

also wrote that Oneal owned the ambulance and not the city, contracted with the city of Dallas to run emergencies. Liked to the FBI almost a year after the shooting. I was still afraid FBI, and don't know what I said to them. I was guessing at the cleared from the hospital, and I don't remember what all we about. I do know we talked for over an hour."

also wrote that "I was with the casket at all times after we closed

's ambulance went to Love Field about the time that Doris Nelson they had in fact left with the body. There is no other mention Secret Service in their testimony and papers before the Warren mission of a trip to Love Field with that ambulance. Serious researchers have contacted Al Rike over the years, and he an unflinching with his help and time. The universal judgment of have met him is that he is thoroughly honest and intelligent. Kellerman testified that the body left Parkland at 2:04 p.m. for Field.²⁹ He said it took about ten minutes to get there.

laceration

Superior Right Profile autopsy photograph shows a long laceration lision extending a half inch into the forehead above the right w and going straight back toward the back of the head. *Nobody* has saw this. "It did not exist," Dr. Peters told me.³⁰

Crenshaw said that he thought it was the sort of cut made at an y when the scalp is reflected back in order to do a craniotomy. swell and Dr. Karnei told me that it was a laceration and not an n, and that it was made by a fracture pushing the bones upward eaking the scalp. They volunteered this information. ink that it might have happened during transport of the body the Secret Service agents almost dropped the heavy casket— ling first to get it disconnected from the floor of the ambulance at Field and then up the stairs and into the plane.

a trying to give everyone the benefit of the doubt, avoiding sinis- planations as much as possible, because every one of these wite- s, though perhaps wrong on one thing, brings important evidence corroborated by others. The above laceration/incision is an issue se some think that perhaps it is evidence of a pre-autopsy or of tampering with the body at some point. It is not rational to me

that any cut would have been made that would extend into the face that was not seen in Dallas.

Mark Crouch has discovered that in the black and white Stare-of-Death photographs, the part of the laceration/incision that extends into the forehead has been blacked out with a small black reference triangle. Somebody did not want that cut into the face to show.³¹

The Calls and the Throat Wound

"Dr. Perry was up all night. He came into my office the next day and sat down and looked terrible, having not slept. I never saw anybody look so dejected! They called him from Bethesda two or three times in the middle of the night to try to get him to change the entrance wound in the throat to an exit wound," Audrey Bell told me.³²

"My whole credibility as a trauma surgeon was at stake," Perry told me. "I *couldn't* have made a mistake like that. It destroys my integrity if I don't know an entrance wound from an exit wound!" he said.³³

"They really grilled Perry about it," Bell said. "They hounded him for a long time." Arlen Specter in fact went to great lengths to change what Perry had originally been quoted as saying.³⁴ Specter's problem was that the entire staff at Parkland who had seen the wound insist today that it was an entrance wound.

Half of the entry wound is clearly visible in the photographs of the throat incision as a neat, perfect semicircle the diameter of a bullet at the bottom of the cut, in the center. An exit wound would appear quite jagged and torn, and would be quite a bit larger.

"He was senior man. He'd been doing trauma for years. He was really hounded about a lot of things," Bell told me.³⁵ "They hounded all of the senior residents about that, and Oswald's death: 'Could they have saved him?'"

Perry denied, in a letter to me, saying to anyone that the cut in the photograph was larger than he had made it. "I've neither verified nor challenged the accuracy of any photos."³⁶

The autopsy doctors put the Dallas team in a bad light on a number of points. The Bethesda team made them look incompetent because of the question of whether the chest tubes had actually gone into the President's chest, which Humes said they did not. And the Bethesda doctors impugned their competence with regard to a unanimous opinion in Dallas that the throat wound was an entry wound.

HM 4/3/92

The one thing of real value I've seen in the first quarter of Hugh Treason 2
 Livingston makes no other use of, the fact that Humes perjured himself in swearing that
 he did not phone Perry until the next morning. Livingston does not relate this to the
 Commission, the autopsy, Humes or any investigative body.
 He does not even point out the significance of Perry being pressured before the
 autopsy report writing began to change what he said to make it consistent with a
 single-butlet, single assassin theory/solution.
 He does not point out the significance of so rapid a decision to say there had been
 a conspiracy.
 Or that the prosecutors knew what Perry had said to the press.
 As I recall, Humes said he phoned Perry about 11 a.m., once. I think Perry testi-
 fied that Humes phoned him twice.
 Livingston does not compare this with what the Commission said and Humes testified
 to or even indicate that it and Humes lied. He is wound up in his own theories and misses
 the real significance of this.
 Among other things it has to reflect an almost immediate policy decision, prior to the
 Katzenbach memo of 11/25. Why whom and how communicated to Humes et al we do not know.
 It can, of course, as Livingston and others have alleged, reflect an official decision
 to assassinate Kennedy, although this does not necessarily follow. For example, that was
 Hoover's decision before the autopsy began.
 Livingston does not even point this out!
 I can only wonder what is in the simply enormous number of his taped interviews that
 has significance in which he was not interested because it did not advance his
 his own theory or make points against Livingston in their feud, which, the feud, appears to
 be a major motive for writing the book. He keeps hammering on Livingston, whose name he never
 once mentions. The one mention is in a direct quote from someone that he uses. Not mention-
 ing Livingston's name defeats this anti-Livston purpose because aside from a minuscule number
 of critics nobody else can understand what Livingston is up to.