

Why were the long-missing autopsy photographs and X-rays of the corpse of President John F. Kennedy so suddenly added to the National Archives November 1, 1966, twenty days less than three years after the assassination?

Why did they surface then, only to re-submerge immediately, still unseen and to remain unseen??

Why was this accomplished with brilliant press-agentry, timed for the early editions of the morning papers, which were confidentially tipped off with only enough advance time to plan for the story?

Why did this seemingly independent action key perfectly with the previous day's revelation of the seizure of a bunch of junk heralded as assassination evidence and its enshrining in the National Archives, an action earlier decided upon, not formalized in a written press release but revealed in a press conference, and a disguised last-minute exploitation of a law that expired the day after the announcement?

Why did the Kennedy family possess this government property? How? Did the government have copies?

Why were the autopsy doctors, who had been denied access to these photographs and X-rays when they were the necessary prerequisite of their expert testimony before the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy, suddenly, mysteriously and privately gotten to examine them, timed perfectly for a third-day story and further public brainwashing?

✓ Why was it possible for the doctors to see these pictures only when the government was in public distress over disclosure that the investigation of the assassination was a whitewash? They knew in advance of their testimony, as first exposed in WHITEWASH (p.180) and here confirmed (p. ), that this "best evidence" would be denied them as expert witnesses.

What reason consistent with honor could have been invoked to deny this essential data to the doctors when it was evidence that should not make it unavailable to them when it served as government-needed propaganda?

What does it all mean, why did it happen at just that time, when it was a shamefully inappropriate commemoration of the assassination, and why did the government make a publicity circus out of this last in a series of questionable acts relating to the assassination?

Is it but coincidence this was the week President Johnson was asked a press-conference question (frequently "planted") about criticism of the Report and, basking in this flood of fresh publicity, seemed to reaffirm it without actually doing so?

Most of the answers are revealed in WHITEWASH, which ~~alone of the literature on this subject,~~ analyzes and discloses the essential Commission evidence of the autopsy and presents it in the context of the evidence on the number of shots. WHITEWASH reveals the destruction of some of this evidence and the willful misrepresentation of other of it; the falsification of some to the members of the Commission by its staff and the substitution of a knowingly false and inapplicable hypothesis as a replacement for fact in the Report.

29 So shocking is this irrefutable intelligence, entirely from the official evidence, that there <sup>w/</sup>has been tremendous public pressure to disregard it. Officially, the government pretends it does not exist, although the documentary proof, including the certification of the destruction of the first autopsy report and actual photographic copies of parts of the altered, substituted autopsy report, appear in that book.

I ~~personally~~ sent copies of the book to the proper government officials, including Commission members and staff and the autopsy doctors

themselves, without a single complaint about a single factual error. And in private letters I solicited just this, asking that either I be shown wrong or be joined in my demand for a full and public airing.

Silence was the response, for there is no error in my work and it requires more courage than ~~anyone in~~ the government has to confess its error and launch a belated investigation to reveal the untainted truth about the assassination, properly termed "the crime of the century".

So overwhelming is the unassailable proof I have assembled that the lawyer who was in charge of this part of the inquiry declined a dozen requests from radio and TV to confront me, invitations I accepted in advance. He dared not. I did not seek to force him to, for if we want the ultimate revelation of truth, we cannot get it by the false fabrication of heroes, which I am not, or the wrongful search for witches; for Arlen Specter is not alone among the staff of the Commission in failing his responsibilities. To single him out for censure would be unfair to him, would protect others equally in need of exposure, and could ~~have~~ frustrated truth and justice.

For example, without Wesley J. Liebeler's career as an assistant counsel, Specter's would have been entirely impossible. Liebeler now loudly proclaims, from behind the skirts of the University of California, that he, impartial and saintly disciple of the law that he is, has launched a "study" that will tell "both sides", as though the world did not expect this of the Report, part of which he authored. Liebeler also assured us in advance that his study, subsidized by the taxpayers and dignified with the honorable name of the university, will prove the rightness of the Report. He thus adds to his distinctions that of being the fox who got himself hired to guard the chicken house.

So much for his impartiality in the present. WHITEWASH II, in telling how and by whom the whitewashing was done, fully explores and explains Liebeler's performance and impartiality. It shows that he made possible the misuse of all the basic photographic evidence belatedly placed in the record, and that he, personally, saw to it that:

None of this evidence was introduced as required by normal legal  
 E practise;

None of it was properly identified or authenticated;

None of it was original;

None was untainted, and all in some way doctored or incomplete.

He personally led these witnesses into testimony that was not in accord with their recollections and fact.

He did this <sup>on</sup> July 23, 1964, the day after his second whitewashing expedition to New Orleans, where he personally assured that the truth of what happened there and of Oswald's real involvements - with the CIA through the right-wing Cuban-exile groups - would not become part of the testimony it was his job to elicit. He did not call as witnesses:

The David W. Ferrie, now conveniently dead, who had threatened the life of the President, as Liebeler knew if his incompetence was not total; or

Guy W. Banister, radical-right racist extremist, former FBI agent; or Any of the miscellany of native and Cuban-exile self-appointed and CIA-supported anti-Castro messiahs, whose stolen munitions were stored in Banister's office in the heart of New Orleans; or

A single one of those who conducted and those who trained in the several exile camps in the New Orleans area -- all part of the strange and Liebeler-suppressed story of OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS, where I expose

30 it.

Part 2 of WHITEWASH II also fully exposes the gutting of the official file of the autopsy, to which, in this book, I add detail. This only began with the suppression of the photographic evidence. No matter what may now belatedly be done to restore to these files what was improperly removed, that it was done can no longer be denied for I have the documentary proof of it and an official certification that it happened. (see        ).

Of course, I am only presuming that what was taken from the official files still exists in uncorrupted form. I believe that it does. I believe the only way it can be faked is to subject those who alone can do it to further danger of criminal action they will not risk.

It is also a presumption and nothing else that what was returned to government possession by the Kennedy family are the authentic and original autopsy photographs and X-rays. There is no reason to suggest that the Kennedys in any way would or could ever bring themselves to tamper with what they were given, and I do not suggest it. But we likewise do not know, any more than they do, that what they were given to begin with was genuine and complete. Today it is impossible to prove - and the government cannot prove it. Grounds for suspicion already exist.

I begin this hitherto untold account of the history of the missing pictures and X-rays with an example.

On Thursday, November 3, <sup>1967</sup> I presented the government, in writing, a demand for a full exposition of the chain of possession of these pictures and X-rays, under an arrangement previously agreed to that forwarded my request for access to this evidence to the legal representative of the Kennedy family, Burke Marshall (see p. 000). I did this because <sup>establishing authenticity is</sup> ~~it is now~~ essential, regardless of what the pictures and X-rays do <sup>or</sup> do ~~Without this chain~~ not know, can or cannot show, ~~Thisxxxxxxxand~~ and with the undeviating

deception of the government, the evidence itself must be suspected.

Nowere in the Report or its ~~twenty-six~~<sup>26</sup> massive volumes of appended testimony and documents, is there a single listing of what pictures and X-rays were taken. Incredible as it seems, this is the grim reality, this is the way the assassination was "investigated" and the autopsy "authenticated" and testified to. The doctor in charge, then Navy Commander James J. Humes (later Captain and now Retired), was asked "precisely" what X-rays and photographs were taken. He was permitted to give only the most imprecise answer, that of the pictures "15 to 20 in number were made in total before we finished the proceedings" and that of the X-rays they exposed "~~ten~~<sup>10</sup> or ~~twelve~~<sup>12</sup>" (2H349).

With any single picture capable of destroying the entire government case, both the impression that was given and without question accepted and the flexibility in numbers now demand a suspicious regard for what has suddenly been indefinitely suppressed in a secret government cache.

The Commission had the most precise accounting of these exposed films of various sorts. This is not in the official receipts, of which I have copies. It is in an official report that was censored from the Commission's enormous printed record, but is in its files, a report made by witnesses who should have been called - and were not. I obtained copies after publication of WHITEWASH and prior to publication of the rash of books that followed. These appear in other books under circumstances that I regard as dubious. They are not understood and not at all explained as presented by other authors as the fruits of their own work, which they are not. They in fact disprove the texts of these other writings.

*This section was crossed off the original - (p. 47)*

The receipts are from the Commission's file numbered 371. The report, rather than standing on its own, is buried in an enormous collection by FBI Agent Robert P. Gemberling. It is in the Commission's seventh file.

The actual report was made by two other FBI agents, Francis X. O'Neill, Jr., and James W. Sibert, who, despite official obfuscations, were at the autopsy from before its beginning until after its end. On the fifth page of their report they list the photographs and X-rays that were given to the Secret Service, the pictures undeveloped and never seen by the doctors:

- 11 X-rays
- 22 4x5 color photographs
- 18 4x5 black and white photographs
- 1 roll of 120 film containing five exposures

So the official but censored record reveals a total of 11 X-rays, and, rather than "15 or 20" pictures, 45!

Not a single one of the accounts published after the return of the pictures and X-rays to the government gives either of these figures! Not one that I have seen makes any reference to 120 film!

The Los Angeles Times of November 2 gave the totals as "14 X-rays, 25 black-and-white negatives and 26 color, 4 by 5 inch transparencies- 65 different pictures in all."

The Associated Press provided the same total and breakdown to its subscribers.

That same morning The Washington Post listed "14 X-rays, 25 black-and-white negatives and 26 color transparencies."

The New York Times, through its various editions listed the same identifications and classifications and on the next day repeated the same total.

Both Washington afternoon papers have the same divisions and the same totals, with the Star adding there were "an indefinite number of prints" made from the black-and-white negatives.

Thus there is nothing but confusion and disagreement in both the numbers and the kinds of pictures and X-rays. The doctor's own accounting is farcically indefinite when his function and his qualifications as an expert in forensic medicine are considered. It could be and remain indefinite and imprecise only because Arlen Specter wanted it that way, for it is he who asked for "precisely" what X-rays and pictures were taken, he who knew why he wanted (and the record needed) precision, he who accepted anything but precision, he who failed to insist that the doctor be specific in his testimony, produce the record of film exposed, and who could and should have placed the Sibert-O'Neill reports in evidence or call them as witnesses and instead did not.

The FBI could be wrong. It could be wrong in both the total and the individual listings, and further wrong in each of the three classifications of film and in any combination of the film, for the addition of the unspecified variety of 120 film to either the color or the ordinary film does not equal the number now given for either. But if we assume the FBI erred, can we assume it to have erred in each and every one of these many ways? This assumption is against enormous odds.

Had the Commission, especially its legal staff, met the minimum that might have been expected of it, this and similar questions would not exist today. This failure cannot be dismissed as incompetence or carelessness, for the medical experts were qualified in the legal aspects of medicine, the lawyers were experienced and qualified and under a former Solicitor General of the United States, and the investigation was into the assassination of a President.

Are we also to assume that prints were made of but one category of film, and that the number is unknown when they are in the possession of the government? The Star gave as its source "A Justice Department spokesman". I have seen no correction or retraction.

Who made the prints? For what purpose? Were they distributed in any way? Are copies now outside government possession?

Can we expect nothing but destruction, misrepresentation, inconsistency, <sup>incompetence</sup> and error in the autopsy of a President, plus the very real question of violation of law, including the possibilities of perjury and the subornation of perjury?

To all this dubious history we add that cheap press-agentry was practiced when announcement of restoration of the film was delayed. It was completed by October 31, the date of the Attorney General's order transferring the accumulation of trivia to the Archives. Announcement <sup>32</sup> was deliberately delayed so it could serve as a dramatic public buttressing of the departmental action with the Kennedy name.

It <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ also <sup>an unbecoming</sup> a propaganda device to arrange delay in the announcement of a lie - that the doctors had "authenticated" the pictures at an unspecified time. This was released November 2, when it served to support everything else that had been done. All of these things required arranging - negotiations over the film, the drafting and approval of the phrasing of the documents (which also are suppressed), and the inspection by the doctors. It is not accidental that they were staggered like a Madison Avenue production.

This technique is more appropriate to the merchandising of a deodorant/<sup>than</sup> to the disclosure of information about a President's murder. Its demeaning use impugns the purity of the government's intentions.

All public accounts, mysteriously, use the identical word for what the doctors did. They "authenticated" the pictures. It is a fair inference that this is the exact word used by the unnamed officials who transmitted the intelligence to the press. Not all the news media could, by accident, fasten upon this single word.

Can the doctors "authenticate" these pictures of inconsistent number, greater in number than they swore to, greater in number than the FBI reported, with or without prints of indefinite number and of no description?

There is no way in the world they can!

Until this mysterious moment, when the doctors pored over the film for an announced three and a half hours - the great time it served the government's <sup>purpose</sup> to emphasize - they had never seen the pictures they themselves had taken!

They could not, therefore, in any way or sense "authenticate" these pictures, had no way of knowing whether these are the ones they took; whether these were each and every one of whatever total is finally seized upon of the various different official totals; each and every one that they had taken, neither more nor less, to the exclusion of any other pictures of this or any other corpse.

The very best the doctors could honestly say, and the very most that could honestly be attributed to them, is that the pictures they examined in late 1966 seem to reflect what they recall, after three years and all the other corpses they had examined in the interval, of what they saw on the President's body beginning 7:35 p.m. November 22, 1963. No more, not a bit.

Only because the autopsy of a murdered president is such a rare thing that would impress itself on the minds of those performing the autopsy can even this much be conceded, for pathologists spend their

working lives with cadavers, and three years is a long time and many corpses later.

Why, then, could and did not the government content itself with the simple truth, if that is what it is, that the doctors saw the pictures at such and such a time under such and such conditions and, after study and reflection, say that to the best of their present recollections these pictures are consistent with what they saw during their autopsy examination?

The simple statement that might be truthful would not suit the government's clear purposes. The government ~~is~~ <sup>was</sup> very much on the defensive. It then had and has now no adequate answer to what I expose in WHITEWASH, parts of which have since been affirmed by others. It was under attack from all the books and all the attention given them and their authors. At some time it may launch a diversion or smear. It did, of course, inspire widely disseminated sycophantic and false attacks on the books and authors.

For no other reason does government resort to the cheapest devices of personal-product promotion with the assassination of a President involved. The timing of all those events was too closely meshed, too near <sup>(33)</sup> to perfect press-agentry, entirely too much to be coincidence.

It coincided with growing and expressed national disenchantment with the official account of the President's murder. Polls revealed an overwhelming majority of the people unsatisfied with or in open disbelief of the official version.

It coincided with an off-year election, but a week away from the first announcement, an election in which the government traditionally loses legislative seats.

It coincided with my effort to avoid an additional private printing of WHITEWASH II, which necessitated that copies be distributed and

its content - more shocking than even that of WHITEWASH - thus was no longer my secret. There was no reason to doubt the authenticity or meaning of the until-then secret government documents which I paid the government for Xeroxing. The government had a record of every sheet that had been copied for me. Thus it knew what I had learned and would print.

It also coincided with the release of a three-hour TV program entirely destructive of the government's official story. On it were four of us who wrote about the assassination, its investigation and the strange upsetting of the actuarial tables in the assaults upon, murders and mysterious deaths among those witnesses and others related to the case whose stories are not helpful to the official account. Invited officials declined to defend themselves before us. They were represented by two unofficial Commission defenders.

It coincided with the then-imminent appearance of the "official" unofficial report on the assassination already beclouded by the ambivalent and contradictory public statements of its author, William Manchester. That is, because of Manchester's sponsorship by the Kennedy family and the vast sums involved, a rare commercialization of the Presidency and its tragedy. This, in turn subjected the Kennedys, especially those in political life, to tremendous pressure. It had the effect of putting the stamp of Kennedy approval on the work of a man who is but a very fallible mortal. Thus, the Kennedys were in the position of endorsing his opinions, subscribing to what he claims to be fact and truth, and underwriting his unchecked and uncorroborated judgment. This is a liability few intelligent politicians would ever face. It was an insurmountable one for Senator Robert Kennedy, who was Attorney General of the United States during the investigation of the assassination, <sup>(the head of the Department of Justice,</sup> hence ~~in charge of that investigation, whether or not he~~

in charge of that investigation, whether or not he in any way participated in it.

I have explained on every one of those countless public appearances when the question was raised, that Robert Kennedy disassociated himself from this investigation for what I regard as human and honorable reasons. His advance endorsement of Manchester's book was more hazardous, not subject to this explanation, and was not necessary. The slightest Manchester error - and "leaks" of his content presaged, but greatly understated, the all-encompassing, contaminating, serious error - could ruin Kennedy because it put him in the position of supporting untruth about his brother's murder.

Many British and American editors knew my private prediction (then more than a year old) that the Kennedys would disassociate themselves from Manchester's work before it appeared. A sign of its coming, a reaction to adverse public opinion, was the near hysteria, despite the surface calm, with which the pictures were returned to the government, whose possession they should never have left.

While few had or cited proof, it had been no secret that the pictures and X-rays were supposed to have been in the possession of the family. This information came to me early in the Spring of ~~last year~~, 1966. For the previous several months it has been published in varying forms.

When the National Archives informed me, eight months earlier, that the Secret Service still had the pictures and X-rays, I wrote its head, James J. Rowley, asking pointed questions, sending a copy of WHITE-WASH, and getting no response - neither refutation of WHITEWASH, which I <sup>invited</sup> challenged, nor information about the location of the pictures and X-rays

(34) which I asked for.

Through all of this, and especially because of the misleading efforts of the government's misguided, misdirected and misinformed apologists, whether self-appointed or official (and there were both kind), the meaning of this film record has been exaggerated beyond all reason and common sense. Under the most advantageous conditions and assuming its sanctity, which cannot be done with reason but can for argument, what can it, now, at the very best, reveal?

Only that one less lie was told.

There is nothing that these pictures can prove except that the doctors gave a fair representation of the location, number and description of the President's wounds.

They can in no way invalidate other medical testimony, which is utterly destructive of the government's story. Nor can they in any way address any of the other, really all the other, evidence or corrupted evidence of the crimes.

They cannot, for example, replace the wound in the front of the President's throat that was cut for the tracheotomy performed under extreme duress in Dallas. They cannot, therefore, show whether, as the doctors in Dallas reported and as, until it was altered, the autopsy report still said two days after the assassination, the President's neck wound was from the front. The government says all the shots were from the back.

Can they establish that the fatal wound was not from the front also? Or that there was only one head wound? The autopsy doctors' testimony is so shaky on this that the Report nowhere gives the precise location and description of the head damage. With the pictures and X-rays denied the<sup>m</sup>, the doctors themselves did not present the Commission with even an artist's representation of the head damage that had any

scientific meaning.

These truly astounding omissions in a Presidential autopsy have escaped public attention. It is particularly unpleasant to consider when it is understood that the autopsy of the alleged assassin is a model of scientific exactitude, completed immediately, with copies promptly delivered to a number of public officials (see <sup>OTU-00</sup> p. ). The additional significance of this is that the President's autopsy remained top secret until it was released as part of the Report, where it got lost in the vastness and the precipitated national emotion following release.

Can they reveal the number of weapons used or their caliber? Of course not.

The kind or kinds of ammunition?

The location of the assassin or assassins? Again, negative, even though one of the too-numerous and substantive changes made in the autopsy report was clearly designed to change the description of the rear non-fatal wound to make it <sup>more</sup> consistent with a shot coming from that sixth floor window. This change was made two days after the assassination, two days after Oswald was arrested (WHITEWASH 183) <sup>after he was murdered and no</sup> ~~no examination was made~~.

The position of the Presidential car at the time any or all of the shots were fired?

The relationship of the President's and the Governor's bodies to each other and the rifle or rifles?

How many shots hit the Governor, and whether any, or the one alleged, also struck the President?

Who owned, and possessed, and used the rifle or rifles - in fact, whether or not smaller weapons were used?

What kind of rifle or rifles were used - even whether this Italian C 2766 Mannlicher-Carcano one was?

They cannot show that the Report is right in saying as one of its <sup>(35)</sup> many bases, error in any one of which destroys it, that a single shot struck both the President and the Governor. They cannot even show that this is possible. That requires evidence not capturable on film in the Naval Hospital in Bethesda, Maryland.

In short, the utmost that now can be expected of this film record, were it to be proven uncontaminated and that of the President's autopsy, which it has not been and cannot be - is that it not indict the doctors for perjury - and others for its subornation.

This in no way authenticates the Report, which remains entirely untenable if the doctors were paragons of testimonial virtue.

And here we have one of the reasons for this spectacular restoration of government property with maximum effort to attract maximum attention to it. The impression given by all the news media is that by this single stroke, by this belated act of presumed generosity, in some magical fairy-tale way all the other wrongs were righted; all the evidence I proved was abused, destroyed and mutilated (esp. <sup>including</sup> WHITEWASH 178-87; WHITEWASH II 97-127) was made pristine; and now, thanks to God and the beneficent government, no one need ever again have any apprehension over the integrity of the investigation of the assassination.

What nonsense! The return of the pictures emphasizes the wrong in their ever leaving government possession. It dramatizes the failure of the Commission to examine them, and proves there was no reason the doctors should not have complied with the requirements of the law for "best evidence". Can it now be argued that there was or could have been any question of good taste in the doctors' seeing pictures of what they in reality saw? Can it be believed ~~or~~ <sup>indecent</sup> alleged that there is something wrong, unclean or evil in their viewing, as a condition and qualification of their testimony, pictures of those parts of the President's body they

themselves disassembled as their <sup>pleasant</sup> unhappy task demanded?

And if this arrant foolishness be argued - the government argued nothing in the Report, where it just avoided the question entirely - how can it then be maintained that in the moment of the government's great and public distress in November 1966, what was wrong in November 1963 and March 1964 suddenly became right? If the doctors could see the pictures in 1966 without violating good taste or giving offense, why could they not have, in 1963, or when their March 16, 1964 testimony (2H347-841) required it?

There is no need to belabor the obvious. When the government did not want the doctors to see the pictures, the doctors did not. When the government desired that the doctors see them, the doctors did. When the government ordered silence, the doctors were mute. When Mr. Big ordered "Talk", the doctors said what was expected of them.

What may we now expect of the doctors? Confession of perjury or its subornation? Or of incompetence? This is no longer possible. Events are rushing and are past the point of return. For the doctors to wait more than three years and then say they made a little mistake in one little part is not credible. We shall return to this in the following chapter.

In its effort to cleanse itself, which it cannot do, the government has further befouled itself. It has fooled some of the people again and will maintain pretenses a little longer. The ultimate unfolding of truth will, because of this additional dishonesty and imposition on the trust and faith of its citizens, be more of an explosion than an unveiling.

Assuming them to be genuine, neither the government nor the Kennedys have bestowed a blessing upon us with the restoration of the pictures and X-rays, for it was accomplished in a way that makes possible the continued suppression of their contents. There was considerable public pressure on

the Kennedys, once it was generally known that they possessed this evidence. This pressure demanded either comment on or revelation of whatever evidence was recorded on the film. Neither suited the Kennedys, nor did the pressure on them and the inevitable interpretations that would be put on their continuing silence. The impending Manchester scandal further endangered their position.

36 Giving the film to the government got the Kennedys off the hook, at least for the immediate. They no longer seem to be suppressing evidence, although in reality they are. The boon to the government is that it has recaptured the evidence and was able to arrange it in a way that cloaks its continued suppression with the trappings of law. This is not an intellectual and legal Rube Goldbergism; it is the reality.

It is not reality to believe suppression is solely attributable to the professed but not expressed antipathy of the Kennedys at the thought of researchers and scholars seeing what with every other mortal the law would grant them access to. This is not a satisfactory reason for continued suppression (See also pp 000-0).

Just before this fast switch in the unended shell game with the evidence, one garbed in the robes of a judge appointed himself defender of the Commission and ~~by twisting and misquoting several~~ undertook to assault me, by ignoring all the fact in my book and by twisting and misquoting several of the very few opinions in it. Judge Arnold Fein, given his forum for an impossible defense of the Commissioners by Norman Cousins in The Saturday Review of October 22, 1966, departed what is expected of either a judge or a reviewer to misrepresent my concern over the abuse of Texas law and authorities (who those less schooled in the law than a judge may regard as the representatives of the law and its embodiment). He pretends I am worried about only "an abuse of Texas authorities." Thus Fein not only found a legal

and/or intellectual figleaf to cloak the nakedness of his avoidance of the unanswerable evidence of the autopsy I mustered; he found it possible to avoid the sentence with which I introduced it.

In acknowledging that I face incurring his wrath by repeating this sentence he found so appalling, I must also acknowledge that I do not, really, fear his wrath, reassured as I am by the certain knowledge it will harm me less than what he intends as friendship does the Commissioners. I am comforted by his failure (not his alone, but one he shares with all those others who perpetuate their abdication of responsibility and leadership at the time of the assassination, and who today seek self-justification in dishonest attacks on those who would not be silent in the face of such monstrous injustice) to debate the facts and issues with me, under conditions and in an environment of his own selection.

That sentence reads, "The law applies equally to the least and the mightiest."

Oswald is certainly the least. The Kennedys are of the mightiest.

At the time the government-Kennedy ploy guaranteed ~~the possibility of~~ indefinite suppression of this film, it also released from the secret files of the Department of Justice to the public archive what The Federal Register describes as "FBI exhibit No. D192, Color prints made in connection with autopsy of Lee Harvey Oswald".

In the United States we have and recognize no royalty of our own. The law does apply equally to the least and the mightiest. It is only by

abuse that it is made to do otherwise. There is no reason for making public Oswald's autopsy pictures that does not embrace those of the President. There is much more reason for making the President's public for, while there is no doubt about who murdered Oswald or how, there is nothing but doubt about who assassinated the President and why. *And he was the President of the United States of America!*

The means by which this neat legal trick was played were clearly and accurately explained by Washington Star Staff Writer Lyle Dennison on November 3, 1966. Dennison did not realize what he was documenting. He thought he was explaining how the government can accept a gift for its archives. His source is a Department of Justice spokesman, unnamed:

"Such arrangements are authorized, the spokesman said, by a 1950 law. The law permits the General Services Administrator - now W. Lawson Knott - to accept 'for deposit' papers and other historical materials of presidents' subject to restriction agreeable to the administrator as to their use'. The restriction on use and availability 'may be specified in writing by the donors or depositors' of the material, the law says. The GSA chief is required to abide by those <sup>(S)</sup>restrictions if he agrees to accept them 'for so long a period' as the donors specify.

"Administrator Knott agreed to the Kennedy condition by signing his name at the bottom of <sup>a</sup> ~~the~~ letter specifying the agreement and the restriction. This is the only document there is, and it will not be made public, the government spokesman said."

✓ This was officially confirmed to me, as the appendix shows (p. 100-100). The balance of Dennison's story is also correct.

The restriction is for the lifetime of living adults. Only government investigators - those who failed to use the pictures and X-rays when it was required of them - may have access for the first five years. There exists no federal investigation to qualify for access. Congressman Theodore Kupferman was, like me, a private citizen, also refused. There-

after, and for the lifetime of either of the Kennedy children or <sup>of</sup> any of the adult close relatives of the late President, <sup>who may live longer,</sup> only pathologists who <sup>specifically</sup> are approved may view them. What do any - even the most qualified pathologists know of the circumstances and the vast accumulation of fact and unifact of the assassination? May we expect any one of them to spend what is required - more time than demanded in the acquisition of his education - to qualify to perhaps get the limited meaning now possible from such an examination?

Stripped of the verbiage, this "contract" guarantees suppression of what evidentiary value the film may have unless an exception is elected. None is likely except, <sup>possibly</sup> perhaps, as another cheap publicity stunt.

As the government misused the about-to-expire special law to cloak its continuing suppressions of other and vital evidence, so it did with this 1950 law, and for the same purpose. This was indeed a remarkable if improbable marriage of convenience between the Kennedys and the government, each of whom was faced with the growing demand that this evidence be seen by other than official sources and neither of whom, for different reasons, wanted it.

Once it was out of Kennedy possession, especially when so falsely but fancily clothed, demands could no longer be addressed to them. Yet it is they alone, through their designated agent, who can waive the restrictions, and they do not. Back in government possession access was hedged with conditions the government could not have imposed had it not first given this evidence to the Kennedys and then accepted these total prohibitions as a condition of the restitution.

Now that the <sup>new</sup> Attorney General, in his great and infinite wisdom, has "determined that the national interest requires the entire body of evidence considered by <sup>the</sup> Commission be preserved in the Archive, where it can be public." <sup>He</sup> He reached this determination officially on

October 31, yet was able, on the following day, to accept the suppressive stipulations which so cozily coincided with the government's desires while avoiding other of his words, "I hereby determine that all of the items of evidence not owned by the United States..." be made part of the public Archives.

For the moment - and for only a brief moment, let us hope - the government has pulled it off, gotten away with another debasement of popular trust, still another unseemly trick. That it would do so when the assassination of a President is involved may seem beyond comprehension, but it happened.

It is a perfidy that brings the day of truth closer.

Alas, it also, by its desperation, will make that day an even more dismal one.

As it turned out, these carefully-staged stunts served to make ready for others in equally poor taste and as opposite to factual <sup>where</sup> two weeks later ~~when~~ the anniversary of the assassination was exploited for another campaign. Ordinarily, the anniversary of a President's death is the occasion for fond recollections of his greatness, humanity, accomplish-ments or, if he had any worthy of mention, his policies. When the <sup>3<sup>rd</sup></sup> anniversary of John F. Kennedy's murder was imminent, people were instead encouraged to forget it, ~~Keep quiet,~~ <sup>listen</sup> not listen to or ~~hate~~ those who said the truth of his murder had not been told, and ~~that~~ they were nuts if they didn't <sup>gulp down</sup> swallow the official hogwash without complaint.

Commissioner-Congressman Gerald Ford is not one of those more disposed to decline comment when a headline is in prospect; so he had his customary illogical and unthought-out insults for those who had proved he hadn't done his job well. He was faithfully rewarded with the

kind of press accolade that keeps him doing these things, a reward sufficient for him.

Governor Connally allowed himself to be interviewed by Life and quoted as saying he was, too, hit by a separate bullet (WHITEWASH 4-5) but that the Report is absolutely correct just the same. No one had bothered to tell him both things cannot be true. Promptly and hot as though the hot line ended in Austin rather than Moscow, he was back in the headlines next day with a denunciation of those whose writing had already proved him and the Report wrong. Such insult and falsehood, strangely, is always good copy, <sup>Connally added</sup> but he had a new twist: writers who do not agree with government are subversive and ought to be hauled before something, anything nasty and hurtful would do. He set another style in prefacing his remarks with the observation he hadn't read any of the books whose authors he threatened and libelled. As he spat it out, those who oppose the official fiction are "scavengers". Not those who become millionaires from support of it, or those whose political stock, like his and Ford's, is escalated by well-publicized if ignorant and wrong defenses of it.

The style all the quick-headline artists were soon copying from Connally amounts to this:

"I don't know what I am talking about but..." and on this basis demanding to be heard and credited. It is a mark of the integrity and discrimination of the press that both happened. There were two prerequisites: ignorance and a lack of scruple or shame. All that had to be said was these two things: the man-to-be-quoted had to certify that, not having read any of the criticism of the government and its Report, he knew nothing about either; and second, that he didn't care, everyone else was wrong anyway. We shall return to the Connally fiasco.

Least becoming of all is the intrusion of Malcolm Kilduff, one but "pure garbage". To Publicist Kilduff, sublime in his ignorance, self-proclaimed ~~this~~ <sup>that</sup> is what authenticated, documented and irrefutable disproof of the official President fiction about the murder of the ~~xxx~~ who made somebody of him is, "pure garbage".

If on Kilduff's behalf it <sup>is</sup> ~~be~~ noted that he <sup>almost</sup> ~~alone~~ of the murdered President's staff did not exploit that <sup>tragedy</sup> ~~murder~~ for self-aggrandizement, it must also be noted that he ~~acknowledged~~, <sup>both</sup> ~~publicly~~ and to me, <sup>privately,</sup> that he knew nothing about the fact. He promised to read my books and, unless he could <sup>Washington</sup> ~~prove~~ them wrong, make a retraction. He did neither. His private career as a <sup>are</sup> ~~public-relations~~ representative for industry, whose concerns ~~were~~ <sup>are</sup> with the government, suffered from neither his initial sneakiness nor his subsequent dishonesty. Government rewards sycophancy, not criticism.

who tried to find out how he became a corpse and why, ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> attracted more attention to the criticism of the government and its Report.

39 But unfortunately, this act of the President's family allowed the improper things they had done and then did with the pictures and X-rays ~~said to be these of his autopsy~~ <sup>separate</sup> to become a <sup>separate</sup> ~~propaganda~~ campaign ~~in itself~~, <sup>at his</sup> and the seemingly legitimate cover for the immediately-ensuing additional propaganda campaigns <sup>was</sup> as successful as it was wrong. The "gift" was lauded in the press as though it had been a fine and generous thing rather than a new device.

With this unstinted praise in the press the reward of the most prominent and publicized family in the country, that of the murdered President, for its public confession of wrong-doing, is it any wonder some of it rubbed off, as we see in the following chapter, on one of those most responsible for the additional and unnecessary tragedy that followed the assassination?

Least becoming of all is the intrusion of Malcolm Kilduff, one of the press secretaries to the murdered President. As befits a man whose lifetime specialty is public relations, he made a notable contribution: the addition of the word "garbage". Not just plain, ordinary "garbage" but "pure garbage". → *insert*

It was a Roman Kennedy Holiday. Papers, radio and TV were full of it.

Only it didn't work, because too many people understood the English they stopped to think about. Too many people had a high regard for that President and a low regard for those who couldn't cover him fast enough.

This not very nice ploy, of throwing the President's corpse at those who tried to find out how he became a corpse and why, backfired. It attracted more attention to the criticism of the government and its Report.

39 But unfortunately, this act of the President's family allowed the improper things they had done and then did with the pictures and X-rays ~~said to be these of his autopsy~~ to become a <sup>separate</sup> propaganda campaign ~~in itself~~ and the seemingly legitimate cover for the immediately-ensuing additional propaganda campaigns ~~was~~ as successful as it was wrong. The "gift" was lauded in the press as though it had been a fine and generous thing rather than a new device.

With this unstinted praise in the press the reward of the most prominent and publicized family in the country, that of the murdered President, for its public confession of wrong-doing, is it any wonder some of it rubbed off, as we see in the following chapter, on one of those most responsible for the additional and unnecessary tragedy that followed the assassination?

What put the whole thing in perspective was almost entirely ignored. It didn't make the headlines, was of no interest to the editorial writers or by-line pundits. It appeared November 13, 1966, in but a single paper, as a letter to the editor of the Washington Star.

It confirmed the position I had already taken in demanding access to the pictures and X-rays and came from an authority:

"SIR: "As a physician and medical administrator, I was more than puzzled by the recent article concerning the 'donation' by the Kennedy family of photographs and X-rays made by the U.S. Naval Hospital at Bethesda in the course of performing an autopsy on the last President Kennedy. Such records are customarily the property of the hospital or medical organization performing the indicated medical procedure and each hospital must retain the original of such records in its files except as it may be directed to do otherwise by court action. In this case, there is the additional complication that these records were the property of the United States Government and should have been available to the Warren Commission in its investigation.

"I cannot see that there is any excuse for the release of these records by Naval authorities to the Kennedy family or for that family to place any restrictions on their use by the Federal Government. The records of medical procedures conducted at a hospital under no circumstances, Government or otherwise, belong to the family nor does any hospital administrator have the right to authorize such release.

John P. Nasou, M.D. //

-Kensington"

There was then and since has been not a single denial, refutation or allegation that in any way Dr. Nasou is wrong. He is not wrong. This

is exactly the position taken by Parkland Hospital when the government <sup>demanding a subpoena</sup> ~~demanded~~ <sup>wanted</sup> the pictures and X-rays of the Oswald autopsy. The government honored <sup>Partisans</sup> the upholding of the law and its requirements with respect to the records of the murdered accused assassin. Only with the President was less than the requirement of the law good enough, only when there was something to be hidden (see p. 000 ).

Worst of all, when public demand for the truth was finally heard, it is the family of the President that helped stify that demand ~~or~~ <sup>and</sup> allowed itself to be used for this ~~evil~~ end.

What put the whole thing in perspective was almost entirely ignored. It didn't make the headlines, was of no interest to the editorial writers or by-line pundits. It appeared November 13, 1966, in but a single paper, as a letter to the editor of the Washington Star.

It confirmed the position I had already taken in demanding access to the pictures and X-rays and came from an authority:

"SIR: " As a physician and medical administrator, I was more than puzzled by the recent article concerning the 'donation' by the Kennedy family of photographs and X-rays made by the U.S. Naval Hospital at Bethesda in the course of performing an autopsy on the last President Kennedy. Such records are customarily the property of the hospital or medical organization performing the indicated medical procedure and each hospital must retain the original of such records in its files except as it may be directed to do otherwise by court action. In this case, there is the additional complication that these records were the property of the United States Government and should have been available to the Warren Commission in its investigation.

"I cannot see that there is any excuse for the release of these records by Naval authorities to the Kennedy family or for that family to place any restrictions on their use by the Federal Government. The records of medical procedures conducted at a hospital under no circumstances, Government or otherwise, belong to the family nor does any hospital administrator have the right to authorize such release.

John P. Nasou, M.D. "

-Kensington"

There was then and since has been not a single denial, refutation or allegation that in any way Dr. Nasou is wrong. He is not wrong. This

*demanding a subpoena*

is exactly the position taken by Parkland Hospital when the government <sup>wanted</sup> demanded the pictures and X-rays of the Oswald autopsy. The government honored <sup>Parkland's</sup> the upholding of the law and its requirements with respect to the records of the murdered accused assassin. Only with the President was less than the requirement of the law good enough, only when there was something to be hidden (see *p. 000* ).

Worst of all, when public demand for the truth was finally heard, it is the family of the President that helped stifle that demand ~~or~~ and allowed itself to be used for this ~~evil~~ end.