

The "New Science", The "New Scientist" And The New Morality.

Two weeks after wider distribution of WHITEWASH ~~THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT~~, was initiated, in May of 1966, I wrote Drs. <sup>H</sup>umes and Boswell about their autopsy examination and testimony. The letters were virtually identical. I sent ~~each~~ <sup>them</sup> ~~copy~~ <sup>copy</sup> of the book, called ~~the attention of each~~ <sup>their</sup> to its appropriate chapters, asked for an interview, separately or together, with or without a tape recording they or I could make to preclude the possibility of my not recalling correctly what they said, and waited.

Neither responded, then or since.

What I then wrote and what I referred them to ~~not only~~ <sup>discredits</sup> entirely ~~disproves~~ the official story - their stories - of that autopsy, <sup>It</sup> but also raises the questions of perjury and subornation of perjury in the medical testimony. That these doctors ~~then and since~~ <sup>their "error"</sup> were and are silent about ~~the questions of~~ perjury and its subornation, and them, has its own kind of eloquence.

Both doctors have been consistent: they have steadfastly refused to see those who indicated disagreement with their testimony, <sup>never</sup> those who merely indicated possible doubt, <sup>but</sup> ~~but~~ have spoken to those they knew in advance would write what they wanted written and what the government wanted read. In refusing to talk to me, the doctors nonetheless talked to others because of me, something not reflected in the stories that appeared the end of November 1966, even where the papers, such as the Washington Post and the Baltimore Sun knew the fact. This is consistent with the effort to suppress WHITEWASH, in which both papers joined. I had given the Post copies of my letters to these doctors and others, ~~like~~ <sup>like</sup> J. Edgar Hoover and James Rowley, the day they were sent. The Sun's reporter got me out of bed early in the morning of the day he interviewed Boswell, when he finished his stint on that morning paper, and kept me up until about 2 a.m. preparing himself for his interview.

Although

Humes says his silence was ordered, both

A number of staff members of the Baltimore Sun were interested in my work and <sup>at</sup> their request, I had driven to that city, met with them, discussed my findings and answered their questions. Richard H. Levine, who <sup>interviewed Boswell,</sup> ~~wrote this~~ ~~story,~~ was not one of them. ~~One was~~ <sup>(was) is</sup> A. W. (Art) Geiselman, Jr. His interview with me, shortly after the spectacular publicity attendant to the "return" of the pictures and X-rays said to have been those of the autopsy, was published November 11, 1966. He then wrote:

L11- leave out what is marked in orange, except for correction. Put "intimely" in perens after "infinitely".

68

This interested Levine, who discussed it with his associate and my friend, John Friedman. There followed a number of post-midnight calls, each beginning after Friedman and Levine had finished their writing for the morning papers, each getting me out of bed, each lasting a long time.

Levine made clear his singular interest was <sup>7</sup>sensation. His ~~x~~ is a jaundiced view of people, reporting, newspapers and life, from the Ben Hecht-Charles McArthur mold of reporters. He had no interest in fact or truth, in helping establish what did happen when the President was murdered or in its official investigation. Scandal was fine, and what difference did it make if he spread misinformation or engaged in propaganda rather than a quest for truth, as long as he got a story that would please his superiors and sell papers. Our discussions were pointed and heated. What I told him of the available fact of the autopsy did not interest him, what he might be able to learn from interviewing the doctors, what he might be able to add to public knowledge by close <sup>16</sup>questioning, in his view, offered little prospect of journalistic sensation.

He fixed upon my comment about the autopsy chart in Geiselman's story.

"What should I asked Humes about that:" he wanted to know.

Mark Lane and a few others then critical of the Commission attributed this chart to Humes. This is a logical but factual error, as reading ~~de~~ Humes' testimony revealed ~~de~~, for he swore he had not prepared that chart. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~  
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ I told Levine, <sup>that</sup> Boswell had drafted it.

"Could he have been wrong:" Levine wanted to know.

"He was wrong", I told him, because the indicated measurements did not coincide with the location marked. All other evidence coincided with the location marked, not the measurements. I suggested to Levine that the error was likely a typographical one in the written number.

*headline*  
If he could get Boswell to say he made a mistake, Levine said, he had his story. The ~~Legine~~ <sup>Legine</sup> formula exactly coincided with the government's interest. His interview with Boswell was set and <sup>came</sup> ~~came~~ off as scheduled- and formulated, <sup>✓</sup> as



69

unofficial official propoganda. But it was too good a formula, too close to perfect in addressing the government's then accute distress, for its carrying off to be trusted to a brash, reporter ~~like~~ unknown to the government or <sup>to</sup> a single paper when that device could be spread around the world.

Of all the days in the <sup>following</sup> 950 since the autopsy testimony before the Warren Commission, by one of those remarkable coincidences we are required to consider nothing else, the Associated Press just happened -entirely by happen-stance - to select exactly the same day Levine had arranged for his interview to seek Dr. Boswell out. And about what did it want to interview him: Only those things Levine had indicated he would ask about.

+ also Sawyer

to Boswell and to me

And what story did the Associated Press carry, what did its reporter want to know: Only those things that fit the Levine formula!

With three doctors to seek out, it <sup>interviewed</sup> sought Boswell <sup>only</sup> also.

Of all the fact and fiction of the autopsy, it also fixed on this chart.

Its story, ~~is~~ <sup>with</sup> a thin transparency of Levine's, containing nothing not in <sup>additionally</sup> <sup>some of</sup> it. Is it not remarkable that the AP carried only what Levine had just gotten from Dr. Boswell's was spread throughout the world.

but his

No less remarkable is the world-wide journalistic acceptance of the seeking boast that a President's autopsy was characterized by sloppy work, inaccuracy, carelessness and conjecture rather than the precise science one expects from autopsy surgeons, specialists in pathology and forensic medicine.

Levine's is a morning paper. The AP works around the clock. It "beat" Levine to his own story, circulating it in time for afternoon use the day before.

Naturally, Levine suspected I had "tipped off" the AP, and he so accused me, wrongly, but he, quite naturally, found it difficult to believe it was pure coincidence that the AP seized upon the same day to interview the same doctor and ask him the same questions - ~~and nothing else~~ <sup>and</sup> nothing else.

- and none else -

This is a part of the history I believe should be recorded, for the papers of that time, November 24-25, 1966, do not disclose this background and,

70

consistent with their effort to suppress mention of and credit to WHITEWASH, falsely indicate the question was raised by ~~KENNEDY~~ Edward Epstein, <sup>his</sup> whose writing on the autopsy, based not upon the testimony, with which he displayed monumental unfamiliarity, but upon what had been fed him by former Commission staff members seeking self-justification, is so <sup>of</sup> inaccurate he was unaware of the content of that document and hypothesized that changes made the morning of November 24, 1963 were made much later.

How the <sup>media</sup> served the country should also be a matter of record, as should its self-conversion into an arm of government, an agency of propaganda, part of the coverup.

So, we are told, Boswell proclaimed his own error as the norm of forensic medicine, the commonplace of autopsies, not different when a President is murdered.

That a pathologist acknowledged error in a Presidential autopsy warranted this headline in the Baltimore Sun, which ran the banner across the top of the front page:

"KENNEDY X-RAY DATA RELEASE BACKED <sup>Safe</sup> ~~Firm~~ in the knowledge nothing like it would-or could- happen, Boswell asked for ~~less~~ <sup>its</sup> examination by "disinterested observers" (read "those who know nothing about it").

This error, to the Washington Star, warranted the headline "Doctor at Kennedy Autopsy Explains Sketch Controversy". This is hardly what Boswell did, not at all what the story said ("made a diagram error" was the <sup>AP's</sup> euphemism ~~of it~~ <sup>and insouciant</sup>).

Even the New York Times, whose well-informed reporter Peter Kihss used the same phrase, "diagram error," and without question quoted Boswell as saying, "If I had known at the time that this sketch would become public record I would have been more careful" - as though secrecy justified slovenly science when a President is murdered - headed its own story "Autopsy Doctor Says Films Back

Warren Report".  
 (1, NSCRT Nov 71) =>

There was no little journalistic child to say the Emperor was naked,

u  
 a. to ask why the doctor might be expected to say the report and his testimony were wrong. *Less*  
*positively: problem himself a perjuror.*  
 LIL- On previous page, next to last line:

to 70  
 The Washington Post (which knew much better, its own staff having asked questions about the autopsy of former staff executive and gotten not a single satisfactory answer) rewrote the AP story to eliminate the direct quotation of error or the indirect acknowledgement of it. "The sketch was drawn quickly, as rough notes," the Post explained, leaving the schizophrenic to its headline ~~line~~ writer, whose first bank was "M.D. Backs Warren report" and whose second ~~was~~ used the word the story did not, "Admits He Erred in sketch".

For all their dilettante attitude, for all their failure to prod and probe, the reporters did come up with what would have been sensational revelations to an honest press and on any other subject. Boswell acknowledged to Levine that:

There were microscopic slides made of tissue "which indicated...foreign substances..." in the neck wound and that "there was no mention of these slides" in the autopsy report, even though, he said, they confirm it.

"All marks and scars were noted", although there is no such chart in the ~~file~~ printed ~~or~~ record or the files.

When the body arrived "The pathologists (himself and Humes) had already been told of the probable extent of the injuries and what had been done by physicians in Dallas" - this destroys entirely the flimsy excuse that they did not know a tracheotomy had been performed, as the Sibert-<sup>an FBI report we should analyze also does.</sup> Neil also does.

When the autopsy was performed - but before Humes <sup>finished</sup> wrote the <sup>draft</sup> final draft by revising what he had written, "Oswald was still alive, and it was believed the autopsy information would later be called upon in court proceedings".

Not until the ~~doctors~~ could not probe the rear, non-fatal wound did the <sup>do</sup> doctors order "complete X-rays of the entire body"! Levine's words are "At this point", or "when the wound in the back of the neck was discovered and probed, by finger and by ~~metal~~ metal surgical probe, no bullet could be found."

Although the President's body was taken apart along the possible path of the bullet, there is no reference to any sign of its path, merely of a bruise that could



72

do make

have been caused by the tracheotomy. The <sup>did</sup> did not see a path, and bullets leave them. <sup>In part, bullets cannot go through a body without making a detectable path.</sup>

The next-day's telephone to the Dallas doctors - he also refers to but one when there had been two-"confirmed", as Levine put it, "what was already a certainty to the pathologists - that there <sup>was</sup> <sup>was</sup> a bullet wound in the President's neck at the point of the tracheotomy incision". Then why was the telephone call made to learn "this, or the second one made at all." The answer is in WHITEWASH: <sup>(150)</sup> the Dallas doctors were tipped off.

"Later that day, November 23, Dr. <sup>H</sup>umes and Dr. Boswell went over the rough draft and completed the protocol in its final form." If this is true, Dr. Humes perjured himself before the Commission (WHITEWASH ~~180~~, 183) in swearing that, "In the privacy of my own home, early in the morning of November 24, I made a draft of this report which I later revised and of which this <sup>(part of Exhibit ~~397~~ 397)</sup> represents the revision. That draft I personally burned in the fireplace of my recreation room" (2E373). This, to the Commission and the newspapers ever since, is normal- burn the President's <sup>autopsy</sup> s autopsy and suppress the notes and the pictures and the X-rays and the slides of microscopic examination and the organ examination.

Yet of his interview with Boswell, Levine said that "before this", meaning earlier <sup>November 23-</sup> when Oswald was still alive and there was the absolute certainty that all the autopsy work and findings would be subject to rigorous cross examination. "Dr. Humes destroyed" ~~his own~~ the draft.

Further complicating it is this representation of more drafts of the autopsy than Humes or Boswell acknowledged under oath: "Dr. Boswell said that all the original notes were preserved, as far as he knows, and were turned over to the National Archives". Of this he can have no knowledge and it is untrue. No such notes are or have been there, nor are they printed where required in the Commission's record. "He said the things that were burned were copies of the protocol as they were revised."

Aside from the conflict with Humes on the time - and if Humes swore falsely, Boswell was also under oath and supported it, raising the question

73  
of perjury again - this language accounts for a minimum of one more burned copy of the autopsy, one draft at the least more than, under oath, the doctors acknowledged ~~they~~ <sup>were</sup> made.

Boswell also indicated papers had been prepared that no longer exist. It is proper and normal, as I have pointed out from the beginning, to orient wounds from inflexible points so that the location is precise. <sup>Only via visible -</sup> This is not true of use of either the shoulder joint <sup>and</sup> or the mastoid, <sup>care</sup> the only points referred to in the autopsy report. <sup>That was done</sup> ~~Grafted after~~ Oswald was murdered, after it was known there <sup>§</sup> would be no cross examination. Levine's language is, Dr. Boswell said "that he thought he had used a vertebra as a third reference point, but that this did not appear in the autopsy report or in the sketch."

This is part of the story that delighted the papers, that caused them to vie with each other in joyous hosannahs because there had been error in the autopsy when a President was murdered; that made the papers <sup>g2</sup> proclaim the good news throughout the land - the President's autopsy was right because it was wrong - better than Gilbert and Sullivan - and all is right with the government and the world! <sup>g</sup> Never have the great and powerful been so uninhibitedly ~~exultant~~ exultant in praise of error.

Error is what made the Warren Report suddenly right!

Nobody wondered - or asked why-it took Boswell three years to admit his "error", especially because it was months <sup>after the autopsy</sup> later that he and Humes testified under oath. Nobody, not Levine, the AP, the Times or any other paper, deigned to embarrass Dr. Boswell, one he agreed to be interviewed, by asking for comment on the throughgoing condemnation of this autopsy months earlier at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, which heard it denounced as ~~even~~ incomplete, "weak,, cannot establish a chain of evidence... failed to maintain original notes... must be taken on faith rather than fact..."

Mystery ~~there may still be~~ about the autopsy, as there now, forever is guaranteed ~~to be~~; but there is no mystery why Drs. Boswell and <sup>H</sup>Humes did not answer my letter, did not agree to speak to me, but did ~~ag~~ agree to be interviewed by those who knew nothing about the fact or, like Levine, cared less.





26 95 Most of a year has passed. The doctors, apparently, are still piqued, for neither responded to me. They were not totally silent. CBS asked H<sub>u</sub>mes to appear on its Special of Specials, four hour-long apologies for the Report and the government, <sup>These were</sup> thinly disguised as non-partisan, <sup>their own conclusions only were</sup> ~~and~~ inconsistent with the <sup>filmed</sup> information presented, on prime time June 25-28, 1967.

Proudly reading the copy carefully prepared for him, Walter Cronkite was blissfully unaware that <sup>the</sup> line in which he took journalistic delight was a big lie. The more he<sup>re</sup> repeated it -and this he did throughout the shows - the prouder he seemed to be:

"Since the X-rays and films were turned over to the Archives, Captain H<sub>u</sub>mes has re-examined them. And tonight, for the first time, he discusses ~~what is~~ With Dan R<sup>ather</sup> what is contained in<sup>t</sup> them".

The press widely interpreted this and its fulsome repetition to mean that CBS had been able to <sup>arrange for</sup> ~~have a~~ private examination ~~made~~ of the suppressed pictures and X-rays of the autopsy. This, as the correspondence with the Archivist <sup>in the appendix</sup> ~~that I will~~ <sup>shows</sup> quote, is false.

If H<sub>u</sub>mes did not know of this CBS lie when he was filmed, he certainly did after the show was aired. He was and has been silent about it, content to leave a lying record, that he "re~~e~~examined" the pictures and x-rays he had never before seen.

This is consistent with the lie in which he, without protest or demurrer, participated in the first quoted question <sup>Rather's</sup>:

"Commander -- now Captain H<sub>u</sub>mes, have you had a look at the pictures and X-rays from the autopsy since the time that you submitted them to the Warren Commission?"

Now, even the ignorance that is reflected throughout this series of CBS whitewashes cannot possibly explain the clever nuances, the <sup>96</sup> ideal subtleties of this false and deceptive question, which tells more big lies, lies that must be <sup>as such</sup> known to anyone with the least extensive basic understanding of the fact of the investigation, autopsy and testimony. Presumably, after the expenditure of a touted half million

77

dollars and the investment of the expensive time of a vast staff for seven months, CBS, on the executive, operational and editorial levels, through all the channels of its research, legal and many other departments, was satisfied it knew the essence of the story at least. ~~There is~~ It is not possible, therefore, ~~honestly~~ to use less unpleasant language to describe the total departure from reality, from the well-publicized fact that the Commission had never seen any of the pictures or X-rays, as the last of this series freely acknowledges during the

*McClay, with appropriate depth of feeling, was sorry, naturally. When it was too late to make any difference,*

~~also first~~ interview with Commission member, John McClellay. *When it was too late to make any difference,*  
"Yes, Mr. Rather, we have," Humes responded, fully aware that he had never seen the pictures and X-rays prior to his appearance before the Commission or during its life and that ~~the Commission~~ he had never "submitted them to the Warren Commission".

There is no question here, no demurrer, no evasion, no qualification.

Humes just plain lied in agreeing that he had "submitted" the suppressed pictures and ~~X-rays~~ "to the Warren Commission". He well knew - as did CBS - that they had left the hospital with the President's body in the <sup>possession</sup> custody of Roy H. Kellerman, chief of that unhappy day's Secret Service escort. <sup>(and certifications)</sup> I print the receipts in the appendix.

*Like* There is no question that Humes also knew the members of the Commission were not going to see this film evidence, for <sup>personally</sup> it is he ~~who~~ who supervised the preparation of "artist's conceptions" as a (to him and the Commission) acceptable substitute for the available and legally required "best evidence", the <sup>pictures</sup> real film (WHITEWASH 181ff).

All echelons of CBS were devoted to this lie and its repetition. The script writer <sup>s</sup> waded no words before repeating it, giving Humes the same pleasure:

"RATHER: And do you have any different conclusion, any different ideas, any different thoughts now, after seeing them again, then you had at that time?"

<sup>Why</sup> There is no complaint from Humes that he had never seen them until they were "returned" to the government, more than two and a half years after his testimony, more than two years after the Commission had ceased to exist;

"Humes: No, we think they bear up very well, and very closely, our testimony



before the Warren Commission".

If the pictures hold up "v ry well", Humes doesn't. It was a lie for Rather and CBS to say, "after seeing them again" of the pictures that Humes had never before seen, as it was for Humes to ~~xxxxxxx~~ accept the lie and pretend by his answer that it was truth. *In neither case could the lie have been accidental. CBS and Humes both knew the sort very truth.*

With this beginning, it is less than surprising that CBS was itself without protest, question, even a raised eyebrow, when Humes announced that the official charts "routinely used to mark in general where certain marks or scars or wounds may be in conducting a post mortem exsmination...are never meant to be accurate or precisely to scale."

This shock <sup>us</sup> those ~~who are~~ <sup>who</sup> square as the author and labor under the <sup>apparent</sup> misapprehension that there <sup>should be</sup> is nothing <sup>less</sup> ~~not~~ as accurate as man and science can make it in the autopsy of a murder victim, more particularly when ~~he~~ he is a President, and that everything in a medico-legal document is "precise", ~~not~~ about 100% wrong in distance, as this mark ~~was~~ is, or in a different part of the body!

Boswell told Levine he thought there had been reference to a vertebra. Humes made no such pretense, and in his description to CBS was careful to avoid the only meaningful point from which measurement <sup>was</sup> made. CBS <sup>is</sup> was just as "precise": ~~It avoided asking him,~~ <sup>CBS,</sup> not through ignorance <sup>for it</sup> was familiar with my writing ~~on just this point and had read my first book in its limited edition, beginning with the executive producer, and since then,~~ <sup>and descending through the marks,</sup> those closer to mere mortality on the ~~CBS staff had done likewise.~~

During his conversation with Rather, no little voice whispered in Humes' ear, "that was a whopper", or "better tell the truth", or "what will history say", or even "better late than never". <sup>Instead,</sup> ~~But when Rather~~ These were wonderful "shows," <sup>it was</sup> as though Anenias ~~sat on the CBS should~~ <sup>be with their</sup> "uncheusen on the witnesses," and ~~Bernum was in the prompter's pit.~~ <sup>precedented hours,</sup> emphasized ~~sed~~ <sup>sed</sup> by all propogandists, asked,

"Yes, sir," Humes again said.

INSERT

There is more to the magic of this inaccurate chart that was never intended

29  
 to be anything else, because <sup>after all</sup> it was <sup>its</sup> only part of a President's autopsy and "notes".  
 This time it is about the fatal head wound(s).

"...the measurements which are noted here in the margin of the drawing are precise measurements", Humes said.

1/13/57  
 Rather asked about the head wound. There are no other notes printed in the official exhibit, No. 397, none in File 371, supposedly identical with Exhibit 397. But: LIL, page 12 of CBS, as marked.

Q Where is the source of Humes' "precise" locating of the ~~the~~ fatal wound - and it is precise "two and a half centimeters to the right of the midline"?

There is no such note in the "margin", ~~was~~ (WHITEWASH 197), no such mark on an unidentified scheme of a head wound that is part of Exhibit 397 (17H46), which abounds in other marks, <sup>as though it might</sup> seems to be ~~the~~ a chart of the President's head injuries, and seems also not to show this "wound of entry" of the bullet ~~how~~ said to have entered the back of his head and ~~fatally~~ to have exploded out its right side - <sup>and only its right side.</sup>

Thus, when asked, "can you be absolutely certain", Humes declared, "very precisely and incontrovertibly", satisfying Rather and everyone else at CBS and explaining again why the autopsy doctors will not speak to anyone else <sup>those without</sup> who has none of CBS' <sup>my theology</sup> preconceptions or dedication to the perpetuation of error when a President is murdered.

Can there be any doubt of the "conclusive scientific evidence", Rather's felicitous choice, when the "precise" and "incontrovertible" evidence is <sup>a</sup> ~~the~~ ~~only~~ chart that has none of the measurements and is described as "never meant to be accurate or precisely to scale"?

This is <sup>the</sup> a new "science", reserved for the solution of Presidential murders and the glories of electronic journalism.

80

We live in a new world that relishes newness, like the "new math". Here with have another, ~~new~~, the "new science"

Going along with it is the "new dictionary" and special meanings to special words. In passing it is worth noting how "precisely" and "incontrovertibly" the rear, non-fatal wound is located, <sup>This is</sup> the beginning point of the interview and the crux of it. The "precision" in locating the wound from side to side comes from its orientation with the shoulder joint ~~rather~~ instead of the spine. Unless "precision" the width of the body is given - and ~~incontrovertibility~~ in this case, <sup>(NO NOTE IN THE MARGIN)</sup> ~~rather~~ eliminated that dimension, too, there is no horizontal location. In the vertical dimension, orienting the wound with the mastoid is the very epitome of "incontrovertibility". The mastoid, you see, is in a different part of the body than the wound. It is in the head. This wound, by the Commission's description and the word of the doctors, was in the neck. <sup>89</sup> By the chart it was in the back. "either is part of the head wherep "incontrovertibly", the mastoid is - even in Presidents. Necks ~~are long~~ come long and necks come short, in Presidents, too. It is conceivable that if a Presidential neck ~~was~~ <sup>were</sup> short <sup>with</sup> enough, "precise measurements" such as those "noted in the margin of the drawing" - and a few centimeters would shorten enough - this ~~would~~ <sup>would</sup> could ~~have~~ been in the air and not in either the neck or the back. Likewise, if the President's head was cocked slightly to the opposite side, his ~~would~~ <sup>would</sup> would, by these "precise measurements" that are "noted in the margin of the drawing", have been nonexistent. On the other hand, cock it down a bit, and it is either in the back had it been in the neck, or farther down in the back if it was where all the observers said it was to begin with - in the back (WHITWASH 180).

Of course, the observers - mere Secret-Service and FBI agents - had ~~not~~ notes in their margins. They had only eyes.

Thus the advantages of the "new science", especially if buttressed by the ~~new~~ "new dictionary", are readily apparent, <sup>They are</sup> and most suitable invoked when it is the murder of a President that is analyzed and reported upon. How much more "precise" or "incontrovertible" can one be? Or need one, when it is a President's murder and the autopsy is in a military hospital, conducted by military personnel who have expelled all others.



81

#  
EXTRA SPACE

The President's body was removed from Dallas, where the only applicable law obtained, in deference to the widow's wishes, according to undisputed published accounts. For the same reason, according to the same sources, before it reached Washington arrangements were made for ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ the autopsy examination to be at Bethesda Naval Hospital. In 900 pages of its Report and 26 volumes of evidence, the official record made of this autopsy is so deficient that the

Official

Commission saw to it there was no public record of those who attended that autopsy. <sup>ab</sup> <sup>no</sup> Such a record in 10,000,000 words about a President's murder. Why? As we shall see, it is not because the record was not in its files.

Such

The examination was in charge of, <sup>Humes as</sup> ~~the~~ Chief of Laboratories, <sup>rather might have said "non civil-</sup> ~~the~~ Commander James J. Humes. <sup>at the time this ship was cited he quit by returned to private practice,</sup> ~~before his retirement in June 1967, immediately after his first and only public appearance and comment on the autopsy.)~~ ~~Humes was promoted to captain.~~

man

Colonel Pierre Finck, of the Army Medical Service, whose experience in both forensic medicine and wounds ballistics (he was chief of that <sup>Army</sup> branch) ~~also~~ assisted, as did

mission

~~Commander I. W. Boswell, Humes' Naval Hospital assistant. Not long after~~ <sup>then</sup> ~~the assassination, Boswell~~ <sup>for, had returned</sup> ~~returned to private life.~~ <sup>practiced</sup> ~~his~~ <sup>his</sup> ~~mission~~

From the official account, these three doctors were the ones who actually performed the examination and signed the report on it. So slight was Boswell's participation, according to the FBI, that he is (in their report) listed merely as among those present.

That Humes did not make any public statement or appearance prior to his telecasting by CBS is not because he was not sought. ~~He~~ <sup>he</sup> just ducked unless he had reason to believe in advance that he would ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> be questioned about what he <sup>had done,</sup> ~~did,~~ unless he received assurances that he would be whitewashed. The same <sup>also</sup> seems to have been true of Boswell. ~~also~~ Finck was more fortunate. His work seems to <sup>have</sup> kept him out of the country for extended periods. When he looks back on this period, Dr. Finck may regard the horrors of long medical service in Viet Nam as a blessing.

No civilian expert - no one not in government military service <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ permitted at the autopsy examination. Had the autopsy been a model of scientific and forensic-medical precision <sup>which</sup> ~~which~~ it was not <sup>this</sup> ~~this~~ <sup>alone</sup> ~~alone~~ would have been sufficient to <sup>insure?</sup> ~~insure~~ assuage doubts and misgivings. It should never have happened this way.

Whether or not Mrs. Kennedy wanted <sup>the autopsy</sup> her husband's examination to <sup>be</sup> ~~have been~~ done in a naval institution because <sup>he</sup> ~~his~~ <sup>her husband's</sup> military service had been naval, someone not as shocked by the crime as she and not as <sup>stunned</sup> ~~overwhelmed~~ <sup>by</sup> its horror and the immediate and pressing consequences and necessities, should have seen to it that civilian experts of the greatest experience and highest repute were at least observers. There should have been ~~civilian~~ pathologists not in the military service, not on any government payroll, not in any sense under any official obligation or compulsion and with unassailable scientific credentials in medical understanding of crimes of violence to assure the impartiality and thoroughness of the examination and its accounting and to satisfy the country and the world ~~of this~~ ~~that~~ ~~there~~ ~~was~~ ~~no~~ ~~question~~ ~~about~~ ~~either~~ ~~the~~ ~~examination~~ ~~or~~ ~~the~~ ~~official~~ ~~report~~ ~~of~~ ~~it~~.

Someone with the power and the ~~authority~~ <sup>official</sup> to prevent this accomplished the opposite. In these same 10,000,000 words on the investigation of the Presidential murder, in those same 900 pages of the official Report on it, the fact of this is entirely absent, as ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> the identity of the person responsible for seeing to it that there was no civilian check on the military, for seeing to it that there was no single civilian expert present, <sup>at the autopsy.</sup>

It is an accident that this obvious failing escaped official Commission attention, an accident that the Commission was without comment on it in its Report and testimony and evidence?

Or is it, as I believe the record establishes, deliberate suppression-part of the whitewashing?

Those present at the autopsy examination - even those who just entered the room and then left - were duly recorded. That data was in the Commission's files.

I print it in this book (see pp. ).

Extra Space

So we have these new insights into the autopsy and the men who did it, the autopsy ~~the~~ report that was from data "never meant to be accurate" by a doctor who "would have been more careful" had he known his work "would become public record"- by a doctor who ~~examined~~ <sup>expected</sup> ~~secretly~~ <sup>secretly</sup> to be the grave of his autopsy work on a President of the United States!

And we now know <sup>about it what was</sup> ~~things~~ not included in the official investigation and the official "report on it":

That microscopic tissue slides were made and "there is no mention of these slides" in the autopsy report ⑥

That despite their contrary statements under oath, the doctors knew during their examination that ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ a tracheotomy had been performed in Dallas and "had already been told of the probable extent of the injuries and what had been done by physicians in Dallas" before the body arrived ⑥

That a revised autopsy was prepared when it was known that, with Oswald's murder, there would be no trial, no cross examination on it ⑥

That not until they could not probe the rear, non-fatal wound did the doctors ~~xxxxxx~~ take "complete X-rays of the entire body".

That the original notes of the autopsy were preserved but do not exist in any of the duplicate places they are required to exist <sup>although</sup> ~~and~~ without them there can be no support for the autopsy, whose raw material they are.

That the "precise" location of the <sup>entry</sup> fatal wound is recorded in non-existing marginal notes on an inaccurate chart, the only existing recorded note of its "location".

That the Commission suppressed the identities of those who attended the autopsy (and as we shall see, did not call most of them as witnesses).

q That the military expelled all civilians from the autopsy examination (about which we shall also have more).

That the chief of the autopsy lied with CBS-TV in lying about when he saw the pictures of the autopsy, how many times he saw them, and what he did with them, all to the complete silence of the press and officials who knew the truth.



~~we~~ we can now better understand that it is this official silence in  
 the presence of <sup>lies and</sup> lies - perhaps perjury - and the <sup>blind,</sup> uncritical support by lies, ~~and~~  
 distortions and the grossest misrepresentations <sup>by a</sup> of the servile press that compounds  
 the tragedy of the phony inquest. Can we expect better from the press that has  
 so abandoned its <sup>responsibilities and</sup> ~~historic~~ traditions that it permitted the original miscarriage?

Can we expect better from the press that suddenly was joyous because <sup>it</sup> ~~they~~  
 found error in the President's autopsy - this wrong making it all right?