

TENTATIVE MEMO ON CHEST WOUND EVIDENCE AS DEVELOPED BY SPECTER, HUMES, AND PARKLAND DOCTORS:

When specter took Humes' testimony, Humes was perfectly clear about the President's chest wounds in the way of the results of operative procedure performed by Parkland doctors to insert closed drainage chest tubes. Humes said at 2H363 that the two bilateral incisions on the chest only penetrated the skin that the "wounds" did not enter the chest cavity and that he assumed that the President had died during this and the efforts were discontinued. Specter never challenges this testimony.

Did Humes tell the truth and was or could Specter have been aware of it? Yes to the latter and no to the former. The operative records from Parkland (see 17H3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 14)--those introduced during Humes' testimony by Specter plus one introduced during Dr. Jones' testimony are clear that the insertion of chest tubes was completed and that they were hooked up to under-water drainage. Now, I have no way of substantiating if Specter read the exhibits he introduced into evidence. I can only assume that he did. If he did, he could only have the most serious doubts about what Humes testified to under oath, which is contradicted by the doctor's statements.

Now I ask if Specter showed any signs of being aware of this and if he tried to correct the record or clarify things. He did on both counts and he proved both that Humes perjured himself and that he was well aware of it. Specter consciously and specifically asked the Parkland doctor who did the chest operations if they had fully inserted the tubes and all responded that they did as did others who were not directly involved in the operative procedures (see 6H34, 54, 70).

When Perry testified in Washington, Specter deliberately developed this point with him and asked if they were fully inserted with the pretense that the autopsy report or "other information" had declared to the contrary. Perry, who was not the one to ask since he did not do this part of the

operative procedures, responded that he thought they had been but has "information" that they weren't. I assume that this infor was provided by Specter since Perry nowhere has given an indication that the tubes were not inserted and he actually knew to the contrary. (See 3H388 and last page here)

I asked myself if the fully placed tubes could possibly not leave evidence which would be visible to Humes on later inspection. To ascertain this, I called a thoractic surgeon at a prominent Philadelphia hospital and interviewed him on tape over the phone. I asked him if he had ever inserted chest tubes and he replied that he had, and many times. I asked him if the tube had to be fully inserted in the pleural space in order to connect it to underwater deainage to which he said that this is absolutely so, that it cannot be connected unless it is fully inserted. This confirms what the Parkland docs said for since they did connect their tubes to underwater drainage, they must have been fully inserted. Thinking that perhaps this might not have been visible to Humes, I asked what damage had to be done to the chest to do this. He said that the doctor could cut through the skin and the muscles straight down to the chest cavity but that this is not usually done. Instead, an incision is made into the subcutaneous tissues and a trocar is inserted through the muscle bundles and then the tube is placed into the trocar. I later found that Dr. McClelland at 6H34 said that a trocar was used on President Kennedy. I asked him if, assuming that the patient transpired, would evidence that the tubes were fully inserted be observable to the autopsy doctor. He said that if a careful examination were made, the pathologist could definitely see that the tubes were inserted. Humes testified that he examined the chest incisions very carefully.

To develop this even more, I wrote a letter to each of the three doctors who were involved with the placement of chest tubes (Baxter, Peters, and Jones--I sent them carbons of the same letter). In this letter I asked them to describe what they did to the chest and what damage would have been



left. None have yet responded.

The above paragraph is actually superfluous in light of what the thoracic surgeon told me plus information I later found in the record. Suppose the unlikely; that Humes really did not see evidence that the tubes were fully inserted. Is there any way prior to his testimony that he could have known that they were indeed inserted? There is and this concerns his second call to Perry. Perry testified to this in detail at 6H16-17 where he says that when Humes called back, it was in reference to the placement of chest tubes. Perry told him what motivated him to have this done and he told him, as he testified to Specter, that he confirmed to Humes that the tubes had been inserted and connected to underwater drainage. He also testified before Specter that he told Humes the doctors who were involved in this endeavor. Humes testified that Perry was somewhat confused on who did this 2H362. Was he trying to distract Specter from the doctors who could provide the answer?

Perry's testimony proves that despite what he may have seen at the autopsy, Humes had been informed that the chest tubes were placed and thus the incisions were not just in preperation for the operation: they were used. This was precisely the subject of Humes' second and virtually secret call.

Humes also compounds his comments on this during his testimony. He says on two occasions that the incisions were intended for placing chest tubes, and he says things like "had the doctors placed the," ect. (see 2H362, 367)

Also note that the doctors' statements were made available to Humes before his testimony. He could have known about the placement if not from Perry then from these. Specter certainly could have, and it is my strong feeling that he suborned perjury from Humes on this point. As I said, we can only presume that Specter read the exhibits he introduced into evidence. Had he read these, he would have had to doubt what Humes said. And as his own record clearly shows, he made conscious efforts to find out if Humes

was right. He asked the docs involved in the placement of the tubes if they had been fully inserted and both replied that they had. His ellipses with Perry was splendid (see page at end of memo where this is reproduced). It is enough to hang him here. As for Humes, he has suppressed or at least attempted to suppress knowledge of chest damage to the President. Were there any wound there? Or did he confuse damage done by the doctors with bullet damage? I welcome comments on why Humes would have done this.

Howard Roffman  
3/10/70

P.S. Perry also indicates that Humes knew from the autopsy that the tubes had been placed. Perry testified that "He subsequently called back and inquired about the chest tubes, and why they were replaced...(6H16."

EXERPT FROM PERRY TESTIMONY:

Mr. Specter: Dr. Perry, was the chest tube inserted in the President's chest abandoned or was that operation or operative procedure completed?

Dr. Perry: The chest tube, to be placed there, was supposedly placed into the pleural cavity. However, I have knowledge that it was not.

Mr. Specter: And what was the reason for its not being placed into the pleural cavity?

Dr. Perry: I did not speak with certainty but at that point I think that we were at the end of the procedure and they just ~~AMXX~~ did not continue with it.

Mr. Specter: Had it become apparent at that time that the President expired?

Dr. Perry: That, I think, is probably true, but I did not state with certainty because I cannot state the exact sequence. I was employed myself at the time, and I think if it had been determined that this was not in, it would have been completed, if there was still time, but I am not sure of that. That is speculation. (3H388).

Now just look at these few lines of Humes testimony and understand just what Specter was trying to do (and with the wrong man):

We examined these wounds very carefully, and found that they, however, did not enter the chest cavity. They only went through the skin.

I presume that as they were performing that procedure it was obvious that the President had died, and they didn't pursue this. (2H363)

Obviously, Specter was trying to get Perry to confirm Humes' perjury. He was leading Perry on as he had done before. Perry was not the one to ask about this since he was not involved in that operation. Those who were told Specter the tubes had been inserted. And even Perry cautions Specter that he speaks with no authority.



MEMO ON SPECTER MEMO AND HUMES:

Harold mentions in EM I that, in his memo on his interview with Humes and Boswell, Specter says that the docs originally thought that the lung bruises were the result of the tracheotomy. He, Harold, goes on to point out that during his testimony, Humes says that they were able to ascertain with absolute certainty that the bullet caused these. He takes this as perjury and accuses (to my recollection) Specter of suborning it. While I may have misunderstood what Harold was saying, I think that it is entirely possible that Specter misconstrued what the docs told him and reflected this in his memo. While this may mean that Humes was telling the truth, it still indicates that to Specter's understanding, Humes was lying and he allowed him to do this.

There is, however, something else in the Specter memo which Harold missed and which indicates that Humes did not perform as Specter expected him to during his testimony. Specter writes in the memo that he showed Humes the Parkland docs reports which described the trachea wound as ragged and states that the docs said that this would be more consistent with exit than with entrance. During the testimony on two occasions (see 2H 362, 364) Specter gets Humes to talk about these reports and is obviously leading him on to say what is reflected in his memo. Finally, at 2H364 he gets down to this with Humes and directly asks him if the ragged description would bear on whether neck wound was entrance or exit. Humes concedes that it is possibly exit but cautions Specter that the trachea is a cartilaginous substance which, unless very carefully incised, will appear ragged when cut.

What do you make of this? To me, it shows that Humes did not perform as Specter apparently expected him to as reflected in the pre-testimony interview. However, I could be over-estimating this.

Howard Roffman  
3/11/70