

**underground**

**underground**

**underground**

**underground**

# THE KENNEDY AUTOPSY PICTURES:

"The best these pictures can do is  
prove that one less lie was told." PAGE 3

UNDERGROUND / Page 3

# WEISBERG INTERVIEW

Harold Weisberg, author of Whitewash, a book critical of the Warren Commission Report, gave Underground this exclusive interview early this month. Sitting in the kitchen of his Hyattstown, Md., farmhouse, Mr. Weisberg talked at length on his book and other re-

cently published books critical of the Warren Commission conclusions. The following are edited excerpts from that interview.

WEISBERG, WHITEWASH,  
THE OTHER CRITICS

I have a unique approach in my work. I restrict myself one hundred percent to the official evidence. I don't pretend to be James Bond and I'm not. I would say that the Commission's best evidence proves that Oswald could have killed no one. I'll go farther in this particular case because of the continuing work I've done in this field since I wrote the book and I'll say that I'm also satisfied that this best evidence is absolutely unassailable.

I don't think anybody has added materially to what I finished in mid-February 1965. I don't think collectively they approach what I did. Thirty to forty percent of my book is not duplicated by any other of the works. Where there are differences, these are differences in emphasis. For example, Epstein's book is really two things. It's an enlargement of my introduction and it serves its own kind of importance that way. But the essence of what he said, I said.

My book was a hundred and ten thousand words. I had a contract for a hundred thousand words. I had to leave a lot of stuff out. I elected not to be interested to any great degree in the things Mr Epstein was interested in, simply because I think they're obvious to the average person who knows how government functions and because I thought the other things I had to say were more important.

What he's added was the opinions of some people. Unfortunately—and I think it is a reflection more of the immaturity of his professor than of Epstein—he never realized that he was becoming the creature of those who were giving him information. What he has is quite biased. Wesley J. Liebeler immeges as a hero in Epstein's book. I have read and studied the careers of very few people who are less heroic than Wesley Liebeler. And I have not seen the functioning of many people who were as interested as Wesley Liebeler in having Epstein say what Epstein said.

Epstein never questioned this apparently. He's a young man and has spent much of his time studying. I think it's quite understandable that a man who hasn't been knocked around by life quite a bit might not think of these things. I find it a lot less understandable that this eminent professor who was his mentor didn't immediately wonder. No cub reporter would have been fooled this way, simply because he would have asked the inevitable question: Why. Why was Wesley Liebeler spilling his guts and rifling files for Epstein?

He also has the FBI report in his book. Now this is something I believe everybody but me has sadly mishandled. All the publishers have made a great mystery out of it. All the mercenary rascals have claimed for their authors that this is a great discovery he made.



Holt, Rinehart and Winston deliberately misrepresented that Mark Lane had discovered the FBI report. Mark Lane didn't even see it until after it was in publication in my book. I didn't discover the FBI report. Nobody discovered it.

The truth is before anybody ever saw it, I had a dozen references to it in my book because it was very carefully leaked by the Government. They didn't leak one hundred percent of it but they actually leaked the essence of it to make the story credible. It's for this reason that I have these references throughout my book. The first actual publication of the words of the text that I know of was by Vincent Salandria. The first actual publication in facsimile was by me. So far as I know neither Salandria nor I were, on our own, claiming any great deal for it. But everybody else who's come after us has.

They've all misused it because they all use it as primary evidence of the autopsy. This is simply because they're lazy workers. It's not evidence on the autopsy at all. It's secondary at best. The others are using it as a substitute for having really analyzed the autopsy story and the testimony of the autopsy doctors and all the other doctors. This I did. In my book, Whitewash, the FBI report is nothing but a postscript. I think in perspective it asks questions about the FBI rather than about the Commission. I am alone in thinking this.

This brings up the entire question of approach. There are a lot of us who say the Commission was wrong. It is not a fiction that I address myself to the re-

CONTINUED ON PAGE 4

letter writing. It tells a shocking story. The picture can destroy the entire report. I have no doubt in my mind that it does.

Somebody on the Commission's staff took a scissors out and cut off what he didn't like. I can't for one minute believe that Senator Russell had his secretary do it, or that Earl Warren brought the scissors in from his wife's sewing kit and he did it. I'd be much more inclined to believe that the members of the Commission had no idea that there was anything to the picture except what they saw, what the staff gave them.

Here is another example. The true story of the autopsy report is that the first copy was burned. Everybody else working in the field including the eminent historians are just unwilling to take the time it takes to trace these things out. You'll find that I also have in my book—and this is the first public use of it in facsimile form—on page 187, the certification of Dr. Humes that he burned the document described with a number. He says that these were certain preliminary rough notes.

It doesn't tell the whole story. What he swore he burned is not described in that certification. He swore he burned the first draft of the President's autopsy.

We have a second draft of the autopsy. I've gone through the existing hand written draft and in my book I have four excerpts but they are the difference between day and night, high and low, up and down, back and front. They contain substantive changes and not editorial changes. Some of them happened by magic and some of them happened by design.

You'll notice the word puncture wound is stricken through with fair regularity but not so heavily that you can't read it clearly. In the second line of the first paragraph, Dr Humes says the doctor in charge in Dallas noticed a puncture wound in the lower anterior neck of the President approximately mid-line. This very clearly says as of two days after the assassination the doctor in charge of the autopsy was still saying that the doctors in Dallas told him that the President was shot from the front.

As of this moment the entire story changed and when those doctors testified before the Commission they were hornswoggled, bamboozled, pressured—you name it. Some of them were resolute men and wouldn't change their stories, but most of them found ways of evading, of hemming and hawing. I think that historically there may be a judgment that some of them found it possible to commit perjury. The Commission didn't care about perjury. In fact it depends on some.

When this language "puncture wound of the lower anterior neck" which you see in that paragraph is not stricken through was typed there was some magic—and the Commission depends also on magic. That word puncture was replaced by the words "second, much smaller." I don't know whether the stenographer did it on her own or whether somebody was standing behind her. In any event the Commission was totally without concern about the substantive alterations in this autopsy report. This is, I think, the most important kind of evidence because it happens that Dr Humes was an expert in forensic medicine.



## KENNEDY PIX 'GREEK GIFT'

The author of a controversial book critical of the Warren Commission Report has said that the best that pictures and X-rays of the autopsy performed on John F. Kennedy "can do is prove that one less lie was told."

Harold Weisberg, author of the recent book *Whitewash*—the Report on the Warren Report, labeled the photos and X-rays, a recent gift by the Kennedy family to the National Archives, a "Greek gift."

"You know the phrase," he said. "Beware of Greeks bearing gifts."

The pictures, examined by Doctors James J. Humes and J. Thornton Boswell, both of whom were present at the autopsy of the assassinated President, will not be available to the general public.

Already the pictures and X-rays are being used to discredit critics of the Commission's one bullet theory. The Commission relied on testimony from the autopsy doctors and did not view the X-rays or photos. Dr. Humes after evaluating the recent Kennedy family gift said that "the pictures showed just what we testified to."

Mr Weisberg maintains that the pictures "are entirely exaggerated in importance." They will not affect criticism of the Commission conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald alone committed the assassination, he says.

The Commission made a "quasi-judicial determination," Mr Weisberg insists, "based on pure speculation that a bullet went through President Kennedy's body, through the neck, from back to front, without hitting a bone. Now, if it hit no bone, what is the X-ray going to show."

"The pictures are the important evidence," Mr Weisberg said. But he insisted that the pictures are important only because they can show where there was a hole. "At this point," he said, "once the body was accessible to people, unless there is a tight chain of evidence that proves that no liberties were taken with it, it's not even possible to tell whether the wound was one of entry or exit." ##