enough leverage to fight back because everyone in the autopsy room knew that there was no brain, and he knew that the military could not knock off every witness. He knew that oaths of silence are straws of convenience, so why should he have strained for a false plausibility in order to indict himself at whatever future time some witness or witnesses decided to come forth?

Humes' statement that the autopsy report he presented to the Comm. was no different from the one he turned in on 11-24-63 contains an allegorical truth, I believe. If I am right about that, then the report he turned in on that date stated that there was no brain. That would explain why the Sibert-O'Neill report was not written until several days later, and why it is worded so elliptically. It does not even state that the agents saw a brain, even though it seems to. It does not even state that Humes saw a brain.

Best wishes,

*Russell Harrell*

Russell Harrell