The "New Science", the "New Dictionary" — and the New Morality

Two weeks after wider distribution of WHITEWASH was initiated, in May of 1966, I wrote Drs. Humes and Boswell about their autopsy examination and testimony. The letters were virtually identical. I sent them copies of the book, called their attention 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 entirely discredits the official story - their stories - of that autopsy. It also raises the questions of perjury and subornation of perjury in the medical testimony. That these doctors were and are silent about their "error", and the question 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, even those who merely indicated possible doubt. Although Humes says his silence was ordered, both have spoken to those they knew in advance would write what they wanted written and what the government wanted ~~read~~ believed. 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 the doctors and others (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 2:00 a.m. preparing himself for his interview.

A number of staff members of the Baltimore Sun were interested in my work. At their request, I had driven to that city, met with them, discussed my findings and answered their questions. Richard H. Levine, who interviewed Boswell, was not one of them. A. W. (Art) Geiselman, Jr., was. 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:

(4)

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 sensation. His 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

*Author Of 'Whitewash'*

# Kennedy Autopsy Data Access Urged

By A. W. Geiselman, Jr.

The author of a book criticizing the Warren Commission said today that serious scholars on the topic of the Kennedy assassination should be permitted to study X-rays and photographs of the late President's autopsy.

Harold Weisberg, author of "Whitewash," said that, otherwise, the announcement Tuesday that the Kennedy family had released the X-rays, negatives and transparencies to the National Archives is meaningless.

He described the announcement as an effort by a Government under pressure "to give the impression it has nothing to hide while it is hiding things."

**In D.C. To Protest**

He said he has gone to the National Archives in Washington to protest the decision to limit for five years access to the X-rays and photographs to official Government investigative bodies except with specific approval of the Kennedy family.

Mr. Weisberg's comments followed the announcement by the Justice Department that the autopsy data was being released to the custody of the Government by the Kennedy family at the Government's request.

The Government spokesman admitted that the recent publication of books raising questions about the commission's findings "had something to do" with the request.

Even after the five-year period, the spokesman said, access to the X-rays and photographs will be considerably limited and that critics of the commission findings

HAROLD WEISBERG

probably would not qualify as persons to be granted such access.

He said, however, that it would be possible for these critics to designate qualified pathologists to study the data after this period.

**Designate Pathologists**

Mr. Weisberg's publication is among a number of recent books and magazine articles questioning the commission's finding that Lee Harvey Oswald was solely responsible for President Kennedy's death.

Mr. Weisberg, 53, a former newspaper man and United States Senate investigator, lives on a farm in Hyattstown in Montgomery county. He said he began his book immediately after the assassination.

"The transfer of the X-rays and photographs is meaningless because of the conditions surrounding them," Mr. Weisberg said today. "The Government from the very beginning had access to the evidence in the pictures and has not used them.

**Access Needed, He Says**

"What is needed now is access to the X-rays and photographs of the autopsy by those infinitely familiar with the evidence, not beginning five years hence with access by uninformed pathologists who know nothing about the case."

The X-rays and photographs in themselves can add little to the knowledge of the case except to confirm testimony of doctors at the commission hearings, he said. But, he said, in the hands of persons such as himself and others with intricate knowledge of the assassination such data can be placed in their proper context and "be quite valuable."

A look at the X-rays and photographs, Mr. Weisberg said, might clear up what he described as "the unresolved conflict of testimony" of pathologists appearing before the commission as to the entrance point of the first of two bullets hitting the President.

**Point Of Entrance**

He pointed out that a chart apparently made at the time of autopsy showed the first bullet hit the President in the back. Yet, he noted, doctors also presented the commission with an artist's drawing showing that the bullet entered the neck.

The point of entrance is important, Mr. Weisberg said, because it could when compared with what some experts believe was the exit hole just at the knot of the President's tie, indicate the height from which the gun shooting the bullet was fired.

The lower the entrance would in the President's body the less likely was the possibility that the same bullet also hit Texas Gov. John B. Connally, Mr. Weisberg said.

He pointed out that the slug which hit the Governor apparently was moving at a downward angle hitting him in the back, exiting through the chest, passing through his wrist and striking his thigh.

**Major Questions**

The matter of how many bullets were fired at the presidential car has been a major question raised by Mr. Weisberg and the other authors.

The commission stated that it had been persuaded by the evidence that the same bullet which first hit President Kennedy also hit Governor Connally. This would conform with the commission's finding that Oswald alone did the shooting from the sixth floor of the Texas Book Depository.

If the two officials were hit by separate bullets there would have had to be two assassins because with the type of rifle used by Oswald he could not have snapped off two shots in so short a span, Mr. Weisberg and others have claimed.

Mr. Weisberg said that so far as he knows the X-rays and photographs of the autopsy were never formally presented to the commission and are not part of its record.

(INTIMATELY)

questioning, in his view, offered little prospect of journmalis tic sensation.

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

"What should I ask 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 Humes' testimony revealed, for he swore he had not prepared that chart. I told Levine that 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.

If he could get Boswell to say he made a mistake, Levine said, he had his headline. The Levine formula exactly coincided with the government's interest. His interview with Boswell was set and came off as scheduled - and formulated - as unofficial official propaganda. But it was too good a formula, too close to perfect in addressing the government's then acute distress, for its carrying off to be trusted to a brash reporter unknown to the government, or to a single paper when that device could be spread around the world.

Of all the days in the nine hundred and fifty following the autopsy testimony before the Warren Commission, by one of these remarkable coincidences we are required to consider nothing else, the Associated Press just happened - entirely by happenstance - to select exactly the same day Levine had arranged for his interview. It also sought out Dr. Boswell ~~out~~. And about what did it want to interview him? Only those things Levine had indicated to Boswell and to me (on my phone), he would ask about.

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 interviewed Boswell only.

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

Its story, a thin transparency of Levine's, contained nothing not in his, but was spread throughout the world. Is it not additionally remarkable that the AP carried only some of what Levine got from Dr. Boswell?

No less remarkable is the world-wide journalistic acceptance of the seeming 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.

Levine suspected I had "tipped off" the AP. Quite naturally, he found it difficult to believe it was only coincidence that the AP seized upon the same day to interview the same doctor - and no one else - and ask him the same questions - and nothing 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, consistent with their effort to suppress mention of and credit to WHITEWASH, falsely indicate the question was raised by Edward Epstein. His 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

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 news media 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 in large type across the top of the front page:

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

This error, to the Washington Star, justified the headline "Doctor at Kennedy Autopsy Explains Sketch Controbersy". This is hardly what Boswell did, not at all what the s tory said ("made a diagram error" was the AP's euphemism).

Evan the New York Times, whose well-informed and conscientious 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".

The Washington Post (which knew much better, its own staff having asked questions about the autopsy of a former staff executive and gotten not a single satisfactory answer) rewrote the AP story to eliminate the

direct quotation of error, the indirect acknowledgment of it. "The sketch was drawn quickly, as 'rough notes'", the Post explained, leaving the schizophrenia to its headline writer, whose first bank was "M.D. Backs Warren Report" and whose second used the word the story did not, "Admits He Erred In Sketch".

There was no little journalistic child to say the Emperor was naked, or to ask why the doctor might be expected to say the Report and his testimony were wrong. Less politely: proclaim himself a perjurer.

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 printed 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 an FBI report we shall analyze also does.
- When the autopsy was performed - but before Humes finished the 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 they could not probe the rear, non-fatal wound did the

25

10

20734

December 1, 1966

Dr. J. Thornton Boswell
Suburban Hospital
6600 Old Georgetown Road
Bethesda, Maryland

Dear Dr. Boswell:

It has been reported to me, I hope erroneously, that your failure to respond to my letter of six months ago, with which I enclosed a copy of my book, WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT, was due to pique, because I had not consulted you in advance of its publication.

A writer attempting to consult all of the 552 people listed as Commission witnesses and the countless thousands of others in the printed evidence in 27 such massive volumes could never in several lifetimes complete a book.

It is my belief that the autopsy of an assassinated President should be a model of completeness, precision, specification, fact, and accuracy. It is my belief that when a body such as the President's Commission, with a staff of men of such outstanding qualifications, takes testimony from medical experts enjoying the high position and respected status you and your colleagues have earned, all of us, including writers, are entitled to assume and expect that the Commission and its witnesses approached their unhappy responsibilities with unlimited dedication to completeness and truthfulness.

Are you suggesting I should have expected your testimony would be inadequate, incomplete or inaccurate, that the Commission desired this, that the requirements imposed on a pathologist by science and law cannot be met except with the prodding assistance of a writer?

The Commission and the medical experts made their own record. All will have to stand on it.

As always happens with this subject, whenever official persons make statements, they raise more questions than they answer. This is true of your statements to the Baltimore Sun, broadcast widely by the Associated Press.

As in the past, I shall make no effort to force my [redacted] on you or Dr. Humes, no effort to entice you to say anything you do not want to say. Whether or not you elect to [redacted] answer questions is entirely your decision. My original offer stands: I will make a tape recording and provide you with a copy.

I cannot avoid noting for the present and for history that you and Dr. Humes decline or refuse to see there you have reason to believe seriously question the autopsy and the testimony on it while, for example, seeing Fletcher Knebel, a Commission defender. I note also that you granted an interview to the Baltimore Sun when it was first apparent to you that the reporter had no knowledge of the subject matter at all and had as his sole purpose eliciting from you what you ultimately said, that you agreed in the official autopsy chart.

My new book, WHITEWASH II, will soon be available. [illegible] I shall not send you copies. But I do want you to know that nothing the things I say and prove in it is that the President's autopsy unworthy of a Bowery bum.

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 surgical probe, no bullet could be found."

Although the President's body was taken apart abng the possible path of the bullet, there is no reference to any sign of its path, merely to a bruise that could have been caused by the tracheotomy. They did not see a path, and bullets do make them. In fact, bullets cannot go through a body without making a detectable path.

The next day's telephone call 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 was 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 (p.180): the Dallas doctors were tipped off.

"Later that day, November 23, Dr. Humes 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 (part of Exhibit 397) represents the revision. That draft I personally burned in the fireplace of my recreation room" (2H373). This, to the Commission and the newspapers ever since, is normal - burn the President'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 November 23 - 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" 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 again the question of perjury ~~again~~ - this language accounts for a minimum of one more burned copy of the autopsy, at least one draft more than, under oath, the doctors acknowledged were 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. Only variables - the shoulder joint and the mastoid - are referred to in the autopsy report. That was done rewritten after Oswald was murdered, after it was known there would be no cross examination. In 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

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! Never have the great and powerful been so uninhibitedly exultant in praise of error.

Error is what suddenly made the Warren Report right.

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

Mystery about the autopsy now is forever guaranteed, but there is no mystery about why Drs. Boswell and Humes did not answer my letters, did not agree to speak to me, but did agree to be interviewed by those who knew nothing about the fact or, like Levine, cared less. It is as though there were guarantees in advance. From Levine none were needed. The performance of the Associated Press could have been no more satisfactory to Boswell if he had written their story.

Levine got his sensation, leaving the country no better for it, with lies about a President's murder more widely disseminated, more firmly believed by more misinformed people. It did him no good, however, for he left the Sun very soon thereafter.

(46)

Only the cause of injustice and untruth profited, only those deserving punishment were protected.

But the newspapers were happy, happier than they ever had been - fairly ecstatic - overjoyed beyond description - that the government at

last admitted an error to their liking. How much more delighted can a newspaper owner or editor be than when he learns the autopsy examination of hsi President was hasty, expected to be secret, hence the beneficiary of careless work, and one of the pathologists acknowledges all this plus error?

Levine told me he had asked Boswell why he had not responded to my letter, to the challenges I published in WHITEWASH, to my offer to tape record anything he wanted to say so I could quote him accurately. Boswell, he told me, was put out because I did not consult him in advance of publication. On December1, 1966, I wrote him the following letter, sending a copy to Humes:

"It has been reported to me, I hope erroneously, that your failure to respond to my letter of six months ago, with which I enclosed a copy of my book, WHITEWASH: THE REPORT ON THE WARREN REPORT, was due to pique, because I had not consulted you in advance of its publication.

"A writer attempting to consult all of the 552 people listed as Commission witnesses and the countless thousands of others in the printed evidence in 27 such massive volumes could never in several lifetimes complete a book.

"It is my belief that the autopsy of an assassinated President should be a model of completeness, precision, specification, fact, and accuracy. It is my belief that when a body such as the President's Commission, with a staff of men of such outstanding qualifications, takes testimony from medical experts enjoying the high position and respected status you and your colleagues have earned, all of us, including writers, are entitled to assume and expect that the Commission

and its witnesses approached their unhappy responsibilities with unlimited dedication to completeness and truthfulness.

"Are you suggesting I should have expected your testimony would be inadequate, incomplete or inaccurate, that the Commission desired this, that the requirements imposed on a pathologist by science and law cannot be met except with the prodding assistance of a writer?

"The Commission and the medical experts made their own record. All will have to stand on it.

"As always happens with this subject, whenever official persons make statements, they raise more questions than they answer. This is true of your statements to the Baltimore Sun, broadcast widely by the Associated Press.

"As in the past, I shall make no effort to force myself upon you or Dr. Humes, no effort to entice you to say anything you do not want to say. Whether or not you elect to see me and answer questions is entirely your decision. My original offer stands: I will make a tape recording and provide you with a copy.

"I cannot avoid noting for the present and for history that you and Dr. Humes decline or refuse to see those you have reason to believe seriously question the autopsy and the testimony on it while, for example, seeing Fletcher Knebel, a Commission defender. I note also that you granted an interview to the Baltimore Sun when it was first apparent to you that the reporter had no knowledge of the subject matter at all and had as his sole purpose eliciting from you what you ultimately said, that you erred in the official autopsy chart.

"My new book, WHITEWASH II, will soon be available. This time I shall not send you copies. But I do want you to know that among the things I say and prove in it is that the President got an autopsy unworthy of a Bowery bum."

 Extra Space

Most of a year has passed. The doctors, apparently, are still piqued, for neither has responded to me. They were not totally silent. CBS asked Humes to appear on its Special of Specials, four hour-long (47) apologies for the Report and the government, presented on prime time June 25-28, 1967. These were thinly disguised as "non-partisan". Their conclusions were inconsistent with the filmed information.

Proudly reading the copy carefully prepared for him, Walter Cronkite was blissfully unaware that a line in which he took journalistic delight was a big lie. The more he 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 Humes has re-examined them. And tonight, for the first time, he discusses with Dan Rather what is contained in them".

The press widely interpreted this and its fulsome repetition to mean that CBS had been able to arrange for a private examination of the suppressed pictures and X-rays of the autopsy. This, as the correspondence with the Archivist in the appendix shows, is false. (pp 000-00).

If Humes did not know of this CBS lie when he was filmed, he ~~xxxxx xxxxxx~~ certainly did after the show was aired. He was and has been silent about it, content to leave a lying record, that he "re-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 Rather's first quoted question:

(sic) "Commander -- now Captain -- Humes, 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 ~~xx~~ nuances, the

ideal subtleties of this false and deceptive question, which tells more big lies, lies that must be known as such to anyone with a minimal understanding of the fact of the investigation, autopsy and testimony. Presumably, after the expenditure of a touted half-million dollars and the investment of the expensive time of a vast staff for seven months, CBS, on the executive, operational and editorial levls, through all the channels of its research, legal and many other dpeartments, was satisfied it knew the essence of the story at least. It is not possible, therefore, 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 INterview with Commission member John McCloy. When it was too late to make any difference, McCloy, with appropriate depth of feeling, was sorry, naturally.

"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 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 possession of Roy H. Kellerman, chief of that unhappy day's Secret Service escort. I print the receipts and certifications in the appendix (pp. ).

Likewise, there is no question that Humes also knew the members of the Commission were not going to see this film evidence, It is he, personally, who supervised the preparation of "artist's conceptions" as an acceptable substitute, to him and to the Commission, for the available and legally required "best evidence", the pictures (WHITEWASH 181ff).

All echelons of CBS were devoted to this lie and its repetition. The script writer wasted 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, than you had at that time?"

There was 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 "very 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 accept the lie and to pretend by his answer that it was truth. In neither case could the lie have been accidental. CBS and Humes both knew the contrary 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 examination...are never meant to be accurate or precisely to scale."

This shocks us "squares" who labor under the apparent misapprehension that there should be nothing less accurate than man and science can make it in the autopsy of a murder victim, more particularly when he is a President and that everything in a medico-legal document is "precise", not about 100% wrong in distance or in a different part of the body, as this mark is.

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 is made. CBS

was just as "precise": it avoided asking him. Not through ignorance, for CBS was familiar with my writing, beginning with the executive producer and descending through the ranks to those closer to mere mortality.

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". Instead, when Rather, with that special CBS delight in this favorite of its lies during four unprecedented hours replete with them, emphasized this lie in the special emphasis of repetition espoused by all propagandists, asked, "Your re-examination of the photographs verify..."

"Yes, sir," Humes again said.

These were wonderful "shows". It ~~was as~~ was as though Ananias sat on the CBS shoulder, Munchausen on the witnesses', and Barnum was in the prompter's pit.

There is more to the magic of this "inaccurate" chart that was never intended to be anything else. (It was, after all, only part of a President's autopsy and its "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," Rather said. 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. This is 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 instead of the spine. Unless the width of the body is given - and "precision" in this case, eliminated that dimension, too, (no note in the margin) there is no horizontal location. In the vertical dimension, orienting the wound with the mastoid is the very apotheosis 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. By

(49)

the chart it was in the back. Neither is part of the head where, "incontrovertibly", the mastoid is - even in Presidents. Necks come long and necks come short. It is conceivable that if a Presidential neck were short, with "precise measurements" such as those "noted in the margin of the drawing" - and a few centimeters would shorten enough - this wound would be 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 wound 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 (WHITEWASH 185).

Of course, the observers - mere Secret Service and FBI agents - had no notes in their margins. They had only eyes.

Thus the advantages of the "new science", especially if buttressed by the "new dictionary", are readily apparent. They are most suitable when invoked in the analysis and report on the murder of a President. 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?

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:

RATHER: About the -- head wound ...

HUMES: Yes, sir.

RATHER: ... there was only one?

HUMES: There was only one entrance wound in the head, yes, sir.

RATHER: And that was where?

HUMES: That was posterior, about two and a half centimeters to the right of the midline, posteriorly.

But first, the observations of Mr. Mather's boss we heard earlier.

WECHT: This sketch that was made by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Mather, is a very important sketch which shows the bullet hole which he diagrammed in at a point approximately several inches below the collar level, although he does give two other measurements to the side - which would place it at a higher level.

RATHER: Now, the Commission Report accepted that the bullet entered very near the neck, did it not?

WECHT: Yes. Take a look at this sketch, if you would, please. This was made by a medical illustrator at Bethesda Naval Hospital. This sketch shows the one that was accepted by the Warren Commission. It shows the point of entrance in the back at a much higher level, and it shows the point of exit again at approximately the level of the knot of the tie. You can then see why it was very important to accurately determine whether or not the bullet wound in the back was at this point, or whether it was five and a half inches below the collar level.

CRONKITE: Since the X-rays and films were turned over to the Archives, Captain Humes has re-examined them. And tonight, for the first time, he discusses with Dan Rather what is contained in them.

RATHER: Commander -- now Captain Humes, 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?

HUMES: Yes, Mr. Rather, we have.

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

HUMES: No, we think they bear up very well, and very closely, our testimony before the Warren Commission.

RATHER: How many wounds in the President's body?

HUMES: There were two wounds of entrance, and two of exit.

RATHER: And the two wounds of entry were where?

HUMES: Posteriorly, one low in the right posterior scalp, and one in the base of the neck, on the right.

RATHER: Let's talk about those two wounds, Captain. Both of these are blowups from the Warren Commission Report, these sets of drawings. Now, there are people who think they see discrepancies in these two drawings from the Warren Commission Report, in that this drawing shows the - what you called an entry wound at the base of the neck of the President - shows

it to be, or seems to show it to be, in the upper back, near the shoulder blade - considerably below the base of the neck. Whereas, this drawing does show the entry wound to be at the base of the neck. Now could you talk about these, and reconcile that?

HUMES: Yes, sir. This first drawing is a sketch that -- in which the outlines of the figure are already prepared. These are on sheets of paper present in the room in which the examination is conducted, and are routinely used to mark in general where certain marks or scars or wounds may be in conducting a post mortem examination. They are never meant to to be accurate or precisely to scale.

RATHER: This is a routine in -- in preparing autopsy reports, to use this kind of drawing, and at this stage for them not to be prepared precisely?

HUMES: No. No precise measurements are made. They are used as an aide memoire, if you will, to the pathologist as he later writes his report.

More importantly, we feel, that the measurements which are noted here at the margins of the drawing are the precise measurements which we took. One states that -- we draw two lines, points of reference -- from bony points of reference. We note that there were -- the wound was fourteen centimeters from the tip of the right acromion, and fourteen centimeters below the tip of the right mastoid. Now the acromion is the extreme outermost portion of the shoulder. The tip of the mastoid is the bony prominence just behind the ear. And where these two lines intersect was, in actuality, where this wound was situated. And if we would try and draw that to scale, which we weren't trying to do as this mark was made, this, I think, would appear a little bit higher.

RATHER: Now, you examined this whole area of the back?

HUMES: Yes, sir.

RATHER: Were there any other wounds except one at the base of the neck, and one up in the skull?

HUMES: No, sir, there were not. Now the second drawing, which I mentioned, was prepared as we were preparing to testify before the Warren Commission, to rather schematically and as accurately as we possibly could depict the story for the members of the Warren Commission.

RATHER: In this drawing you were trying to be precise?

HUMES: Yes, sir, we were. We were trying to be precise, and refer back to our measurements that we had made and noted in the margins of the other drawing.

Also, of course, since this time we have had opportunity to review the photographs which we made at that time. And these photographs show very clearly that the wound was exactly where we stated it to be in our testimony before the Warren Commission, and as it is shown in this drawing.

RATHER: Your re-examination of the photographs verify that the wounds were as shown here?

HUMES: Yes, sir, they do.

RATHER: About the -- the head wound ...

HUMES: Yes, sir.

RATHER: ... there was only one?

HUMES: There was only one entrance wound in the head, yes, sir.

RATHER: And that was where?

HUMES: That was posterior, about two and a half centimeters to the right of the midline, posteriorly.

RATHER: And the exit wound?

HUMES: And the exit wound was a large irregular wound to the front and side -- right side of the President's head.

RATHER: Now, can you be absolutely certain that the wound you described as the entry wound was, in fact, that?

HUMES: Yes, indeed, we can - very precisely and incontrovertibly. The missile traversed the skin, and then traversed the bony skull. And as it passed through the skull it produced a characteristic coning, or beveling effect on the inner aspect of the skull - which is scientific evidence that the wound was made from behind and passed forward through the President's skull.

RATHER: This is very important. You say the scientific evidence -- is it conclusive scientific evidence?

HUMES: Yes, sir, it is.

RATHER: How many autopsies have you performed?

HUMES: I -- I would estimate approximately one thousand.

RATHER: Is there any doubt that the wound at the back of the President's head was the entry wound?

HUMES: There is absolutely no doubt, sir.

Where is the source of Humes' "precise" locating of 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", (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, seems as though it might be a chart of the President's head injuries, and seems also not to show this "wound of entry" of the bullet said to have entered the back of his head and to have exploded out its right side - and only its right side.

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 those without CBS' preconceptions or dedication to mythology 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 a chart that has none of the measurements and is described as "never meant to be accurate or precisely to scale"?

This is the "new science", reserved for the solution of Presidential murders and the glories of electronic journalism.

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 the autopsy examination to be at Bethesda Naval Hospital. In ~~nine hundred~~ 900 pages of its Report and ~~twenty-six~~ 26 volumes of evidence, the official record made of this autopsy is so deficient that the Commission saw to it there was no public record of those who attended that autopsy.

(19) No such 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.

The examination was ~~in charge of~~ by Humes as Chief of Laboratories, (Rather might have said "Now, Civilian" instead of "Now, Captain"; for at the time this show was ~~aired~~ recorded Humes knew he was ~~he~~ quietly returned to private practice immediately after this, his first and only public appearance and comment on the autopsy.) ~~x~~, assisted by Colonel Pierre Finck, of the Army Medical Service, whose experience in both forensic medicine and wounds ballistics (he was chief of that Army branch) ~~assisted, as did~~ and Boswell, then Humes' Naval-Hospital assistant. Not long after his Commission testimony, Boswell had returned to private practice.

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 in their report ~~He~~ he is 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 just ducked unless he had reason to believe in advance that he would not be questioned about what he had done, unless he received assurances that he would be whitewashed. The same also seems to have been true of Boswell. Finck was more fortunate. His work seems to have 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 - <u>no one not in government military service</u> - <u>was permitted at the autopsy examination</u>. Had the autopsy been a model of scientific and forensic-medical precision - which it was not - this

alone would have been sufficient to assure doubts and misgivings. It should never have happened this way.

Whether or not Mrs. Kennedy wanted the autopsy examination to be done in the naval institution because her husband's military service had been naval, someone not as shocked by the crime as she, and not as stunned by its horror and overwhelmed by 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 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 that there was no question about either the examination or the official report of it.

Someone with the power and the authority to prevent this accomplished the opposite. In these same 10,000,000 official 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 the identity of the person responsible for seeing to it that there <u>was</u> no civilian check on the military, for seeing to it that there was no single civilian expert present at the autopsy.

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. ).

Is it an accident that this obvious failing escaped official Commission attention, an accident that the Commission was without comment on it in its Report <u>and</u> testimony <u>and</u> evidence?

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

So we have these new insights into the autopsy and the men who did it, the autopsy 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 expected secrecy to be the grave of his autopsy work on a President of the United States!

And we now know about it, what was not included in the official investigation and the official Report on it:

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

That despite their contrary statements under oath, the doctors knew during their examination that 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;

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;

That not until they could not probe the rear, non-fatal wound did the doctors 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 - although without them there can be no support for the autopsy, whose raw material they are;

That the "precise" location of the fatal entry 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);

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

That the chief of the autopsy ~~vied with~~ JOINED 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 can now better understand that it is this official silence in the presence of "error" and of lies - perhaps perjury - and the blind, uncritical support by lies, distortions and the grossest misrepresentations by a servile press that compounds the tragedy of the phony inquest. Can we expect better from the press that has so abandoned its responsibilities and traditions that it permitted the original miscarriage?

Can we expect better from the press that suddenly was joyous because it found "error" in the President's autopsy - this wrong making it all right?