

J. GARY SHAW  
ARCHITECT

P. O. BOX 722 • CLEBURNE, TX 76033-0722  
805 N. MAIN ST. • (817) 641-6578  
METRO: (817) 558-2217 FAX: (817) 558-2217

N.C.A.R.B.  
Certificate  
No. 12,707

December 12, 1994

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
7627 Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, Maryland 21702

Dear Harold,

Thank you for your recent letter and your kind offer to revise those portions of NEVER AGAIN! which deal with Dr. Crenshaw and me. As requested, I am enclosing copies of the pages on either side of the passages in question in order to give you the continuity you need.

Please do not blame Brad Kizzia for not sending you the copy of your manuscript as you requested. He had sent his only copy to me, and, later, had asked me to make a copy and send along to you. Needless to say, I didn't follow up on his request. The oversight was entirely my fault...no excuses...just sorry I didn't follow through on it at the time. I am, therefore, sending you the original copy of the manuscript under separate cover -- today.

Though I am hesitant to do so, there is one other request of you that I would like to make. On page 596 (as hand-numbered) of NEVER AGAIN! you mention that the paraffin tests performed on the faces of FBI personnel who test-fired the "Oswald" rifle were positive and had "...left heavy deposits on all of the shooter's faces." If you have ever mentioned this before in any of your writings, I missed it. I believe, as you do, that this is extremely important, and as you point out, "...even more exculpatory..." of Oswald. Can you, without too much trouble, direct me as to how I may obtain a copy of this important FBI report? You note in the manuscript that this report was included among those records you received as a result of your lawsuit CA-75-226.

I am also enclosing, for your reading and comment, copies of the proposed rebuttal articles which have been submitted to the attorneys for JAMA and The Dallas Morning News. Though I feel that it is unlikely these will be accepted for publication in their present form, I thought you might like to see how we have approached the issue in the limited space agreed upon in the settlement.

Page 2: Weisberg, December 12, 1994

Again, thank you for all your help. Please continue with your excellent and important work in this case. I doubt seriously that I can ever be of much assistance to you from way down here in Texas; but, if by chance I might, please do not hesitate to call on me.

I sincerely hope that your health is improving and that you and Lil have a wonderful holiday season.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Gary", is written over the printed name "J. Gary Shaw".

J. Gary Shaw

Enc: As noted.

SETTLEMENT ENDS SILENCE

In April, 1992, the book JFK: Conspiracy of Silence was published, describing my observations, as an eyewitness to history, of the events at Parkland Hospital in Dallas, Texas, during that tragic weekend in November, 1963. As documented by sworn testimony of witnesses to the Warren Commission in 1964, as well as newspaper accounts in November, 1963, I served on the Parkland Trauma Team that strove to save President Kennedy's life. Two days later, I served on the team that tried to save Lee Harvey Oswald's life. My descriptions of President Kennedy's wounds, as contained in the book, were consistent with the descriptions of the wounds that were provided to the Warren Commission in contemporaneous reports and testimony by other Parkland medical personnel. Nevertheless, JAMA attacked my book and me personally, without even attempting to interview me or giving me an opportunity to respond. The JAMA articles were obviously not written by a physician, and despite its editor's description of the articles as peer reviewed, we have since learned that neither the author, nor any reviewer, was an

acknowledged expert on the subject and that the articles were not submitted for outside peer review. These inadequacies also contributed to the most glaring JAMA error -- the false suggestion that I was not even in Trauma Room 1 at the time--a suggestion refuted by the Warren Commission testimony of five Parkland witnesses, two of whom were interviewed by JAMA. JAMA also failed to mention the existence of evidence supporting a call to Parkland's emergency room two days later from someone claiming to be President Johnson who requested a deathbed confession from Mr. Oswald. Such shoddiness is uncharacteristic of responsible scientific journalism. Furthermore, although derogatory statements were made about me and my book at a press conference where the AMA seal was prominently displayed for the media, neither the statements made at the press conference, nor the JAMA article being promoted, were endorsed by the AMA.

I thereafter submitted a 6800-word article<sup>1</sup> in rebuttal to JAMA's 11,000 word article, but publication in JAMA was refused. Additionally, no correction has been published in JAMA for purposes of the record, even though JAMA's errors were immediately noted in the New York Times. With no other recourse to JAMA's irresponsible abuse of journalistic power, a defamation suit was filed on behalf of me and my co-author, Gary Shaw. After more than 1½ years of litigation, a settlement was recently reached, part of which requires JAMA to publish this response. The following reflects a letter that I sent to the editor of JAMA over two years ago, but which JAMA refused to publish:

To the Editor of JAMA:

I continue to be amazed and disgusted by JAMA's biased and unfair coverage of issues pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. It is probably unprecedented for an allegedly scientific and

---

<sup>1</sup> The original 6800-word rebuttal article that JAMA refused to publish is scheduled to be published in March, 1995, by Open Archives Press, along with papers submitted by other critics of JAMA's coverage of the JFK assassination in a book entitled Betrayal of Truth: The AMA Cover-Up in the Assassination of JFK.

professional journal to treat such a controversial subject in such an unscientific and unprofessional manner. It is little wonder that the overwhelming majority of Americans reject the single assassin theory JAMA has tried so hard to sell. If that were not enough, Dr. Lundberg and Mr. Breo went further to defame me and to attack my book JFK: Conspiracy of Silence, which is based upon my experienced, professional observations at Parkland Hospital on the tragic weekend of November 22, 1963. *unlike* Dr. Lundberg and Mr. Breo, I WAS there, and I DID see a small wound in President Kennedy's throat that was consistent with an entrance wound and a large hole *toward* in the back of his head consistent with an exit wound. My observations are not only perfectly consistent with the statements of medical personnel at Parkland immediately after the assassination and their sworn Warren Commission testimonies, they are also consistent with accounts of virtually all of the witnesses, who saw the head wound at Bethesda Naval Hospital. In fact, not one single person -- from Mrs. Kennedy to the Dallas doctors and nurses (27 people at last count)-- originally described the wounds as represented in the JAMA articles. Thus, what I have said is nothing new; rather, what is new is that I went public with the facts (not theories) about what I saw almost thirty years ago.

Without ever having even attempted to talk with me, (seemingly an established journalistic courtesy and one

expected between fellow physicians), Dr. Lundberg pronounced my book "-- a sad fabrication based upon unsubstantiated allegations." In contrast, he declared the JAMA article to be ". . . scientifically sound," furnishing ". . . the definitive history of what happened," and providing ". . . irrefutable proof that President Kennedy was killed by two bullets that struck him from above and behind." The record, clearly, is otherwise. If the recent misuse and abuse of JAMA to present an unscientific and unobjective view of the JFK case were not so harmful, it would merely be sad and unfortunate; but it has gone beyond that. Worse, JAMA has refused to apologize, to retract anything it has said, to attempt to be balanced or even to minimize the damage already done by publishing rebuttal articles, including my submission. Rather, the critics of the JAMA articles were limited to a few 500-word letters to the Editor, like this, which obviously cannot adequately address all of the inaccuracies contained in the prior articles and the misimpressions caused thereby. (Also, questions directed to the autopsists were never answered by them.)

I stand ready to provide the public with a complete and detailed rebuttal (with citations)<sup>2</sup> to each of JAMA's

---

<sup>2</sup> Id.

inaccurate and defamatory remarks about me and my book;  
an opportunity denied me by this forum.

When I stood over President Kennedy in Parkland's emergency room thirty-one years ago, it was my medical opinion that he had been shot from the front -- that the throat wound was an entrance wound and the wound in the rear of the head was an exit wound. This is what I reported in my book, and it remains my firm belief today.

Charles A. Crenshaw, M.D.



Humes and Boswell "for the only time . . . publicly discusses their famous cases" with Breco and Lundberg.

~~Whether or not what JAMA says about the autopsy and its report is true, Breco and Lundberg have no basis for saying that "the bullet and rifle evidence . . . and subsequent detailed documentation" combine with the protocol to prove that "Kennedy was killed by a lone assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald."~~

It is not only that they do not cite or refer to their sources or bases, the hard scientific approach one expects of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, they know nothing at all about the alleged other evidence and documentation they misrepresent it here. They do not even claim to have sought or used any of it. They did not.

They skirt around Finck's absence by saying merely that he "declined to come to Florida for the joint interview."

~~Suddenly the phones stopped working? Or, they could not go to Switzerland?~~

Under the heading, "Irrefutable evidence" Breco quotes Lundberg on his pleasure at getting the interviews and Humes on his alleged lack of interest in the controversy over his autopsy:

Lundberg says, "I am extremely pleased that, finally, we are able to have published in the peer-reviewed literature the actual findings of what took place at the autopsy table on November 22, 1963. I completely believe that this information, as personally given by Jim [Humes] and 'J' [Boswell], is scientifically sound and, in my judgment, provides irrefutable evidence that President Kennedy was killed by only two bullets that struck him from above and behind and that caused fatal high-velocity wounds."

Humes concludes, "I really have not had much ongoing interest in the autopsy. We did what we had to do in 1963, and we did it right. . . ."

With all the intense, national and international controversy about and involving that autopsy; with all the books and articles so critical of it, some charging him with being an accessory in crimes; with all the nutty theories so many so unfair to him; with the international attention to the Garrison fiasco and to what was attributed to him <sup>therein</sup> at it; and with Oliver Stone's

movie so incensing him after seven years of refusing even he stacked deck protection he got from Lundberg he finally agreed to it, Humes did not have "much ongoing interest in the autopsy?"

This is not easy to believe!

~~Twice in the interview as quoted in JAMA did Humes nonetheless display emotion.~~

~~Once was when asked about the pot-boiling book a Parkland Hospital resident at the time of the assassination, Charles Crenshaw, wrote with two coauthors who never saw a conspiracy theory they didn't love and at least one of who has clung simultaneously to mutually-refuting conspiracy theories, a triviality of a book in which Crenshaw portrays himself as so important President Johnson phoned to speak to him. "Humes exploded," Breo writes.~~

Aside from what Crenshaw alleges making no sense at all and not being credible in any detail, that LBJ phoned to demand that the doctors get a death-bed confession from Oswald, with all those who would have been privy to any such stupidity, I have the White House phone logs and the Secret Service transportation records for that period. There is no such call listed and where LBJ was at the time, which was the time of the funeral ceremonies, make it virtually 100 percent impossible.

Here is what Breo wrote about that:

Coincidentally, on the second day of the interviews, Boswell told the group that a Fort Worth physician, Charles Crenshaw, MD, had appeared on TV that very morning to argue the claim in his recent book, *JFK: Conspiracy of Silence*, that when he allegedly observed the dead President at Dallas' Parkland Hospital, he was positive that the bullets struck Kennedy from the front, not the back, "as the public has been led to believe." Crenshaw, who was a surgical resident in 1963, is not mentioned in the Warren Commission's 888-page summary report and his 203-page, generously spaced paperback was written with the aid of two assassination-conspiracy buffs. Crenshaw's book is only the latest in a long parade of conspiracy theories purporting to tell how Kennedy was really killed, including the 1991 release of Oliver Stone's film, *JFK*. Humes and Boswell had agreed to the *JAMA* interview without the slightest idea that Crenshaw's book had been published.

Now, his face incredulous with disbelief, Humes exploded with his summation. Pointing toward the window, the exasperated pathologist said, "If a bullet or a BB were fired through that window, it would leave a small hole where it

entered and a beveled crater where it exited. That is what 'J' and I found when we examined the President's skull. There was a small elliptical entrance wound on the outside of the back of the skull, where the bullet entered, and a beveled larger wound on the inside of the back of the skull where the bullet tore through and exploded out the right side of the head. When we recovered the missing bone fragments and reconstructed this gaping wound where the bullet exited, we found this same pattern--a small wound where the bullet struck the inside of the skull and a beveled larger wound where it exited. This is *always* the pattern of a through-and-through wound of the cranium--the beveling or crater effect appears on the *inside* of the skull at the *entrance* wound and on the *outside* of the skull at the *exit* wound. the crater effect is produced when the bony tissue of the skull turns inside to where the bullet leaves."

*JAMA* has Humes' second display of emotion under the heading "A foolproof finding":

He concludes, "In 1963, we proved at the autopsy table that President Kennedy was struck from above and behind by the fatal shot. The pattern of the entrance and exit wounds in the skull proves it, and if we stayed here until hell freezes over, nothing will change this proof. It happens 100 times out of 100, and I will defend it until I die. This is the essence of our autopsy, and it is supreme ignorance to argue any other scenario. This is a law of physics and it is foolproof- -absolutely, unequivocally, and without question. The conspiracy buffs above totally ignored this central scientific fact, and everything else is hogwash.

In both of these quotations Humes persists in the pretense that there was a definitive investigation that left it without question no other shots were fired and that in his own autopsy examination he established that without possibility of question.

Neither is true. Humes merely followed the government's "party line" on a lone-nut, no-conspiracy theory substituted for any real investigation at all.

We are left to wonder why they elected to be interviewed by a pathologist they knew was professionally better equipped than reporters to doubt what they said, ~~and to have what they said aimed at the nation's doctors.~~ It is not possible to avoid the suspicion that before saying a single word on the record to Lundberg and Breo they had dependable assurances that whatever they said would be accepted and repeated without any questions ~~about it at all.~~ Otherwise they would have been absolutely insane to say a word for publication, especially publication aimed at their peers and certain to attain considerable wide additional attention.

~~And there is nothing at all, not a single word, in what JAMA published that is not consistent with this more than mere suspicion -- this belief.~~

Humes and Boswell not only refused to speak to me in 1966 when in seeking interviews I sent them copies of my book which reflected my knowledge of their work as of the time it was published, a few months later Boswell agreed to be and was interviewed by Fletcher Knebel, the Sun's Levine, the New York Times' Peter Kihss and by the Associated Press.

The reason is obvious: Humes and Boswell knew what I knew and they knew also that those to whom Boswell did then speak on the record had no such knowledge and none of the interest made clear ~~in my book.~~

My purpose in emphasizing Boswell's ~~agreed to~~ interviews for ~~publication~~ is to indicate that rather than never once having spoken in public, ~~what~~ JAMA says, ~~they~~ did speak in public when

they thought it could serve their interests and when they had no choice. As recently as ~~for publication in~~ Harry Livingstone's 1992 book, Boswell did agree to be interviewed and was interviewed. <sup>(I have not listed all the known interviews of both doctors)</sup>

~~Humes spoke in public on nationwide TV when before the House Select Committee on Assassination. That very public testimony of September 7, 1978 was also aired internationally by radio and by the print press. It also was published in the committee's first volume of hearings beginning on page 323.~~

~~Without the need to do any research, from recollection alone it is obvious that the exact opposite of JAMA's almost stupefying false representation, that the autopsy pathologists agreed to be interviewed by it in "their first-ever public discussion of the case" and that in this they ended their "twenty-eight years of silence."~~

It is this emotionally attractive, human-interest approach that JAMA exploited to launch its campaign to defend the Warren Commission and Lundberg's friends, the autopsy pathologists.

Breo's second article is dramatized in JAMA's press conference with this headline, "DALLAS PHYSICIANS SUPPORT AUTOPSY, DENOUNCE CONSPIRACY THEORY BY EX-COLLEAGUE." (The former colleague is Dr. Charles Crenshaw. He had put his name and reputation in the hands of imaginative and inaccurate "buffs" who ~~do theorize conspiracies in his~~ cheap sensationalism in his the slim paperback, JFK: Conspiracy of Silence. <sup>(Signet, 1992)</sup>)

As with the autopsy pathologists, JAMA jerks at the heartstrings still again in flacking for greater attendance at its press conference in saying of the four Dallas doctors interviewed

and quoted that in speaking to JAMA, they, too, "broke their 29-year silence."

There were some 15 Dallas doctors engaged in the futile effort to save the ~~already dead~~ President. JAMA interviewed only four. How or why they were selected <sup>is</sup> ~~of the 15 Broo does not~~ <sup>known</sup> ~~say~~ However, again from recollection, which can always be imperfect, almost none of them had been silent. (Crenshaw, then a resident, had been silent.)

~~Part II of JAMA's treatment of "JFK's Death" in the journal that bills its purpose as "To promote the science and art of medicine and the betterment of public health" is headed, "Dallas MDs recall their memories." At least this is what "Part I's subtitle surely is not, "the plain truth from the MDs who did the autopsy."  
But of them, too, it is starkly false for JAMA to claim that they had been publicly silent for those 29 years.~~

The four selected for this part of the JAMA propaganda in support of the Warren Report are, in the order in which JAMA names them, surgeons Malcolm Perry and James Carrico (then a resident), M. T. "Pepper" Jenkins, chief of anesthesiology, and Charles Baxter, also a surgeon.

~~Even to suggest that had to be silent for (something less than JAMA's) 29 years insults and defames them, these four and all the others, with Crenshaw the 1992 exception.  
It infers they had or thought they had something to hide and therefor did not dare speak publicly. Certainly not for their ~~valiant efforts to save the man already dead when he reached their~~~~