

copy to = A. WEISBERG

FREDONA, N.Y. conference
July
1996

**"Barefoot Sanders, Ramsey Clark, and the Dallas Invasion
of Washington: The Later Coverup of the Medical Evidence."**

By Harrison E. Livingstone c 1996

The place of origin or longtime residence of figures in the JFK case may or may not be significant. Texans are suspect due to the probabilities that the conspiracy had its origin in Texas. There is a pattern of not just Texans moving to Washington for high positions in the Johnson administration after the assassination of John Kennedy, but those from Dallas itself. I'm not proposing guilt by association with Texas, but what can we read from this when there was enough money in Dallas/Fort Worth to buy or coerce anyone?

Johnson's ranch was near Austin, yet his primary support before the assassination had its base in the Dallas/Fort Worth area, both politically and financially, though not with the voters. One of his chief political backers in Dallas was United States Attorney Barefoot Sanders. Barefoot (a family name) Sanders was credentialed as a liberal Democrat, and if anything, acted as a brake on the more conservative and radical elements in his city.

Sanders drove Judge Sarah Hughes to Love Field to go to Kennedy's funeral in Washington. She had sworn in Johnson on the plane shortly after the assassination. Soon more than 90 witnesses were making statements to the Warren Commission in Dallas, and many of these testified in Sander's office. Some complained that their testimony was altered.

Sanders still in Dallas, began playing a rôle in the investigation early. Leon Hubert of the Warren Commission wrote a memo to Rankin, May 11, 1964, saying that "I spoke to Mr. Barefoot Sanders only casually... Sanders took occasion to say to me that he had a great deal of concern about the publication of some of the depositions. He had reference to those in which the witnesses being deposed made derogatory statements against other people and particularly those police officers who criticized their superiors. He told me that there was concern in Dallas about these matters."¹

Sanders was involved on the edges of the trial of Jack Ruby in Dallas, and as U.S. Attorney there, looked after the interests of the FBI. The FBI had generated various reports on witnesses, and a long report by Dallas FBI agent Manning Clements (17 January, 1964). It was decided that these reports would be made available to Dallas D.A. Henry Wade, and "requested that Sanders exhibit the reports to Wade so he can (I.D.) the information which would be of value. Such information will probably be made available to him by the Department. Sanders will retain possession of the reports in his office at all times."² The FBI gave Sanders 18 reports which had been given to Herbert Miller who censored them.³ They removed the records of the Bank of Dallas with regard to Ruby's finances.⁴ For an extensive list of what else was deleted, see Rosen's memo to Belmont, January 22, 1964.⁵ Sanders also called Hubert at the WC to say that Judge Joe Brown wanted to testify, but they did not want him.⁶

On June 9, 1964, Sanders wrote Rankin and included the Dillard photo of the curb.

Dillard told him that "it looked like a piece of lead had struck it."⁷ On July 10, 1964, a Rudy Brenk or (Bronk) brought him a film of the assassination (or so he wrote) and he wrote Howard Willens of the Warren Commission about it the same day.⁸

Sanders filled William Manchester in on Dallas for his book, and Manchester conducted a long interview with Sanders on 22 September, 1964. He noted that in 1960, Sanders "headed up the Kennedy-Johnson campaign in Dallas County. At the time of the assassination, I was the ranking justice department officer here. I got very involved in the Kennedy trip. I knew about it a month or so in advance. I was trying to help on the plans and to figure out what kind of occasion it should be and who would be invited. There was much bitterness about who was and who was not invited to the Trade Mart. The citizens council was the moving force--Connally was behind that.... They envisaged this as a luncheon where business men would come.... The real driving force was the citizens council. It was an invitation-only affair. The basic problem was the people who had worked for Kennedy in 1960 were not invited. There was just the token representation of Negroes and labor leaders. There were about one hundred people here who had really worked hard for Kennedy and as the thing was originally set up they were not going to get the opportunity to see the President.... I was getting all sorts of outraged phone calls from people who had been active in the 1960 campaign, and there was a good deal of anguish on my part. Feeling was that the President was going to eat lunch with Republicans but Democrats were not going to see him.... Then I thought of Kennedy stopping downtown, but Jerry Bruno vetoed that. The Secret Service was originally opposed to the Trade Mart, so the motorcade was really all that was left. the motorcade was on and off-- finally, just a few days before the Dallas visit, it was decided to have a motorcade. A guy from the Agricultural Department was among the advance people." According to Sanders, the motorcade decision was finally made on November 19 when LBJ was in Dallas ("Because Cliff Carter had a business interest in 7-Up"). They were at the bottlers convention, as was Richard Nixon.

"The business people here in Dallas were scared stiff of an incident--they were scared stiff; that's why the Trade mart luncheon was to be exclusive.

"The *Dallas Morning News* was the focal point of the bitterness toward Kennedy. Also the business community, but not speaking out... contributed to the climate.... The *Times Herald* had turned down that ad that was in the *Dallas News*. I thought the *Dallas News* ad was a disgrace.... I served in the legislature for 6 years and I was considered unusual to be from Dallas because I was moderate. Great emphasis on conformity is placed here. Many high school football games went on as scheduled in Texas on Friday November 22nd under floodlights...." Sanders told Manchester that on 2:15 Sunday morning the FBI got an anonymous call that Oswald might be killed when being moved from the jail. "This was relayed to the sheriff's office in to the police. The FBI privately urged that Oswald be moved at 3 a.m...."

Sanders noted that the Kennedy/Johnson ticket lost badly in 1960 in Dallas County and "President Kennedy never would have carried Dallas."⁹

Speaking over the phone on September 26, 1964, Sanders gave Manchester a run

down on various people from Ted Dealey, A. C. Greene, and Congressman Jim Wright.¹⁰

With regard to the trial of Ruby, there was a venue hearing in February, 1964, and FBI Dallas teletyped Washington that "All afternoon witnesses except Sanders and Walker indicated they did not believe Ruby could get fair trial in Dallas. Sanders said he spoke for self and not as representative of Federal Government, that in his opinion there would be less difficulty in getting unbiased jury outside Dallas, but that an unprejudiced jury might possibly be formed here."¹¹

Madeleine Brown reported to me that Sanders recommended that Kennedy not come to Dallas because of the incidents against Adlai Stevenson. In her manuscript, *Texas In The Morning*, she quotes an acquaintance as saying "Barefoot Sanders has told him to scrub the Dallas visit--the climate ain't good here," and also states that Congressman Henry Gonzalez told them they should not come to Dallas.

Sanders set aside an agreement between the Texas Attorney General's office and the Warren Commission for a joint investigation which would share all interviews with Texas, and Rankin explained that there was nothing he could do, as Sanders had the power.¹² I'm sure Sanders did not make this decision on his own.

Sanders represented or advised and accompanied FBI agents Al Manning and Manning Clements to Judge Joe Brown's hearings in the prosecution of Ruby by the State of Texas. The FBI (Malley) had advised the agents, who had interviewed Ruby after he shot Oswald, not to reveal the contents of the interview, which the defense wished to bring out in order to show a lack of premeditation on Ruby's part. Sanders wrote, "I told Shanklin that in my judgement we could not pick and choose the questions to be answered but would have to take a consistent position which in view of Malley's instructions would be to invoke the privilege under Order 260-62," Sanders told Wade and Alexander, the D.A.s, that "the agents did not intend to answer any questions concerning any information gained in the performance of their official duties."¹³ Manning Clements had been Lee Harvey Oswald's case officer before he went to New Orleans. Hosty took over when Oswald returned, but Clements helped interrogate Oswald the night of the assassination.

Soon, Sanders took a high position as Assistant Attorney General of the United States under Robert Kennedy (shortly, Nicholas DeB. Katzenbach became Acting Attorney General, 1964, and AG, 1965-6. From New Jersey, he was an assistant AG under JFK and RFK), in the Civil Division of the Department of Justice in Washington. And, soon, he played a rôle in the odyssey of the autopsy photographs. Eventually he became a U.S. Federal District Judge and later Chief Judge in Dallas, and today remains active in Democratic Party politics there.

Former Attorney General Nicholas DeB. Katzenbach wrote a letter to the FBI July 8, 1965 concerning the "Public disclosure of Warren Commission records." Attached to it was a list of guidelines approved by Mr. McGeorge Bundy, former assistant to the President, which contained the guidelines for withholding information from the public. A letter from J. Edgar Hoover to Barefoot Sanders stated that, "According to the guidelines, the type of data to be held back from the public were as follows: Statutory requirements which prohibit

public disclosure; respect of security classification of the data being reported; data detrimental to the administration and enforcement of laws and regulations of the U.S.; information which would reveal identity of confidential sources; information consisting of rumor, gossip, and the like, the disclosure of which would harm or embarrass innocent persons."¹⁴

Ramsey Clark, also from Dallas, replaced Robert Kennedy's figure-head position at the head of DOJ, and, he too played a rôle in the disposition and history of the autopsy photographs. Clark constituted what became known as the Clark Panel to examine the autopsy materials and report on what they showed with regard to the wounds. The results, as we all know, were startling in that the findings contradicted some key points on the locations of the wounds in the autopsy report and statements of the autopsy doctors and other witnesses, especially later on when they were interviewed by the HSCA. I have repeatedly made this an issue in each of my books.

According to Carl Eardley, an assistant U.S. Attorney general, "Ramsey Clark appointed a 'strike force' to do a paper investigation of the Kennedy assassination following the publication of Mark Lane's book, 'Rush to Judgement' in 1966 or 1967.... This report was written for the Attorney General himself and concluded that Mark Lane is a phoney. For example, they concluded that Mr. Lane ignored contradictory facts in his book that may have pointed away from his central hypothesis, namely that there was a conspiracy in the assassination." The same memorandum then tells us that "Sometime after this Ramsey Clark asked Mr. Eardley to do a project concerning the medical evidence in the assassination. Specifically, Ramsey Clark wanted an independent review of the JFK autopsy materials by medical experts." Eardley was present during that review at the N.A. in 1968.¹⁵

The Clark Panel was constituted, it is thought, because of a letter written by Dr. Boswell to officials asking for the opportunity to reexamine the materials.* But I think this was just a convenient pretext, and it is obvious that there were other reasons for an official release of information on the false materials which far more solidly backed up the fiction of the Warren Report. The Jim Garrison case soon heated up and it was necessary to counteract that, but at the same time, there were powerful reasons to fear the Kennedy family itself, and the chief witness to the President's wounds: Jackie Kennedy.

Wesley Liebler, former counsel of the Warren Commission, wrote an important letter to J. Lee Rankin, the former chief counsel, on November 16, 1966, with copies to W. David Slawson and Ramsey Clark, Acting Attorney General, raising significant questions about the autopsy photographs--issues which were also addressed by Arlen Specter. Liebler's 13 page memorandum, "Autopsy Photographs and X-rays of President Kennedy" is dated November 8, 1966. "It does not appear from the Commission's Record that these pictures and X-rays were ever examined by any member of the President's Commission or by any of its counsel. There is strong feeling that the Commission should have examined them in connection with its investigation. This is particularly true because of the importance of the autopsy findings in determining the number and direction of shots which struck the

It was not clear if it came from the White House - John Pugh

*DOJ CIVIL 182-10001, -10002, Jan. 26, 1968, Letter from Boswell to Ramsey Clark

President.

"The availability of these photographs and X-rays provides an opportunity to verify the autopsy findings and the conclusions which the Commission reached on the basis of those findings."

Liebeler discussed this with Slawson on the phone, November 21, 1966. The letter that Slawson then wrote to Clark does not have a date, but appears to be 21 November, 1966.¹⁶ Harrison Salisbury of the *New York Times* had talked with Liebeler the week before: "Salisbury told him that the Times was planning a series of articles on the criticisms of the Warren Report, that he, Salisbury, was to be in charge of the series, that he believed the criticisms were serious enough to warrant a re-opening of the investigation and that he thought there should be such a re-opening....Salisbury also said that the *Times* had asked Burke Marshall to cooperate with it or others in having some nongovernment pathologists examine the autopsy X-rays and photographs but that Marshall refused.

"Liebeler feels strongly that public opinion will soon force the Department of Justice and Burke Marshall to permit some kind of unofficial access to the photographs and X-rays and that it is better that such permission be granted as soon as possible. The dangers in waiting are:

(1) It will then look like we consented only under pressure, especially if by then the *New York Times* has joined the chorus.

(2) There is still a reasonable chance of spiking this thing by a re-investigation limited to aspects of the autopsy, but if public opinion continues to develop as it has over the past few months we may soon be faced with a politically unstoppable demand for a free-wheeling re-investigation of all aspects.

(3) The lunatic fringe already allege, or broadly hint, the involvement of the highest echelons of the Government in the assassination, and the Government's participation in the 'hiding' of the photographs and X-rays dangerously lends creditability to their hints and allegations....." There is more in this letter that deals with Richard Billings' meetings with Liebeler, with the fact that they had got an agreement from Edward J. Epstein to support the WR report if the questions about the autopsy photos could be answered ("Epstein will publicly state his satisfaction with the Report--in effect, he will publicly repudiate the doubts and suspicions he himself cast in his book. And he will join with Liebeler and others in defending the Report against Lane, who Epstein now is convinced is unscrupulous and dangerous."). They were also afraid of Barbara Garson's play *MacBird*, which indicated that the Johnsons killed JFK.

As for the lunatic fringe, that would have included Jacqueline Kennedy who entirely disbelieved the Warren Report on the basis of what she saw happening in Dealey Plaza. This letter ends with "Liebeler, Bert Griffin and Arlen Specter, the three Assistant Counsel who have been most concerned with answering public criticisms of the Report, would be glad to talk any of this over with you if you want them to." How come the staff counsel and not the Warren Commissioners themselves defended the Report? All this was a couple of years later, after the Warren Commission closed up shop, as well.

This letter shows the groundwork being laid with Clark, to whom Slawson's letter was addressed, for what became the Clark Panel.

Clark's (Ramsey Clark was the son of famous Supreme Court Justice and Civil Rights supporter Tom Clark, a former leading AG of the U.S., who retired from the Court in 1967 when Ramsey became AG,) subsequent wallowing in ultra liberal and leftist causes bespoke a deep seated guilt, in my view (in spite of the fact that he was only following in his father's footsteps), and certainly a parting of the ways with the right wing extremists with whom he was only too familiar on the Dallas scene.

Not long after Clark's ascension to AG, the Clark Panel met in Washington in February 26-7, 1968 to review the autopsy materials, after the materials were transferred from the Kennedy family's control to the National Archives on October 29, 1966, and an inventory was made by the autopsy doctors and the photographer who each signed every photograph on November 1, 1966. It was this key moment in our history when the seeds of the later conflict over the authenticity of those materials were sewn. The obvious machinations should have alerted anyone observing them to the fact that something was seriously wrong. Else, why go to so much trouble to authenticate and examine this material at that time? The doctors were back for another look on the 20 of January, 1967 when Dr. Finck arrived from Vietnam, and met with Barefoot Sanders. The doctors then went with Carl Eardley to the National Archives to examine the photographs. On the 26th of January, the doctors signed a statement prepared by the DOJ that the photos and X-rays did not modify their conclusions stated in the autopsy report. This was double talk. I think its clear that the photos and X-rays meant nothing to them and they recognized that something was wrong, so the materials did not change their opinion. But the statement could be read two ways, and also supported the government's position of a lone assassin.

Cliff Sessions at DOJ wrote Carl Eardley on 29 May, 1967 a letter clearly meant to shape what Dr. Humes said in public. "Please ask Dr. Humes to follow, in essence, the attached statement. However, we should not insist that he read it. If he chooses, he might want to do it in question and answer form. He might display Exhibit #397 to make his point.

"There is no reason for Dr. Humes to go into great detail. CBS would like answers to the following four questions and I am sure Dr. Humes will want to provide the answers:

- (1) How many bullet wounds were there?
- (2) Were they both fired from the rear?
- (3) What is the explanation of Exhibit #397?
- (4) Have the pictures been examined and do they confirm the autopsy report?"

Heaven forbid that Dr. Humes go into "great detail." I must say I love the lines: "How many bullet wounds were there? Were they both fired from the rear?"

We then have the Dallas run Department of Justice spelling out in the statement they wrote for Humes what his findings are. We continue to hear the same stuff thirty some years later, it seems.

"I am Dr. James J. Humes, a certified pathologist and Director of Laboratories at the Naval Medical Hospital in Bethesda, Maryland. I was in charge of the autopsy performed on the body of President Kennedy the night of November 22, 1963. Two other certified pathologists assisted me.

"We found that two bullets struck the President, both from the rear. One entered the back of the skull and exited through the right front. The other entered the back of the neck and exited through the throat. Some public confusion about the location of the neck wound has resulted from a drawing prepared for the Warren Commission. This free-hand drawing shows the wound to be lower than it was. However, the location of the wound was accurately described in a notation on the margin of the drawing as '14 centimetres below the tip of the right mastoid process, and 14 centimetres from the right acromion.' There were no other bullet wounds.

"A large number of photographs and X-rays taken (sic) during the autopsy. These pictures are now in possession of the National Archives and Records Service. I have thoroughly examined them. I can report that they support, in every detail, our autopsy findings which were reported to the Warren Commission."

This statement never would have been written if any of it was true, and the doctors did not need to be programmed in what to say. If they were speaking the truth, they would know what to say.

One must ask who the hell Cliff Sessions was, where was he from, and what were his politics? In the history of official lying, I suppose someone from Newfoundland or Alaska could do just as well getting the right answer from a witness in the interests of national security.

Interesting that an HSCA interview conducted by Andy Purdy and Jim Kelly with Harry Van Cleve, a lawyer with supervisory capacity over the N.A., stated that he "....felt the inconsistencies were best explained by the U.S. Secret Service. I tried to get Rowley but he refused to answer my telephone calls or to talk to me." "Regarding the meeting in February, 1969, regarding the present location of the autopsy materials, Mr. Van Cleve said it was 'utterly unproductive.' He said he was surprised by Rowley's 'flat refusal to discuss anything to do with it.' He said he '....got the impression there were shenanigans going on and no one wanted to talk about it."¹⁷ Again, this points the finger at the SS for possible involvement in the switching of evidence.

It would be very easy to say that once the die was cast--the faked materials planted in the National Archives--that Clark, Sanders et al were innocent unwitting parties simply going through bureaucratic motions suggested by others. Were Sanders and Clark active in the cover-up regarding the forgery of the autopsy photographs, or were they merely used or acting under orders they dared not countermand? Were they guilty parties, at least after the fact?

At all times one must keep in mind the immense power of the Presidency at that time, and coupled with the immense power of J. Edgar Hoover's FBI, this combination for control of the United States and its destiny, backed by the enormous wealth of the Dallas billionaires who supported their friends Johnson and Hoover, mere men representative of

the more liberal elements in Dallas, such as Clark and Sanders, would be unable to resist or even to resign when asked to do something that might be questionable. In the case of putting forward as legitimate for the first time the autopsy materials, as the Clark Panel did, it would have been very easy to manipulate these men, along with their assistant who played a large rôle as well, Carl Eardley. They may never have suspected a thing, being used as stooges without knowing it.

#

DOCUMENTS LEADING UP TO THE CLARK PANEL REPORT

As we know, the phoney autopsy photographs were flashed at Specter and Earl Warren (perhaps no others saw them) soon after agitation (staged or otherwise) by Specter to see it. Specter told *U.S. News & World Report* that, "The complete set of pictures taken at the autopsy was not made available to me or to the Commission. I was shown one picture of the back of a body which was represented to be the back of the President, although it was not technically authenticated. It showed a hole in the position identified in the autopsy report. To the best of my knowledge, the Commission did not see any photographs or X-rays.

"Why were all the pictures not shown?"

"Because the Commission decided that it would not press for these photographs, as a matter of deference to the memory of the late President and because the Commission concluded that the photographs and X-rays were not indispensable.

"The photographs and X-rays would, in the thinking of the Commission, not have been crucial, because they would have served only to corroborate what the autopsy surgeons had testified to under oath, as opposed to adding any new facts for the Commission."¹⁸ Obviously, Specter and the others did not foresee that the material had been changed and did not corroborate the autopsy material, in fact contradicting it, in order to bolster the lone assassin theory. There had been fatal flaws in the autopsy report with the placement of the rear wounds. In case anyone figured it out, the pictures had to be changed.

Specter, (much as I dislike him) to his credit, was trying (or at least leaving a paper trail tending to exonerate him). Specter wrote a series of revealing letters during the life of the Warren Commission which dealt with the questions at least in his own mind about the autopsy photos. He wrote Rankin on 30 April, 1964: "In my opinion, it is indispensable that we obtain the photographs and X-rays of President Kennedy's autopsy for the following reasons:

"1. The Commission should determine with certainty whether the shots came from the rear.....

"2. The Commission should determine with certainty whether the shots came from

above.....

"3. The Commission should determine with certainty that there are no major variations between the films and the artist's drawings...."

Apparently, from this letter, Robert Kennedy exercised some control over who saw them then, and Specter suggested reassuring RFK.¹⁹ Specter interviewed the autopsy doctors, Humes and Boswell, on March 11, 1964, for two hours, along with Admiral C.B. Holloway, prior to the above letter to Rankin. He wrote Rankin about this the next day. Specter mentions the bullet hole described by them as on the "back," not the neck.

An interesting comment in this letter by Specter contradicts the autopsy report and tends to indicate that what we now have was written much later than its date: "They noted, at the time of the autopsy, some bruising of the internal parts of the President's body in that area but tended to attribute that to the tracheotomy at that time."

Specter had a hands on approach at the time, for those who think that the WC trusted the FBI to do all of the investigating. He personally not only talked to the autopsy doctors outside of an official hearing in camera, but interviewed the FBI agents present at the autopsy. On March 12, 1964, he wrote Rankin about this, saying that he had talked to Francis X. O'Neill and James W. Sibert that day. They "advised that the autopsy surgeons made substantial efforts to determine if there was a missile in President Kennedy's back to explain what happened to the bullet which apparently entered the back of his body. They stated that the opinion was expressed by both Commander Humes and Lt. Col. Finck that the bullet might have been forced out of the back of the President's body upon application of external heart massage." They thought this after they all learned that a bullet had been found on a stretcher in Dallas, without knowing what stretcher.

"SA O'Neill stated that he is certain that he had a verbatim note on Kellerman's statement that the President said 'Get me to a hospital' and also that Mrs. Kennedy said 'Oh, no.'"

On April 16, 1964, Specter wrote Rankin about the work that remained in his area. He recommended that the Johnsons, the Connallys, Mrs. Kennedy and Senator Yarborough testify before the Commission, and that David Powers and Cliff Carter not be called, as they had been interviewed and statements prepared for them to sign. In the case of Carter, special assistant to LBJ, he may have been a prime suspect for complicity in the conspiracy.

Specter also outlined in this letter further work in the medical area, including a viewing of the autopsy photos and X-rays "to make certain of the accuracy of the artist's drawings of President Kennedy's wounds." He further advised that Drs. Seldin, Crenshaw, and Sanders give depositions: "These individuals were on the periphery of the events, but it may be worthwhile to hear from them for purposes of completeness."

On May 12, Specter wrote Rankin on "Examination of Autopsy photographs and X-rays of President Kennedy... When the autopsy photographs and X-rays are examined, we should be certain to determine the following: The photographs and X-rays confirm the precise location of the entrance wound in the back of the head depicted in Commission Exhibits 386 and 388... confirm the precise location of the wound of entrance on the upper

back of the President as depicted in Commission Exhibits 385 and 386... the precise area of the President's skull which was disrupted by the bullet when it exited as depicted in CE 388... The characteristics of the wounds on the President's back and on the back of his head should be examined closely in the photographs and X-rays to determine for certain whether they are characteristic of entrance wounds under the criteria advanced by Doctors Finck, Humes, Boswell, Gregory, Shaw, Perry and Carrico..." Specter also suggested checking this material against the frames of the Z film which showed the head shot to see if the angle of declination is accurately depicted in CE 388. He then wanted to re-examine Humes after they saw the pictures to "put on the record any changes in his testimony or theories required by a review of the X-rays and films, and corroboration of the portions or all of his prior testimony which may be confirmed by viewing the photographs and X-rays."

On November 22, 1966, Carl W. Belcher, Chief of the General Crimes Section Criminal Division of the DOJ wrote a memorandum concerning the "Discussion with Naval Medical Staff participating in the Autopsy upon the body of the Late President John F. Kennedy."²⁰ This memo notes that documents were being kept at the office of the commandant of the National Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, and we hope that what is mentioned there and anything else they had has been transferred to the N.A. But the main thrust of the memo deals with the examination of the autopsy material by the doctors and photographer (Stringer) on 1 November, 1966 and the statement that they were given to sign, as well as the problem of trying to make the material jibe with what was thought by the doctors to exist on the night of 22 November, 1963. Dr. Humes consulted notes he had compiled as to the numbers of photographs made during the autopsy, using documents that were kept in the Commandant's office to make his notes, which he had with him during their review in 1966. The punch line is found in the following comment: "Regardless of the explanations that are possible for the twenty-one total reached by the Secret Service, Captain Humes believed that all of the photographic items taken by his staff during the autopsy were present and inspected at the National Archives on November 1, 1966."

Yeah, well how come Humes and the other doctors have looked high and low for the interior chest and skull photographs? They certainly made it known very often that they went to a lot of trouble to make those photographs, so where are they?

And who the hell is Carl W. Belcher?

Toward the end of that year, 25 November, 1966, Ramsey Clark was getting a bit worried. He wrote a memo to Barefoot Sanders and Messrs. Fred Vinson and Mitchell Rogovin: "We would carefully examine all the criticisms, hypotheses and suggestions contained in the existing body of literature concerning the President's assassination and the work of the Warren Commission. The purpose is to inventory the contentions so we can evaluate their dimensions and validity. I would like the task described above to be undertaken by a small group of lawyers within the Department on an unpublicized basis...." Why? What was going on then?

Shortly after, on December 19, Carl Eardley wrote a three page note to Sanders suggesting a number of steps "which a further investigation of the assassination might

attempt to obtain.... in general, we think that the suggested lines of inquiry do not offer any substantial possibility of shedding new light on the assassination or of changing the major conclusions of the Warren Commission." For example, Eardley mentions that critics pointed out that some witnesses had not been interviewed. "It is suggested that the testimony of these people should now be taken. But the Commission did take eyewitness testimony of these events.... and in view of backfires and reverberations, it was not surprising that witnesses would disagree as to the source and number of the shots.... There is not substantial prospect that additional eyewitness testimony would change the major conclusions of the Commission, which were not solely based on eyewitness testimony but also relied on fingerprints, ballistics tests, proof of ownership and possession of the murder weapons, photographs, and medical evidence." The tragedy of this, the mind-set showing clearly in the above words, is the shortcomings of criminal investigation and thought processes. Above all, an unwillingness to truly consider the alternatives and possibilities. Beside, Belmont of the FBI, who is quoted in a footnote on the first page of this letter to Sanders, said, "No, sir, I frankly don't... (author's note: no further investigation is justified) We do not have any unexplored areas in this investigation that should be explored.... We have no evidence and, I could support no conclusion that this was other than an act of Oswald."

Was the bottom line that someone owned Sanders and Clark?

After discussing the uselessness of further tests, Eardley talks about the uselessness of further investigation of a possible conspiracy. The only straw men set up to be knocked down have to do with Oswald's possible involvement with communists, with Ruby, with Tippit, and Ruby and the Dallas police. "The Commission concluded that Oswald acted alone in shooting the President. This conclusion has been criticized, but the critics have not offered any suggestions as to how the existing evidence on the subject could be supplemented in any significant way by further investigation.

"It has been alleged that there was a conspiracy to frame Oswald....Quite apart from the far-fetched nature of this theory, the critics have not suggested how additional investigation would be helpful on this point." Nothing about the men from Dallas killing John Kennedy and framing Oswald.

The remaining short points addressed in this three page letter deal with Oswald's alleged connection with the FBI, evidence allegedly withheld by the Commission, and finally, the autopsy photographs and X-rays. This letter says that "In a previous memorandum we have explained the relevance of these items and suggested an inquiry into the possibility of having their contents made public through an examination by an independent group of qualified physicians. Such an inquiry might shed light on one of the major sources of criticisms--the single bullet theory."

On February 1, 1967, a year before the Clark Panel but not so long after the autopsy doctors looked at the photos under Assistant AG Carl Eardley's direct supervision, Anthony Nugent of the Criminal Division of the DOJ wrote Eardley of the Civil Division a memo with the subject, "Unanswered questions re Kennedy autopsy films."²¹ Nugent first of all mentions that when the doctors inventoried the photographs on 1 November, 1966, "The

doctors discuss what apparently was done and speculate as to why it was done. Although their theory makes sense, it is not a definitive answer to what was actually done by the developer and why it was done. We should ask the developer himself." Nugent tries to deal with the discrepancies in the count of the photos between what was recorded at the time of the autopsy and the more recent inventories. Humes "felt that in reaching the total of 21 mentioned in his 12/5/63 letter, Bouck counted only the developed film, that is, the 20 color transparencies and Misc. (3), and did not count Misc. (2).

"If so, Capt. Humes' speculation is still not the final answer. That can come only from SAIC Bouck." Secret Service official Robert Bouck initially controlled the film after it left the autopsy, and had it developed at the Anacostia Naval Processing Center, where agent James Fox took it. Unfortunately, Nugent entirely misses--at least in any document I have seen--the many more discrepancies in the count, and serious problems with the materials themselves. At least we have a paper trail of some effort, however small, to identify and deal with some part of the overall problem.

Why were both the criminal and civil divisions of the DOJ involved in this?

Reflecting whatever the behind the scenes confusion, fear or panic about the autopsy materials some people must have known were quite false by then, is the paper trail being established as to the chain of evidence of this stuff. DOJ requested a statement from the Secret Service "concerning the custody of the photographs of the autopsy performed on the late President Kennedy, and on 23 February, 1967, James J. Rowley forwarded the statement to Barefoot Sanders, which was signed by Roy Kellerman, James K. Fox, Edith Duncan, Thomas J. Kelly and Robert Bouck.²² A little late, one would think?

One of the many failings of the HSCA is reflected in the utter incompetence of the interview conducted by Belford Lawson of Barefoot Sanders, which deals with no substantive matters whatsoever. The only interest Lawson had was what Sanders might know about the motorcade and the planning for Kennedy's visit.²³ I can think of a few cogent questions that should have been asked Sanders about why he conducted the investigation he did, when he did, and why did it result the way it did.

Ramsey Clark released the report of his panel reviewing the autopsy evidence at the moment Clay Shaw was about to go to trial. An FBI teletype (January 20, 1969) wrote that the assistant D.A. James Alcock "branded Clark's action in releasing the report just as the case was about to go to trial and just as Clark was about to leave office as 'unconscionable' and 'not in keeping with his high office.' Alcock said it 'could not help but influence jurors.'²⁴

An HSCA memorandum indicates that the doctors on the Clark Panel may have refused to continue their work unless the brain turned up. "The controversy, pointed out by Dr. Russell Fisher, concerned the refusal of the panel to continue its deliberations without having access to the tissue materials and brain...."

The same document states that "the purpose of the Clark Panel was to determine the number of bullets and their entry and exit points, as well as the direction of their passage."²⁵

Sanders and Garrison

Sanders was Acting Attorney General in 1967, and from the documents in the files, apparently was intensely interested in anything having to do with the Jim Garrison investigation and prosecution. He called the FBI for information on a regular basis. The *Washington Daily News* for February 20, 1967 carried an article about David Lewis, "a bus station express handler who worked as a private investigator in New Orleans in the months before the assassination, claimed to have the names of five persons allegedly involved in the planning phase of the plot on President Kennedy's life. Mr. Sanders requested that he be furnished information in Bureau files that can be identified with David Lewis."²⁶ Hoover wrote Sanders on 21 February, 1967, and enclosed a five page memorandum giving him what they had on Lewis. "Also set forth....is other information we have received concerning the investigation being conducted by the District Attorney's office in New Orleans concerning the assassination."²⁷

On February 17, 1967, Sanders called the FBI to ask what they knew about a possible phone call between Clay Shaw and David Ferrie on November 22 or 23, 1963, or a book written by Clay Shaw. A note appended to the end of Hoover's response (February 18) to Sanders says, "We do not know the purpose of....Sanders' request in this matter. We, of course, did not investigate Clay Shaw....."²⁸

On March 2, 1967, Sanders wanted to know about James R. Lewallen, whose name came up in the Garrison case. The next day the FBI sent him their November 27, 1963 interview with Lewallen.²⁹

Sanders maintained his interest in the case. Lawrence Shiller, then with Capital Records, sent (on 16 January, 1967) him a transcript of a recording made with Jack Ruby, his lawyers and family five days after he learned that he was dying of cancer. This transcript dealt with his shooting of Oswald, and indicated he had not planned the shooting.

Sanders also was also the Federal Judge who dealt with the Richard Case Nagel odyssey through the courts.³⁰

Sanders was quoted in the *Dallas Morning News*, June 12, 1975, saying that he agreed with the Warren Report. It was in his office and presence in Dallas where numerous key witnesses were questioned by the Warren Commission. He spoke at the dedication of Dealey Plaza on November 22, 1963.

Concerning the investigation of Henry Marshall (later murdered) in 1962 of Billie Sol Estes, Sanders made constant reports to Robert Kennedy as to what the Grand Jury was doing.³¹ When Estes later convinced a grand jury that Marshall had been murdered by Malcolm Wallace under Lyndon Johnson's orders, Sanders did not believe it. "I would not believe Billie Sol Estes then, and I would not believe him now." He said the FBI had investigated Marshall's death but found no tie between Estes, Johnson, Wallace and Cliff Carter.³² The crime was uncovered by then Texas Ranger and later U.S. Marshall Clint Peoples, who found a pattern of several deaths in the Estes case.

They tracked back to Estes and Johnson.

So I don't have an answer as to the conscious culpability of Barefoot Sanders and Ramsey Clark. There is a certain obtuseness and withering of the mental processes that can set in as people grow older. Minds become set in their ways and less questioning for some. Those nurtured in governmental organizations often lie and cover-up as a matter of course, and know when to keep their mouths shut. While these men are alive, it would be nice to ask them what they knew and when they knew it, but I think if they did know something, that they would dare tell us. Too many of the players in our drama prefer not to know anything.

#

Postscripts

I had several talks with the autopsy photographer Thomas Stringer, this year. On one occasion he denounced several of the photographs as being unreal and not those he took. After I informed Judge Tunheim of this, I could no longer get a similar statement from Stringer, who found no significant differences with the photos that we have made public and those in the Archives which appear to be identical. Of course this did not ring at all true. Stringer had been put on notice by the ARRB that he was to go to Washington, but had not done so. At this point, I have absolutely no confidence in the major medical investigation being conducted by the ARRB. Some of the reasons are that Judge Tunheim nor any of the other Board members were present during the eight hour interviews with each doctor at the National Archives, and the Board has not been forthcoming on a complete revelation of the background of the men who conducted those interviews: Jeremy Gunn, and David Marwell. What are their qualifications? What government positions have they held previously? Above all, why were such important interviews left up to staff whom we really know nothing about? U.S. Senators or Supreme Court justices should be asking these questions.

But, I could be wrong about the ARRB's medical investigation.

I believe that if and when Jacqueline Kennedy's book is published, it will corroborate the findings of many of us and stand as a monument to the terrible truth of her husband's murder. The trouble is, who will believe even her, if she does not have the proof or the scientific facts to back some of it up? She may know the overall story, and she may testify to those facts we have not heard about before this directly from her: that the limousine stopped, that the back of her husband's head was gone and not the top.

History will be left with the riddle, but in the end, her word may go farther than almost anything else in stating the truth of the conspiracy.

1. HSCA 180-10071-10036, Agency File No. 005093. Letter of Hubert to Rankin, May 11, 1964.

2. HSCA 180-10055-10158, Agency File No. 44-24016-992, 22 January, 1964.
3. HSCA 180-10055--10167, Agency File No. 44-24016-1000, 22 January, 1964. for a list of the reports, see HSCA 180-10062-10405, Agency File No. 44-24016-992 (2), Box 24, section 40 FBI case files; 22 January, 1964.
4. HSCA 180-10055-10181, Agency File No. 44-24016-1012.
5. HSCA 180-10055-10193, Agency File No. 44-24016-1023, FBI Case Files, Box 8, section 40, Rosen's memo to Belmont, January 22, 1964.
6. HSCA 180-10071-10042, Agency File No. 005093, 1 June, 1964.
7. HSCA 180-10015-10449, Agency File No. 62-109060-3659, Box 16. Section 85 (3632-3660)
8. HSCA 180-10015-10168, Agency File No. 62-109060-NONE, 10 July, 1964; follows 3525, Box 15, Folder title: Section 81 (3513-3550).
9. HSCA 180-10116-10115, Agency File No. 015060, 22 September, 1964, Box 290, Manchester interview of Sanders.
10. HSCA 180-10116-10144, Agency File No. 006572.
11. HSCA 180-10063-10298, Agency File No. 44-24016-1088, Box 25. Section 42, FBI teletype of 12 February, 1964 from Dallas to Hoover.
12. Penn Jones, Jr. *Forgive My Grief* 4, p. 147-149, from WC Executive Session of 5 December, 1963, quoting Earl Warren.
13. DOJEOUSA 187-10001-10024, Memo of Sanders to File, 23 December, 1963. See also Sanders memo 2 January, 1964, DOJEOUSA 187-10001-10025.
14. Letter from the Director to Barefoot Sanders, FBI, March 7, 1967.
15. HSCA 180-10091-10157; Agency File No. 010934; Andy Purdy, 18 August, 1978.
16. DOJ-CIVIL 182-10001-10013, November 21, 1966.
17. HSCA interview with Harry Van Cleve, September 6, 1977, 180-10097-10137, Agency No. 002234.

18. *U.S. News & World Report*, October 10, 1966, p. 53.
19. Specter letter to Rankin on 30 April, 1964, HSCA 180-10108-10332; Agency file No. 002961.
20. DOJ CIVIL 182-10001-10021; November 22, 1966, Carl W. Belcher, Chief of the General Crimes Section Criminal Division, DOJ memorandum concerning the "Discussion with Naval Medical Staff participating in the Autopsy upon the body of the Late President John F. Kennedy."
21. DOJ CIVIL 182-10001-10004.
22. DOJ CIVIL 182-10001-10003, 23 February, 1967, Rowley to Sanders.
23. HSCA 180-10101-10374; Agency File NO. 014014, Sanders transcript with Belford Lawson, 26 July, 1978.
24. HSCA 180-10024-10215, Agency File No. 62-109060-6668; also see *New Orleans States Item* same date, January 20, 1969
25. HSCA 180-10075-10147; Agency File No. 010435, Andy Purdy memo of 1 August, 1978 talk with Judge Bruce Bromley.
26. HSCA 180-10046-10080,; Agency File No. 105-82555-Unrecorded. Also 180-10019-10418, 62-109060-4561; and 180-10046-10084, 105-82555-Unrecorded--letter of W.A. Branigan to W.C. Sullivan, February 21, 1967.
27. HSCA 180-10046-10085, Agency File No. 105-82555-Unrecorded, containing letter to Sanders and the five page memorandum. This also contains the *Times Picayune* article about Lewis and "concerning the investigation being conducted" by Garrison.
28. FBI 124-10048-10338, Agency File No. 62-109060-5089.
29. HSCA 180-10046-10122, Agency File No. 105-82555-Unrecorded, FBI case files, Box 36, second following 5556, Section 232.
30. Russell, *The Man Who Knew Too Much*, but I can't find the reference.
31. *Dallas Morning News*, David Hanners, 4 April, 1984, and 6 January, 1985.
32. David Hanners, *Dallas Morning News*, March 23, 1984.