

Mr. Brad Kizzia  
Strasburger & Price, L.L.P.  
901 Main St., #4300  
Dallas, TX 75202

6/8/94

Dear Mr. Kizzia,

By now you know my typing cannot be any better. I'm sorry about it.

I enclose copies of my letters to Gary and to <sup>G</sup>allen.

On my <sup>separate</sup> file on my debate with Belin at Vanderbilt no copy of my speech exists. I cannot understand this. I had the original and carbon copies. The file does hold several news stories <sup>it and on</sup> on his coming out for a new investigation as soon as he got home and I had some correspondence with him. I examined my other Belin files and while it is not in them some things that might be of use to you, like a tape of his appearance on a network Sunday talk show and some of Sylvia Meagher's criticisms of him, are there and you are welcome to them if they can be of use. When the student who has been doing my filing returns I'll ask her to search my basement ("overflow" files) to see if it may have been moved there <sup>to</sup> make space in my office files. I'll also ask two history professors if I gave them copies.

I've interpreted the "etc" after Humes' notes broadly on the chance it can be ~~of~~ of use to you from what I recall of the depositions <sup>G</sup>ary sent me. (I do have paperclips on the pages I thought you might be able to use to lead into questions if that is ever of interest to you.)

What I have on Humes' notes in the form of documents that I can remember I published in Post Mortem. I also quoted from his Commission testimony on them. I did that I think more extensively in NEVER AGAIN! with quotations of Specter's questioning in which he said the CD of a certain number was identical with the CE of a certain number and that they both hold those notes.

While perhaps it might be argued that Humes did not refer to his "notes" in his 11/24/63 certification the next document leaves that without question. My copies of the records I reproduce on pages 524 and 525 are in a sealed package that represents what I published. My recollection is that the Archives copied them for me from the originals that along with other originals <sup>was</sup> misfiled the one place nobody would look for them, with what the Commission sent to the printing office to be printed. These were not, of course, and until I published them it was not known that Burkley had ~~accepted~~ accepted, approved or verified anything at all. The reference in this first Humes certification is to handing over "certain preliminary draft notes." I am confident there are no such things in autopsy notes.

Burkley's acceptance and approval on 525 is that Humes handed in "autopsy notes and the holograph," and this is beyond call.

That the National Naval Medical Center retained not a piece of paper <sup>is</sup> on 526. As of 11/25/63. The Secret Service receipt of the next day, and that item was marked on

the Commission file copy - I did not add it - includes the "notes of the examining doctor." From page 527. (I do not know whether you might want the records of the transfer of what had not been transferred to the Archives but I include them.

In Humes' Commission testimony he swore that what he burned was the first draft of the autopsy. If you have not read that part of Post Mortem I hope you can find the time. He destroyed that and did an entirely new protocol as soon as he knew Oswald was dead. Before the House assassins committee he swore that it was his notes that he burned.

Because of the content of the articles and what I read in the depositions I also include, and these were copied for me from the originals, what follows. I also note that this first one alone proves that <sup>Boswell</sup> Humes lied to JAMA because that body chart, <sup>Boswell,</sup> on a required Navy form, not a throw-away as I think Boswell said, has the President's blood and other body fluids on it. I think you can now get color pictures of this from the Archives and of the holograph to which I return below because I had an undeveloped ~~35mm~~ 35mm roll that the Archives ~~has~~ <sup>sent</sup> for me and it is mislaid.

My point in this is that Burkley "verified" that the back wound was where <sup>JAMA,</sup> Boswell and Humes say it wasn't, well below where their protocol and their testimony placed it.

The next two pages, 508-9, are xeroxes made at the Archives for me of the certificate of death that had been hidden and I then published for the first time. It places that wound exactly where the body chart does, at the third thoracic vertebrae.

I do not now recall the two different verified body charts but I include both.

With regard to their <sup>claiming</sup> balmin what they did not do that they should have on the Kennedys, I include Bobby's complete waiver in Jackie's name. He signed it.

The last of these pages is a xerox made for me from the original of the existing holograph. I have that on film somewhere but do not know where. You can, I am confident, get printed color pictures from the Archives. On page 515 of the book is Humes' page 7. I think it is important with regard to the nature of the changes made and to the claim that nothing was required of them to be changed. Humes testified that these changes were made in Admiral Galloway's office. The description of the fatal head wound in Humes' version was of "a puncture wound tangential to the surface of the scalp." All of this was replaced by the single word, "lacerated".

I've added an Afterword to NEVER AGAIN! <sup>based</sup> based on new evidence evidence I think you can use. Here I call to your attention from it that Finck finally broke down and testified that Galloway told them not to do those things they did not do. I also have there what shows that it was not possible for Galloway to have left the autopsy room for all those trips to the 17th floor where Jackie and others were and, still under oath, that Humes phoned Perry as early as 10 p.m. 11/22 and not later than 11 p.m., attested to by a doctor who was there and saw and heard Humes make the call. I also go into that timing in Post Mortem along with the truthful explanation of why Perry ducked the 11/23 press conference: Humes had told him what they were going to conclude.

Oh, my, with what I have could you call Humes as a witness! Boswell, too!

IN NA, I'm abbreviating the book, I also have Finck's formerly secret memos to his boss at AFIP and I think some of his own comments. I think I am correct in saying that he said he made <sup>autographs</sup> notes and handed them in.

It also holds a first-person account of the Army's major wound expert who was to have been called in on all VIPs and wasn't and his account of how from the wrist wound alone the single-bullet theory is impossible. That could be available on videotape, I am sure. I have no idea whether that doctor is still alive. He retired years ~~ago~~ ago and a young friend of mine interviewed him in his retirement at my suggestion.

Please excuse my taking a liberty and making a few suggestions but from my knowledge and experience they are very important for you and for your case.

One is to avoid all conspiracy theories. None can be proven and just about all can be disproved. They all entail liabilities for you. I ~~am~~ mean to include in this all that are only theories despite the confidence <sup>ce</sup> others have that they are factual when they are not. There also is no need for them.

Particularly is this true about such things as the back of the head being blown out. It was not. It is visible, clearly and intact, on the ~~Zapruder~~ Zapruder film after the fatal shot, in the ~~ninth~~ nine frames the Commission <sup>was</sup> to have published and didn't. When I caught that the Archives put those slides made from the original in the tray of <sup>slides</sup> slides and I examined them with care. They are 334-343. The back of the head shows no damage and no blood and there is no blood on the shirt collar or the back of the jacket. You can see this by stopping or printing from any clear VCR version of the film. I have <sup>small</sup> small prints made of two of those frames, in color, made from a cassette.

It just occurs to me, you could show prints to Lundberg or Deo or even <sup>to</sup> Delin.

You can, of course, get all of what I enclose copied from the Archives.

Post Mortem has been listed in Books in Print, the standard source, since it was published. Any consultation with it would have told JAMA of its existence, if they did not know.

If you should need a medical-records expert, my friend Mrs. William (Betsy) Heichter, is so qualified. His office is 1313 Lyndon Lane, #115, Louisville, KY 40222. He is a lawyer.

Sincerely,  
*Harold Weisberg*  
Harold Weisberg