

Evidence for small wound(s) in the front of JFK's head

Contents

Part 1: Intro

Part 2: Dr. George Burkley, Kennedy's personal physician; Malcolm Kilduff, White House press secretary

Part 3: Tom Robinson, mortician

Part 4: James Curtis Jenkins, autopsy lab technician

Part 5: Dennis David, William Pitzer, and Jerrol Custer

Part 6: Joe O'Donnell

Part 7: Quentin Schwinn

Part 8: Roy Kellerman, Secret Service

Part 9: Janie Taylor's witness

Part 10: Parkland Drs. Robert McClelland, Marion Jenkins, Malcolm Perry, Kemp Clark, Robert Shaw, David Stewart Gene Akin, Ronald Jones, Lito Porto, and various other media reports

Part 11: Father Oscar Huber

Part 12: Hugh Huggins

The body of John F. Kennedy was examined by three autopsy pathologists – Drs. James Humes, J. Thornton Boswell, and Pierre Finck. All three claimed to agree the wounds in the body were caused by two bullets that entered from behind. Still, their conclusions have never stopped coming under scrutiny. What exactly did Kennedy's body look like after the shooting? Is the lone gunman hypothesis true?

The pathologists said that they found a small wound in the back of the head and a large wound on the side of the head. Were there any other small defects on the head? Statements attributed to at least eighteen witnesses suggest there was a small wound on somewhere on the FRONT of JFK's head:

Dr. George Burkley (Malcolm Kilduff, 11/22/1963 press conference at Parkland Hospital [[transcript](#)] [[video](#)] [[video 2](#)] [[video 3](#)]; Chet Huntley, NBC, 11/22/1963 [[video, 56:15](#)]; KLIF Dallas radio, 11/22/1963 [[audio, 2:14:42-2:49:56](#)]; UPI, 11/22/1963 [[link 1](#)] [[link 2](#)] [[link 3](#)] [[link 4](#)] [[link 5](#)])

Malcolm Kilduff (4/17/1991 interview by Harrison Livingstone, *High Treason 2*, 1992, p. 447, Chapter 21. *The Presidential Party, Malcolm Kilduff*)

Tom Robinson ([ARRB MD 63, 1/12/1977 interview by the HSCA](#) [[text](#)] [[audio](#)]; 10/6/1991 interview by Harrison Livingstone, *High Treason 2*, pgs. 284-285, 290, 579-581; Joe West, notes on

5/26/1992 interview [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)] [[link 3, Journal News, 12/28/2013](#)]; [ARRB MD 180, report on 6/21/1996 interview](#))

James Curtis Jenkins (1990-1991 interviews by Harrison Livingstone, *High Treason 2*, 1992, Chapter 11. *James Curtis Jenkins*; 4/6/1991 Dallas conference [[video, part 1, 1:25:10](#)] [[video, part 2](#)]; Livingstone, *Killing The Truth*, 1993; Nov. 2017 meeting [[video, 45:15](#)]; Jenkins and Law, *At The Cold Shoulder of History*, 2018)

Dennis David (News-Sun, 5/1/1975, *Another Link in JFK Death?* by Art Peterson [[link 1](#)] [[link 2](#)]; 1990-1991 interviews by Harrison Livingstone and 9/11/1991, 10/31/1991 letters to Joanne Braun, *High Treason 2*, p. 556, Chapter 27. *A Proposal; The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, Episode 6: *The Truth Shall Set You Free*, 1995 [[video, 22:13](#)] [[transcript, partial](#)]; [JFK/Deep Politics Quarterly, Jan. 1998, p. 9, The Untimely Death of Lieutenant Commander William B. Pitzer by Allan R.J. Eaglesham and R. Robin Palmer](#); [ARRB MD 177; report on 2/4/1997 interview by the ARRB; 11/16/2001 interview, JFK Lancer Conference in Dallas, Texas](#); Law, *In The Eye of History*, 2004; *Without Smoking Gun* by Kent Heiner [[2019 DRAFT](#)]; [Black Op Radio, 2003, part 121](#); 6/20/2006 interview by James Douglass, *JFK and the Unspeakable*, 2008 [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)]; [Educationforum.ipbhost.com, comment 70044](#); [Educationforum.ipbhost.com, comment 70802](#); [The Putative Pitzer Movie: A Discussion by Allan Eaglesham, 2007](#); The Lone Gunman podcast, episode 30, 2014 [[audio, 18:05](#)] [[link 2](#)] [[link 3](#)]; Nov. 2016 JFK Assassination Conference in Dallas [[video](#)])

Jerrold Custer (Mar. 1998 interviews by Vincent Palamara and William Law, *In The Eye of History, 2004, Jerrold F. Custer* [[video](#)])

Joe O'Donnell ([ARRB MD 231, ARRB report on 1/29/1997 and 2/28/1997 interviews](#); *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, Episode 7: *The Smoking Guns*, 2003 [[video, 21:14](#)])

Quentin Schwinn (Doug Horne, Future of Freedom Foundation, 2014, *Altered History: Exposing Deceit and Deception in the JFK Assassination Medical Evidence* [[video, part 2, 27:26](#)] [[link 2](#)])

Dr. Robert McClelland ([WC Vol. 17, p. 12, CE 392, 11/22/1963 hospital report](#) [[text](#)]; [WC Vol. 6, p. 30, 3/21/1964 WC testimony](#) [[text](#)]; 12/1/1971 interview by Harold Weisberg, *Post Mortem*, 1975 edition, p. 376-377, Epilogue; [6/23/1990 letter](#); [JAMA, 5/27/1992, JFK's death - the plain truth from the MDs who did the autopsy](#) [[text](#)]; 9/10/1992 interview by Brad Parker, [Kennedy Assassination Chronicles, Volume 3, Issue 1, Spring 1997, p. 7, Dr. Robert McClelland in Trauma Room One](#); [ARRB group interview, 8/27/1998](#) [[text](#)]; 10/1/2002 and 11/30/2002 interviews by Vincent Bugliosi, *Reclaiming History, 2007*, Book One: *Matters of Fact: What Happened, Kennedy's Autopsy and the Gunshot Wounds to Kennedy and Connally*; [D Magazine, The Day Kennedy Died by Michael J. Mooney, Nov. 2008](#); 2009 interview by Brent Holland [[audio, 14:35](#)]; 10/24/2013 talk, Baylor University [[video, 44:49](#)])

Dr. Marion Jenkins ([WC Vol. 6, p. 45, 3/25/1964 WC testimony](#) [[text](#)]; [HSCA Vol. 7, p. 285, HSCA report on 11/10/1977 interview with Jenkins](#) [[text](#)]; [2/9/1979 letter to John Lattimer](#); 1979 interview with Harrison Livingstone, *The Radical Right and the Murder of John F. Kennedy*, 2004 [[link](#)]; interview by Gerald Posner, [Case Closed, 1993](#), Chapter 13. "He Had a Death Look")

Dr. Kemp Clark ([Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 11/27/1963, Movies Reconstruct Tragedy](#) by Arthur J. Snider, [Chicago Daily News Service](#) [[link 2](#)]; *High Treason* by Harrison Livingstone, 1989, Part II: The Medical Evidence, Chapter 2p: *The President's Head Wounds And The New Evidence Of Forgery, THE HOLE IN THE BACK OF THE HEAD*)

Dr. Gene Akin (6/28/1984 FBI Memo on contact with Gene Akin/Solomon Ben Israel by Doug Davis, RIF#124-10158-10449 [\[link\]](#); *High Treason* by Harrison Livingstone, 1989, Part II: The Medical Evidence, Chapter 2p: *The President's Head Wounds And The New Evidence Of Forgery, THE HOLE IN THE BACK OF THE HEAD*)

Dr. Robert Shaw (Larry Ross, *Today*, Feb. 1964 [\[link\]](#) [\[link 2\]](#))

Dr. W. David Stewart ([Nashville Banner, 1/17/1967, Doctors Believed President Shot In Forehead: Physician by Lewis Williams](#); [Lebanon Democrat, 3/30/1967, JFK shot from the front, speaker tells rotary, cites coverups and deception by Carl Wallace](#); [Joe Dolan Show, KNEW radio, Oakland, CA, 4/10/1967](#))

Dr. Ronald Jones ([ARRB group interview, 8/27/1998 \[text\]](#))

Dr. Lito Porto (*High Treason* by Harrison Livingstone, 1989, *Afterword*; Dr. Ronald Jones, [ARRB group interview, 8/27/1998 \[text\]](#))

Father Oscar Huber (Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, 11/24/1963; 11/24/1964 letter from Shirley Martin to Vincent Salandria, *Praise From a Future Generation: The Assassination of John F. Kennedy and the First Generation Critics of the Warren Report* by John Kelin, 2007; [The Scavengers and Critics of the Warren Report by Richard Warren Lewis and Lawrence Schiller, 1967](#), authors' interview with Shirley Martin; [Interview by Mark Lane](#); [Midlothian Mirror, 2/14/1967, An Open Letter to Father Oscar Huber by Shirley Martin](#); Shirley Martin, 6/23/2000 interview and email with John Klein, Teresa Martin, 6/16/2000 interview and email with Klein, *Praise from a Future Generation*, 2007)

Hugh Huggins (*JFK: Breaking the Silence* by Bill Sloan, 1993)

- No small wounds in the front of the head were specified in the official autopsy protocol ([WC D 77 \[text\]](#)) or the Warren Commission testimonies of the three pathologists ([WC Vol. 2, p. 347 \[text\]](#); [WC Vol. 2, p. 376 \[text\]](#); [WC Vol. 2 p. 377 \[text\]](#)).

If such a wound did exist, does this count as strong evidence against the official story? One could try arguing that a bullet entering from behind could leave a small shrapnel exit wound in the front. Still, no such wound was specified by the pathologists. Is it possible they were engaged in a cover-up? Many would doubt they could have missed a bullet wound as they were examining the scalp and skull.

- When Dr. Boswell was later shown the official autopsy photographs, he pointed out a small spot on the upper back of the head which he said was tear in the scalp related to the large defect ([HSCA Vol. 7, p. 243, HSCA interview with Humes and Boswell, 9/16/1977 \[text\] \[audio\]](#); [Boswell's ARRB deposition, 2/29/1996 \[text\]](#)). This could mean there were other small defects in the scalp which were not properly identified at the time.

- On the diagram of the body marked during the autopsy, there is a small dot on the level of the left eye, which appears to be marked "0.4 cm", and a small circle on the level of the right eye, marked "0.8 cm". In another drawing of the head made at the time, there is a square-shape on what looks to be the left side of the head, with "3cm" marked above the square ([ARRB MD 1](#)). None of the original autopsy materials explain what these markings mean. This issue was brought up when Boswell was interviewed by Baltimore Police Officer Richard Waybright on 10/2/1990. From the 1992 book *High Treason 2* by Harrison Livingstone:

[...p. 191, Chapter 8. *J. Thornton Boswell*]

Boswell was very gracious to my investigator, and answered all of Mr. Waybright's questions to the best of his ability. He promised to locate his notes and at a further meeting explain what some of the markings on his blood-stained drawings made at the autopsy meant. In particular, we wanted to know what the sketch of an apparent wound in the left eye marked "three centimeters" meant, and what the dot over left eye was in the full body drawing.¹

[...194-195]

Richard Waybright's report to me said: "Dr. Boswell could not explain the markings on the skull diagram that indicate '3.4 cm,' nor could he explain the markings on the body chart [face area] which are located in the area of both eyes. This inability to recall these markings is plausible because it has been twenty-seven years. What this tells me is that there were no entry wounds in the face or left temple area.

"Dr. Boswell was adamant that there were no wounds in the face or left temple area

"Dr. Boswell stated that when you use his diagrams to locate the wounds you should use only the measurements next to the diagram and not the marks, because they will indicate the general area and not to be considered exact by any means. The marks were to orient the area of the wound and the measurements were to pinpoint it exactly." In addition, Boswell did not make all of the notations on his drawings. Jim Jenkins made some of them.

Lab technician James Curtis Jenkins was asked about the markings, at a 4/6/1991 conference in Dallas:

Harrison Livingstone: Could you look at these two drawings of Dr. Boswell's that were done at the autopsy and say how accurate they are and what do they mean?

Jenkins: This one is confusing, I don't- to be honest with you, as I look at this and if I'm looking for-

Livingstone: This drawing right here.

Jenkins: Okay. I'm not sure of what three millimeters on the left eye is, I'm not sure what-

Livingstone: Centimeters. Three centimeters.

Jenkins: Or centimeters. I'm not sure of what the 'missing' means. They seem to be almost inverted as far as the wounds depicted and things of this nature. I really don't know what to make of these. I have never been able to orientate them.

Dr. Phillip E. Williams: Did he do autopsies routinely, this particular doctor?

Jenkins: No.

Livingstone: Do you know what these, in the other drawing here showing the full body, do you know what these arrows pointing to each eye, what's written or what that means?

Jenkins: I know- I know what- what the numbers are because that's my handwriting. Okay.

Livingstone: You- you wrote that in? You wrote everything in here?

Jenkins: Most of it, except the description and so forth, Dr. Boswell did this 'ragged', so forth. This one where we did the initial-

Livingstone: On the left side?

Jenkins: Yeah. Well, actually, well, this- this is related to- to the frontal area of the body and this was-

Livingstone: Yeah.

Jenkins: -this was a preliminary to all the autopsies. Dr. Boswell dictated a lot of this. He measured the wound in the neck.

Livingstone: What do these pointing to both eyes- there's- there's a circle drawn around the right eye and there's a line drawn to the left eye.

Jenkins: I- my impression is that that's the dilation structure of the eye itself.

([Video, part 2, 37:14](#))

From Dr. Humes' 2/13/1996 deposition to the Assassination Records Review Board:

Q. Up at the top of the skull, there is a 3 cm, I assume 3 centimeters. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you have any knowledge about what that would mean?

A. I certainly don't.

([Transcript \[text\]](#))

From Dr. Boswell's ARRB deposition, 2/26/1996:

Q. Going up further on the diagram, there appears to be a "3 cm" right over what appears to me to be the left eye. Is that correct? First, does that say "3 cm"?

A. Yes. And that's not my writing. Either Jim or--and that doesn't look like his writing, so that may be Pierre. That apparently is the vomer bone, which is crushed and drawn up there. I don't believe that this is in the frontal bone.

Q. When you say "this," you're pointing to the rectangular shape?

A. To the little oblong 3-centimeter specimen there.

Q. Do you know what the 3 centimeters is referring to there?

A. I'm sure it must be--now, that is mine, that 3 centimeters is my writing, and that must be the length of the piece of bone there.

Q. Does that signify a cracked bone or--

A. Crushed, yeah.

Q. Crushed?

A. Mm-hmm.

Q. Could you explain why, at least to me as a lay person, it appears that there is a rectangular drawing near what I would presume to be the area of the right--or the left orbit and it seems to be circular in the right orbit? Is there some explanation for that that you know of?

A. Well, I remember that the fracture through the bone extended from the frontal bone and through the floor of the orbit. Why that is round and this one is square over here, I don't know.

([Transcript \[text\]](#))

- After Kennedy was pronounced dead at Parkland Hospital, the body was washed and wrapped in sheets. Nurses Diana Bowron and Margaret Henchcliffe said they were the ones who did this ([WC Vol. 21, p. 203, Bowron's hospital report](#); [WC Vol. 6, p. 134, Bowron's WC testimony, 5/24/1964 \[text\]](#); [WC Vol. 6, p. 139, Henchcliffe's WC testimony, 3/21/1964 \[text\]](#)), At least three other witnesses may have seen the body being handled at this time - Nurse Patricia Hutton, Nurse Doris Nelson, and orderly David Sanders ([WC Vol. 21, p. 150, CE 392, Medical reports from doctors at Parkland Hospital, Dallas, Tex., concerning treatment of President Kennedy at that hospital on November 22, 1963 \[text\]](#); [WC Vol. 6, p. 143, Nelson's WC testimony, 3/20/1964 \[text\]](#)). None of these witnesses reported any small wounds in the head. In 1993, Nurse Bowron told researcher Harrison Livingstone "*When we prepared the body, I washed as much blood as I could from the hair; while doing this, I did not see any other wound either in the temples or in other parts of the head*" (Livingstone, *Killing the Truth*, 1993, p. 183, Chapter 6. *Diana Bowron*). Nurse Henchcliffe told researcher Wallace Milam on 6/25/1993, as reported, "*After Kennedy died and doctors left, she and Diana Bowron washed the body...Face was cleaned by wiping [no wounds seen]*" (*JFK: From Parkland to Bethesda* by Vincent Palamara, 2015 [[link](#)]). But, as Nurse Audrey Bell said at the 4/6/1991 conference in Dallas, "*It would've been cleaned up partially. However, you didn't do too much cleaning up because medical examiner- you couldn't wash away evidence. So, medical examiner never liked to have a body totally cleaned up before they got it. You sent everything intact with all IV tubes, chest tubes, any drains, anything that's been attached, go intact*" ([Video, part 1, 47:22](#)).

- On 10/8/1990, Harrison Livingstone asked James Curtis Jenkins if he remembered any damage to the left temple area. Jenkins "*said that neither he nor anyone else at the autopsy to the best of his knowledge had seen any such wound*" (Livingstone, *High Treason 2*, 1992, p. 229, Chapter 11. *James Curtis Jenkins*). At the 4/6/1991 Dallas conference, Livingstone showed autopsy assistant Paul O'Connor one of the photographs showing the right side of Kennedy's head.

Livingstone: Well, we're talking about the forehead, we're talking about a possible entrance wound in the forehead.

O'Connor: [points to forehead on the photo] Right there.

Livingstone: Did you see anything at the autopsy that-

O'Connor: Absolutely not. [...]

([Video, part 2, 51:06](#))

On 5/9/1991, Paul O'Connor was asked by Livingstone “[Did you see anything that looked like an entry wound in the left temple area?](#)”, and O'Connor replied “[No](#)”. Livingstone noted “[Another time I asked him if there was an entry wound in the right temple area, and he said no](#)” (Livingstone, *High Treason 2*, 1992, p. 259, Chapter 12. *The Recollections of Paul O'Connor*). Francis X. O'Neill, an autopsy witness from the FBI, was asked by Livingstone on 5/20/1991 “[...you didn't note any or remember anything about entry hole or any small hole in either right or left temple area?](#)”, to which he replied “[There was none](#)” ([Audio](#), 31:29).

- The scalp was not shaved at the autopsy. Shaving the scalp would have given a clearer look at the wounds.

- If there was a small wound somewhere on the head, it could have appeared hidden beneath the hair and blood to others who were there with the body. Parkland Hospital's Dr. Robert McClelland would later say that, in his opinion, Kennedy was shot from the right front ([JAMA, 5/27/1992, JFK's death - the plain truth from the MDs who did the autopsy](#) [text]; 4/6/1991 Dallas conference [[video, part 2](#), 44:09, 1:22:51]; *High Treason 2*, 1992, Chapter 5. *Bethesda Naval Hospital*, p. 138; 10/1/2002, 11/30/2002 interviews by Vincent Bugliosi, [Reclaiming History, 2007](#), Book One: *Matters of Fact: What Happened, Kennedy's Autopsy and the Gunshot Wounds to Kennedy and Connally*; *D Magazine, The Day Kennedy Died* by Michael J. Mooney, Nov. 2008; [McKinney Courier-Gazette, 1/28/2012, Surgeon recounts JFK operation](#) by Chris Beattie; [Undated talk, uploaded to Archive.org on 2/15/2012](#); TCSS conference, 2012 [[video, part 3](#)] [[part 5](#)]; [2/21/2013 talk at the 15th annual Gathering of Eagles conference in Dallas, TX](#); [Dallas Morning News, 6/21/2013, Lee Harvey Oswald gets hung jury at mock JFK murder trial](#) by Jennifer Emily; [9/24/2013 interview, Sixth Floor Museum](#); [10/24/2013 lecture at Baylor University](#); [Undated presentation, uploaded to Youtube on 11/22/2013](#); [2013 interview on Televisa](#); [2014 talk at UT Southwestern](#); [10/5/2015 drawing 1](#) [[link](#)]; [10/5/2015 drawing 2](#) [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)]; [11/12/2015 interview at Allen Public Library](#); [12/22/2016 drawing](#) [[link](#)]; [2016 speech at Berkner High School](#); [2/28/2017 drawing](#) [[link](#)]; [4/6/2017 drawing 1](#) [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)]; [4/6/2017 drawing 2](#) [[link](#)]; [4/10/2017 drawing 1](#) [[link](#)]; [4/10/2017 drawing 2](#) [[link](#)]; [6/14/2017 drawing 1](#) [[link](#)]; [6/14/2017 drawing 2](#) [[link](#)]; [7/17/2017 drawing](#) [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)] [[link 3](#)]; [2/16/2018 drawing](#) [[link](#)]; [Undated drawing 1](#); [Undated drawing 2](#) [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)] [[link 3](#)] [[link 4](#)] [[link 5](#)] [[link 6](#)]; [Undated drawing 3](#) [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)] [[link 3](#)]; [Undated drawing 4](#) [[link](#)]; [Undated drawing 5](#) [[link](#)]; [Undated drawing 6 and letter](#) [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)]; [Undated audio at studentsforrenew.org](#)). McClelland conceded the possibility that there could have been a small wound in the front of the head, even if he didn't personally see one (12/1/1971 interview by Harold Weisberg, *Post Mortem*, 1975 edition, p. 376-377, Epilogue; 4/6/1991 Dallas conference [[video, part 2](#), 44:09, 1:22:51]; Bugliosi, 10/1/2002, 11/30/2002 interviews, [Reclaiming History, 2007](#), Book One: *Matters of Fact: What Happened, Kennedy's Autopsy and the Gunshot Wounds to Kennedy and Connally*; TCSS conference, 2012 [[video, part 5](#), 4:33]; 9/24/2013 interview, Sixth Floor Museum [[video, 23:34](#)]; 2013 interview on Televisa [[video, 14:45](#)]; [10/5/2015 drawing 1](#) [[link](#)]; [10/5/2015 drawing 2](#) [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)]; [2/28/2017 drawing](#) [[link](#)]; [4/6/2017 drawing 1](#) [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)]; [4/6/2017 drawing 2](#) [[link](#)]; [4/10/2017 drawing 1](#) [[link](#)]; [4/10/2017 drawing 2](#) [[link](#)]; [6/14/2017 drawing 1](#) [[link](#)]; [7/17/2017 drawing](#) [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)] [[link 3](#)]; [2/16/2018 drawing](#) [[link](#)]; [Undated drawing 1](#); [Undated drawing 2](#) [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)] [[link 3](#)] [[link 4](#)] [[link 5](#)] [[link 6](#)]; [Undated drawing 3](#) [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)] [[link 3](#)]; [Undated drawing 4](#) [[link](#)]; [Undated drawing 5](#) [[link](#)]; [Undated drawing 6 and letter](#) [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)]).

- Bullets not always leave easily recognizable entry wounds. Sometimes, a bullet striking tangentially will leave one wound of both entry and exit.

- The case of JFK involves extensive tearing of the scalp and fragmenting of the skull, which could have made it difficult to recover evidence. The official autopsy protocol says there was an “*actual absence of scalp*” in the area of the large defect ([WC D 77, p. 3 \[text\]](#)). Dr. Humes said in his 3/16/1964 testimony to the Warren Commission “*We had to do virtually no work with a saw to remove these portions of the skull, they came apart in our hands very easily*”, “*...as we moved the scalp about, fragments of various sizes would fall to the table...*”, “*...the fragmentation was so complex that it was impossible to accurately pinpoint the exit of the missile in the head wound*” ([WC Vol. 2, p. 347 \[text\]](#)). The autopsy was judged to be inadequate by the House Select Committee on Assassinations forensic pathology panel. Among the complains listed in the panel's report, “*the head was not reconstructed in order to determine the precise location of the head exit wound*” ([HSCA Vol. 7, p. 181, 3/29/1979 \[text\]](#)).

Neither Drs. Humes nor Boswell were experienced in gunshot wounds. Dr. Finck was experienced ([Bugliosi, Reclaiming History, 2007, Book One: Matters of Fact: What Happened, Kennedy's Autopsy and the Gunshot Wounds to Kennedy and Connally](#)), but he only arrived at the autopsy AFTER the brain had been removed through the skull ([ARRB MD 28, 1/25/1965 and 2/1/1965 Reports From Dr. Finck to Gen. Blumberg; Finck's Shaw trial testimony, 2/24-2/25/1969 \[text\]; ARRB MD 30, Finck's HSCA testimony, 3/11/1978 \[text\] \[audio\]](#)). While the autopsy was in progress, the pathologists were given a portion of skull bone which was reportedly found in the Limousine ([HSCA Vol. 7, p. 23, 3/29/1979, Medical Panel Report, Section II. Performance of Autopsy](#)). According to the official autopsy protocol and Humes' testimony, there were three late-arriving skull fragments ([WC D 77, p. 4 \[text\]; WC Vol. 2, p. 347, 3/16/1964 WC testimony \[text\]](#)). There is an [x-ray](#) in the official record showing three skull fragments, one large and two small ([HSCA Vol. 7, p. 121](#)). The pathologists said a large skull fragment they received showed external beveling which suggested it was a part of a bullet exit ([WC D 77, p. 4, autopsy protocol \[text\]; WC D 7, p. 280, Sibert and O'Neill FBI report, 11/26/1963; WC Vol. 2, p. 347, Humes WC testimony, 3/16/1964 \[text\]; WC Vol. 2, p. 377, Finck's WC testimony, 3/16/1964 \[text\]](#)), as well as dense particles resembling metal ([ARRB MD 149, 11/23/1963 FBI teletype from James Sibert and Francis X. O'Neill; WC D 77, p. 4, autopsy protocol \[text\]; WC D 7, p. 280, Sibert and O'Neill FBI report, 11/26/1963; WC Vol. 2, p. 347, Humes WC testimony, 3/16/1964 \[text\]](#)). Dr. Humes told the Warren Commission “*I would estimate that approximately one-quarter of that defect was unaccounted for by adding these three fragments together and seeing what was left*” ([WC Vol. 2, p. 347, 3/16/1964 testimony \[text\]](#)). When the body was being prepared for burial, a type of plaster was used to fill the empty voids in the skull ([ARRB MD 65, HSCA report on 8/24/1977 interview with James Curtis Jenkins; ARRB MD 64, HSCA interview of Paul O'Connor, 8/29/1977; O'Connor, 4/20/1990 and 5/9/1990 interviews by Harrison Livingstone, High Treason 2, 1992, p. 256-257, Chapter 12. The Recollections of Paul O'Connor; O'Connor, 6/11/1990 interview by Harrison Livingstone, Killing The Truth, 1993, p. 729, Appendix J, Encyclopedia of Medical Events And Witness Testimony, PREPARING THE BODY FOR BURIAL; Jenkins, 4/6/1991 Dallas conference \[video, part 1, 14:17\] \[video, part 2, 35:33, 57:20\]; Joe Hagen, 8/15/1991 interview by Livingstone and Kathlee Fitzgerald, Killing the Truth, 1993, p. 728-729, Appendix J, Encyclopedia of Medical Events And Witness Testimony, PREPARING THE BODY FOR BURIAL; Tom Robinson, 8/17/1991 interview by Harrison Livingstone, High Treason 2, 1992, p. 580-581, Chapter 28. What Really Happened, Who Benefited?; Notes on 5/26/1992 interview with Tom Robinson by Joe West \[Link\] \[link 2\] \[link 3, Journal News, 12/28/2013\]; ARRB MD 182, ARRB report on 5/17/1996 interview with Joseph E. Hagan; Humes ARRB deposition, 2/13/1996 \[text\]; ARRB MD 180, ARRB report on 6/21/1996 interview with Robinson; Jenkins, A Meeting Of The Minds, Nov. 2017 \[video, 49:30\]; At the Cold Shoulder Of History by William Law and James Jenkins, 2018 \[link\]](#)), and a piece of rubber was used to cover the area of missing scalp ([ARRB MD 63, HSCA interview of Tom Robinson, 1/12/1977; ARRB MD 64, HSCA interview of Paul O'Connor, 8/29/1977; HSCA Vol. 7, p. 243, HSCA interview with Humes and Boswell, 9/16/1977 \[text\] \[audio\]; O'Connor, 4/20/1990 and 5/9/1990 interviews by Harrison Livingstone, High Treason 2, 1992, p. 256-257, Chapter 12.](#)

The Recollections of Paul O'Connor; O'Connor, 6/11/1990 interview by Harrison Livingstone, *Killing The Truth*, 1993, p. 729; 8/17/1991 interview of Robinson by Livingstone, *High Treason 2*, 1992, p. 580-581, Chapter 28. *What Really Happened, Who Benefited?*; [Notes by Joe West on 5/26/1992 interview with Robinson](#) [[link 2](#)] [[link 3](#), *Journal News*, 12/28/2013]; [Humes ARRB deposition, 2/13/1996](#) [[text](#)]; [ARRB MD 180, ARRB report on 6/21/1996 interview with Robinson](#); [In The Eye Of History by William Law, 2004](#), Paul K. O'Connor, James C. Jenkins; Jenkins, *A Meeting Of The Minds*, Nov. 2017 [[video, 49:30](#)]; Jenkins and Law, *At the Cold Shoulder Of History*, 2018 [[link](#)]).

- More bone fragments were either reported but never recovered or recovered but later lost. These fragments could have held valuable evidence. We know of a fragment reportedly found on 11/23/1963 by William Allen "Billy" Harper, lying on the ground in Dealey Plaza. Billy Harper gave the fragment to his uncle, Dr. Jack C. Harper, who then brought it to Methodist Hospital in Dallas. By 11/25/1963, it was examined and [photographed](#) along with Dr. A.B. Cairns and M. Wayne Balleter. ([HSCA Vol. 7, p. 122, Medical Panel Report, Section V. Report of the Forensic Pathology Panel, Description of President Kennedy's Wounds, Exit \(outshoot\) wound of the side of the head, 4. "Harper bone fragment"](#) [[text](#)]). On 11/26/1963, custody of the Harper fragment was given to James W. Anderton of the Dallas FBI office ([WC D 5, p. 150](#) [[scan 2](#)] [[scan 3](#)] [[scan 4](#)] [[scan 5](#)]; [FBI 62-109060 JFK HQ File, Section 1, p. 99](#) [[scan 2](#)]). A 11/25/1963 document by Anderton discussed planning to have the Secret Service obtain the fragment, until deciding that the FBI should receive it for examination at their Laboratory in Stafford County, Virginia ([FBI 89-43-479](#) [[scan 2](#)]). At the FBI lab, [more photographs](#) were taken, as well as [x-rays](#) ([Into Evidence, presentation by John Hunt](#)). The photos and x-rays still survive in the storage of the National Archives, even if the fragment itself has gone missing ([HSCA Vol. 7, 3/29/1979, p. 24, Medical Panel Report, Section III. Chain of Custody of the Materials Acquired During the Autopsy, 2. Physical specimens retained during the autopsy or discovered at the scene of the assassination](#) [[text](#)]). Documents from the FBI detail how the fragment was given to Dr. George Burkley, JFK's former personal physician, on or around 11/27/1963 ([FBI 62-109060 JFK HQ File, Section 1, p. 99](#); [FBI 62-109060-438](#); [FBI HQ RN 124-10017-10014](#); [USSS RN 179-10001-10039](#) [[scan 2](#)]; [FBI 62-109060-990](#)). Handwriting on the lab work sheet says the fragment was delivered to Dr. Burkley at the White House by "McWright", at "4:30 PM 11/27 by his request" ([FBI 62-109060 JFK HQ File, Section 1, p. 100-102](#) [[scan 2](#)] [[scan 3](#)]). A 11/27/1963 document from Burkley reads "11/27/63 5:15 p.m. Just received a small Neman Markus box about 2 1/2" x 3 1/2" containing material which had been discussed previously with them. A letter of the full report will be made. This material will be deposited with the Commanding Officer of the Bethesda Naval Hospital for subsequent retention with other material of similar nature. Material was received in the presence of Dr. James M. Young and me. The contact with the FBI was Roy Jevous at Code 175 x 353". What may be the last word we have on the whereabouts of the fragment is from a HSCA report on a 8/17/1977 interview with Burkley: "Regarding the skull fragments, DR. BURKLEY said the one which was found on the street had been given to the FBI. He said he'd received a letter from the uncle (presumably DR. HARPER) and that the fragment came to him at the White House and he then gave it to the FBI", "DR. BURKLEY does not recall who he gave the single skull fragment to (associated with the FBI), but remembers having it taken to the FBI" ([ARRB MD 19, p. 4-6](#) [[text](#)]). A total discrepancy – the FBI said they gave the fragment to Burkley, and Burkley said he gave it to the FBI. This issue was not pursued in the Committee's medical panel report ([HSCA Vol. 7, 3/29/1979, p. 24](#) [[text](#)]).

The FBI Lab notes on the Harper fragment claim that no bullet metal was found, but that Spectrochemical Analysis was not performed, which would have proven whether or not metal was present. There is a notation saying "[no report to be made](#)" ([FBI 62-109060 JFK HQ File, Section 1, p. 100-102](#) [[scan 2](#)]). The lab findings were summarized in FBI documents, saying the fragment was "[examined microscopically](#)" for bullet metals but "[none were found](#)" ([FBI HQ RN 124-10017-10014](#); [WC D 5, p. 151](#) [[scan 2](#)] [[scan 3](#)]; [FBI 62-109060 JFK HQ File, Section 5, p. 170](#); [USSS RN](#)

[179-10001-10039 \[scan 2\]](#)). There is a lot of information contradicting this. A HSCA report on a 8/9/1977 interview with Dr. A.B. Cairns reads "*DR. CAIRNS remembered a small area of the skull fragment showing grayish discoloration suggesting metal had stained the bone. He said he had had experience with lead-caused damage in the past which looked similar to this discoloration*" ([ARRB MD 19](#)). In 2005, researcher John Hunt pointed out that an [x-ray of the Harper fragment](#) shows a small amount of high-density material on it's corner edge ([Hunt, Into Evidence](#)). In the same area of that dense material, Dr. David Mantik said the original photos of the Harper fragment show some dark discoloration on the outer surface of the bone ([The JFK Autopsy Materials: Twenty Conclusions after Nine Visits; JFK assassination conference evidence presentation, Nov. 2018](#)).

There were more possible sightings of lost bone fragments ([ARRB MD 54, Burkley receipt, 11/27/1963; HSCA Vol. 7, p. 23, 3/29/1979, Medical Panel Report, Section III. Chain of Custody of the Materials Acquired During the Autopsy, 2. Physical specimens retained during the autopsy discovered at the scene of the assassination \[text\]; WC D 80, Secret Service report on the Presidential Limousine, 1/6/1964, p. 4; WC Vol. 7, p. 105, WC testimony of Seymour Weitzman, 4/1/1964 \[text\]; Murder From Within by Fred T. Newcomb and Perry Adams, written 1974 and published 2011, Part II: The Body Snatchers, Chapter Six: Bethesda How Kennedy's Wounds Were Altered, interview with Harry D. Holmes; No More Silence by Larry A. Sneed, 1998, interviews with Jack Faulkner, Vincent Drain, and Joe Cody](#)).

- The autopsy specimens of Kennedy's body are currently missing, while the official documents, photographs and x-rays still survive in the storage of the National Archives ([HSCA Vol. 7, p. 23, 3/29/1979, Medical Panel Report, Section III. Chain of Custody of the Materials Acquired During the Autopsy \[text\]](#)).

- The photographic record has been criticized by medical experts as as seeming incomplete, and the image quality looking poor ([HSCA Vol. 7, Medical Panel Report, p. 45, 3/29/1979, Section IV. Authenticity, Part I. Introduction \[text\]; ARRB MD 228, report on 3/21/1996 and 12/12/1996 interview of Earl McDonald; Jim Stamos, <http://the-puzzle-palace.com>, PART IV: THE AUTOPSY](#)).

- The x-rays were taken with portable equipment which produces a lower picture quality. The autopsy's radiologist Dr. John Ebersole told the HSCA "*In summary I would like to emphasize one thing. These films, these X rays were taken solely for the purpose of finding what at that time was thought to be a bullet that had entered the body and not exited. If we were looking for fine bone detail, the type of diagnostic exquisite detail we rant in life, we could have taken the pictures in the X ray department, made the films there, but we felt that the portable X ray equipment was adequate for the purpose, i.e., locating a metallic fragment*" ([ARRB MD 60, HSCA testimony, 3/11/1978 \[text\] \[audio\]](#)).

- The [official photos of the brain](#) show major damage on the top-right side, but no damage on the outer left side. These pictures do not show the brain cut into sections. The best procedure would have been to section the brain "coronally" or "serially", like a loaf of bread, which was apparently not done ([HSCA Vol. 7, 3/29/1979, Medical Panel report, p. 134, p. 193 \[text\]](#)). The autopsy supplemental report does list some small sections taken for microscopic examination ([WC Vol. 16, p. 987 \[text\]](#)), but there aren't any known pictures of those. Some have questioned the authenticity of the brain photos ([Doug Horne, ARRB staff memo, 8/28/1996, Questions Regarding Supplementary Brain Examination\(s\) Following the Autopsy on President John F. Kennedy](#)). When Stringer met with the ARRB on 7/16/1996, he was shown the official collection of photographs and photographic film. The film of the brain is Ansco brand, originating from a thin type of film holder called a "press pack" or "film pack". Stringer told the ARRB that he didn't remember using Ansco film, and only remembered using thick "duplex" film holders. Stringer doubted that he was the one who took the pictures of the brain shown to him ([7/16/1996 deposition \[text\] \[audio\]](#)).

- The leaked versions of the autopsy photos do not appear to confirm or refute the existence of a small wound in the left of the scalp where it is covered by hair (NSFW):

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1UIXPW0axhVrOscN2-eu0kndjSS5V0eFL?usp=sharing>

- What do the pictures show? There is a lot of discussion over whether x-rays or photos of the body have gone missing, or if the ones that exist today have been somehow faked or altered. Some argue the body itself could have been tampered with before the autopsy officially began. Unless Kennedy's body can be exhumed and given another autopsy, the x-rays and photos may be the public's only chance at seeing physical evidence for a small wound in the front of the head. More experts should study these pictures to gather the maximum information possible. What we have so far is this:

On the right lateral skull x-ray, there is a point of interest on the forehead area:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1VLh2rSCmsE6sr9pc0CMpc3i613BMFE0?usp=sharing>

At least three medical professionals have said this point indicates a small defect resembling a bullet entry - Neurologist Dr. Joseph N. Riley ([11/20/1994 presentation, *What Struck John*](#)), neurologist Dr. Michael Chesser ([2015 JFK Lancer Conference presentation, *A Review of the JFK Cranial x-Rays and Photographs*](#); [Nov. 2017 presentation, *The Application of Forensic Principles for the Analysis of the Autopsy Skull X-Rays of President Kennedy and a Review of the Brain Photographs*](#)), and radiation oncologist Dr. David Mantik ([JFK assassination conference evidence presentation, Nov. 2018](#)).

The frontal skull x-ray shows a dark path on the left side of the head:

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/19puGSXA6TE5YCSEwGdQnD_Bltg0mI4v6?usp=sharing

Dr. Mantik said that he thinks this dark path is a bone fracture (Medical Research Archives, Vol. 7, Issue 9, September, 2019, *The Robertson Hypothesis: A Joyless Review* [[link 1](#)] [[link 2](#)]).

On the photos showing the cranium after the scalp was reflected, there appears to be at least one small semi-circular hole on the right side of the head:

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1uvGaBl2_EanXn4OwQrr083_yiLVrNGYK?usp=sharing

According to some members of the HSCA forensic pathology panel, the open-cranium photos show the outer front of the skull in the foreground, with the scalp reflected over the eyes ([HSCA Vol. 7, 228, 10/24/1977 memo from J. Lawrence Angel](#); [HSCA testimony of Dr. Michael Baden, 9/7/1978 \[text\]](#); [HSCA Vol. 7, 3/29/1979, p. 118-119, Medical Panel Report \[text\]](#)). If that interpretation were true, then there appears to be a semi-circular dark spot on what would be the left side of the skull:

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ZMqMgORz_ROKDU7srijqcsoJrrtt1mLO?usp=sharing

In the photos showing the outside of the scalp, there are some points of interest on the right front of the head.

There is a semi-circular dark spot in the forehead, above the right eye. It is not clear whether this could be a piece of hair, a shadow, a bullet hole, or an artifact of photo-manipulation (NSFW):

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1aVqhS6WrvKXHDJjWfDXadtpCVhlQ5feN?usp=sharing>

There appears to be a v-shaped defect in the right frontal scalp (NSFW):

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1CDf_LiYXUyJ5dTDCUvJC6Si0KxU70s6f?usp=sharing

What made the v-shaped defect? On the 1988 PBS Nova program *Who Shot President Kennedy?*, Parkland's Dr. Paul Peters was given a chance to look at the official autopsy photos. Peters said afterward "*I would have to say, honestly, in looking at these photos, they're pretty much as I remember President Kennedy at the time, [gestures at right front of head] except for that little incision that seems to be coming down in the parietal area. In looking at the photographs, I could envision that an incision might have been made in order to pull the scalp back to expose this bone to make a photograph of that area*" ([Video](#), 47:57).

From *The Third Decade* newsletter, Volume 7, Issue 3, March, 1991:

[...p. 9, [New Evidence of Body Tampering by Joanne Braun](#)]

My next step was to write to the Dallas doctors, or to most of them, about fifteen in all, enclosing copies of the [High Treason](#) photo of the right side of the head. To Dr. Peters I quoted what he had said on *Nova* and asked him why he thought the V-shaped irregularity coming down on the right forehead was a surgical incision. In my letters to the other doctors I simply directed their attention to this feature and asked if they had seen it at Parkland. Eight of them replied.

Dr. Peters wrote, "It appeared to me, in reviewing the photos, that the incision was very sharp, as if cut by a knife, and I thought at the time that the prosecutor might have made it to enhance the removal of the brain and contents. I suppose it could have been an extension of the tear from the wound, but I did not notice it at the time we operated on President Kennedy."³⁷ (He also drew an arrow of the photo pointing to the "incision" and noted that he had meant to say it was in the "fronto-parietal" region.)

Of the others, five of them, Drs. Curtis, Giesecke, Jones, Salyer and White merely said that they did not see this V-shaped feature at Parkland Hospital.³⁸

Dr. Perry's answer was "there was no incision or indentation" in the right forehead.³⁹

Dr. McClelland replied, "I did not see any such incisions at the time of examination in the Emergency Room at Parkland. I would imagine the incisions shown in the copy of the photograph you sent me were made during the autopsy in Bethesda and do not find them mysterious or any reason for concern."⁴⁰

So here we have eight Parkland doctors, all of those who answered my letters, saying that they did not see the V-shaped irregularity when they treated President Kennedy; three of them independently characterizing it as an incision, two specifying that they thought it was made at the autopsy and one referring to it in conjunction with other forms in the photo which he assumed were autopsy incisions also. This is still not proof of body-tampering, but it's about as close as anything yet.

This article began with a quote from Dr. Michael Baden and it will end the same way. Dr. Baden was the guest on a local radio talk show some time ago,⁴¹ and as might be expected the subject of the Kennedy autopsy came up. I called in and, after reminding him of his statement on "KRON Presents" that the body had not been tampered with, told him about Dennis David's story of the memo and the four large pieces of lead. His reaction to this was to reject it out of hand, insisting that David must have been "mistaken."⁴² Somewhat taken aback, I said that there was other evidence indicative of tampering, that there might not be time to go into it over the air, but that I would be glad to send it to him if he liked. Although he wasn't exactly encouraging, I did write him soon afterward telling him primarily what I had learned from the Parkland doctors.

I never got a reply, but I can guess what it would have been---that those doctors who interpreted the V-shape in the photograph as a surgical incision were, again, mistaken, and the reason none of them saw it in Dallas is that they were too busy trying to save the President's life to pay attention to such details.

[...Notes]

37. Letter from Paul C. Peters, M.D., dated August 25, 1989

38. Letter from Don T. Curtis, D.D.S., dated September 8, 1989; undated letters from Drs. Adolph H. Giesecke, Ronald C. Jones, Kenneth E. Salyer and Martin G. White.

39. Letter from Malcolm O. Perry, M.D., dated August 29, 1989. Dr. Perry went on to say, "One of the problems was that there was so much damage to the skull and the scalp that the entire scalp and hair were displaced, sagging slightly forward and to the side, and of course this made it appear that there was something really there. (?) You must recognize that the parietal occipital bone was shattered and parts of it were missing which allowed the scalp to be displaced anteriorly."

40. Letter from Robert N. McClelland, Md.D., dated August 29, 1989

Parkland Hospital's Dr. Kenneth Salyer appeared on the 1993 documentary *JFK: The Case For Conspiracy*. While looking at copies of the autopsy photos, Salyer said:

A: This wound is not correct, this isn't right.

Q: That is not right?

A: No. See, this- this has been doctored right here, this is laying open [gestures to right side of the head]. See, the way- the way you have him, the way they've got him here is- skinflaps have been cut, or altered, or pushed up, or changed, and isn't the way he looked. This- He looked- Here, this was wide open with brain open here. This is scalp that's pushed back, and it's all distorted.

[...]

A: Something's been done right here [points to v-shape], and the way he was on the- on the emergency table is this is open, and this whole area is an open wound.

([Video, 1:02:41](#))

On 1/8/1993, Harrison Livingstone talked to Nurse Diana Bowron:

HL: Okay. One more question about that. Do you remember any laceration across the scalp from front to back where it comes on to the forehead, where the scalp would have been lacerated and it goes straight back from that area? Picture the right eyebrow. A laceration about a half an inch into his forehead, and then going straight back, where the scalp was torn. Do you remember anything like that?

DB: No.

HL: You would have because you washed the hair, right?

DB: Yes. When I say washed it, I just took cotton swabs and washed all the clotting blood off. I mean, I didn't shampoo it or anything.

(Livingstone, *Killing The Truth*, 1993, p. 185, Chapter 6. *Diana Bowron*)

So, at least 9 Parkland witnesses indicated they didn't remember such a defect visible in the right forehead – Drs. Paul Peters, Don Curtis, Adolph Giesecke, Ronald Jones, Kenneth Salyer, Martin White, Malcolm Perry, Robert McClelland, and Nurse Diana Bowron. Was there any explanation from the autopsy pathologists from Bethesda? On 9/1/1991, Dr. Boswell was interviewed by Harrison Livingstone. From Livingstone's 1992 book *High Treason 2*:

[...p. 197, Chapter 8. *J. Thornton Boswell*]

"[...] There was apparently a laceration that extended about a half inch into the forehead just above the right eye."

"That wasn't apparent after they got through restoring the body."

"Did that laceration sort of go straight back—in other words—front to back across the side of the head there, above the right eye going back?"

"You mean the posterior of the skull?"

"Yeah, it was only three inches long or so, wasn't it?"

"That laceration extended from around the eyebrow all the way back to the posterior of the skull."

"It was over the top of the large defect of originally missing bone?"

"Yeah, sure. The bullet exploded inside the skull, and just sort of blew the top of his head off, but it separated the scalp with the laceration. And didn't tear it away or anything. That was destroyed."

"So the laceration extending from the right eye—the scalp was basically intact? It was just torn through there?"

"Right."

[...p. 159, Chapter 6. *The Autopsy: Some Conflicts in the Evidence*]

Scalp Laceration

The Right Superior Profile photograph shows a long laceration starting about a half inch into the forehead above the right eye (the "V" notch) and extending straight back to the occiput—according to both Dr. Boswell and Dr. Karnei in their interviews with me. Paul O'Connor told me that the laceration corresponded to a fracture line on the skull.³⁶

Nobody saw any such fracture or laceration of the scalp to Dallas, to my knowledge. During transit to Bethesda, movement of the head in the coffin might conceivably have caused the broken bone, if it existed there, to break the scalp. Dr. Crenshaw suggests that it is in fact an incision, as Joanne Braun, a researcher, suggests. Crenshaw thinks it is a type of cut made at an autopsy to reflect the scalp back, and it certainly would have had to have been cut there in order to remove the frontal bone to make the fake X-ray.

[...p. 624, Notes]

36. Interview of September 23, 1991.

From the ARRB deposition of Dr. Humes, 2/13/1996:

Q. I'd like you to look at the object that looks somewhat triangular right over the right eye of President Kennedy. Do you see that triangular mark?

A. Yes.

Q. Was that triangular mark made by any incision that was caused at Bethesda?

A. No.

Q. Can you identify or explain whether anything on that triangle appears to have been a surgical incision?

A. No. I think it's a result of the disruptive missile that left the President's skull in that vicinity.

(Transcript [text])

From Dr. Boswell's ARRB deposition, 2/26/1996:

A. [...] The scalp had to be reflected for part of that area, but there was an incised wound up there that extended into the right eye socket and then back across his temporal and frontal bone.

[...]

Q. Do you recall whether there were tears or lacerations in the scalp?

A. Right across here and--

Q. Approximately across the midline?

A. What I previously described, post-occipital, and on the left, across the top, and then down to the right frontal area, and then the laceration extended into the right eye.

[...]

Q. Could you please describe in general terms what you observe in terms of wounds in the scalp first of President Kennedy?

A. Well, the scalp is actually avulsed, and this is a huge laceration. The one that I was talking about in earlier questions.

Q. If I could just state for the record, it appears that you're talking about a laceration that is roughly slightly above the ear, that is, towards the vertex, and that the laceration appears to go slightly into the forehead above the right eye? Would that be fair?

A: Yes.

[...]

Q. Okay. And right to the right of the portion that I have described as being rectangular- -and when I say to the right, we should say that the head from the direction that we're looking at is at the top of the document--there is something like a V-shaped indentation there. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. That is coming closer towards the frontal bone. What do you perceive that V-shaped mark to be?

A. Well, the bone is fractured in a straight line here, and then this is another fracture margin. And this may come all the way across here, probably does.

Q. All the way across almost the coronal suture?

A. Yes. This is probably frontal bone, and then this is parietal bone extending up to here.

Q. Can you identify any difference between this photograph and how President Kennedy's body appeared from the right profile when you first saw him at Bethesda?

A. No. It looks the same.

Q. Was this photograph or were these photographs, which we're describing as View 2 or the second view, taken reasonably near the beginning of the autopsy?

A. Yes.

[...]

Q. I'd like you to note the semi-triangular- shaped marking that goes into the forehead. Does that correspond to the laceration that we previously noted in the second view?

A. Yes.

([Transcript \[text\]](#))

Why did Boswell refer to the v-shape as an “incised wound”, only to then claim the right profile photographs looked like what he remembered the body originally looking like?

Dr. George Burkley, Kennedy’s personal physician; Malcolm Kilduff, White House press secretary

As JFK’s personal physician, Dr. George Burkley witnessed Kennedy’s body being handled at Parkland Hospital.

On the afternoon of 11/22/1963, White House press secretary Malcolm Kilduff appeared at a press conference held inside of Parkland:

MR. KILDUFF: President John F. Kennedy died at approximately 1:00 o'clock, Central Standard Time, today, here in Dallas. He died of a gunshot wound in the brain.

I have no other details regarding the assassination of the President.

[...]

MR. KILDUFF: The President was shot once, in the head.

[...]

Q. Mac, can we have a doctor?

MR. KILDUFF: Dr. Burkley told me it is a simple matter, Tom, of a bullet right through the head.

Kilduff pointed to the right side of his forehead.

([Video \[video 2\]](#) [\[video 3\]](#))

According to transcript, the conference continued:

[...]

Q. Where did the shots come from?

MR. KILDUFF: They came from the right side.

[...]

Q. Can you say where the bullet entered his head, Mac?

MR. KILDUFF: It is my understanding that it entered in the temple, the right temple.

Q. Was it a rifle bullet?

Mr. KILDUFF: Yes it was apparently a rifle bullet.

([LBJ Library, Kilduff press conference, 11/22/1963, Transcript 1327B](#))

These words were repeated in the news media and attributed to Dr. Burkley himself. Other reports mentioned the “right temple” without being clear whether the information came from Kilduff/Burkley or another source.

On NBC, 11/22/1963, news anchor Chet Huntley announced “*President Kennedy, we are now informed, was shot in the right temple. ‘It was a simple matter of a bullet right through the head’, said Dr. George Burkley, the White House medical officer*” ([Video, 56:15](#)).

On KLIF Dallas radio, 11/22/1963, it was announced: “*We’re just looking at a new bulletin just arriving, Joe*” “*This late bulletin, the President was shot in the right temple. It was a simple matter of a bullet right through the head. This is a quote from Dr. George Burkley, the White House medical officer. The shooting occurred as the motorcade passed through downtown right near a grassy knoll at the street where the motorcade was moving along*” ([Audio, 2:14:42](#)), “*...Urgent call went out for neurosurgeons and blood, but it was too late. The President, shot in the left temple, died at 1 o’clock Dallas time, 2 PM eastern standard time*” ([Audio, 2:22:00](#)), “*It would be worth while, Joe, reviewing some of the details of the President’s death. He was shot in the left temple.*”

There is evidence that he lived for a while on his way to the hospital, his lips seemed to be moving normally, at least according to some reports. A single shot through the right temple took the life of the 46-year-old chief executive of the United States, third American president to be gunned down by slayer's bullets" (Audio, 2:34:20), "...and then came this tragedy this morning when the President was gunned down by an assassin's bullet, he was struck directly in the right temple. One bullet in the head, and the President is dead" (Audio, 2:38:00), "...President Kennedy shot in the right temple, and was apparently alive in the arms of his wife Jackie..." (Audio, 2:45:51), "The interior of the car was literally splattered with blood as the bullet ripped into the President's right temple" (Audio, 2:49:56).

News reporter Seth Kantor wrote in his notes "*intered right temple*" (WC Vol. 20, Kantor Exhibit No. 3, p. 353).

Many newspapers reported from UPI: "*President Kennedy was shot in the right temple. "It was a simple matter of a bullet right through the head," said Dr. George Burkley, White House medical officer" (The Berkshire Eagle, 11/22/1963; Press and Sun-Bulletin, Evening Press, 11/22/1963; Port Huron Times Herald, 11/22/1963; The Washington Reporter, 11/22/1963; The News-Review 11/22/1963), "A single shot through the right temple took the life of the 46-year-old chief executive" (The Bend Bulletin, 11/22/1963; The Billings Gazette, 11/22/1963; The New Mexican, 11/22/1963; Santa Maria Times, 11/22/1963; The Daily Register 11/22/1963; Miami Herald, 11/23/1963), "President Kennedy was shot once in the head, in the right temple, today" (Boston Globe, 11/22/1963; The Morning Call, 11/23/1963), "President John F. Kennedy, who was assassinated with a bullet through his right temple yesterday..." (The Sentinel, 11/23/1963), "Oswald allegedly shot President Kennedy in the right temple with a rifle from a position on the upper floor of a building as the President passed in a motorcade below" (Eureka Humboldt Standard, 11/23/1963).*

The New York Herald Tribune reported "*Death came at 2 p.m., EST, at Dallas' Parkland Hospital, approximately 40 minutes after he was hit by two rifle shots in the neck and in the right temple*".

The Washington Post reported "*He was shot at 12:30 P.M. CST [...] by an assassin, who sent a rifle bullet crashing into his right temple*".

The Brimingman News reported "*...The President fell face down on the back seat of his car, a bullet in his right temple and a bullet in his neck*".

Dr. Burkley never went on the record to clarify the "right temple" information.

Hours later, Burkley witnessed the autopsy at Bethesda Naval Hospital (WC D 7, p. 282; HSCA Vol. 7, p. 8 [text]). He authored the 11/23/1963 White House death certificate (ARRB MD 6). After the supplemental examination of the organs, Burkley had custody of the autopsy documents, photos, x-rays, and body specimens until 4/26/1965 (HSCA Vol. 7, p. 23, 3/29/1979, Medical Panel Report, Section III. *Chain of Custody of the Materials Acquired During the Autopsy* [text]).

Burkley was interviewed by William Manchester for his 1967 book *The Death of a President*. Manchester's files on Burkley, among others, are stored by the Wesleyan University library in Middletown, Connecticut, and are due to be sealed until 2067, 100 years after the publication of *The Death of a President* (Vanity Fair, 8/31/2009, *A Clash of Camelots* by Sam Kashner; Wesleyan Argus, 1/29/2010, *University To Unveil William Manchester Writings Amid Return of JFK Manuscript* by Justin Pottle).

When interviewed on 10/17/1967 for the JFK Library in Boston, Massachusetts, Burkley was asked "*Do your conclusions differ at all with the Warren report of the circumstances or cause of death?*",

and he replied "*My conclusion in regard to the cause of death was the bullet wound which involved the skull. The discussion as to whether a previous bullet also enters into it, but as far as the cause of death the immediate cause was unquestionably the bullet which shattered the brain and the calvarium*". Then, when asked "*Do you agree with the Warren Report on the number of bullets that entered the President's body?*", he replied "*I would not care to be quoted on that*". The interviewer did not mention any "discussion as to whether a previous bullet also enters" the head, Burkley raised the subject himself (*Burkley, George C.: Oral History Interview - JFK #1, 10/17/1967* [text] [audio, 44:52]). A 3/18/1977 letter from Burkley's attorney Richard Sprague to the House Select Committee on Assassinations reads "*...he had never been interviewed and he has information in the Kennedy assassination indicating that others besides Oswald must have participated*" (HSCA 180-10086-10295). A HSCA report on a 8/17/1977 interview with Burkley reads "*DR. BURKLEY said the doctors didn't section the brain and that if it had been done, it might be possible to prove whether or not there were two bullets. DR. BURKLEY thinks there was one but concedes the possibility of there having been two*" (ARRB MD 19, p. 4-6 [text]). Burkley's 11/28/1978 affidavit to the HSCA said "*Had the Warren Commission deemed to call me, I would have stated why I retained the brain and the possibility of two bullets having wounded President John F. Kennedy's brain would have been eliminated*", "*I directed the autopsy surgeons to do a complete autopsy and take the time necessary for completion. I supervised the autopsy and directed the fixation and retention of the brain for future study of the course of the bullet or bullets*" (HSCA 180-10104-10271).

Burkley was mentioned in a story by Coast Guardsman George Barnum. When interviewed by researcher David Lifton on 8/20/1979, Barnum had in his possession a written account dated 11/29/1963. From Lifton's 1980 book *Best Evidence*:

[...Part IV, *What, When, And Where?*, Chapter 16. *Chain of Possession: The Missing Link*]

Next I called Barnum. He said that although he did remember there had been confusion, he could not recall the details.⁸⁰ But Barnum didn't have to rely on his memory for information about that night. He explained that when he reported back for duty after the funeral, his superior at Coast Guard Headquarters directed him to write a report. That officer's interest was purely historical. He knew of someone associated with the Lincoln funeral who, years later, regretted not having created a contemporaneous record. Barnum was surprised to learn that his November 29, 1963 account, which he had saved primarily for his children's benefit, contained details of interest to me.

[...Part VII, *SYNTHESIS*, Chapter 20. *The X-rays and Photographs Reconsidered*]

[...] In his November 29, 1963 account, Coast Guardsman George Barnum wrote that as the men were having sandwiches and coffee sometime after midnight, Admiral Burkley came in and talked to them, and said three shots had been fired, that the President had been hit by the first and third, and he described the trajectories of the two that struck:

*"The first striking him in the lower neck and coming out near the throat. The second shot striking him above and to the rear of the right ear, this shot not coming out...."*⁶¹

"This shot not coming out"? Was that part a mistake?

In 1982, Burkley had brief contact with researcher Henry Hurt. As summarized in Hurt's 1986 book *Reasonable Doubt*:

[...p. 49, 3. *Autopsy of the Century*]

It is significant that Dr. Burkley had been with the President in Dallas, with him in the Parkland Hospital emergency room, with his body as it was flown east, and present during the autopsy. It is also significant that even though he was the only doctor present both at Parkland and at Bethesda, Dr. Burkley's testimony was never taken by the Warren Commission, nor was it taken later by the House Select Committee.⁶⁶

In 1982 Dr. Burkley told the author in a telephone conversation that he believed that President Kennedy's assassination was the result of a conspiracy.⁶⁷ This startling statement, after so long a silence, amplified an obscure exchange Dr. Burkley had in an oral-history interview on file at the Kennedy Library in Boston. [...]

[...]

*When he originally telephoned the author, Dr. Burkley expressed his willingness to discuss various matters concerning the assassination. He asked for a letter detailing the areas the author wished to discuss. Dr. Burkley acknowledged receipt of the letter with a letter of his own. Two months later, the author proposed a meeting with Dr. Burkley to discuss the points. The doctor responded with an abrupt refusal to discuss any aspect of the case.

Researcher Paul Hoch wrote, in the 5/31/1987 issue of his newsletter *Echoes of Conspiracy*, Vol. 9, No. 1:

Dr. Burkley's comments to Hurt may well not have been based on what he knew about the medical evidence, according to information recently provided to me. William Manchester, who interviewed Dr. Burkley five times from April 1964 through July 1966, told me that at that time Dr. Burkley said he did not believe in a conspiracy theory, and was emphatic on that point.

Also, Dr. Burkley recently told a relative of his that he did think that Oswald must have been part of a conspiracy, because the way he and his family lived and traveled was indicative of financial support. (This suspicion has been voiced by many people over the years, and the Warren Commission attempted to rebut in in Appendix XIV of the Report.) This relative also asked Dr. Burkley about Lifton's book when it was published; Dr. Burkley did not provide any clarification of the issues involved, nor did he indicate that he agreed with any of Lifton's analysis.

If there is more information to be obtained about what Dr. Burkley knew, it will probably have to come from existing documents, or as the result of an official inquiry by the Justice Department.

([Link](#) [[link 2](#)])

Dr. Burkley passed away on 1/2/1991 ([Washington Post, 1/4/1991](#); [New York Times, 1/5/1991](#); [St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 1/6/1991](#); [LA Times, 1/7/1991](#); [Arlingtoncemetery.net](#); [Findagrave.com](#)). From the public record so far, it looks like Burkley was indeed critical of the lone gunman hypothesis - just not in very clear terms. We may never know exactly what he was talking about when he mentioned the possibility of more than one bullet striking Kennedy's head.

On 4/17/1991, Malcolm Kilduff talked to researcher Harrison Livingstone. When Livingstone said "*As you know, the face was not damaged at all. No witness saw any damage to the head past the midline of the skull, forward of the right ear*", Kilduff replied "*Forward of the right ear? No! Forward of the left ear, they did. I did. The bullet came in on the right side and exited the left side. What splatter there was*". Kilduff apparently meant "left" to mean the anatomical right, as he also said "*...the left part of his forehead looked like—when I got over to the car—looked like two pounds of ground beef*", "*The blow-out was in the left front. The Zapruder film shows that. Frames 313,*

314, 315” (Livingstone, *High Treason 2*, 1992, p. 447, Chapter 21. *The Presidential Party*, Malcolm Kilduff). Sometimes people can misspeak or confuse anatomical language.

Kilduff may have told researcher Gary Mack that pointing to the right front of his head at the 11/22/1963 press conference was meant to signify the LARGE wound, not a small wound. As explained in [Pat Speer's online book *A New Perspective on the Kennedy Assassination*](#):

[...[Chapter 18c: *Reason to Doubt, By Way of Illustration*](#)]

Kilduff's subsequent statements to Gary Mack, in which he confirmed that when he pointed to his temple during the 11-22-63 press conference he was pointing to, in Mack's words, "*where the big hole was on Kennedy's head.*" (Note: I can't remember where I got this quote from Mack...via an article, a taped interview, or a personal email. If you know the answer, please remind me. As it stands, I've tracked down a 12-29-99 post from Mack on the alt.assassination.JFK newsgroup in which he claims Kilduff told him but a month before that he didn't intend to specify the wound by the temple as an entrance or an exit in the 11-22-63 press conference, and that he was merely pointing out the location of the wound.)

Kilduff passed away on 3/3/2003 ([UPI, 3/4/2003](#); [New York Times, 3/5/2003](#); [Washington Post, 3/5/2003](#); [Arlingtoncemetery.net](#); [Findagrave.com](#)).

Tom Robinson, mortician

Tom Robinson was a mortician from Gawler's funeral home tasked with preparing Kennedy's body for burial ([WC D 7, p. 280, Sibert and O'Neill FBI report, 11/26/1963](#); [ARRB MD 134, Gawler's after-action report, *Funeral Arrangements for John Fitzgerald Kennedy*; HSCA Vol. 7, p. 8, Medical Panel Report \[text\]](#)).

When interviewed on 1/12/1977 by the House Select Committee on Assassinations, Robinson described at least one small defect in the front of the head:

Purdy: Did you notice anything else unusual about the body which may have been artificially caused, that is, caused by something other than the autopsy?

Robinson: Probably, a little mark at the temples in the hairline. As I recall, it was so small, it could be hidden by the hair. It didn't have to be covered with make-up. I thought it probably a piece of bone or a piece of the bullet that caused it.

Purdy: In other words, there was a little wound.

Robinson: Yes.

Purdy: Approximately where, which side of the forehead or part of the head was it on.

Robinson: I believe it was on the right side.

Purdy: On his right side?

Robinson: That's an anatomical right, yes.

Purdy: You say it was in the forehead region up near the hair line?

Robinson: Yes.

Purdy: Would you say it was closer to the top of the hair?

Robinson: Somewhere around the temples.

Purdy: Approximately what size.

Robinson: Very small, a quarter of an inch.

Purdy: Quarter of an inch is all the damage. Had it been closed up by the doctors?

Robinson: No, he didn't have to close it. If anything I just would have probably put a little wax on it.

[...]

Purdy: Were there any other wounds on the head other than the little one in the right temple area, and the big one in the back?

Robinson: That's all.

[...]

Purdy: Did you get a good look at that wound on the right temple area?

Robinson: Oh yes, I worked right over for some time.

Purdy: What did you feel caused that wound.

Robinson: I think either a piece of bone or a piece of the bullet. Or a very small piece of shrapnel.

Conzelman: Did it pierce the entire skull, could you see from the inside that it was evident from the inside skull as well as outside?

Robinson: The inside of the skull was badly smashed, it could have well been a piece of bone that passed through there or

[...]

Purdy: Do you feel that any significant portion of the bullet after it hit the head, exited from the head, not just being picked up by the doctors? Do you feel that possibly exited, where could some if exited from the head? If any. You mentioned one possibly was that right temple.

Robinson: Yes, that did go through my mind. Well they had the little pieces, They picked them out.

Purdy: So you feel that's the only place that the significant size of the bullet could have exited.

Robinson: It was no bullet, it was a fragment or a piece of the bone.

Purdy: You would say that there is no other part of the head where that bullet would exited or a part of the bullet? Were there other little holes anywhere?

Robinson: No.

[...]

Purdy: And your feeling about the forehead, you felt then and you feel now that was caused by what?

Robinson: A piece of bone or metal exiting.

([ARRB MD 63](#) [text] [audio])

From Harrison Livingstone's 1992 book *High Treason 2*:

[...p. 284-285, Chapter 14. *New Evidence: The 1991 Dallas Conference*]

There may very well have been a puncture to the left temple, because the mortician told me the head was penetrated in several places by shrapnel,² which he filled with wax, but the Dallas doctors later strongly retracted the observation of an entry wound in the temple.

[...p. 290]

Malcolm Kilduff, acting White House press secretary, points to the spot on the autopsy photographs that could be an entry hole, just above the corner of the right eyebrow. Tom Wilson's computer study of that spot, visible on the Groden Right Superior autopsy photograph, indicates that it is in fact a hole through the skull. One of the morticians, Tom Robinson, told the author how he filled a penetrating hole in the same area with wax. "I didn't have to do anything more to it," he said. Robinson thought it was one of a few very small penetrating skull wounds and exits from "shrapnel."

[...p. 579-581, Chapter 28. *What Really Happened*]

On August 17, 1991, just two days after speaking with Joe Hagen, president of Gawler's Funeral Home, which prepared John Kennedy's body for his coffin, I interviewed his assistant, Tom Robinson.

[...]

"The body had been cleaned up before we got it. The face was perfect and undamaged except for a small laceration about a half inch into the forehead, which I covered up."

I asked him if any of the frontal bone or bone behind any part of the face, forehead, or front top of the head underlying the scalp was damaged.

"It may have been fractured [and I couldn't see that], but it was perfectly intact. I don't think any of it had been removed or replaced before we got it. The face was perfect. It would have fallen in without the frontal bone."

"There was one very small hole in the temple area, in the hairline. I used wax in it, and that is all that I had to do. I just put a little wax in it."

"What side was it on?"

"I can't remember for sure, but I think it was on the right side." In another interview he told me that the skull was penetrated in two or three more places by shrapnel, which he filled with wax. These places were near the eyes.¹⁰

There was only one significant hole of any kind in the head beside small puncture wounds, and that was the large defect. He said that it was in the very back of the head and could not be seen with the head on the pillow. The scalp back there was badly mangled and "some of it was missing."

[...]

His face was perfect and did not require work of any kind, and the frontal bone underlying it was intact, but slightly fractured.

[...Notes, Chapter 14]

2. Interview with Tom Robinson, October 6, 1991.

[...Notes, Chapter 28]

10. Interview of October 6, 1991.

On 5/26/1992, Robinson was interviewed by private investigator Joe West. West's personal notes read:

Wounds:

- large gaping hole in back of head. Patched by stretching piece of rubber over it. Thinks skull full of Plaster of Paris.
- smaller wound in right temple.

Crescent shape, flapped down (3")

- (approx 2) Small shrapnel wounds in face.

Packed with wax.

([Link 1](#) [[link 2](#)] [[link 3, Journal News, 12/28/2013](#)])

Crescent shaped what? Scalp or skull? Either one doesn't sound like it could be the result of an ordinary round bullet entrance. Joe West is not alive now to confirm what he meant by the double prime " symbol. 3 centimeters? 3 inches? In Robinson's 1/12/1977 statement, he said the temple wound he saw was "*Very small, a quarter of an inch*" ([ARRB MD 63 \[text\]](#) [[audio](#)]).

From a report on Robinson's 6/21/1996 interview by the Assassination Records Review Board:

-Visible damage to skull caused by bullet or bullets (as opposed to damage caused by pathologists): Robinson described 3 locations of wounds:

-he saw 2 or 3 small perforations or holes in the right cheek during embalming, when formaldehyde seeped through these small wounds and slight discoloration began to occur (and executed a drawing

of three slits, or holes, in the right cheek of the President on a photocopy of a frontal photograph of the President);

-he described a “blow-out” which consisted of a flap of skin in the right temple of the President’s head, which he believed to be an exit wound based on conversations he heard in the morgue amongst the pathologists (and executed two drawings of this right temporal defect on both a photocopy of a right lateral photograph of the President, and on a right lateral anatomy diagram of the human skull);

-he described a large, open head wound in the back of the President’s head, centrally located right between the ears, where the bone was gone, as well as some scalp. He related his opinion that this wound in the back of the President’s head was an entry wound occurring from a bullet fired from behind, based on conversations he heard in the morgue among the pathologists. (Robinson executed two drawings of the hole in the back of the President’s head, one on an anatomy drawing of the posterior skull, and one on an anatomy drawing of the lateral skull. On the annotated lateral skull drawing, the wound in the rear of the head is much larger than the wound in the right temple.)

[...]

Fox Autopsy Photographs:

After completing his four drawings of head wounds and describing those wounds, ARRB staff showed Mr. Robinson a set of what is alleged to be the Fox autopsy photographs to see whether they were consistent with what he remembered seeing in the morgue at Bethesda. His comments follow, related to various Fox photos:

-Right Superior Profile (corresponds to B & W #s 5 and 6): He does not see the small shrapnel holes he noted in the right cheek, but he assumes this is because of the photo’s poor quality.

-Back of Head (corresponds to B & W #s 15 and 16): Robinson said: “You see, this is the flap of skin, the blow-out in the right temple that I told you about, and which I drew in my drawing.” When asked by ARRB where the hole in the back of the head was in relation to this photograph, Robinson responded by placing his fingers in a circle just above the white spot in the hairline in the photograph, and said “The hole was right here, where I said it was in my drawing, but it just doesn’t show up in this photo.”

([ARRB MD 180](#))

Diagram marked by Robinson:

https://www.history-matters.com/archive/jfk/arrb/master_med_set/pdf/md88.pdf

Robinson pointed to the large gaping area on the other side of a bone flap on the autopsy photos as the wound he was describing. But, he did draw a comparatively smaller triangular mark on the diagram. Robinson’s earlier statements also indicate a SMALL-sized wound: *"a little mark at the temples in the hairline. As I recall, it was so small, it could be hidden by the hair. It didn't have to be covered with make-up", "Very small, a quarter of an inch", "he didn't have to close it. If anything I just would have probably put a little wax on it" (ARRB MD 63, 1/12/1977 HSCA interview [text] [audio]), "a small laceration", "one very small hole in the temple area, in the hairline. I used wax in it, and that is all that I had to do. I just put a little wax in it" (Livingstone, High Treason 2, 1992, p. 284-285, 578-581).*

James Curtis Jenkins, autopsy lab technician

James Curtis Jenkins, an assistant at the autopsy ([WC D 7, p. 280, Sibert and O'Neill FBI report, 11/26/1963](#); [HSCA Vol. 7, p. 8, Medical Panel Report \[text\]](#)), described seeing some dark discoloration on the right side of the skull, which could have been bullet lead.

The autopsy pathologists did report finding metal fragments inside of the cranium, and they did describe receiving skull fragments later in the night, one of which showed what looked like metallic residue ([ARRB MD 149, 11/23/1963 FBI teletype from James Sibert and Francis X. O'Neill; WC D 77, p. 4, autopsy protocol \[text\]](#); [WC D 7, p. 280, Sibert and O'Neill FBI report, 11/26/1963](#); [WC Vol. 2, p. 347, Humes WC testimony, 3/16/1964 \[text\]](#)). Jenkins, on the other hand, said he remembered residue stuck onto a part of the skull that was still attached to the head.

Jenkins was interviewed by researcher Harrison Livingstone on 9/8/1990, 10/8/1990, 3/25/1991, 4/6/1991, 4/28/1991, 4/30/1991, 5/5/1991, 5/14/1991, 5/19/1991, 5/24/1991, 5/25/1991, 5/29/1991, 6/6/1991, 6/16/1991, 7/14/1991, and 10/19/1991. From Livingstone's 1992 book *High Treason 2*:

[...p. 229, Chapter 11. *James Curtis Jenkins*]

I also asked him if he had seen any damage in the left temple area. In Dallas, the death certificate said that the President had died "from a gunshot wound to the left temple." Jenkins said that neither he nor anyone else at the autopsy to the best of his knowledge had seen any such wound.

"I might have gone along with *right temple*," he said. I agree with that because just above the right ear there was some discoloration of the skull cavity with the bone area being gray and there was some speculation that it might be lead.

"There might have been an entry wound there?"

"Yes. And the opening and the way the bone was damaged behind the head would definitely been a type of exit wound. The reason I have said this is I saw this before in other wounds and it was very striking.

[...p. 246]

"In the temporal area, right in front of the ear, as I told you before, there was a flap of skin there that was hanging on and there was a discussion about some markings on the bone in that area."

"For a possible bullet going in or out?"

"Yes."

"This would be the flap that we see in the photo?"

"Yes."

"We're talking about the Back-of-the-Head picture with the flap sticking straight out of the side of the head by the ear?"

"Yes. The flap was right above and forward of the ear."

From the 4/6/1991 Dallas conference:

Jenkins: [...] The other thing with the wounds, and again relating back to conversation, was that where the flap area is on the scalp-

Livingstone: This? [points to photograph]

Jenkins: Yes. I remember that the flap area was more attached and hinged a little bit more to the top of the skull and the fact is that it would actually come up a little bit.

Livingstone: So you're saying that this photograph is inaccurate with regard to that?

Jenkins: Well, I'm not really sure, because I'm not orientating real well on this. But there was a discussion in the autopsy about some graying areas on the bone anterior or in front of this flap where the wound actually- it looked like it started. Now, when I say 'started', the areas, like Paul had drawn, those areas were still fragmented. The skull was still broken up at that point in time, but most of the damage, or the noticeable damage was anterior or towards back of the skull at that time. I remember Dr. Finck making a statement, 'could this possibly be from a bullet?'. And, you know, it was examined as such, things of that nature, and you know, again I'd like to say when the official report of the autopsy came out, I was stunned.

(Video, part 1, 1:25:10)

[...]

Livingstone: Do you feel that there was anything peculiar about Dr. Humes and Dr. Boswell, Dr. Finck who was not a Navy doctor who had been brought over, and Dr. Ebersole, do you feel that there was anything peculiar going on with regard to the investigation they were supposed to be conducting in view of what the later results were as in the form of the autopsy report and so on?

Jenkins: Again, I have to relate back to the conversations, you know. When I left the morgue the next morning and went to Dr. Stover's- Captain Stover's office to receive the orders, I would've been- I would've been a hundred percent sure at that point in time that the fatal shot to the head came from the side, and it came from-

Livingstone: From here? [gestures to right side of head]

Jenkins: From here [points to right front of head] at this angle. I was, as I said before, very surprised, and almost to the point of being shocked, of the conclusions that came out. [...]

(Video, part 2, 6:33)

[...]

Livingstone: Now, before the break you were demonstrating an apparent shot from here and how that related to this quote 'surgery of the head area' and this- what was it, the severance of the-

Jenkins: Of the brain stem.

Livingstone: Well, no, there was another-

Jenkins: Okay.

Livingstone: -cut.

Jenkins: There was a-

Livingstone: And what kind of bullet might've done this.

Jenkins: fracture in- actually, the vomer process behind the orbit here in the base of the cranium. In other words, the base that the skull sits on that has the pituitary and so forth. My- and again, you know, this again is my impression and, you know, and supposition is that, relating back to the conversation of this area [points to right side of a model head], there was some gray- I hesitate to describe it as metallic- area approximately the size of the end of my finger in this area.

Livingstone: Could it have been from scraping from a bullet or-

Jenkins: That was my impression and that was the discussion. That was the discussion between Dr. Finck and Dr. Humes.

Livingstone: Could you point at that area again?

Jenkins: [points to right side of model head] It's primarily in this area, maybe a little lower. My question to Dr. McClelland so forth, and Dr. Williams was, you know, with the impact of a high-velocity bullet at that point in time, and with the damage that was created here to the cranium, you know, was the distortion such that it could've created a hairline fracture in the vomer? And, you know, I guess as we all have to say, you know, we're again dealing in possibilities and probabilities here. And as Dr. McClelland answered, it is a possibility. This was the reason- and this was one of the primary reasons that I was surprised at the results from the autopsy.

([Video, part 2, 41:18](#))

[...]

Jenkins: I think the entrance wound according to, as I said, and I'm going on the impression from the grayed area, would've been in this area [points to right side of model head], and-

Livingstone: Looked like lead scraped on to the-

Jenkins: On to the bone.

([Video, part 2, 45:16](#))

[...]

Jenkins: [...] My perception at the end of the autopsy was the fact is that there had been at least two bullets, the one doing the injury to the head had been slightly anterior and above the ear, and I had related that back to the conversation of the gray marks in the bone.

([Video, part 2, 1:18:13](#))

From Livingstone's 1993 book *Killing The Truth*:

[...p. 70-71, Chapter 2. *Summary of the Evidence*]

Right Front Head Entry

Some men from the autopsy describe metal smears in the right temple area on the skull, indicating a bullet's entrance or exit, but one of the men (James Jenkins) thought it was an entrance.⁹⁵ [...]

[...p. 578, Notes, Chapter 2]

95. *High Treason 2*, p. 290 (Jenkins).

[...p. 691-692, Appendix J, *Encyclopedia of Medical Events And Witness Testimony* by Harrison E. Livingstone and Katlee Link Fitzgerald]

SMALL HOLE IN TEMPLE

[...]

Jenkins was asked if he had seen any damage to the left temple area. In Dallas, the death certificate said that the President had died "from a gunshot wound to the left temple." Jenkins said that neither he nor anyone else at the autopsy to the best of his knowledge had seen any such gunshot wound in that area.

"I might have gone along with *right* temple," he said. I agree with that because just above the right ear there was some discoloration of the skull cavity with the bone area being gray and there was some speculation that it might be lead.

"There might have been an entry wound there?"

"Yes. And the opening and the way the bone was damaged behind the head would definitely been a type of exit wound. The reason I have said this is I saw this before in other wounds and it was very striking." (a: Oct. 8, 1990)

Jenkins also stated that there was some gray discoloration of the skull and skin in the right temple area that possibly could have been caused by lead. (a: May 24, 1991)

From a November 2017 meeting with Jenkins:

David Mantik: Also indicate where you thought there was a bullet entry hole.

Jenkins: Okay. At the beginning, Dr. Finck and Dr. Humes said- they started examining it, and they found a puncture wound just about in this area.

Mantik: I'm not sure if the camera is going to be able to get that. Turn your head. Yeah, there you go. Try it now.

Jenkins: [gestures to Michael Chesser's right temple] It would be above the ear and slightly forward.

Mantik: Right.

Jenkins: Right in this area here. And they examined it. It was, oh I would say roughly 2 to 4 millimeters, maybe 5. And it had- it had gray on this border and this border. And Dr. Finck had- you know, he said 'well, maybe that's from the bullet'. Well, when they begin to discuss that, Dr. Humes

was called to the gallery, he was talking to, at that time, I saw it was just an admiral, but he actually- you know, later I was told it was Dr. Burkley. And then they had a discussion.

Mantik: But Burkley was in the gallery?

Jenkins: Yes. They had a discussion, and then Humes came back to the table and went directly back to the head, and then- or something like that- and they never returned to the wound here. [...]

([Video, 45:15](#))

James Curtis Jenkins and researcher William Law collaborated on the 2018 book *At The Cold Shoulder of History*. Chapter four reads: *“Dr. Pierre A. Fink and Dr. Humes started examining the head wounds. They found a small wound on the right side of the head in the temporal are just forward and slightly above the right ear. The small hole (wound) was rounded and about the size of the top of one’s little finger. There appeared to be graying around the margins of the wound, but it was difficult to see because the wound was in the hair line. Dr. Finck speculated that the gray material might have come from a bullet. During the examination of the temple wound, Dr. Humes was called to the gallery to talk to one of the people that had come into the morgue with him and who seemed to be directing the autopsy. I later was told this was Dr. George G. Burkley (Admiral), the President’s personal physician. Dr. Humes returned to the table and immediately directed Dr. Fink away from the small wound in the temple to the large posterior head wound. The temple wound was abandoned and never returned to that night”, “During the examination of the head, the small wound on the right temple just slightly forward and above the right ear was discovered and examined by both Dr. Humes and Dr. Fink while the brain was still in the cranium”, “The mortician [...] then put mortician’s wax on the small wound in the right temple over the ear, which I believe was from a bullet, and then sutured the wound in the throat and put wax over it, so the wound appeared to be nonexistent”.*

Dennis David, William Pitzer, and Jerrol Custer

Dennis David was a Naval officer at Bethesda Hospital. David claimed to remember his superior officer William Bruce Pitzer showing him pictures of what appeared to be the autopsy of JFK. These images, David said, showed a small wound in the right front of the head. Pitzer was found dead on 10/29/1966.

On 5/1/1975, Dennis David appeared in a Waukegan, Illinois newspaper:

A Navy technician who filmed the autopsy of President John F. Kennedy may have been an early victim of a mysterious death syndrome that has been a bloody footnote to the assassination.

In the 12 years since the ambush in Dallas, investigators have identified more than 50 persons connected with the incident who have died under mysterious or unusual circumstances.

The death of the technician, Lt. William Pitzer, should be an early addition to that list, believes a Lake County man who worked at Bethesda (Md.) Naval Hospital in 1963.

The Lake Countian doesn’t want his identity made public. He contacted the newspaper after reading a series on the Kennedy assassination which concluded in the News-Sun Tuesday.

“He was shot with a 45-caliber pistol and was found with the gun in his right hand,” he said. “But he was left-handed. If he would have used a weapon he would have used his left hand.”

The technician had filmed in detail the Kennedy autopsy. Just before he was due to retire, ending 28 years in the service, he was found dead. "I've always believed he was murdered," the former hospital worker said.

"They said he was depressed, but he was close to retirement and had just received an offer to work for a network television station at \$45,000 a year," he added. Information on the autopsy was vigorously sought at the time, particularly for evidence that would have indicated if any of Kennedy's wounds were not caused by shots fired from the rear. The county man believes his friend may have been killed as part of a coverup of a conspiracy to kill Kennedy. Pitzer, a native of the Washington, D.C. area, was 49 when he died. He was buried in the Arlington National Cemetery. A cousin said, "At the time of the funeral there seemed to be little mystery as to how he died. We were told there was going to be an investigation into his death, but we never heard anything." He is survived by his widow, two sons, and mother. Pitzer had enlisted in the Navy at age 21.

The Lake County man defends the autopsy as "thorough," and "well-done," but doubts that all the necessary information was forwarded to the Commission or made available to experts. He contends that one "ambitious" member of the autopsy team may have misrepresented the autopsy results when questioned by the Warren Commission, which concluded in its final report that Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone gunman.

[...]

The man, who saw many wounded men while serving in Vietnam, said he saw slides of Kennedy's wounds. "It looked like they came from the front," he said. Commenting on the Commission conclusion that Kennedy was shot from behind, he said, "I do not believe there was just one individual shooting."

(News-Sun, 5/1/1975, *Another Link in JFK Death?* by Art Peterson [[link 1](#)] [[link 2](#)])

Researcher David Lifton interviewed Dennis David at length on 7/2/1979. However, the story about Pitzer and the autopsy film did not appear in Lifton's 1980 book *Best Evidence*. Lifton explained his opinions to Kent Heiner, author of the 2004 book *Without Smoking Gun* ([2019 edition DRAFT](#)):

As I review the emails between Lifton and me, I see that between all his denunciations of various and sundry persons - ranging from the well-deserved to the ill-considered - some wisdom was to be found. Saying that I was "dealing with people who are pushing an exaggerated and ever changing story," he observed: "Any normal journalist would understand where the truth lies in this situation, but you keep digging, as if there's some great secret being hidden." "I am in the business of evidence, not urban legend," he wrote to me. An "urban legend" might less pejoratively be called a "meme." The term has come to common usage in the context of internet cat pictures and the like, but it also represents a certain intellectual approach to understanding where ideas come from and how they spread. LCDR Pitzer's death is a fact. The idea that he was murdered to safeguard the cover-up of the true nature of JFK's murder is - regardless of its truth or falsity - a *meme*.

([Heiner, *Laying Old Ghosts to Rest*, Jan. 2015](#))

From Heiner's *Without Smoking Gun*:

When interviewing Dennis David for 1980's *Best Evidence*, David Lifton had passed over Dennis' information regarding Pitzer, focusing instead on Dennis' account of the circumstances in which the - or "a" - casket arrived at the morgue for the Kennedy autopsy. In fact, by the time I wrote to Lifton

in 2002, he strongly implied that David's talk of Pitzer was a made-up story he had somehow been later induced to tell by Harrison Livingstone. Lifton wrote to me:

As to any filming of Dennis David, I interviewed him in July, 1979 by telephone. What he told me then appears in my book, verbatim, exactly as he told me. The book went to press over the summer of 1980 and was published at the tail end of 1980 (Dec. 1980/Jan. 1981).

I filmed Dennis David in October 1980. There was nothing about Pitzer mentioned in that filmed interview, which basically put on camera what he told me in our July, 1979 telephone interview. . . .

Somewhere around 1988 or 1989, Harrison Livingstone got involved in this affair and started to promote the theory that Pitzer's death was connected with the JFK assassination. He would call up various witnesses who I had interviewed and attempt to get them to change or amend their accounts about any number of things, but the Pitzer business was part of his agenda. Again, this was all in 1988 and thereafter.

Do you subscribe to the idea that its an author's responsibility to change his book to accommodate a witness who changes his story a decade after the book appears? Changes which apparently occurred after being lobbied by an assassination "researcher" who, incidentally, would call me up and leave death threats on my telephone answering machine? And send me similar letters in writing? [Livingstone wrote comparable accusations regarding Lifton in his emails to this author.]

This is the kind of territory into which you are heading. Do you think that's credible?

I first heard the William Pitzer story coming from Dennis David directly when he was being interviewed by KRON-TV around November 1988. That film shoot was not conducted by me, but I was present. The two experienced news people who were conducting the filming - producer Stanhope Gould and Sylvia Chase - were quite put off by Dennis David's change of story. It appeared to them so completely non-credible that they wanted to drop him from their documentary as a witness. However, out of respect for his prior interview with me (in 1979) and the prior filmed interview (in 1980) they did in fact use him in their show.

. . . the first I ever heard of Dennis David "viewing" "movies" of the autopsy was when he said so in front of me and Stanhope Gould in the fall of 1988, when he was interviewed (as I recall) by Sylvia Chase for KRON-TV.

Also, as I recall (and quite vividly) he said he viewed them and "edited" them with Pitzer, at his residence. Again, if that Dennis David interview footage is ever located, I defer to whatever he said. Suffice it to say that whatever Dennis David said on the subject, I had never heard it - or at least, heard it stated quite that way - until 1988, and Stanhope Gould was quite unprepared for it too, because it seemed completely bizarre and off the wall. As I mentioned before, it was so bizarre that it essentially destroyed Dennis David's credibility, and extreme efforts on my part were necessary that everything he said was not thrown out along with his allegations about Pitzer.

This was rather astonishing to me because Lifton had only been able to locate Dennis David in the first place after reading of him in Art Peterson's *News-Sun* article (an article which, by the way Harrison Livingstone has taken credit for passing on to Lifton). After further discussion with me and a review of the 1975 article, Lifton did agree that Pitzer's film of the autopsy had been mentioned at that time, but he also maintained that the first he ever heard Dennis speaking of having viewed such a film was in 1988, as quoted above; this may be true, but Dennis David thinks otherwise, and his memory seems to be more reliable than Lifton's. David's email to me in 2003 said:

In '79, when David and his film crew sat in my living room, I told David of my experiences of the 22 Nov 63. This included my feelings on Bill Pitzer. . . .the story of Pitzer he was not able to corroborate, for obvious reasons, and [therefore] he did not pursue it. Which, I think, was the legitimate thing to do. In 1998 [sic - he means 1988] sitting in my back yard under a maple tree, I told Sylvia Chase and her crew essentially what I had told David in 1979. That: 1) I had seen portions of a 16mm film in Bill's office, and helped edit a portion of the film. 2) I had also looked at photos, some B&W and some colored. 3) I told them from the film and pictures, both Bill and I drew the same conclusion that the killing shot was a frontal entry wound. 4) They ask[ed] me if Bill was in the autopsy room, and if he had taken the film and pictures. I told them I did not know if he took the film or pictures of the autopsy. I did say that "considering Bill's job at Bethesda, it would be logical to assume that he had, however I do not recall seeing him that night."

If David's later testimony can be suspected of having been colored by anyone's influence, it would be Lifton, not Livingstone, who would seem the most likely source, intentionally or otherwise. Lifton bestowed minor fame on Dennis David in a book promoting a hypothesis which has direct connection to the later details of the Pitzer story.

In 2010, Lifton's expressed opinion regarding Dennis David and Bill Pitzer was again highly dismissive and in contradiction of his own earlier recollections. In a post on The Education Forum, he wrote: "To make this clear: Dennis David, who knew Pitzer, does not believe Pitzer committed suicide, and has made a variety of claims about having seen autopsy photographs –and/or films—of the autopsy, because of his friendship with Pitzer. I should also add that Dennis David told me none of this when I interviewed him in July, 1979, via phone, and in October [sic], 1980, on camera; nor in 1989 [sic], again, on camera." So which of Lifton's tales are we to believe? The one in which David totally sprung the Pitzer story on Lifton and company during the KRON-TV interview, nearly derailing the program, or the one in which he didn't mention it at all?

(2019 edition DRAFT)

Dennis David was contacted by researchers Harrison Livingstone and Joanne Braun, as summarized in Livingstone's 1992 book *High Treason 2*:

[...p. 556, Chapter 27. *A Proposal*]

[...] Pitzer, according to David, had filmed the autopsy.²¹

[...] After all (according to Dennis David), Pitzer was in the gallery filming the entire autopsy with a movie camera, and David, a chief petty officer at the time—who had helped bring in the casket—helped Pitzer edit the film. David was a bridge partner and close friend of Pitzer's for many years and used to baby-sit for his children. They all believe he was murdered.

What the film might have been used for we do not know. Nor do we know if it was made for personal reasons. Dennis David wrote the following to researcher Joanne Braun: "As to Bill Pitzer's involvement, I never asked him, 'Were you there?' or 'Did you do the filming?' I have always assumed he did, but cannot verify that he was in the autopsy room that evening. I do know that he had the film in his possession at one time. When he and I looked at a portion of the film, we remarked only on the extent of injury, apparent point of entry, etc. Bill also had some 35mm slides which, again I assumed, were excerpts from the film.

I would say the films which *I viewed* with Bill were prior to the commencement of the postmortem, as there was no evidence of a Y incision on the torso, nor was the scalp incised and peeled forward on the face as would be done during a postmortem.”²⁵

In another letter to Joanne Braun, David wrote that “the film slides I viewed with Bill Pitzer showed much the same as the pictures which you enclosed. First, I had seen and helped treat gunshot wounds and from training and experience had some idea of their effect on human flesh. Even high-powered rifle or pistol (375, M-1, M-16, etc.) entry holes are substantially smaller than their exit. It is inconceivable that anyone even vaguely acquainted with gunshot wounds would conclude that the massive wound in the *rear* of JFK’s skull could have occurred from a rear-entry projectile, unless it was from a grenade or mortar shrapnel, which tears and rends flesh and bone rather than pierces it. What appeared to be an entry was near the point of the arrow you drew on the right lateral picture. Also, the extension of the original tracheotomy incision appeared to be approximately twice the length necessary.”²⁶ [...]

[...p. 635-636, Notes, Chapter 27]

21. Interviews of April 22, 1990, May 12, 1990, April 25, 1991, and June 4, 1991.

22. 7 HSCA 28.

23. 7 HSCA 27.

24. Their inventory is contained in Weisberg, p. 565.

25. Letter of September 11, 1991.

26. Letter of October 31, 1991.

From Livingstone’s 5/20/1991 interview with Francis X. O’Neill, an autopsy witness from the FBI:

Livingstone: Alright, the- the whole scene during the autopsy. We’re trying to- first of all, there were- was the, you know, was there a microphone hanging over the table, see the room is no longer there.

O’Neill: Of course not.

Livingstone: There was no taping going on?

O’Neill: No.

Livingstone: And how about filming?

O’Neill: No.

Livingstone: Did you know Commander Pitzer?

O’Neill: No.

Livingstone: Well, he was in the gallery filming and one of the men helped-

O’Neill: He might have been in the gallery, but when you say ‘filming’, what do you mean?

Livingstone: He had a movie camera, and the next day one of the men helped him edit the film.

O'Neill: I am not aware of that at all. In fact, when you say that he was in the gallery, we took a listing of every individual who was there at any particular period of time when we started.

Livingstone: So you're speaking on the benches?

O'Neill: I'm talking about the entire amount of people at the autopsy room.

Livingstone: Yeah.

O'Neill: And he possibly came in later, I know several people did come in later. I don't know if he was there at the start of it. In fact, to my recollection- go ahead.

Livingstone: But you're- you know what I mean, the benches, they call it a gallery.

O'Neill: I don't know what exactly what benches. They were up higher, they were not on a level with the-

Livingstone: Okay, but you considered that in the room and you took their names, of everybody up there?

O'Neill: We took the names of everybody in the room, we sent a listing around.

([Audio](#), 22:45)

From Dennis David's appearance on *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, 1995, Episode 6: *The Truth Shall Set You Free*:

Three or four days after the assassination, I walked into this office and I saw, he was working on some film. He had a movie editor, one of those reel-to-reel that runs across with a screen. And he showed it to me, and it was a 16mm film of the autopsy. There were also some slides. He had some slides, that he had, that showed tissue slides and also showed some slides of President Kennedy that were taken from while he was on the table at the morgue. And we looked at them, kinda horrified I guess you would say, at the seriousness of the wound, but I remember that one of the things that I remembered was that we saw- they had a picture of Kennedy laying on the table and it was a front profile and the only thing we saw was a little hole about here in the temple [points just above the right side of his right eyebrow] and- in another photograph, another slide that Bill had, showed a huge gaping hole here in the back, and so Bill and I logically assumed that the wound was a frontal entry wound, as opposed to what the Warren Commission later said, being shot from behind.

[...]

Bill had told me, shortly before I left Bethesda, which was around the 7th of December, of '65, he told me that he was planning on retiring, because he had enough time in, and he was wanting to get out. And he also told me that he had some damned lucrative offers from some TV networks, and other people have asked me why I think he was assassinated, and I think it was because, that with him retiring, they- and I don't know who "they" are- were afraid he would take these pictures that he and I had seen, this 35mm and the 16mm film, that he would take them and if he went to work for a major studio that they would use them or he would have them aired, and that would really blow

some people out of the water if that would have transpired. I could be wrong, I could be right, but I do know those films exist because I was there, I saw the damn things.

(Video, 22:13 [transcript, partial])

David's story may have some corroboration from Bill Pitzer's widow, Joyce Pitzer. From *The Fourth Decade* newsletter, Volume 2, Number 4, p. 16, *Bits and Pieces: A Green Beret on the Periphery of the JFK Assassination* by Daniel Marvin:

Late in the afternoon, on Saturday, 29 October 1966 Lieutenant Commander William Pitzer was found dead in his office at the Bethesda Naval Hospital where the autopsy on President Kennedy had been performed three years earlier. With a gunshot wound to the right temple, Dr. Pitzer's death was officially ruled a suicide, but family and friends found this verdict impossible to accept, not least of all because his widow knew better. In January 1995 Mrs. Joyce B. Pitzer told me unequivocally that she knew her husband "had parts of the autopsy that they wanted destroyed." She was speaking of our government wanting the autopsy photos he'd taken of JFK on 22 November 1963 destroyed. She told me that her husband "refused to do this." Instead of the United States Navy assisting Mrs. Pitzer to get to the bottom of her husband's violent death, they ruled it suicide. She knew different, but the Navy refused her access to the autopsy of her husband. Instead, she told me, "After his death, four of the Navy Intelligence were here at the house. They told me not to talk." She clarified that, saying, "and for 25 years I did not really discuss this." Even after a quarter of a century had passed, Mrs. Pitzer told me of how "Several of the Captains and one of the Admirals told me when Livingstone was writing the book [High Treason 2] to stay out of it."

On 2/13/1996, lead autopsy pathologist Dr. James Humes told the Assassination Records Review Board that there was a closed-circuit television set up in Bethesda Naval Hospital:

Q. Could you describe in a general way what the autopsy room looked like? You mentioned a few minutes ago that it was new. Could you just describe the room?

A. Well, it's about the size of the room in which we're seated, which looks to me like it's 30 by 25 or something of that nature. We had a permanently fixed autopsy table in the center of the room. We had a viewing stand, a two-place viewing stand, along one wall. I think it had two steps. It would accommodate maybe 20 or 30 people, because we used to have conferences in there. Routinely, at the end of a week, we would retain the organs from the autopsies of the week. In fact, not only did we review them there, but there was a closed-circuit television. They went to Andrews Air Force Base, NIH, and it was a closed-circuit instruction program. That platform, a two-step platform, was for observers.

And in an adjacent area, we had a refrigerated storage place with either four or six--I forget the number--places for retention of bodies. And we had a shower and restroom adjacent.

Q. Was there any kind of gallery in the room other than the two steps that you--

A. That's what I'm speaking of. It might have three steps. I couldn't--you know, I don't recall how many steps it had. We used to get a fairly decent number of people. Maybe it had three steps.

Q. Was there any closed-circuit broadcasting--

A. No.

Q. --during the night of the autopsy?

A. No, absolutely not. I wish there was, retrospectively.

([Transcript \[text\]](#))

From the 7/16/1996 ARRB deposition of autopsy photographer John Stringer:

Q: One last question, and this is probably repetitive from earlier questions we have. Was there anyone taking any motion picture photographs -

A: Negative.

Q: - during the night of the autopsy?

A: Negative.

MR. GUNN: Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: And how about Mr. Pitzer?

BY MR. GUNN:

Q: Was Mr. Pitzer present at the autopsy?

A: He was not present. In fact, I shot his autopsy.

([Transcript \[text\]](#) [[audio](#)])

From the [January 1998 edition of the newsletter *JFK/Deep Politics Quarterly*](#):

[...p. 9, *The Untimely Death of Lieutenant Commander William B. Pitzer* by Allan R.J. Eaglesham and R. Robin Palmer]

[...] He found Pitzer working on a 16-mm film, slides and black and white photos of the Kennedy autopsy.[3] Vivid in his memory is his agreement with Bill Pitzer that those materials showed what appeared to be an entry wound in the right frontal area with a corresponding exit wound in the lower rear of the skull. Thereafter, on occasion, Dennis heard Bill refer to contacts he'd had with "agents" about the Kennedy autopsy materials on which he had worked. These references, made in the company of others and thus precluding further discussion with Dennis, were couched in matter-of-fact terms without hint of threat or intimidation.[4]

[...Notes]

3. Dennis David interview on *The Men Who Killed Kennedy VI. The Truth Shall Set You Free*, produced by Nigel Turner (A&E History Channel, 1995).

4. Dennis David, audiotaped responses to written questions from Colonel D. Marvin, 16 December 1996.

On 2/4/1997, Dennis David talked to the ARRB. As reported:

LCDR Pitzer's Film(s) of President Kennedy's Autopsy

Mr. David said that 3 or 4 days after the autopsy, a good friend of his, LCDR William Bruce Pitzer, who was in charge of Bethesda audio-visual services, showed him photographic images of the autopsy inside Pitzer's office. He said he was shown the following:

-A portion of a B & W 16 mm movie film, displayed using a viewer with two reels on it and a hand-crank (i.e., an editing machine); he estimated the size of the reel of film was probably about 10' in diameter, and that the reel was about half full of film. He said he witnessed only a short section of the film, which appeared to show the President's body during initial examinations, and before any incisions. He said the film was clearly shot in the morgue at Bethesda, but not from immediately adjacent to the autopsy table; instead, it was shot from a distance--either from the gallery, or from well back in the room. He said that other persons' torsos, from the waist down, and some gloved hands examining the body, could be seen in the film. He said that the motion picture film, although somewhat grainy, clearly showed a gaping wound in the back of the President's head, and that the top of the head looked intact.

-Six or seven 35 mm color slides of post mortem images of the President; like the movie film, these were also pre-incision post mortem images of the President. He said the slides were viewed by holding them up by hand in front of a lamp. (See below for description of contents of both slide and print images.)

-Four or five black-and-white prints, approximately 3" X 5' in size, of post-mortem, "pre-incision" images of President Kennedy. Like the color slides, he said these prints "made it very clear that President Kennedy was hit from the front as well as from the rear." When I asked him what it was about the B & W prints, and color slides, which made him say this, he said that first, in both the B & W prints and color slides, he could see a round or oval wound, about one quarter to three-eighths of an inch in diameter, in the right front temporal area of the President's head, just below the hairline, which he immediately interpreted as a bullet entry wound; he also said that, just as in the movie film, there was a gaping hole in the back of the head. When asked, Mr. David clarified that the top of the head looked intact in these photographs. [...]

(ARRB MD 177)

The autopsy's x-ray technician, told the ARRB on 10/28/1997 that he remembered a man with a movie camera:

Q: In addition to Floyd Riebe's taking photographs, did you see anyone else take photographs?

A: There was a chief there that night that was taking movies. Remember how I had stated that he was the gentleman that had committed suicide, supposedly, and had the deformed hand - where they found the gun in that deformed hand? He was there that night, taking movies.

Q: Did you actually see him taking movies?

A: Yes, I did.

Q: What kind of movie camera was he using?

A: I would imagine, a simple eight millimeter.

Q: Was he wearing a uniform?

A: Yes, he was.

Q: And what was his rank?

A: Chief.

Q: Did you hear any discussion during the time of the autopsy about movies being taken?

A: Well, there was quite a few upset people from the gallery that were - didn't like the idea. But the chief just kept right on going. He said, "I'm doing my job."

Q: In addition to the chief who was - Do you remember the chief's name?

A: No, I don't.

Q: Does the name Pitzer mean anything to you?

A: Yes. Now, it rings a bell, but I'm not quite sure. But that name "Pitzer" does ring a bell.

Q: Are you able to elaborate at all why you -

A: Not really. I'm not sure if it was - It could have been brought to my recollection that night that we had the get-together in Pittsburgh. I think it was Pittsburgh. Yes, it was.

Q: But did you know that name at all on the night of the -

A: No, I didn't know that name at that time. No, I didn't. Some of this stuff is starting to come back.

(Transcript)

Custer seems to be the only autopsy witness who claims to remember a person filming in the morgue.

In March of 1998, Jerrol Custer was interviewed by researchers William Law and Vincent Palamara (Law, *In The Eye of History*, 2004, Jerrol F. Custer):

Law: I want you to do me a favor.

Custer: Sure.

Law: I'd like you to- to put- tell me where the- the wound in the head was located to the best recollection.

Custer: The wound in the head?

Law: Yeah.

Custer: To the best of my recollection, it was in the frontal sinus on the right hand side. Just above the orbit, right about here [points to forehead above right eye].

Palamara: Okay, now you claim that that's the entry wound?

Custer: That's the entry wound.

(Video, 8:18)

[...]

Palamara: Okay, but it still jives with the notion that you saw a frontal entry wound [points to forehead] and you still think that [gestures to right side of head] was an exit of some sort, even though it wasn't technically back here [gestures to lower back of the head], it still made sense with...?

Custer: Remember the trajectory. Forty to forty-five degrees.

Palamara: Okay. Okay.

Custer: You're going in like this [gestures to left profile autopsy photo]

Palamara: Okay. Okay.

Custer: Are you blowing out the back of the head?

Palamara: No, not at that angle. Okay.

Custer: Frontal-temporal region. That's what's being destroyed.

Palamara: Okay. That would explain a lot.

(Video, 11:52)

[...]

Custer: Part of the cover-up. They don't want people to know. This is why the chief was taken care of, literally. He actually had photographic evidence they didn't want – they didn't want out.

Law: And by "chief," who are you talking about?

Custer: Chief Pitzer.

Law: I know we went into Chief Pitzer a little bit last night, and maybe we've covered him enough. But, Dennis David who- who was Pitzer- he was- Pitzer was a mentor to Dennis David and they were- and they were basically best friends.

Custer: Right.

Law: I've been told by him that- that- that he helped edit film.

Custer: Correct.

Law: That night.

Custer: Correct.

Law: And there's been no corroboration from that- for that except that you- you said that you- you saw him, you do remember him-

Custer: Absolutely.

Law: Filming.

Custer: Right.

Law: And he, Dennis David also told me that he saw pictures of a wound in the side of the president's head. A small bullet wound in the right temple.

Custer: Now you've got to remember something, Dennis David is a layman. His anatomy sometime can be a- leave a lot to be desired. What he considered the side of the head could be here or here [points to the right front of his head]. But I would say the side of the head would be in the temporal region. There was no bullet wounds here [indicating the right temple].

Law: Really. Okay.

Palamara: He did mention on a- on a certain TV documentary, he did point to here [points to the right side of forehead] as far as whether it was an entrance wound and it appeared that President Kennedy was shot from the front. Viewing this film.

Custer: Right.

Law: So would you say that's correct?

Custer: I would say that's pretty close to where it was. When you're discussing something with somebody, you don't actually hit it right on, you can come off to the side a little bit [points above right eyebrow], and see where I'm at?

Law: Um-hum.

Custer: Actually, it was right in here. You can see where the- the fragment is, where it went in, the destruction. You have the picture, watch where the lines emanate from. There's a focal point. That's the shell entrance. Back to the same simple theory. Look at what you have. It's as plain as the nose on your face. Don't surmise 'well, the bullet looks like it's at the back of the head there'. No. Look at your fractures. Where do they come from? Where do they start at? Where's all the damage at? You see damage on the frontal sinuses. You see damage on the orbit. The floor of the orbit. The orbital ridge. If a bullet goes in the front you'd have fracturing in that area. The bullet would come out that front, go in at the back and come out that front. You wouldn't have no orbital area or the frontal sinuses. If you've ever seen anybody that's been shot in the back of the head and the bullet exited from the face, there's not much of the face left.

([Video, 1:04:20](#))

Custer's earlier recorded statements do not mention a small frontal head wound ([HSCA 180-10103-10116](#); 9/30/1979 and 10/7/1979 interviews by David Lifton, *Best Evidence*, 1980; KRON, 11/18/1988, *JFK: An Unsolved Murder* [[video, 33:27](#)]; Oct. 1980 interview by Lifton, *Best Evidence: The Research Video*, 1989; Interview by Harrison Livingstone, undated [[draft chapter](#)]; Reuter-AP, 5/30/1992 [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)] [[link 3](#)] [[link 4](#)] [[link 5](#)]; Reuters, 11/18/1993, *JFK x-rays are*

fake, radiologist charges by Jeanne King; JFK/Deep Politics Quarterly, Vol. 1, Number 1, Oct. 1995, *Interview: Jerrol Custer* by Walt Brown; ARRB deposition, 10/28/1997 [audio]).

From *The Fourth Decade* newsletter, Volume 5, Number 4, May, 1998, p. 19:

UPDATES: NEW DEVELOPMENTS ON PREVIOUS ARTICLES

William Pitzer. The following information regarding "The Pitzer File," (issue of January 1998) was furnished by Vince Palamara in a communication dated April 1, 1998:

Oregon researcher Bill Law (see Winter 1997 KAC/Lancer journal) and I interviewed, for over three intense hours, Bethesda x-ray tech Jerrol Custer on 3/15 and 3/16/98. Among MANY other things, he stated: (1) Pitzer was present at the autopsy filming the whole thing, inc. the gallery with the military men, who flipped out upon seeing him doing this; (2) He also believes that Pitzer was murdered; (3) Custer also believes the circumstances for alleged suicide are extremely suspect, esp. due to Pitzer's handicapped hand/arm... This totally corroborated Dennis David who, when Bill Law phoned David with the news of this independent corroboration, appeared to be crying on the other end, as Bill told me!

In September of 1998, researcher Alan Eaglesham sent a letter and a copy of his essay "The Untimely Death of Lieutenant Commander William B. Pitzer" to Dr. Humes. Than, according to Eaglesham:

One morning in early October, I was at work, as usual, in my home office when the telephone rang. It was Dr. Humes. I had not expected that he would respond to my letter; at first I did not understand who was calling. Here are notes that I made immediately after his call:

- He knew Bill Pitzer well and worked closely with him on films on tropical medicine for use in Vietnam. These were films made on video and transferred to film; WBP was in charge of the television part. He does not know whether Bill made the conversion to film.
- He does not know where Bill was on the evening of the Kennedy assassination. He was certainly not in the morgue.
- Bill was a "nice fellow," with whom he enjoyed working.
- I said that some people felt that Bill was the last person they'd have thought would commit suicide. He said that "suicide is a part of life." He believes that Pitzer killed himself.
- He has read the article (The Untimely Death of Lt. Cmdr. William B. Pitzer: The Physical Evidence) and said frankly that it is weak and that we are barking up the wrong tree.
- He was categorical that all photos at the autopsy were taken by Stringer. Bill took no photographs at the JFK autopsy. He (i.e. Cmdr. Humes) "was in charge of everything," and has total certainty that Bill took no photographs, neither did he expose movie film.
- He said that the morgue was new, and he does not know whether it was wired for closed-circuit television on 11/22/63. Certainly the autopsy was not recorded on CCTV.

It seems to me that his certainty that the autopsy was not recorded on CCTV, on top of uncertainty as to whether the autopsy room had CCTV installed, should be viewed with caution, particularly so considering that he displayed no such uncertainty in his testimony to the ARRB.

On 10/25/1998, Eaglesham received an email from John Stringer which read "*I did not see Bill Pitzer on the evening of President Kennedy's postmortem examination*". Stringer had reportedly known Pitzer for nine years.

(Eaglesham, Pitzer: An Update, Apr. 1999)

From David's 11/16/2001 interview at the JFK Lancer Conference in Dallas, Texas:

DD: [...] And then subsequent to that I also talked about the assassination of William Pitzer. Because on Tuesday, after the autopsy, I don't know, figure the day after, I had stopped by to see Bill Pitzer, who was head, he was Lt. Commander William Pitzer, he was head of the audiovisual at Bethesda and on staff of their medical school. And he was one of my mentors for the medical service corps program. And I stopped in as I frequently did during the week, I wanted to ask him some questions about the MSC program. Bill was editing a 16mm film of the autopsy. He also had some slides and some black and whites. I was only there for 15 or 20 minutes, I looked at some of them and they were unquestionably, without a doubt, they were of the JFK autopsy. I could see that on the editing. One of the things that Bill and I, [agreed] that it was a frontal entry wound. You know, the wounds were caused by frontal entry wounds, just by what we viewed. We didn't discuss it a length or go into detail and try to, because you know at that time, and then I left Bethesda in '65 and I don't recall that Bill and I ever discussed that again after that. Because on that following Monday, the people who had been in the morgue during the actual autopsy were all taken to John Stover's office, Captain, he was the commanding officer, and signed statements. Well, what they were were, keep your mouth shut and the threat of court marshal.

[...]

DD: [...] I could describe the detail of the pieces of lead that were removed from the head and they showed me while I was under, they showed me a number of photographs and I picked up one and said, "No, this is not right. There is an entry wound there." And it was a picture and of course it was from a picture that I had seen on the Tuesday afternoon. That this was a picture that I described to them and then they showed me some others and it was a little terrifying I guess. [...]

[...]

GS: When you were observing the editing of the 16mm film with this Mr. Pitzer what was the interaction, was it just you two in the room?

DD: Just us two, yes.

GS: Did you have any exchange about what he was thinking, what you were seeing?

DD: The best that I can recall was the remarking on the size and the positions of the wounds. A lot of what I am telling you now is what I recall after going under hypnotic regression. Because when they brought me out I was to remember everything that I had learned and wasn't to repress it. That there was a distinct bullet entry wound, if you start like at the corner of the right eye and go right up the hairline on Kennedy. There was an entry wound there about the size - my little finger would probably just about fit into it. Believe me I can recognize, I have seen enough in my time, I know an entry wound from an exit wound. There was no doubt about it.

JDW: Now you saw that on the photograph.

DD: On the photograph, yes and on the film. I get the impression that it was taken clips off of the 16 mm film at the same time. I don't know for what intent purposes, I have no idea. Our general feeling was that it was definitely the president, the body of the president. And secondly that the shots came from the front.

In 2004, Eaglesham was invited to search a house that was previously occupied by Pitzer. Nothing of interest was found (Eaglesham, *The Untimely Death of Lieutenant Commander William B. Pitzer: II. The Case for Homicide Reconsidered*).

Dennis David was interviewed for William Law's 2004 book *In The Eye Of History*:

[...*Dennis D. David*]

Also, Lieutenant Commander Munroe—who was a physical therapist and also an MSC officer—Bill Pitzer and myself and the physical therapist used to play bridge together at noon damn near every day. Bill was not only my mentor, but he was also a good friend. A very good friend. A couple, three days after the assassination—I don't remember if it was Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday—it was two or three days after—I stopped in to see Bill about something about the MSC exams that would be coming up—and, again, I just walked in. He was working on a sixteen-millimeter film, and on his desk he had some black and whites, some color photos and some thirty-five-millimeter slides. All of these were from the autopsy. There was, you know—one of them I recall was—I saw years later—was the so-called death-stare photo of President Kennedy on the table at the morgue.

Law: Now, these are pictures.

David: These were pictures. They were black and whites, and colored.

Law: So he actually had these with him?

David: Yes he did. And he was editing a film, a sixteen-millimeter film. I watched him do several reels. I got the impression that he was pulling some of the frames off of the film to make slides with. I could be wrong. You know, I helped him. And, you know, watched some of these. We were looking at various aspects, and we made some comments. Number one, it was our distinct impression—impression, hell, it was our opinion, actual opinion—that the shot that killed the president had to have come from the front.

Law: And why do you say that?

David: Because we both noted a small entry wound here (points to the right side of his forehead) from another photo, and a large exit wound back in this area (indicates right rear of head). I had seen gunshot wounds before, and so had Bill. I've seen a lot of them since, and I can assure you that it definitely was an entry wound in the forehead.

Law: Now I'm going to hand you a picture, the "stare-of-death" photograph (photo 1). Is this the picture that you remember seeing with Bill Pitzer?

David: Very similar, except that it seems to me that there was more to it—the camera seemed to be at an angle like this (indicating a right-profile perspective). What I saw, there seemed to be more of a ninety-degree shot to it. But there was a small hole that looked like an entry wound. It was about the size of the tip of my finger. Maybe a little over a quarter of an inch, five-sixteenths of an inch in

diameter. It was located right in this area right here (indicates a point at the hairline above the pupil of the right eye).

Law: Now, is there anything else about that picture that looks different? Does it look about the same?

David: I don't recall seeing this (neck wound) at the time. I may have. But I do know one comment that has been made about this is that if that was supposed to be a tracheotomy incision, it was a Goddamned sloppy job! Because, I had done tracheotomies—I am not a physician—but I did a tracheotomy on a young lad in Memphis in 1957, it was the first time I ever did one, in the back of an ambulance—and I sure as hell didn't need a two-and-a-half-inch diameter incision! Besides, the incision should have been vertical to get into the cartilage so that the trach tube could be inserted.

[...]

Law: I know I'm asking you to remember from a very long period. What about the forehead itself? Did it look like that from what you recall from the film and the pictures that you saw?

David: It didn't seem to be as clean.

Law: Was there damage to the forehead that you can recall?

David: Well, again, the picture that I remember seeing really was kind of more of an angle... the right eye seemed to be a little more prominent than it is here in this picture.

Law: More prominent as to what?

David: Protruded.

Law: So it was popped.

David: You could say that.

Law: Okay.

David: But this one seems to be almost in a natural position.

Law: All right. So maybe there were some differences then?

David: Yes. Some differences between this photo and the one that I saw on Bill's desk, and on the film ... And also, I might add that this area back here, that is so shadowy? (motioning with a ballpoint pen in the right rear area of Kennedy's head) I don't recall that. You could clearly see the outline of the skull, of the head.

Law: So then it was a clear—?

David: Much clearer picture.

Law: It wasn't as dark?

David: No, it wasn't nearly this dark.

Law: I'm going to show you a series of autopsy photographs now.

David: Okay.

Law: Just for clarification, to see if they are anything like what you remember. I believe that's a shot of the cranium (photo 5).

David: I don't ever recall seeing this.

Law: How about this next one (photo 4)?

David: Let's get this thing in perspective. Again, I presume that this is a flap of scalp or something (above the right ear). The picture that I saw, it would have been back more in this area, the exit wound (points to the rear of the skull behind the right ear).

Law: Did this particular picture look anything like what you remember?

David: No.

Law: What is different about this picture?

David: Number one, this—whatever it is—looks like a flap of scalp or something (circles the flap of scalp above the right ear) is protruding. There was more of a gaping hole back in this—about... oh, about that wide, two to two and a half inches wide by maybe an inch or an inch and three quarters—not a rectangular hole, I mean it was kind of blown out (points to the lower portion of the back of the head).

Law: Right. How about that little speck down there at the bottom (photo 4a)? Some have said it was an entrance wound, some have said it was a piece of brain matter. Did you see that on the photograph?

David: I don't recall. I don't recall, William.

Law: Can you tell me anything else about this photograph you might find interesting?

David: The hand that's holding it up. Be nice to know whose hand that is.

Law: But basically, you're telling me there was a defect back there?

David: The picture that I saw—I don't know whether I remember the hand being there—but, the picture I saw—that Bill had—showed a hole. This almost looks to be slightly forward of the right ear. My recollection of what I saw—the exit wound—was more to the rear of the right ear. Behind it, not forward of it.

Law: This next one (photo 3)—what can you tell me about it, and was it one of the ones—

David: Now this is closer to what I remember seeing.

Law: Now I notice you said *closer*. Is there something different about—

David: I don't remember seeing all this matter down there (pointing to the shredded tissue hanging down). It may have been cleaned out or something. But, there was more—the head was held up

more. The shot—this looks like it's almost a direct head-on view But this is the area—in this area—is where I remember seeing the gaping exit wound.

Law: Okay, so—

David: This looks like bone. Apparently brain tissue or something in there.

Law: Was that small metal table there? Do you remember that?

David: I don't remember this, no. I don't remember this (head) support here.

Law: Again, how about the small metal table over the body do you remember that? I know I'm asking you to remember an awful lot.

David: I can't remember that or whether they ever used such an apparatus at the morgue, I don't know. But I don't believe the morgue table at Bethesda was equipped with this type of headrest.

Law: How about the background of the photograph? It seems to be awfully dark. Do you remember if it looked like that? Was it dark in the background?

David: I can't remember, William.

Law: That's fine. How about this photograph (photo 6)?

David: I remember seeing something similar to this. One of the pictures that I saw, that Bill had, was very similar to this. It showed—they have it encircled here (pointing to the back wound)—the head was more—the head seems to be craned back, the one I saw was almost on a flat level as though he were laying flat looking down. That's why—

Law: Show me on your own head again.

David: You could see the entrance wound here. That's what I am talking about— you could see the wound that was back here (takes his pen and encircles the lower rear portion of his own head).

Law: Okay. Back in this area.

David: Again, I don't remember seeing the hands or anything like that. And I may well have, but this looked like an entry wound also (pointing to the back wound, photo 6a, arrow A).

Law: But you do remember that being there?

David: Yes I do.

Law: Okay, and this last one (photo 2). Is that anything like what you recall?

David: I did not see this picture, no.

Law: You didn't see that picture.

David: Seen it many times since.

Law: But at that particular time in '63, no?

David: This was a view of the left side of the head. There, again, this headrest is, you know—but, I was never in the morgue—I was not a pathology tech and was never in the morgue that often—maybe two, three times in my life have I ever been in there. This may well be a part of it, but I don't recall ever seeing it.

Law: Okay. Now you've had a chance to look over the pictures. As the story goes, you went in and saw Bill Pitzer.

David: Right.

Law: And he had film that he was editing and he also had some pictures on his desk. Would you say that these photographs show basically what you saw?

David: They were *similar*.

Law: They were similar, but there were not exactly the same.

David: Not exact. They were similar pictures. They were clearer, more definitive, which is the reason

Bill and I came to the conclusion that he'd been shot from the front.

Law: So, they actually showed—did they show, like, a hole?

David: Yes.

Law: Did they show an entrance? Point to your own head and tell me where you think—

David: Right about there. Just slightly to the back of the eye. If you drew a line straight from the corner of the eye and came back about maybe a half-inch, right in this area. Almost in the hairline. As I said it was about as big as the end of my finger like that. Just like that. Right in that area there (pointing to the extreme right side of his own forehead at the hairline).

Law: What did he say as he was editing this film. Do you remember any of the conversation?

David: Oh, not exact words, no. Comments, you know: "That looks like an entrance wound." "Yeah, like the one I saw in Morocco where the kid was shot with an M-1. Like he was shot right here, just below the breast plate (pointing to his chest). I couldn't put my finger into it, but where it came back out here, I could put both fists in it."

Law: Okay.

David: That type of thing. And then again when I was in 'Nam, I saw a lot of gunshot wounds, and so on. There's absolutely no question in my mind that that was an entry wound up here (again pointing to the right side of his own forehead).

Law: So what did Bill Pitzer say? Did he tell you that he took this film?

David: No.

Law: He didn't tell you that?

David: I never asked him. He was head of the Audio-Visual Department. I just assumed he had done it, he had taken it.

Law: So that would have been part of his duties.

David: It could have been, yes.

Law: Did he tell you how this transpired?

David: He just said that he was editing and kind of, in a round about way, that it was to be used partly for the investigation into the death, for autopsy studies you know, as back up to the autopsy—whatever. Exactly what he said, I don't recall. It was just light conversation about it. Remarking upon the extent of the injuries—what size of a weapon would have made that kind of a hole—you know, whether it would have been a hollow point, or whether it would have been a solid jacketed bullet, or what. And neither he nor I were ammunitions experts, so a lot of it was just guesswork and supposition on our part.

Law: Do you remember a Y-incision?

David: I don't recall seeing a picture that Bill had that showed a Y-incision, no.

Law: How about on the film itself?

David: No.

Law: How was he editing this?

David: With a little monitor and a hand-crank. You could crank it and you could advance it. The faster you cranked it the faster it went, but you could crank it slow enough that you could do one frame at a time.

Law: Did you notice anybody—movement of people. Did you see anybody in the background that he filmed?

David: Yes, in some of the pictures, faintly in the background. Bear in mind you're looking at sixteen-millimeter film and the viewing screen has perhaps three by five or two and a half by three inches, something like that—about that size— and till you put it on a projector where you could blow it up on a large screen, you could see what looked like figures in the background—ah, not that I could identify any of them, no.

Law: Did he mention that anybody had tried to stop him from taking film? David: No, he did not say anything to me.

Law: He didn't say anything about "no camera." See, there's a story that, at some point, some film had been taken away from someone. Just out of the peripheral vision of these fellows.

David: I heard about that later, yes.

Law: But you didn't know that he was the one that—

David: No, I do not. And again—because of Bill's position—I logically assumed that he had taken the pictures. He may not have, but, at that time, I just assumed that he did. I never did say, "Yes he did," or "No he did not take them."²

Law: What happened to Bill Pitzer?

David: As I said, Bill was one of my mentors—and I took the program for MSC in '64 then—starting early '64—and missed it. They selected forty—I was forty-third on the list. In 1965 I applied for and took the program again. And there were sixty selected that year, and I was number two on the selection list. So then, in late August of '65, Congress passed the bill and the president signed the bill, and I became an officer and a gentleman (laughter). I used to laugh about that because I used to say, "Well, they made me an officer, but my mother made me a gentlemen." At least I tried to be, before that. I left Bethesda in the first week in December of '65 to go to Officer's School and Naval Justice School in Newport, Rhode Island. And shortly before I left, Bill indicated to me that he was getting ready to retire—probably in '66—and he would have had, I think, thirty years at that time. He had been through the second world war for one thing. So I left, and reported in at Newport, Rhode Island, in the early part of January.

I went through the three weeks at Officer's Training School and Naval Justice School, and was assigned to a naval hospital in Great Lakes—one of the jobs I had there was as an assistant to one of the department heads. I was in the lobby of the hospital at Great Lakes when Lieutenant Commander Barb Munroe came in and saw me and came over, and of course we renewed old friendships. And she said, "By the way, did you know Bill's dead?" And I said, "No, what happened?" Then she said, "Well, he shot himself." I said, "I don't believe that." And she said, "Well they found him with a gun in his right hand, and he blew his brains out." And I said, "But Bill's left-handed..." That's what I recall, because sometimes—back at Bethesda, Barb, Bill, and I would play bridge together—he sometimes would deal the cards in reverse, you know instead of dealing them clockwise he would deal them counter clockwise (with his left hand) and we'd kid him about it.

That was the first time I had heard he was dead. I asked, "Well, why did he commit suicide?" And she said "It's highly questionable that he did." I said, "Well, it stands to reason." And then she said something to me about, "Did you know that he'd had some pretty good job offers?" And I said I had, and that just before the last time I'd seen him, just before I'd left Bethesda, he'd told me that he had some very lucrative offers from a couple of the national networks like ABC, CBS, to go to work for them. I said, "I suspect it was probably because of some of the films and the material he had from the assassination." She said, "You know he had those?" And I said, "Yes, because I was over there a couple, three days after the autopsy and saw them." She kind of nodded her head as though she agreed with me, or something like that.

Law: Did she apparently know that he had the film?

David: I don't know whether she did. She seemed surprised when I told her that I knew about it though. Now whatever that was—the reaction—that was the first time she heard... we really didn't discuss it too much after that, because even in '67—excuse me, in '66 May or June³—you still didn't talk about what you knew, your experiences on the night of the assassination. It was still classified information.

[...]

Law: What happened to Bill Pitzer's film? What's the official line on Bill Pitzer?

David: The official line is that Bill Pitzer was never in the autopsy room and that the film never existed. No government agency has told me that, but researchers who I have told my story to later on got back with me and said that, when they asked officials about it, Pitzer was never even in the morgue, he never took the pictures, the films don't exist, they were never taken.

Law: So, in essence, what we're hearing from the government is this never happened to begin with.
David: Exactly right. Total denial.

Law: Would it surprise you to know that I did an interview some months ago back with Jerrol Custer, and he told me that he knew what Bill Pitzer looked like and Bill Pitzer was in the morgue and that he was taking film. (However, see footnote 6, page 116).

David: I think you can recall my reaction when you first called me and told me about that. I damn near cried. In fact I did cry. Because it was—really everything that I have ever told anyone about my experiences with the assassination committee and Bill Pitzer—everything had been corroborated except for that one little thing. And that completely corroborated everything that I had ever told anybody. I was not making things up out of my head. This is what happened. This is the way it went.

Law: This is the real reason you keep doing this isn't it?

David: Exactly right. I would like to see the man responsible—and I don't think Dan Marvin did it—I would like to see the man who killed Bill Pitzer brought to trial.

Law: So this is the real reason you keep going through this isn't it?

David: Yes, it is.

Law: It's really the reason you are talking about this, isn't it?

David: Yes, it is, very much so. Very much so. And, if he's ever identified and brought to trial, rest assured I'll be in the front row of that courtroom every *Goddamn* day!

In 2003, Dennis David appeared on [Black Op Radio, part 121](#):

James Fetzer: Did you see Pitzer then?

Dennis David: No. I did not see Bill Pitzer that night.

Fetzer: Do you know if Jim or Paul or- or Floyd or Jerrol saw Pitzer?

David: Riebe thought he remembered seeing Bill, and- but the others did not recall seeing for sure—excuse me, Custer said he thought he saw him there. The others didn't recall whether they saw him or not.

Fetzer: Now, for everyone who doesn't know what we're talking about, Bill Pitzer was Lieutenant Commander I believe at the time, who ostensibly took a motion picture of the autopsy as it was taking place. I don't believe it would've been with a handheld camera, though I could be mistaken. Are you aware of any device located in the morgue, David, that would've allowed a motion picture to be taken?

David: I- only in the last few years, there's been- both Dr. Humes and Captain Stover have indicated that there was a closed-circuit TV set up with the morgue.

Fetzer: Aha.

David: And- the- what Dr. Humes- I'm citing what one of the researchers quoted him as saying, and a friend of mine in California who has met and talked with John Stover, who now lives out in California, told me that he- that Captain Stover recalled there being a closed-circuit TV. I do know Bill Pitzer was head of the audio visual department, was my mentor or one of my mentors, and had a lot to do with my becoming a commissioned officer in the Navy.

Fetzer: You never personally viewed any- any video or a motion picture of the autopsy, however?

David: I saw the sixteen millimeter film in Bill Pitzer's office on the Monday following the autopsy.

Fetzer: You saw the physical film? Did you watch it? Did you see-

David: We looked- Bill and I- I stopped by on that following Monday to talk to Bill about the professional exams and everything coming up for MSC selection in January of '64, and I just, you know, rapped on the door and walked in, as he had told me I could do, and when I walked in, he said 'Dave, come here, I want to show you something'. And I walked over, he had a sixteen millimeter film and a desktop, one of those small desktop editor-types. Also laying on his desk were some black and white and color photos of the body of the late President. And together, we hand-wound- the little crank- hand-wound the projector. We looked at probably three-four feet of the film, and it- it appeared that from the pictures, that there was no- the autopsy proceedings hadn't yet begun because there was no evidence of any, you know, incisions being made, no y-incision in the torso.

Fetzer: Right.

David: And mostly what I saw was if you were looking down at the body, not- mostly as if I were on the right side looking down. And then during the proceeding, the head was turned and the back of the head was visible for a while, and we remarked on the- what appeared to be a bullet entry wound in the right temple just above the right eye near the hairline. We kind of wondered about the rather large gash in the throat. And it was both Bill and I's assumption at the time that the killing shot was a frontal entry wound.

Fetzer: Yes, very good. And so the throat already had this kind of melon-slice aspect to it, I mean kind of a grossly large? I mean, certainly didn't look like any ordinary endotracheal incision?

David: No it didn't look like a tracheal incision because it was- Number one, it was too wide, and if, you know, and if it was- if that's what it was intended for, it was a damn sloppy job.

Fetzer: Yes.

David: I've done tracheotomies, Jim, in my time.

Fetzer: Yes.

David: And all- all you need is about three-quarters- up to a maximum of an inch of an incision at most, and it goes transverse, it doesn't go- it doesn't go across the body, it goes up and down.

Fetzer: Aha. Very interesting, because Malcolm Perry who performed the tracheostomy incision at Parkland was a very skilled surgeon, and in fact Charles Crenshaw provided me with diagrams of what it looked like, and his incision was a straight-across incision, but it went through the- a small round entry wound to the throat, which of course he described subsequently as having been present before he made the incision. But it was- it looked grossly different, you can find the diagrams that Crenshaw, for the audience, that Crenshaw drew for me in *Assassination Science*, I published them as appendices.

David: Yeah, I've seen those.

(Audio, part 121b, 11:52)

[...]

Len Osanic: Now, have a couple of questions then. One of them is to with with, now you called him your mentor?

David: Yes.

Osanic: And-

David: Pitzer.

Osanic: Yeah, do you want to go into the relevance of Pitzer's film here?

Fetzer: Yeah, that's good, that's very good, Len, I wanted to back to that too.

Osanic: Right, and the question actually, a question just came to my email is that 'are you sure that that was JFK on the film?'

David: Absolutely positive.

Osanic: Yeah.

Fetzer: Yeah, yeah, Dennis, describe the- the appearance of the face, for example. Was the face generally intact? I mean, you know-

David: Yes.

Fetzer: You know, it looked normal except that there was this- this hole in the right temple, is that correct?

David: Exactly.

Fetzer: And you said you saw it from the side, did you see any evidence of the massive blowout to the back of the head?

David: The only that- that we saw was in the parietal area. There was what appeared to be an exit wound, oh, maybe two and a half by three and a half inches. Not- not rectangular by any means, but not circular either. It was a shattered mass.

Feter: In the back of the head?

David: In the back of the head, yes.

Fetzer: Occipital-parietal region?

David: Yes.

Fetzer: Slightly to the right, say, of the back of the head?

David: Oh yeah. Slightly to the right. Yeah.

Fetzer: Yeah. And- And pretty big, about the size of your fist when you double it up?

David: Yeah. Just about- the size of my fist would be about right.

Fetzer: That was exactly how Crenshaw described it.

David: Um-hum. And, you know, that's why, you know- Now, I've seen and treated bullet wounds before, and did so many times afterwards. When I was, you know, in- both in Vietnam and other areas, and Bill Pitzer had been through World War 2, he was familiar with gunshot wounds. Nether Bill or I were forensic pathologists by any means, but I can assure you it's easy to recognize entry wounds from exit wounds.

Fetzer: Yes.

David: From high-powered rifles or pistols.

Fetzer: Yes. Yes.

Osanic: And I guess the relevance here is that, of course, the thought is that Bill Pitzer had made copies of this film and was going to release it somehow. And he- he-

Fetzer: You mean when he was killed?

Osanic: Yeah, just for the sake of our audience, right, let me mention that shortly before he was to retire from the Navy, that Pitzer was found dead. Dennis can comment on this, but his left hand was mangled, he allegedly had committed suicide, which is very peculiar because in fact Pitzer was left-handed. My suspicion is that his left hand was mangled in order to extract information from him as a form of torture to ascertain whether there were any other copies of the film that he had taken of the autopsy, and here I invite Dennis to add to this.

David: The last time I talked with Bill Pitzer was the week of December 1965. I didn't make- I didn't get commission in '64, but thanks to Bill Pitzer and Larry Webb and John Connally, all three MSC officers who mentored me, I was selected in 1965 and received my commission in December, the first week of December of '65, and Bill was there when I was sworn in, you know, proud as a peacock with that gold band around my arm, and Bill talked to me and he said 'Well', he said, 'This is probably our last time we'll pull duty together', he said 'I'm gonna be retiring next year and I've had some fairly lucrative offers from some major media sources'. And the next thing that I heard about Bill was that he had committed suicide in October of '66. And- now, by the way, Jim, I've always thought that Bill was left-handed because he and I used to play Bridge almost every day at noon, not- not every day but almost. And he always dealt cards left-handed.

Fetzer: Yeah.

David: And sometimes he would reverse it, so I was always under the impression he was left-handed.

Fetzer: Yes.

David: But Joyce, his wife, says that no, that he was right-handed, and other people that knew him seem to think that he was right-handed too, so I don't know, I may have been mistaken that, you know, in my assumption that he was left-handed, but you know, based on my experience on him.

Fetzer: Of course, his left hand being mangled is all by itself inconsistent with the idea of suicide, why would anyone who's going to commit suicide put themselves through the torment of mangling their left hand?

David: Well I remember- Yeah, I know, and Joyce told me the last time that I talked to her that- that they told her that they couldn't get his wedding ring off his finger-

Fetzer: That's right.

David: -because it was mangled so badly.

Fetzer: It was- it was- yeah, crunched into the-

David: -Or something to that effect.

Feter: Yeah. Yeah.

David: And she- she told me also, she said 'Well I knew Bill had had some- something dealing with the assassination, but he never told me what it was'.

[...]

Fetzer: Listen, let me mention, I have this- I have a description from the- from based upon an interview with the- one of the embalmers of JFK. And this is a- I'd like to read this to you, Dennis, just to see if it strikes any bells, you know, I'm just gonna read parts of this.

David: Okay.

Fetzer: The description of the wounds that were given to Joe West, who was an investigator who had this interview with the fellow Thomas Evan Robinson on May 26, 1992. Here's the description that West wrote based on upon his interview by telephone with Robinson: 'Wounds – large gaping hole in back of head, patched by placing piece of rubber over it. Thinks skull was full of plaster of paris. Smaller wound in right temple. Crescent shaped, flapped down, 3 inches'. Now, that allusion I believe was to a chunk of skull on the right side of the skull in the vicinity of the ear that is seen in some of the autopsy photographs and drawings, that was kind of like a flap, was kinda loose flap, but you may or may not have noticed anything like that.

David: I never saw that flap on any of the pictures I've ever seen until I- I've seen it since-

Fetzer: Yeah.

David: But not what Bill Pitzer had in his possession.

Fetzer: Yeah.

David: I did not see anything like that.

Fetzer: Well that's valuable. That's valuable too because if they had been an add-on to create the impression of a bullet having been fired from behind when in fact it was fired from in front.

[...]

David: [...] I know that some of the x-rays and some of the pictures that we viewed that- at Pittsburgh that- in '92, Custer said were retouched, and some of the pictures Riebe said had been retouched.

Fetzer: Oh yeah. Well, yeah. Actually, yeah. You mean the- the autopsy photographs do not appear to be consistent with the observations that you made at the time, that they appear not to be authentic autopsy photographs, they have at the least been retouched, possibly reshot, somehow fabricated or reconstituted.

David: Exactly.

Fetzer: Let me read a couple more items here from this interview. 'Small shrapnel wounds in face, approximately 2, packed with wax'. You wouldn't be familiar with anything like that?

David: I never saw those.

Fetzer: Yeah. These are interesting, I'll come back to them later because the- the bullet that actually hit Jack in the throat passed through the windshield and the small- David Mantik believes that these small shrapnel wounds were caused by splinters of glass from that bullet going through the windshield. 'Wound in back, 5 to 6 inches below shoulder to the right of the backbone'.

David: Right.

Fetzer: 'Adrenal gland and brain removed. Other organs removed and then put back. No swelling or discoloration to face meaning he died instantly'. You can probably confirm the later that from the photographs you saw in Pitzer's office that there was no discoloration, he looked pretty much like himself in those images?

David: Oh yes. I mean, it was- it was recognizable. Some researcher in- when I was at the JFK Lancer meeting in nineteen- 1998, said he thought that the body we treated- the body in the pictures I saw were those of Officer Tippit, and I said 'No way'.

Feter: Yeah.

David: Absolutely no question in my mind that what I saw was the body of the President.

Fetzer: Have you seen this one photograph sort of taken from the right side, it's a funny view, his eyes are open and he's looking upward.

David: Death stare?

Fetzer: Yeah, so-called stare-of-death photograph as Livingstone called it, have you seen that?

David: Yes.

Fetzer: Did that correspond to the images you saw with Pitzer or did they look somewhat different?

David: The- It looked very similar except for the flap on the side of the head, that- the picture I saw on the film, on the sixteen millimeter film a couple of pictures that Bill had showed that, the stare-of-death if you will-

Fetzer: Yeah.

David: But the- that flap over the right ear in the- in the- almost into the temporal area, I never saw that.

Fetzer: Uh-huh.

David: Never saw that.

Fetzer: I'm looking at it right now. What they have there is it almost looks like pieces of black duck tape, you know, on the body in that stare-of-death, and of course the skull is all gunked up, this is massively gunkey. You know, one of the interesting features of the autopsy photographs, Dennis, is some of them show all this massive gunkey stuff, such as you find in Livingstone's High Treason, there's quite a bit of that. And others show a kind of neatly-trimmed and kind of clean head with only a small hole toward the top in the vicinity of the cowlick, have you seen those inconsistent photographs?

David: No, I haven't. I've seen pictures of them in some of the publications, yes, Jim, but only from that standpoint.

Fetzer: How would you have described the- the head or skull of the President at the time as you were observing it in the photographs that Pitzer had?

David: It appeared to be, you know, from the pictures I saw, the head appeared to be fairly intact.

Fetzer: Yes.

David: The- there was, as I said, a small hole near the hairline- if you would go from the right corner of the right eye and go straight up right to the hairline, there was a small- what appeared to be a small entry wound there, about- well, about the size of the end of my finger, which-

Fetzer: Right.

David: -would be three-eighths of an inch in diameter, a little more maybe, and then the pictures didn't show any of the men that were in the autopsy room, just arms that were moving the body around.

Fetzer: Aha.

David: And the head was turned one, and the back of the head, and- you know, it seemed to be a clear through-and-through entry wound with the entrance in the forehead, in the temple area, and the exit wound in the occipital-parietal area to the rear.

Fetzer: You could see the definition of this blow-out to the back of the head fairly clearly, distinctly enough to see that it was not perfectly symmetrical and that it rather resembled a fist doubled up?

David: Yes.

Fetzer: And therefore, it wasn't concealed or covered by a lot of gunk or matted hair or massey stuff back there that looked weird?

David: No.

Fetzer: Yeah.

David: I know I've seen pictures since, you know, hair hanging down and it looks like all kinds of stuff hanging out of it, I never saw that.

Fetzer: Right, so those were inconsistent with your observations?

David: Yes.

Fetzer: So those photographs would be, in your judgment, of someone else or else doctored or fabricated photographs.

David: I- I don't know where they would've come from.

Fetzer: Yeah, but I mean they're not consistent with your observations?

David: They're not consistent with what I recall.

Osanic: Right, but you also mentioned that what you saw was before the autopsy?

David: It- from the films, it appeared to be that- Now, again, I did- we didn't- I did not look at the whole reel of tape with Bill, just about the first three or four feet of it, and it appeared- it was- he was obviously on, well, what would be an autopsy table, and that it was obviously, it appeared to be the examination, if you will, that normally is done before the actual autopsy begins. Because the first step in an autopsy proceeding is to physically eyeball and examine the body from head to toe, write down any identifying marks or abnormalities, scars, etcetera, etcetera, moles, whatever, which are supposed to be put on the autopsy report. I've helped do autopsies in my time.

Fetzer: So this was actually the perfect time, Len, for Dennis to be observing. You know, I mean, if he had access through the- through the photographs that Pitzer had taken, I mean it was the ideal time to be observing the body in the- in it's more-or-less pristine state for the- for the deceased in order to observe, you know, the wounds before in fact the autopsy incisions and other- and other forms of change of the body had taken place. You didn't observe anything that looked to you remotely like surgery of the head, did you Dennis?

David: No. No I did not. Not at that time, no.

[...]

Fetzer: Do you- do you recall, Dennis, specifically thinking back about the body, whether the eyes were open or closed?

David: Open.

Fetzer: That's very interesting, 'cause- 'cause Crenshaw remembered having closed his eyes himself, that he closed Jack's eyes before he was-

David: That's- that's why I said that the- one of the pictures I remembered was that- there was the picture of the death stare that is present in these books-

Fetzer: Yeah.

David: Was- was very- was very similar to what I saw-

Fetzer: Yeah.

David: Except for that-

Fetzer: Massive gunkey black-

David: Black- Yeah, the gunkey black flapping mass.

Fetzer: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

David: But- but the eyes were open when I saw them.

Fetzer: But the- the surface of the face looked pretty much similar?

David: Yes.

Fetzer: Yeah. Very interesting.

David: Yeah.

Fetzer: Very interesting.

[...]

David: Well I never believed- When the Warren Commission report came out, I was appalled at what their conclusions- because their conclusion that it was done by- was a rear entry wound that was shot from the rear just didn't jive with what I remembered. I've-

Osanic: And it must have been a lot of people that didn't-

David: Exactly. And, you know, I- as I said, I never- I kept quiet until '79 when I agreed- when I agreed to let David use my name. The first time I ever said anything to anybody was to a reporter to Waukegan in '74, which is how David happened to get through to me eventually. And, you know, and from- from 1980 to the present day, I give anywhere from 8 to 12, 15 talks a year to schools, fraternal social groups, women's clubs, men's clubs, etcetera. And, you know, there's certain questions that always come up, they want to know who I thought did it, or they want to know why didn't I go public in 1963, '64, my standard response to that was I was 26 years old, had 2 kids and wanted to grow up- I wanted to be around to see my kids grow up.

Fetzer: Yes. Yeah.

Osanic: So if- and if I can read into that, then you did- you were worried at some point- for one man to go against the official word?

David: Len, there were too many people associated with the assassination who departed this life under unusual or strange circumstances, and I had no desire to be one of them.

Osanic: So, from the minute you heard that- that William Pitzer had committed suicide, you were leery of that?

David: Yes. Very much so. I didn't believe he committed suicide from day one. In fact, Len, in 1980- in 1979, when David called me, my wife was sitting here in tears shaking her head, she did not want me to go public even in 1979. You know.

Fetzer: Out of fear.

David: Yeah, exactly. She's resolved to it now, but she- even then she didn't want me to, even then she wanted me to keep my mouth shut. [...]

(Audio, part 121c, 1:33)

On 6/30/2006, Dennis David was interviewed by researcher James Douglass. As summarized in Douglass's 2008 book *JFK and the Unspeakable*: "*As Pitzer hand-cranked a sixteen-millimeter, black-and-white film through the machine, David watched the short movie on a small screen. What he saw was the body of President Kennedy viewed from the waist up, being touched by the hands of unseen individuals. He saw the hands roll the body onto its side and back*" ([Link](#) [[link 2](#)]).

Dennis David made an [account](#) on educationforum.ipbhost.com. On 7/24/2006, he posted in the *JFK Assassination Debate* section:

(3) It was on the Monday, after the post-mortem. I had stopped in to see Bill, about another matter, when I walked into his office, he had a hand-operated film editor on his desk. He also had some B&W and Color photos of the autopsy on his desk. There was a 16mm film in the editor. We looked at perhaps the first three feet of the film. I don't remember our exact conversation, but I do remember we both felt that there was a frontal entry wound in the right forehead near the hairline.

([Educationforum.ipbhost.com, comment 70044](#))

In the film and the pictures I saw only the body was shown. It did show hands that moved the body but no picture showed faces, etc. Some of the surroundings were visible but quite honestly we paid little attention to that. The body and the wounds it had sustained were our focus. Bill only commented as to the location/magnitude of the wounds, that the temple wound appeared to be an entrance wound. I did wonder at the tracheotomy incision, considering the size and location of the exit wound in the parietal/occipital area. It seemed to me that the tracheotomy was an exercise in futility. Bill's demeanor, hard to say, I know we both got teary eyed. Magnitude of what we saw???? We saw what we felt was a frontal entry wound in the right forehead with a large exit wound in the rear of the skull of a President we both admired and liked. How Bill felt when the Warren Report came out, I do not know. I felt disgusted and very, very angry but I was also afraid to say anything, and didn't until my talk with the Waukegan Sun reporter. Even then I would not allow my name to be made public.

(Educationforum.ipbhost.com, comment 70802)

From [Allan Eaglesham's 2007 essay *The Putative Pitzer Movie: A Discussion*](#):

In the same way that no eyewitness (other than Mr. Custer) saw a movie camera, neither was a television camera reported; was a non-obvious CCTV system permanently installed in the autopsy room with lens-access in the ceiling and/or wall(s)? It is noteworthy that one of William Pitzer's areas of professional specialization was the use of CCTV for instructional purposes. In an October 1998 telephone conversation, CDR Humes told me that he had worked closely with Bill Pitzer on films on tropical medicine for use in Vietnam. These films were made on video and transferred to film; Pitzer was in charge of the television part. Therefore, it seemed possible -- if not plausible -- that Pitzer recorded the Kennedy autopsy on videotape via a CCTV system, unbeknownst to those present in the autopsy room, from which he generated the movie film seen by Dennis David. However, if a CCTV system was permanently installed in the autopsy room, few knew of it. Harold Rydberg -- director of the Medical Illustration School and of the Department of Medical Illustration at the Naval Medical School -- who had been in the autopsy room on many occasions, assured me in the strongest possible terms that it was not permanently equipped with CCTV.

New Witnesses

A memorandum, dated 5 November 1963, recently discovered among William Pitzer's papers (provided by a family member) expresses appreciation for "television coverage" provided by "Lieutenant W.B. Pitzer" and four gentlemen "who performed under his direction" (Figure 1). (Two of these gentlemen are deceased and the others do not wish their names to be quoted in this article.)

Figure 1. A November 1963 memorandum detailing the CCTV personnel under William Pitzer's direction (names deleted from item 2): <http://www.manuscriptservice.com/WBPMovie/memo.jpg>

Neither Mr. "A" nor Mr. "B" has any knowledge of a role played by William Pitzer in the autopsy on President Kennedy's body. And neither has any knowledge of a CCTV system permanently installed in the autopsy room at the BNH in 1963.

Most of the CCTV feeds at the National Naval Medical Center went out from the television studio in Building 144 (where LCDR Pitzer's body was found, October 29, 1966); but feeds were generated at other locations within the hospital. Mr. A has no recollection of feeds from the autopsy room. Mr. B recalls CCTV generation from the autopsy room on a regular basis, not of autopsies however; the autopsy room was used for routine teaching purposes. This is consistent with CDR Humes' statement to the ARRB [10]:

[The autopsy room] would accommodate maybe 20 or 30 people, because we used to have conferences in there. Routinely, at the end of each week, we would retain the organs from the autopsies of that week. In fact, not only did we review them there, there was a closed-circuit television. They went to Andrews Air Force Base, NIH, and it was a closed-circuit instruction program.

Mr. B told me that for the CCTV feeds from the autopsy room to elsewhere in the hospital and beyond, "we wheeled in a television camera."

We Wheeled in a Television Camera

Often, it is impossible to prove a negative. But, this may be as close as one can come to proving that the BNH autopsy room was not permanently equipped with a CCTV system. If it had been

permanently equipped, then it is unlikely that the CCTV team would have gone to the considerable trouble involved in transporting a bulky camera from Building 144 to that location.

It is a tautology that if no television or movie camera was present, then the movie film of President Kennedy's body -- reported by Dennis David -- was not generated in the BNH morgue during the Humes/Boswell/Finck autopsy.

Walter Reed?

Messrs. A and B confirmed CDR Humes' statement (see above) that there was a CCTV link with the National Institutes of Health (NIH) directly across Wisconsin Avenue from BNH. They are unaware of a similar link with Andrews Air Force Base, but both stated that there was a microwave link with Walter Reed Army Hospital and that CCTV feeds passed between the two military medical institutions in both directions.

[...]

A few years ago, I asked Dennis David to show on a blank face sketch what he recalled of President Kennedy's wounds as seen in the 16-mm movie film in William Pitzer's possession (Figure 2). His depiction of the wound at the rear of the head is similar to the descriptions of the Parkland doctors in Dallas and dissimilar from what is seen in the extant autopsy photographs.

Figure 2. Dennis David's depiction of President Kennedy's head wounds:
<http://www.manuscriptservice.com/WBPmovie/ddd.jpg>

In a recent telephone conversation with Mr. David, I asked: "Is there any doubt at all in your mind that the body in that movie was John Kennedy's?" He responded: "Absolutely none."

[...]

A Question of Color

Shortly after this article was published here, I received a message by email:

Interesting article. Did any of those who supposedly saw the "movie" or who worked with those cameras ever say whether the images were in color or b&w?

I responded:

Only Dennis David has said that he saw the movie in Pitzer's possession, and if my memory is good, he said he saw color slides too. Come to think of it, the assumption at that time was that those slides were produced from the movie. If the movie was generated from TV, it would have been in B/W. Am I following your thinking?

He responded:

Yes, you certainly are...I worked for [a TV station] that went color in 1954. They could only do color in the studio and the cameras were huge and weighed hundreds of pounds. In 1963, color cameras were extremely expensive, trouble-prone, and difficult to use unless there was a huge amount of light on the subject. All of that argues emphatically against the possibility of color at [Bethesda Naval Hospital]. For one thing, they could not be hidden from view -- everyone in the room would have seen it. And the camera had to be fairly close to the subject, otherwise there

wouldn't be enough available light to get a viewable image. And since close-ups would have been mandatory for autopsies (otherwise why record them?), long lenses would not have been practical. So, if anyone claims that the Pitzer images were color, they cannot be telling the truth.

I responded:

The crux of the article is that no TV camera was present at the Humes/Boswell/Finck autopsy. If a TV camera had been there, everyone would have known it. Furthermore, the fact that the CCTV crew wheeled a camera into the autopsy room for broadcast from there is as good a demo as any that no TV camera was fixed to the wall or invisibly installed in the ceiling, which -- until now -- has been my theory (despite remonstrations to the contrary from Harold Rydberg). William Pitzer could have been in possession of 35 mm color slides as well as a B/W movie. However, if my two contacts say that the TV camera(s) they worked with generated B/W images and Dennis David maintains that the movie film he saw was in color, then a significant disconnect exists. Either way, it's an aspect that needs to be covered.

I emailed Dennis David, and he responded:

I recall that the film was in color.

And I emailed Messrs. "A" and "B":

Did the CCTV system that you worked with generate black and white or color images?

Mr. "A" responded:

The CCTV system was equipped with both monochrome and color cameras. Color was limited to a surgical camera, mounted on a pedestal that permitted the camera to overhang the operating table, and a color film camera for slides and films. The bulk of the work was monochrome using Dumont cameras.

Before Mr. "B" responded, I emailed the next logical question:

Were CCTV feeds from Walter Reed in color (as well as monochrome)?

To which he replied:

We did have both color and monochrome television equipment, either of which could have been transmitted to Walter Reed. I don't remember if we received color television feeds, or just monochrome, from Walter Reed.

I asked:

Is it at least theoretically possible that Bill Pitzer had a color movie in his possession -- within a few days of the assassination -- that was generated as a result of a CCTV feed from Walter Reed?

Mr. "B" responded:

I would agree that it would be highly likely that both color and monochrome signals could be transmitted between NNMC and Walter Reed.

-

Mr. "B" also told me that he worked for DAGE Television as a field engineer stationed at a major hospital in Chicago, prior to moving to the NNMC in 1958. In Chicago they had a color television camera installed over one of the operating tables. Information on DAGE hardware available in the 1950s is available [here](#), showing the brand/type of equipment they had at the NNMC. The Chicago and NNMC cameras were similar in operation to the film chain shown in the brochure. The major difference was that the NNMC "surgical" camera was movable.

In 2014, Dennis David spoke to Rob Clark on The Lone Gunman podcast, episode 30:

Dennis David: [...] I also learned, in my opinion and satisfaction, that the period between 7:35 and a few minutes before 8 o'clock, or until that body was put back in the bronze casket some time after- after 7 o' clock, that that period of time I believe was utilized to alter the wounds of the President in order to make it appear as though all- all the killing shots came from the rear.

Rob Clark: I agree. Most definitely.

David: Yeah.

Clark: Yeah.

David: Because on Monday, after the autopsy, I saw a sixteen millimeter film which the federal government denies ever existed. I also saw about six black-and-whites, I saw six photo- color photos of the body of the President, and I know that those photos did not match the photos later that were supposedly taken at the autopsy proceedings, after the official autopsy began at oh-eight-hundred- or at twenty-two-hundred. 8 o' clock. So, that alteration had to be done some time between roughly 7 o'clock and, say 7:30.

Clark: Right.

David: Which'd been ample time to have done that. Because the photos that were officially released after the- of the official autopsy began at 8 o'clock- showed massive injuries to the head. I only saw- the photos I saw showed a bullet wound at the hairline directly above the corner, right corner of the right eye, and about a three- about four-inch circular kind of wound, which was obviously to me an exit wound, roughly about the size of a small orange or a very large peach. And that's all. That's the photos I saw on Monday that had been- that I believe were taken some time between 7 o'clock and say 7:30 or whatever. After- after- afterwards, when the Warren Commission report came out, other publications came, and I saw the photos where they had this huge massive injury that involved the temporal bone, as well as the parietal and the occipital bones. That was- I think that's where the alteration occurred.

Clark: So what you saw basically matched what the Parkland doctors reported seeing?

David: What I saw the first time.

Clark: The pre-autopsy photos?

David: The pre- yeah.

Clark: The pre-pre-autopsy photos.

David: The pre-pre-aut- yeah. What I saw then was that, as I said, about- exit wound about the size of an orange that involved only the occipital- the occipital and a portion of the cranial floor.

Clark: Behind- behind the ear then?

David: Back here, yeah. But the temporal bone, which was on the side of the head, was not involved. This was located about- the exit wound I saw was low enough to have exposed the cerebrum- cerebellum- cerebral part of the brain. Not- not large- top of the head, sorry. The cerebral is what they called it. So you know, I didn't really put all this together until after '65 when the Warren Commission report came out. When I looked at that, and-

Clark: You knew something was-

David: I knew something was not right.

Clark: Yeah.

([Audio, 18:05](#) [[link 2](#)] [[link 3](#)])

In November of 2016, Dennis David spoke at the JFK Assassination Conference held in Dallas:

On the following Monday, I went to- I was a First Class enlisted man. I was taking- I had enrolled in a program to gain commission. There was a man named William Pitzer who was the Lieutenant Medical Service Corps, who kindly sent it to be one of my mentors to help me out. So I had gone over on Monday after the autopsy to talk to Bill about the tests coming up in January, seeking his advice. And when I walked in the door, he said 'Denny, come here, you gotta see this'. On his desk he had a film editor, and on the editor was a sixteen millimeter film, and he had been looking at it. He also had black and white photo- color photos on his desk, all of them were of the autopsy. None of you have ever seen those pictures to this date, or even about the film, because the government said they don't exist. The hell they don't, I saw the damn things!

Of those films that were quite clear, Bill and I observed an entry wound approximately here [points to right forehead], an entry wound here [points to front of neck], and during that film, Pitz showed, the body was rolled up on it's side and we observed an entry wound about six inches down from the neck and about an inch and a half to the right of the spinal column. We also observed an exit wound which involved- it was approximately this size [makes circle shape with hands], involving the parietal and occipital bones back here and did not involve the bones in this area [gestures to right front of the head] which the pictures you've seen show a piece flapped from the temporal. Years later, at the request of a researcher, I drew on a skeletal diagram of the wounds that I saw. I had never seen what Parkland doctors had said, but this investigator took my drawings, compared them to what was seen at Parkland, and they matched almost exactly. They were not the films and the pictures that David Lifton had in his book, because he- the ones he got had come from what they released- what the Warren Commission eventually would release. [...]

([Video, 7:39](#))

[...]

The next Monday, I walked in with- when I saw Bill Pitzer and he was looking at this film and everything- things begin to gel, begin to question everything I've seen happen that time. So I went on, and finally in '65, I did get commission and was issued a medical service card. I was sworn in first week of December, 1965. Bill was there, 'come over, give me a big hug', and said 'well, shipmate, probably won't see you- serve with you anymore, 'cause I'm gonna retire next year', and he said 'I've had some lucrative offers from major media'. So I went on my way, I went to Portland,

West Virginia, went to knife-and-fork school, or what they call 'knife-and-fork school', and Naval justice school, and from there went to Great Lakes naval hospital for duty, and in April of '66, Barb Munroe, who had been both Bill's friend and my friend at Bethesda came in for duty. She'd been transferred and she says 'hey, did you hear about Bill?', I said 'no, I hadn't heard anything', and she said that he'd been killed. And I said 'what?', she said 'yeah, they're saying he committed suicide', and I said 'that doesn't sound right', and she said 'well, there was some question about it because his hand had been mutilated and it looked as he'd been- as if he's been tortured. And I said 'I wonder if that's because of the materials he had', and she said 'did you know about those?', and I said 'Yes, I saw 'em'. And so, we talked about it for a while. [...]

([Video, 14:22](#))

Joe O'Donnell

Joe O'Donnell was a photographer who claimed to remember coming across a picture of Kennedy's body with a small wound in the right front of the head.

From a report on a 1/29/1997 interview of O'Donnell by the Assassination Records Review Board:

The Joe O'Donnell lead was passed to ARRB staff by Randy Robertson, Kathleen Cunningham, and Gary Aguilar. We were informed that Mr. O'Donnell was a government photographer who had known Robert L. Knudsen (White House photographer) in 1963, and who had been shown JFK autopsy photographs by Robert Knudsen shortly after the assassination.

[...]

Summary of the Call:

Jeremy Gunn and Doug Home called Joe O'Donnell this date, following up on the most recent Joe O'Donnell lead from Dr. Gary Aguilar. He confirmed that he did know Robert Knudsen in 1963, and that he was shown autopsy photographs of President Kennedy by Robert Knudsen.

The following is a summary of information provided by Mr. O'Donnell in response to questions asked by Mr. Gunn:

-Mr. O'Donnell was a government photographer, employed by USIA in 1963, who was frequently detailed to the White House to perform various photographic tasks during the Kennedy administration.

-He knew Mr. Robert L. Knudsen quite well, and had a close professional association with him circa 1963. He said that he always called Knudsen "Knute," but had never met his family.

-Within the week after President Kennedy's assassination, on two occasions Robert Knudsen showed him autopsy photographs of President Kennedy.

-On the first occasion, he was shown approximately 12 ea 5" X 7" B & W photos. The views included the President lying on his back, on his stomach, and closeups of the back of the head. He said that the back-of-the-head photograph(s) showed a hole in the back of the head, about 2" above the hairline, about the size of a grapefruit; the hole clearly penetrated the skull and was very deep. Another one of the photographs showed a hole in the forehead above the right eye which was a round wound about 3/8" in diameter which he interpreted as a gunshot wound.

-The second occasion occurred a few days later, when Knudsen showed him a second set of photographs, once again about 12 ea 5' X 7" B & W prints. On this second occasion, the back-of-the-head photograph(s) was intact, and showed no hole in the back of the head. Instead of a hole, he remembers seeing neatly combed hair which looked slightly_wet, or damp in appearance. Another photograph he remembers showed President Kennedy lying on his back, with an aluminum probe emerging from his stomach or right side (details were vague).

-He said it was his impression that Knudsen had taken the photographs himself, but that he had never specifically asked him that question. He said he never discussed with Knudsen the apparent discrepancy between the two back-of-the-head photos.

-He said Jacqueline Kennedy told him, in response to his questions about her apparent attempt to 'escape" from the limousine in Dallas during the assassination, that she was not trying to escape, but rather was trying to retrieve a part of President Kennedy's head from the back of the limousine (i.e., the trunk lid).

Jeremy Gunn told Mr. O'Donnell at the conclusion of this first interview that ARRB would be contacting him soon to engage in further discussions on this matter, and Mr. O'Donnell said that was agreeable with him. END

From a report on a follow-up call with O'Donnell on 2/28/1997:

He confirmed that "Knut" Knudsen showed him post mortem photographs of the President on two separate occasions, sometime within a month after the assassination. Each time, he said Mr. Knudsen produced the photographs from, and returned them to, a manila envelope, and that he had no idea where Knudsen subsequently placed them. A summary of his recollections regarding the two separate events (at which he was shown post mortem photographs of President Kennedy by Knudsen) is provided below:

-First Viewing: He said Knudsen showed him about 12 each B & W glossy prints, about 5" X 7" in size, which were post mortem images of the President. He said the images were quite clear and that he assumed they were first generation prints. He said some images were close-ups of the head, some were close-ups of the shoulders, and that some were views of the entire body. He said that in some images the President was lying on his back, and in some images he was lying on his stomach. He said he remembers a photograph of a gaping wound in the back of the head which was big enough to put a fist through, in which the image clearly showed a total absence of hair and bone, and a cavity which was the result of a lot of interior matter missing from inside the cranium. He said that another image showed a small round hole above the President's right eye, which he interpreted as an entry wound made by the same bullet which exited from the large wound in the back of the head.

-Second Viewing: At a subsequent private viewing, he said Knudsen showed him approximately 6 to 8 (and no more than 10) additional glossy B & W prints of post mortem photographs of President Kennedy, in which the small round hole above the right eye was no longer visible, and in which the back of the head now looked completely intact. He said that the appearance of the hair in the 'intact back of the head" photograph(s) was wet, clean, and freshly combed. His interpretation of the differences in the photographs of the President's head was to attribute the differences to the restorative work of the embalmers.

Mr. O'Donnell was asked whether he ever discussed the photographs with Mr. Knudsen, either during the viewings, or afterwards, and he said no--he felt privileged just to be able to see them, but that they were so disturbing that he didn't want to see them or think about them anymore.

[...]

Mr. O'Donnell's memory was uneven. He sometimes had trouble remembering the names of Presidents. He also gave a different timing on his viewing of the two different showings of post-mortem photographs (i.e., both events within a month or so of the assassination) from his first interview (in which he said both viewings occurred within a week or so of the assassination). On the other hand, he appeared to remember with apparent precision some events from the 1940s through the 1960s. END

([ARRB MD 231](#))

There was a White House photographer named Robert Knudsen. The record shows that Robert Knudsen was present at the Naval Photographic Center in Washington, D.C. while the photographic film from the autopsy was being processed ([ARRB MD 121](#); [ARRB MD 124](#); [HSCA Vol. 7, p. 23 \[text\]](#)). In his 8/11/1978 interview with the House Select Committee on Assassinations, Knudsen said he remembered a time where he saw at least one photo negative showing surgical probes in Kennedy's body ([ARRB MD 135 \[text\] \[audio, partial\]](#)). Knudsen passed away on 1/27/1989. Some of Robert's family members recalled him telling the story of probes through the body ([ARRB MD 230](#); [\[Audio\]](#)). None of these recorded statements make note of a small wound in the front of the head.

From O'Donnell's appearance on *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, Episode 7: *The Smoking Guns*, 2003:

A few days after the assassination, I was at the White House in the press room, and Knudsen came to me, and he said 'Joe, I have something I want to show you'. So, I went back to his- sort of a work room- and he pulled out an envelope and showed me about twelve pictures, five by seven, and had all these pictures of the President on his stomach and on his back, and you could see the hole here [points to right forehead], about three-eighths of an inch, and the back of his head above the [gestures to shirt collar]- the line- big hole [makes circle shape with hands] about the size of a grapefruit. And then a couple days later, maybe a day later, he said 'Joe, you have a minute?' and I said 'Sure', he said 'I want to show you something, those pictures I showed you the other day, these are the same ones but a little different', and I said 'What do you mean?', he said 'Let me show you'. He got the first one out, and I said 'No hole' [points to right forehead], he said 'No, they covered it up', and I looked in the back, the hole was neatly covered up, and I said 'Who did that?', he said 'Well, I didn't do it'. I said 'Well, I'm not saying you did, but I'm surprised'.

([Video, 21:14](#))

Joe O'Donnell may have some credibility problems. After he passed away on 8/9/2007, it came to light that O'Donnell tried to take credit for some well-known photographs that he did not take ([Digital Journalist, Aug. 2007, *The Bizarre Story of Joe O'Donnell* by Marianne Fulton; Editor & Publisher, 9/5/2007, *UPDATED: Questions Raised about Claims by Photographer -- His Son Responds -- 'NYT' Corrects* by Greg Mitchell; NPPA, 9/15/2007, *A Photographer's Legacy Tarnished* by Heather Graulich; *New York Times*, 9/15/2007, *Known for Famous Photos, Not All of Them His* by Michael Wilson](#)). His son, Tyge O'Donnell, stated that he believed Joe had been suffering from dementia, and began having noticeable problems with his memory since the 1990's ([The Oklahoman, 9/20/2007, *Photo Causes Uprow Among Photographers* by Travis Loller](#)).

Quentin Schwinn

A photographer named Quentin Schwinn came out in 2010 and told researcher Doug Horne of a meeting he had where he was shown a picture of what appeared to be JFK's body with a small circular wound in the right forehead.

A drawing based on Schwinn's description: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1w-LbMlxL-vVfgHfe3HcMK0d-wnxDUuEq/view?usp=sharing>

From a 2014 presentation by Doug Horne, former staff member of the Assassination Records Review Board:

[...] There's additional corroborating evidence of an entrance wound high above the right eye, and that's provided by new evidence who has come forward since my book was published. I was contacted in the year 2010 by a person named Quentin Schwinn. He's a contractor with a high-level security clearance who works at one of the eight NASA centers. He was once a student of photography at the Rochester Institute of Technology. He has a vivid recollection of being approached during what was clearly a job interview in late 1982 or early 1983. While he was a student at RIT, he was approached by one of his professors, a professor David Haysey, and by an unknown stranger from out of town. Stranger had a briefcase, stranger pulled out two photographs, one was a satellite image of airplanes parked on a runway, obviously taken from a great distance. And they asked Mr. Schwinn all kinds of photogrammetric questions about 'how would you determine the size of this airplane, the length of the wings, the length of these shadows', and apparently he satisfied him with his answers. He indicated to them that he had a good knowledge of photogrammetry and of photography and of photographic analysis. They then showed him one color positive transparency, a post-mortem image of JFK after death. And I spent three years off and on interviewing Mr. Schwinn on the phone, assessing his credibility. I even had him contact RIT and I had them send me a sealed transcript of his matriculation there. I received a sealed transcript, I verified that he was in school there when he said he was, he did receive the two degrees in photography that he said he did, and my considered judgment after interviewing him for three years is that Quentin Schwinn is a reliable witness and that he was shown a post-mortem image of President Kennedy which is not in the official collection today by two individuals as part of a recruitment pitch. By the way, he was subsequently offered two federal jobs in photography and declined both of them. But this event happened. And so this is what I encouraged him to do: this image is the result of Quentin Schwinn going to a qualified medical illustrator, describing to him what he recalled seeing in the image and getting the medical illustrator to draw a picture. And I believe this is the third of fourth attempt of the effort. I mean, Quentin Schwinn is a perfectionist and he had in fact more than one artist work on the project and he finally settled on the best artist. And then he- I think this is the third attempt made by the second artist. This is important for two reasons. One is the entrance wound, apparent entrance wound above the right eye, and the other reason is the condition of the throat wound which we'll talk about later in this presentation. So this is the wound that apparently Dennis David and Joe O'Donnell recalled seeing in photographs the week after the autopsy. I forwarded this image to Dennis David with a minimum of description and asked him if it was similar in any way to the photographs he was shown by Lieutenant Commander Pitzer, and he said the entrance wound above the right eye is exactly what he recalls. The condition of the throat wound is different, which we'll talk about later in this presentation, which is significant. But he said that the small entrance wound above the right eye is- he said that the small entrance wound above the right eye is one hundred percent consistent with the photographs shown to him by Lieutenant Commander Pitzer a week after JFK's death. Joe O'Donnell is now deceased, so I could not contact him, but this I think gives the viewer a good impression of an entry wound from a shot from the front which was later removed from President Kennedy's skull by illicit clandestine post-mortem surgery before the autopsy began. [...]

(Future of Freedom Foundation, Horne, 2014, *Altered History: Exposing Deceit and Deception in the JFK Assassination Medical Evidence* [[Video, part 2, 27:26](#)] [[link 2](#)])

[Between 2010-2015, an Amazon.com account under the name of Quentin Schwinn left several book reviews about the JFK assassination.](#) A “Quentin Schwinn” also commented on a [10/22/2011 blog post by researcher Lisa Pease](#) about the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy.

Roy Kellerman, Secret Service

Roy Kellerman was the Secret Service agent seated in the right-front passenger side of the Presidential Limousine. Later that night, Kellerman also witnessed the autopsy. When testifying to the Warren Commission on 3/9/1964, Kellerman described “four wounds” on Kennedy’s body, one in the back, one in the throat, a large one in the head, and a small one in the head:

Mr. KELLERMAN. Entry into this man's head was right below that wound, right here.

Mr. SPECTER. Indicating the bottom of the hairline immediately to the right of the ear about the lower third of the ear?

Mr. KELLERMAN. Right. But it was in the hairline, sir.

Mr. SPECTER. In his hairline?

Mr. KELLERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPECTER. Near the end of his hairline?

Mr. KELLERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPECTER. What was the size of that aperture?

Mr. KELLERMAN. The little finger.

Mr. SPECTER. Indicating the diameter of the little finger.

Mr. KELLERMAN. Right.

([WC Vol. 2, p. 61](#) [[text](#)])

The transcript is not clear where exactly on the head Kellerman was referring to. It is often interpreted to mean the BACK of the head, but what did it mean where it says “*the bottom of the hairline immediately to the right of the ear about the lower third of the ear*”?

The HSCA interviewed Kellerman on 8/24/1977 and 8/25/1977. The interview report said he "*only recalls one large hole in the head and no small holes in the head*" ([ARRB MD 56](#)). Still, Kellerman made a crude drawing of JFK’s body, facing away, with a small circle on the head underneath a large circle: https://history-matters.com/archive/jfk/arrb/master_med_set/md56/html/Image9.htm

Kellerman passed away on 3/22/1984 ([Findagrave.com](#)).

Janie Taylor's witness

On 11/25/1995, a retired biologist named Janie Taylor was interviewed by the Assassination Records Review Board. As reported:

I spoke with retired biologist Janie Taylor today regarding an account she was told regarding the JFK Autopsy. Taylor worked as a biologist at the National Institute of Health (NIH) in 1963. NIH is physically located across the street from the Bethesda Naval Medical Center, where the JFK autopsy was conducted. I informed her of the fact that the secrecy order applicable to people at the autopsy was lifted in 1977.

A man named Clarence Israel (deceased) of Rockville, MD told Taylor that his brother (deceased and no name given) was one of two African-American orderlies present in the autopsy room of the Medical Center the day of the autopsy. Israel said his brother had not mentioned the story to anyone including his wife & daughter who his brother outlived. His brother wanted to insure that his story was known because he was verbally threatened by a guard at the time of the autopsy.

Taylor said that African-Americans during that time period were often ignored and that non-African-American workers in many workplaces would assume that an African-American's presence did not count. She believed that activities were often done in their presence with the perception that the activities would never be reported.

Israel told her the orderlies saw one doctor was in the autopsy room at the Medical Center who was waiting for some time prior to the arrival of the body and any other physicians. When the body arrived, many people were forced out of the room and the doctor performed some type of mutilation of three bullet punctures to the head area. The doctor was working at a very "hurried" pace and was done within a few minutes, at which point he left the autopsy room.

Taylor believes she may have Israel's obituary which may provide more information about the family and any other relatives which may know of the story. I thanked her for her time and told her I would send an information packet and letter to her based on our conversation.

(ARRB MD 45)

Researcher Tyler Newcomb found that this "Clarence Israel" was a former baseball player in the Negro Leagues, as was his brother Elbert Israel, in the 1940's-50's. When Newcomb posted a message asking about the Israel brothers on the website of the Negro League Baseball Players Association, he received a response from a user named Jim Lavin. As summarized in the 2011 edition of the book *Murder from Within* by Fred T. Newcomb and Perry Adams:

Jim Lavin eventually did speak with Mrs. Elbert Israel and was told that yes indeed both he and his brother Clarence were on duty that night in the morgue of Bethesda Naval 11/23/1963. Neither of them ever spoke about it from then on until Janie Taylor was told by Clarence Israel just as kind of criminal acts were happening in front of their eyes that night. In the words of Mrs. Israel "that's when he started drinking". Jim Lavin's father agreed saying "No wonder he started drinking".

Parkland Drs. Robert McClelland, Marion Jenkins, Malcolm Perry, Kemp Clark, Robert Shaw, David Stewart Gene Akin, Ronald Jones, Lito Porto, and various other media reports

After JFK was pronounced dead at Parkland Hospital, Dr. Robert McClelland wrote in his 11/22/1963 hospital report "*The cause of death was due to massive head and brain injury from a gunshot wound of the left temple*" (WC Vol. 17, p. 12, CE 392 [text]). Many have taken this to mean a bullet entrance wound in the President's left temple. McClelland's report was publicly released on

9/24/1964 with the Warren Commission report appendices, and also on 11/23/1964 in the Commission's volumes.

On the afternoon of 11/22/1963, Parkland Drs. Malcolm Perry and Kemp Clark spoke at a press conference about what they experienced in Trauma Room One. According to transcript, there was no talk of a frontal entry wound in the head. Only two defects were reported – a small one in the front of the throat and a large one on the head. Dr. Perry said he thought the neck wound looked like a bullet entry.

DR. MALCOM PERRY- I was summoned to the Emergency Room shortly after the President was brought in, on an emergency basis, immediately after the President's arrival. Upon reaching his side, I noted that he was in critical condition from a wound of the neck and of the head. Immediate resuscitative measures—

QUESTION- Would you go slower?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- I noted he was in critical condition from the wound in the neck and the head.

QUESTION- Could that be done by one shot?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- I cannot conjecture. I don't know.

QUESTION- A wound of the neck and of the—

DR. MALCOM PERRY- —of the head. [...]

[...]

DR. KEMP CLARK- I am Dr. Clark. —because the President had sustained a brain wound. On my arrival, the resuscitative efforts, the tracheostomy, the administration of chest tubes to relieve any possible—

QUESTION- Could you slow down a little bit, Doctor, please?

DR. KEMP CLARK- —to relieve any possibility of air being in the pleural space, the electrocardiogram had been hooked up, blood and fluids were being administered by Dr. Perry and Dr. Baxter. It was apparent that the President had sustained a lethal wound. A missile had gone in or out of the back of his head, causing extensive lacerations and loss of brain tissue. Shortly after I arrived, the patient, the President, lost his heart action by the electrocardiogram, his heart action had stopped.

[...]

QUESTION- Doctor, can you describe the course of the wound through the head?

DR. KEMP CLARK- We were too busy to be absolutely sure of the track, but the back of his head.

QUESTION- And through the neck?

DR. KEMP CLARK- Principally on his right side, towards the right side.

[...]

QUESTION- Can you describe his neck wound?

DR. KEMP CLARK- I was busy with his head wound. I would like to ask the people took care of that part to describe that to you.

QUESTION- What was the question?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- The neck wound, as visible on the patient, revealed a bullet hole almost in the mid line.

QUESTION- What was that?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- A bullet hole almost in the mid line.

QUESTION- Would you demonstrate?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- In the lower portion of the neck, in front.

QUESTION- Can you demonstrate, Doctor, on your own neck?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- Approximately here (indicating).

QUESTION- Below the Adam's apple?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- Below the Adam's apple.

QUESTION- Doctor, is it the assumption that it went through the head?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- That would be on conjecture on my part. There are two wounds, as Dr. Clark noted, one of the neck and one of the head. Whether they are directly related or related to two bullets, I cannot say.

QUESTION- Where was the entrance wound?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- There was an entrance wound in the neck. As regards the one on the head, I cannot say.

QUESTION- Which way was the bullet coming on the neck wound? At him?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- It appeared to be coming at him.

QUESTION- And the one behind?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- The nature of the wound defies the ability to describe whether it went through it from either side. I cannot tell you that. Can you, Dr. Clark?

DR. KEMP CLARK- The head wound could have been either the exit wound from the neck or it could have been a tangential wound, as it was simply a large, gaping loss of tissue.

[...]

QUESTION- Can't we clear this up just a little more? In your estimation, was there one or two wounds? Just give us something.

DR. MALCOM PERRY- I don't know. From the injury, it is conceivable that it could have been caused by one wound, but there could have been two just as well if the second bullet struck the head in addition to striking the neck, and I cannot tell you that due to the nature of the wound. There is no way for me to tell.

QUESTION- Doctor, describe the entrance wound. You think from the front in the throat?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- The wound appeared to be an entrance wound in the front of the throat; yes, that is correct. The exit wound, I don't know. It could have been the head or there could have been a second wound of the head. There was not time to determine this at the particular instant.

QUESTION- Would the bullet have to travel up from the neck wound to exit through the back?

DR. MALCOM PERRY- Unless it was deviated from its course by striking bone or some other object.

([ARRB MD 41](#) [text])

To this date, nobody has found a full audio recording of the Perry/Clark news conference. The transcript has Dr. Clark suggesting the large defect looked like it could have been a "tangential wound". Tangential wounds are caused by a missile striking the body at a shallow angle, leaving no easily-identifiable entry point. The possibility was also raised that both wounds could have been made by one bullet – perhaps with a bullet entering the neck and exiting the head. This was reflected in news reports at the time. UPI reported "*President Kennedy was shot through the throat and head, possibly by the same bullet, the attending surgeon said Friday*", "*Two of the 10 physicians in attendance on the President said it was possible that one bullet entered the throat and went through the back of the President's head. It was possible, they said, that he was hit by two bullets, but they doubted it*" ([Detroit Free Press, 11/23/1963, Doctor Tells Of Fight for JFK's Life](#)). Earl Ubell of the New York Herald Tribune reported "*...He said he did not know if two bullets were involved. It is possible, he said, that the neck wound was the entrance and the other the exit of the missile*" ([WC Vol. 22, p. 832, CE 1415](#)).

At least a couple of news reports claimed that Perry spoke of a frontal head wound. On 11/23/1963 2:43 PM CST, an Associated Press dispatch on the press conference quoted on WOR radio reported that Dr. Perry said "*the entrance wound was on the front of the head*" ([Patspeer.com, A New Perspective on the Kennedy Assassination, Volume 1: The Kennedy Assassination, Politics, and Propaganda, Chapter 1: The Aftermath](#)). A widely circulated Associated Press story said that when Perry was "*asked if possibly the wounds could have been made by two bullets, he said he did not know*", "*When asked to specify, Perry said the entrance wound was in the front of the head*" ([Associated Press, United Press International and Dow Jones teletype reports of the Kennedy assassination, Sheet 10; Lancaster New Era, 11/22/1963; The Hammond Times, 11/22/1963; The Charlotte News, 11/22/1963; Oakland Tribune, 11/22/1963; Albuquerque Tribune, 11/22/1963; Great Falls Tribune, 11/23/1963; Hartford Courant, 11/23/1963](#)). The 11/23/1963 San Francisco Chronicle said "*At Parkland Hospital, Dr. Malcolm Perry said Mr. Kennedy suffered a neck wound--a bullet hole in the lower part of the neck--and a second wound in the forehead*". None of Perry's other recorded statements describe any small wounds in the head ([WC Vol. 17, p. 6, 11/22/1963 hospital report](#) [text]; [NBC WBAP-TV, 11/23/1963; New York Herald Tribune, 11/24/1963, A Death in Emergency Room One](#) by Jimmy Breslin; [WC Vol. 6, p. 7, 3/25/1964 WC](#)

[testimony \[text\]](#); [WC Vol. 3, p. 366, 3/30/1964 WC testimony \[text\]](#); [Harold Weisberg's notes on 11/14/1968 interview with Perry](#); [A CBS News Inquiry: The Warren Report, Part 2, 6/26/1967 \[video, 19:01\] \[transcript\]](#); [12/1/1971 interview by Harold Weisberg, Post Mortem, 1975 edition, p. 378](#); [HSCA Vol. 7, p. 292, HSCA interview, 1/11/1978 \[text\] \[audio\]](#); 1979 interview by Jeff Price, [Baltimore Sun, 11/18/1979, The bullets also destroyed our confidence by Steve Parks](#); Livingstone, *High Treason*, 1989, PART II: *THE MEDICAL EVIDENCE*, Chapter 2: *The President's Head Wounds and the New Evidence of Forgery*; [1981 Boston Globe interview report](#); Livingstone, 8/10/1979 interview and 12/21/1981 letter, *High Treason 2*, 1992, p. 121, Chapter 4. *Parkland Memorial Hospital*, 6/14/1991 interview, p. 572, Chapter 28. *What Really Happened*; 1986 conversation with Dr. Robert Artwohl, 2/14/1992 online post [[link](#)] [[link 2](#)]; [JAMA, 5/27/1992, JFK's death - the plain truth from the MDs who did the autopsy \[text\]](#); 4/2/1992 interview by Gerald Posner, [Case Closed, 1993](#), Chapter 13. "He Had a Death Look"; 5/2/1994 letter to Brad Parker, [Dealey Plaza Echo, Vol. 1, Issue 3, p. 26, Dr. Robert McClelland in Trauma Room One](#); 5/16/1994 letter to Brad Parker [[link](#)]; [ARRB group interview, 8/27/1998 \[text\]](#); 11/6/1996 letter to researcher Russ McLean [[link](#)]; 8/26/1998 letter to Vincent Palamara, *JFK: From Parkland to Bethesda*, 2015 [[link](#)]; 1998 interview by Mark Oakes, *Eyewitness Video Tape part III* [[audio](#)].

There were more early news reports speaking of an entrance wound in the front of Kennedy's head.

From the [Boston Globe, 11/27/1963, President's Neck, Head Hit by Bullets by Herbert Black](#):

The Globe has got from an unofficial but authoritative source here what is believed to be an accurate description of the course of events.

[...]

When he was struck, he apparently turned his head toward Mrs. Kennedy (to the left) and began to slump. A second bullet then tore into his left temple and emerged from the right top of his head, the mortal wound.

This information did not come from doctors at the hospital here, who have said they were too busy trying to save the President to study the trajectory of the bullets.

It is, however, from a source in position to know the facts, which were ascertained at the Naval Hospital in Bethesda, where Mr. Kennedy was taken.

This information was doubted at first because it reported that the President was hit on the left temple. It did not seem reasonable that a sniper above and to the right behind the car could hit him on the left side, but information from a film taken of the events tends to corroborate this.

The FBI is investigating all aspects of the shooting and that is believed to be the reason why the official medical reports from the naval hospital have not been released.

From the [Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 11/27/1963, Movies Reconstruct Tragedy by Arthur J. Snider, Chicago Daily News Service](#):

The 6.5 mm bullet-about .25 caliber - pierced the President's neck just below the Adam's apple. It took a downward course.

"If you're wearing a bow tie, the position is just about where the knot is," said a Dallas neurosurgeon who saw the wound.

[...]

Identification of two points of entry, the throat and the skull, was made by Dr. Kemp Clark, neurosurgeon, and Dr. Tom Shires, chief of surgery at Parkland Hospital.

They said neither bullet was recovered in the hospital emergency room. One bullet was said to have emerged from the left temple.

([Link 2, The Akron Beacon Journal, 11/28/1963, What Was Correct Bullet Sequence? First 2 hit JFK, Film Indicates](#))

Why would the article say that a point of “entry” in the skull was made by Dr. Clark and Dr. Tom Shires? Dr. Shires wasn’t even there at the time ([WC Vol. 21, p. 253, Shires' 11/27/1963 statement; WC Vol. 6, p. 104, Shires' 3/23/1964 WC testimony \[text\]](#)), and none of Clark’s direct recorded statements describe a point of entry in the skull. On 3/21/1964, Clark testified to the Warren Commission:

Mr. SPECTER - Were you a part of any press conference which followed on the day of the assassination?

Dr. CLARK - Yes sir; I was.

Mr. SPECTER - And who made the arrangements for the press conference?

Dr. CLARK - Mr. Malcolm Kilduff, the Presidential press secretary.

Mr. SPECTER - At what time did the press conference occur?

Dr. CLARK - Approximately 2:30.

Mr. SPECTER - Where was it held?

Dr. CLARK - It was held in room 101-102, Parkland Hospital.

Mr. SPECTER - What mechanical instruments were used, if any, by the press at the conference?

Dr. CLARK - Tape recorders and television cameras, as well as the usual note pads and pencils, and so forth.

Mr. SPECTER - And who was interviewed during the course of the press conference and photographed?

Dr. CLARK - Dr. Malcolm Perry and myself.

Mr. SPECTER - No one else?

Dr. CLARK - No.

Mr. SPECTER - What, if anything, did you say then in the course of that press conference?

Dr. CLARK - I described the President's wound in his head in very much the same way as I have described it here. I was asked if this wound was an entrance wound, an exit wound, or what, and I

said it could be an exit wound, but I felt it was a tangential wound.

Mr. SPECTER - Which wound did you refer to at this time?

Dr. CLARK - The wound in the head.

Mr. SPECTER - Did you describe at that time what you meant by "tangential"?

Dr. CLARK - Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. SPECTER - What definition of "tangential" did you make at that time?

Dr. CLARK - As I remember, I defined the word "tangential" as being---striking an object obliquely, not squarely or head on.

Mr. SPECTER - Will you describe at this time in somewhat greater detail the consequences of a tangential wound as contrasted with another type of a striking?

Dr. CLARK - Let me begin by saying that the damage suffered by an organ when struck by a bullet or other missile---

Mr. SPECTER - May the record show that I interrupted the deposition for about 2 minutes to ascertain what our afternoon schedule would be here because the regular administration office ordinarily closes at 12 o'clock, which was just about 15 minutes ago, and then we resumed the deposition of Dr. Clark as he was discussing the concept of tangential and other types of striking. Go ahead, Doctor.

Dr. CLARK - The effects of any missile striking an organ or a function of the energy which is shed by the missile in passing through this organ when a bullet strikes the head, if it is able to pass through rapidly without shedding any energy into the brain, little damage results, other than that part of the brain which is directly penetrated by the missile. However, if it strikes the skull at an angle, it must then penetrate much more bone than normal, therefore, is likely to shed more energy, striking the brain a more powerful blow.

Secondly, in striking the bone in this manner, it may cause pieces of the bone to be blown into the brain and thus act as secondary missiles. Finally, the bullet itself may be deformed and deflected so that it would go through or penetrate parts of the brain, not in the usual direct line it was proceeding.

Mr. SPECTER - Now, referring back to the press conference, did you define a tangential wound at that time?

Dr. CLARK - Yes.

[...]

Mr. SPECTER - At any of the press conferences were you asked about a hole on the left side of the President's head?

Dr. CLARK - Yes.

Mr. SPECTER - At which conference or conferences?

Dr. CLARK - I was asked about this at the CBS conference and I stated that I personally saw no such wound.

Mr. SPECTER - And who asked you about it at that time, if you recall?

Dr. CLARK - The man who was conducting the conference. This was brought up by one of the physicians, I think Dr. McClelland, that there was some discussion of such a wound.

Mr. SPECTER - Did Dr. McClelland say that he had seen such a wound?

Dr. CLARK - No.

Mr. SPECTER - What was the origin, if you know, as to the inquiry on the wound, that is, who suggested that there might have been a wound on the left side?

Dr. CLARK - I don't recall--I don't recall.

Mr. SPECTER - Had there been some comment that the priests made a comment that there was a wound on the left side of the head?

Dr. CLARK - I heard this subsequently from one of the reporters who attended the press conference with NBC.

(WC Vol. 6, p. 18 [text])

Maybe the Commission should have asked Dr. Clark about the news article by Arthur Snider. The transcript does show Clark saying that he "assumed" that he had "probably" been hit "on the other side of the head", but he again said the large defect looked like a tangential wound.

From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 11/30/1963, UNCERTAINTIES REMAIN DESPITE POLICE VIEW OF KENNEDY DEATH – Did Assailant Have an Accomplice? by Richard Dudman:

There have been two other reports of injury to the President's head. One of the physicians who attended him in Dallas said afterward that he had noticed a small entry wound in the left temple.

Another person, who saw the President's body a 'few minutes after he died,' told the Post-Dispatch he thought he had observed a wound in the President's forehead. He asked that his name not be used. Reports of the temple and forehead wounds could have referred to the same injury.

By December, Dr. McClelland seemed to express some approval for the lone gunman theory. From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 12/18/1963, Secret Service Gets Revision On Kennedy Wound by Richard Dudman, A Washington Correspondent of the Post-Dispatch:

Two Secret Service agents called last week on Dallas surgeons who attended President John F. Kennedy and obtained a reversal of their original view that the bullet in his neck entered from the front.

The investigators did so by showing the surgeons a document described as an autopsy report from the United States Naval Hospital at Bethesda. The surgeons changed their original view to conform with the report they were shown.

"There was no coercion at all," Dr. Robert N. McClelland told the Post-Dispatch. "They didn't say anything like, 'This is what you think, isn't it?'"

The Associated Press reported that a source familiar with the autopsy findings said Mr. Kennedy might have survived the first bullet to strike him. He said it was the second bullet which struck his head, that proved fatal.

This source said last night the first bullet struck the President in the back and did not damage any vital organs. He said it was not likely to have caused death. The surgeons' earlier description of a wound in the front of the President's throat as an entry wound had cast doubt on the official belief that Lee Harvey Oswald was the only assassin. It had suggested the possibility that a second sniper had fired simultaneously from somewhere in front of the President's auto-mobile.

The surgeons now support the official view that both bullets that struck the President were fired from behind, from the direction of the sixth story warehouse window where Oswald is believed to have been hiding.

They now believe that the bullet in the neck entered from the neck, where the right shoulder meets the neck, and passed out through the hole in front, about two inches below the Adam's apple.

Dr. McClelland told the Paos-Dispatch last night by telephone of the visit by the federal agents and the manner in which the doctors changed their opinion.

He said the investigators called on the doctors about a week ago at the Southwestern Medical School of the University of Texas, adjoining Parkland Memorial Hospital, where the President died a half hour after he was shot.

The visit was after the Federal Bureau of Investigation had completed its report of the assassination and the Justice Department had given it to the special investigating commission headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren.

"I was wandering down a hall when they snagged me," Dr. McClelland said. He was one of three physicians who worked on the President's throat and per-formed a tracheotomy, cutting a hole in the throat, in an effort to restore satisfactory breathing.

He said the Secret Service agents met with Dr. Malcolm Perry, the first doctor to reach the emergency room after the President had been carried in. and Dr. Tom Shires, who was out of the city at the time but arrived an hour later.

Ask To See Reports

Dr. McClellan said the investigators asked to see reports the doctors had written the day of the President's death about what they had seen and done in the emergency room. He said he recalled saying in his report that the throat wound might have been an entry wound.

Dr. Perry had told reporters the day of the assassination that the wound had the appearance of an entry wound. A few days later. Dr. McClelland had told the Post-Dispatch that he judged it to be an entry wound on the basis of considerable familiarity with gunshot wounds. He had said doctors at the hospital saw one a day and sometimes several a day, continuing that a bullet normally enters through a small hole and tears its way out through a large hole.

In the course of the conversation last week. Dr. McClelland said, the Secret Service men showed them the long autopsy report and pointed out the place where it described the course of the bullet in the President's neck.

Wound in Back of Neck

He said it told of an entry wound, which the Dallas doctors had not seen, in the back of the neck, low on the right side. The bullet passed to the right of the spinal column, not injuring it, but damaging the windpipe, the report stated, he said. The report indicated that the whole bullet or a large fragment of it passed out the front of the throat just above the breastbone.

Dr. McClelland said he did not know whether the autopsy report told of recovering a bullet from the President's body, as told in some accounts.

"I didn't read the entire report," he said. "I was mainly interested in finding out what the wound in the neck was."

Recalling his thinking the day of the assassination, Dr. McClelland pointed out that the Dallas doctors were with the President's body only about 22 minutes and were working to save his life, not to determine the course of the bullets.

Lying on Back

"He was lying on his back on the stretcher," the surgeon said. "It was not necessary or possible to examine him in the back. My first impression was the purest kind of supposition."

He said when he saw a small wound in the front of the neck and a large wound in the back of the head he thought it possible one bullet had caused both, entering at the throat, passing up along the vertebrae and going out the back of the head.

That conclusion was on the basis of "no complete history and no complete examination," he said. By history, he said, he meant the circumstances of where the bullets had come from.

A few days later, he said, the Dallas electors received a third-or fourth-hand report from the Naval Hospital that another wound had been found in the back of the neck and that the throat wound was thought to be an exit wound. That report, along with news of the supposed position of Oswald in the ware-house window, caused them to start reconstructing the shooting in their minds, so that both bullets came from behind.

"This was confirmed by the autopsy report," he said.

Accepting Report

Dr. McClelland said he and Dr. Perry fully accept the Naval Hospital's explanation of the course of the bullets.

"I am fully satisfied that the two bullets that hit him were from behind," he said. "As far as I am concerned, there is no reason to suspect that any shots came from the front."

The Associated Press gave this new account of the wounds, as reported by a source fully acquainted with results of the post mortem examination conducted at the Naval Hospital:

The first shot struck Mr. Kennedy in the back, made what was described as a small, neat hole and penetrated two or three inches without damaging vital organs.

The bullet may even have entered Mr. Kennedy's back after first glancing off some part of the presidential limousine, because its penetration was not deep when compared with the damage done by the other shot. The first bullet was said to have been the one that was recovered from the stretcher on which Mr. Kennedy was carried into the hospital.

The Fatal Wound

The second bullet to strike Mr. Kennedy, the third bullet fired, left a large hole in the back of the President's head, destroyed considerable brain tissue and severely damaged the forehead. Unquestionably, this wound was fatal, the source told the AP. In effect, it caused instant death, although a faint spark of life may have remained a few minutes in the heart and lungs. This bullet, the source said, was recovered from the limousine.

The second shot fired by the assassin hit Gov. John B. Connally of Texas in the chest as he turned toward Mr. Kennedy after the first bullet hit the President. The source said Connally's wound was at approximately the same elevation as the one in Mr. Kennedy's back. He was seated in front of Mr. Kennedy on a jump seat.

Because there was an interval of five or six seconds between Mr. Kennedy's first and second wounds, the new account leaves the implication that Mr. Kennedy might have survived, perhaps escaped serious injury, had he quickly thrown himself to the floor of his limousine after the first bullet struck, the AP said.

It seems apparent, however, that Mr. Kennedy was unable to react immediately except to throw his hands in front of him. the AP said. Mr. Kennedy's life might have been saved had some-one shielded him or knocked him to the floor of the car before he was struck in the head, the AP reported.

Secret Service agents are trained to react in such a fashion, but none was close enough to the President to intervene. Mr. Kennedy did not want agents at his elbow except when driving in heavy crowds. The crowd was a thin one at the point where the President was assassinated.

If a witness is exposed to outside information, it can interfere with their ability to accurately to recall their own experiences.

McClelland's approval may have been half-hearted. In a [12/21/1963 article in The New Republic](#), Richard Dudman added this detail on his meeting with McClelland: "*The throat wound puzzled the surgeons who attended Mr. Kennedy at Parkland Memorial Hospital when they learned how the Dallas police had reconstructed the shooting. Dr. Robert McClelland, one of the three doctors who worked on the throat wound, told me afterward that they still believed it to be an entry wound, even though the shots were said to have been fired almost directly behind the President. He explained that he and his colleagues at Parkland saw bullet wounds every day, sometimes several a day, and recognized easily the characteristically tiny hole of an entering bullet, in contrast to the larger, tearing hole that an exiting bullet would have left*".

The early Parkland reports were condensed in the January 1964 edition of the Texas State Journal of Medicine, in the article *Three Patients at Parkland* ([CD 374](#) [\[link 2\]](#) [\[text\]](#)), which was partially edited by Dr. Marion Jenkins (*JFK: From Parkland to Bethesda* by Vincent Palamara, 2015 [\[link\]](#)). Instead of mentioning the "left temple", the article simply says "*The cause of death, according to*

Dr. McClelland was the massive head and brain injury from a gunshot wound of the right side of the head”.

Dr. Robert Shaw was a Parkland hospital employee who treated Texas Governor John Connally. While he was not there to see the body of President Kennedy, but he would have had the opportunity to hear what his coworkers discussed about the case. According to the British magazine *Today*, February 1964, Dr. Shaw wrote the following to reporter Larry Ross: “*The first bullet struck the President in the back of the neck at the region of the second thoracic vertebrae and emerged from the front of his neck, piercing his trachea. The third bullet struck the President on the left side of the head in the region of the left temporal region and made a large wound of exit on the right side of the head*” ([Link](#) [[link 2](#)]).

On 3/21/1964, Dr. McClelland testified to the Warren Commission:

Mr. SPECTER - Have you had discussions with the other doctors who attended President Kennedy as to the possible nature of the wound which was inflicted on him?

Dr. McCLELLAND - Yes.

Mr. SPECTER - And what facts did you have available either to you or to the other doctors whom you talked this over with, with respect to the nature of the wound, source of the wounds, and that sort of thing?

Dr. McCLELLAND - Immediately we had essentially no facts. We knew nothing of the number of bullets that had supposedly been fired. We knew nothing of the site from which the bullet had been fired, essentially none of the circumstances in the first few minutes, say, 20 or 30 minutes after the President was brought in, so that our initial impressions were based upon extremely incomplete information.

Mr. SPECTER - What were your initial impressions?

Dr. McCLELLAND - The initial impression that we had was that perhaps the wound in the neck, the anterior part of the neck, was an entrance wound and that it had perhaps taken a trajectory off the anterior vertebral body and again into the skull itself, exiting out the back, to produce the massive injury in the head. However, this required some straining of the imagination to imagine that this would happen, and it was much easier to explain the apparent trajectory by means of two bullets, which we later found out apparently had been fired, than by just one then, on which basis we were originally taking to explain it.

Mr. SPECTER - Through the use of the pronoun "we" in your last answer, to whom do you mean by "we"?

Dr. McCLELLAND - Essentially all of the doctors that have previously been mentioned here.

Mr. SPECTER - Did you observe the condition of the back of the President's head?

Dr. McCLELLAND - Well, partially; not, of course, as I say, we did not lift his head up since it was so greatly damaged. We attempted to avoid moving him any more than it was absolutely necessary, but I could see, of course, all the extent of the wound.

Mr. SPECTER - You saw a large opening which you have already described?

Dr. McCLELLAND - I saw the large opening which I have described.

Mr. SPECTER - Did you observe any other wound on the back of the head?

Dr. McCLELLAND - No.

Mr. SPECTER - Did you observe a small gunshot wound below the large opening on the back of the head?

Dr. McCLELLAND - No.

Mr. SPECTER - Based on the experience that you have described for us with gunshot wounds and your general medical experience, would you characterize the description of the wound that Dr. Perry gave you as being a wound of entrance or a wound of exit, or was the description which you got from Dr. Perry and Dr. Baxter and Dr. Carrico who were there before, equally consistent with whether or not it was a wound of entrance or a wound of exit, or how would you characterize it in your words?

Dr. McCLELLAND - I would say it would be equally consistent with either type wound, either an entrance or an exit type wound. It would be quite difficult to say--impossible.

Mr. SPECTER - Dr. McClelland, I show you now a statement or a report which has been furnished to the Commission by Parkland Hospital and has been identified in a previous Commission hearing as Commission Exhibit No. 392, and I direct your attention specifically to a page, "Third Report", which was made by you, and I would ask you first of all if this is your signature which appears at the bottom of Page 2, and next, whether in fact you did make this report and submit it to the authorities at Parkland Hospital?

Dr. McCLELLAND - Yes.

Mr. SPECTER - And are all the facts set forth true and correct to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?

Dr. McCLELLAND - To the best of my knowledge, yes.

Mr. SPECTER - Dr. McClelland, did you and I sit down together for just a few minutes before I started to take your deposition today?

Dr. McCLELLAND - Yes, sir.

Mr. SPECTER - And I discussed this matter with you?

Dr. McCLELLAND - Yes.

Mr. SPECTER - And, during the course of our conversations at that time, we cover the same material in question form here and to which you have responded in answer form with the court reporter here today?

Dr. McCLELLAND - Yes.

Mr. SPECTER - And has the information which you have given me on record been the same as that which you gave me off of the record in advance?

Dr. McCLELLAND - Yes.

Mr. SPECTER - Do you have any interest, Dr. McClelland in reading your testimony over or signing it at the end, or would you be willing to waive such signature of the testimony?

Dr. McCLELLAND - I would be willing to waive my signature.

Mr. SPECTER - Thank you so much for coming and giving us your deposition today.

Dr. McCLELLAND - All right, thank you.

(WC Vol. 6, p. 30 [text])

From the WC testimony of Dr. Marion Jenkins, 3/25/1964:

Mr. SPECTER - Did you observe any wounds immediately below the massive loss of skull which you have described?

Dr. JENKINS - On the right side?

Mr. SPECTER - Yes, sir.

Dr. JENKINS - No---I don't know whether this is right or not, but I thought there was a wound on the left temporal area, right in the hairline and right above the zygomatic process.

Mr. SPECTER - The autopsy report discloses no such development, Dr. Jenkins.

Dr. JENKINS - Well, I was feeling for---I was palpating here for a pulse to see whether the closed chest cardiac massage was effective or not and this probably was some blood that had come from the other point and so I thought there was a wound there also.

Mr. SPECTER - At approximately what time was President Kennedy pronounced dead?

Dr. JENKINS - Well, this was pronounced, we know the exact time as 1300, according to my watch, at least, at the time.

Mr. SPECTER - And what, in your opinion, was the cause of death?

Dr. JENKINS - Cerebral injury--brain injury.

[...]

Mr. SPECTER - What is your view, Dr. Jenkins, as to whether the wounds which you observed were caused by one or two bullets?

Dr. JENKINS - I felt quite sure at the time that there must have been two bullets--two missiles.

Mr. SPECTER - And, Dr. Jenkins, what was your reason for that?

Dr. JENKINS - Because the wound with the exploded area of the scalp, as I interpreted it being

exploded, I would interpret it being a wound of exit, and the appearance of the wound in the neck, and I also thought it was a wound of exit.

Mr. SPECTER - Have you ever changed any of your original opinions in connection with the wounds received by President Kennedy?

Dr. JENKINS - I guess so. The first day I had thought because of his pneumothorax, that his wound must have gone--that the one bullet must have traversed his pleura, must have gotten into his lung cavity, his chest cavity, I mean, and from what you say now, I know it did not go that way. I thought it did.

Mr. SPECTER - Aside from that opinion, now, have any of your other opinions about the nature of his wounds or the sources of the wounds been changed in any way?

Dr. JENKINS - No; one other. I asked you a little bit ago if there was a wound in the left temporal area, right above the zygomatic bone in the hairline because there was blood there and I thought there might have been a wound there (indicating).

Mr. SPECTER - Indicating the left temporal area?

Dr. JENKINS - Yes; the left temporal, which could have been a point of entrance and exit here (indicating), but you have answered that for me. This was my only other question about it.

Mr. SPECTER - So, that those two points are the only ones on which your opinions have been changed since the views you originally formulated?

Dr. JENKINS - Yes, I think so.

Mr. SPECTER - On the President's injuries?

Dr. JENKINS - Yes, I think so.

Mr. SPECTER - Is the conversation you had with that Secret Service Agent the only time you were interviewed by anyone from the Federal Government prior to today about this subject?

Dr. JENKINS - As far as I remember--I don't believe so.

Mr. SPECTER - Now, you say that was the only time you were interviewed?

Dr. JENKINS - Yes, as far as I remember--I have had no formal interviews. I have been asked--there have been some people calling on the phone. As you know, there were many calls from various sources all over the country after that, wanting to know whether we had done this method of treatment or some other method and what principles we followed.

Mr. SPECTER - But the only one you can identify as being from the Federal Government is the one you have already related from the Secret Service?

Dr. JENKINS - Yes.

Mr. SPECTER - And did you and I have a very brief conversation before the deposition started today, when you gave me some of your views which you expounded and expanded upon during the course of the deposition on the record?

Dr. JENKINS - Yes.

Mr. SPECTER - And is there anything which you think of to add that you believe would be of some assistance or any assistance to the President's Commission in its inquiry?

Dr. JENKINS - I believe not, Mr. Specter.

(WC Vol. 6, p. 45 [text])

At the very least, Dr. Jenkins said that he considered a wound in the left temple possible. He said there was blood on that area of the head, and "*I was feeling for---I was palpating here for a pulse to see whether the closed chest cardiac massage was effective or not and this probably was some blood that had come from the other point and so I thought there was a wound there also*".

Neither Drs. McClelland nor Jenkins denied the possibility of a left temple wound in their testimony transcripts. This would contrast with their later statements, where they claimed the "left temple" information was based on a misunderstanding.

Dr. David Stewart was an employee at Parkland Hospital. He was not there to see the President's body, but he did describe speaking with his coworkers about what happened. According to Dr. Stewart, they told him of a wound in Kennedy's left temple. From the Nashville Banner, 1/17/1967, *Doctors Believed President Shot In Forehead: Physician* by Lewis Williams, Banner State Editor:

Physicians at Parkland Memorial Hospital, Dallas, thought President John Kennedy had been struck in the left forehead by a bullet, a Gallatin doctor told THE BANNER today.

Dr. David Stewart, who moved to Gallatin a year ago from Dallas, where he served his residency in Parkland Hospital, said doctors who administered aid to the President there thought a bullet had struck him in the frontal part of the head "behind the hairline" and had caused the massive damage to the back of the victim's head.

"They were working frantically, of course, and nobody had time to make an extensive examination. There was some talk about that (apparent wound) but we never heard any more about it later on." Dr. Stewart said.

Stewart, a Gallatin native who served internship at Nashville General Hospital in 1959 and 1960 and was in the Air Force two years before going to Dallas' Parkland Hospital, said he was not in the emergency room when the President was brought there with Texas Gov. John Connally.

"I was upstairs in the operating room at the time and later helped care for Connally when they brought him up", he said "but I remember all the excitement just like it was yesterday. We got a call they were bringing the President there and that he was wounded and to 'get ready'. We just stood around waiting to see if it was true or whether it was a crank call.. there wasn't anything to get ready; we were always ready for emergencies."

The much-discussed and debated throat wound, which the Warren Commission said was an exit wound and many critics insist was an entrance wound, was used as a hole for insertion of a breathing tube, Stewart said, but "no incision was made."

Warren Commission conclusions inferred that doctors at the hospital performed a tracheotomy, thus obliterating the wound to such an extent it could not positively be identified as an entrance or an

exit wound (Parkland doctors reported immediately after the assassination it was an entrance wound).

Dr. Stewart, however, quoted associates at the hospital as saying no tracheotomy was performed. "The hole was there and they just used it as it was to insert the tube," he declared. "It was not necessary to make an incision at all."

Dr. Stewart admitted he had no "first hand knowledge" of the President's wounds.

"I can't testify about these things, but they all came from my friends there and I pretty well accept them to be true. I know they have covered up some things and it makes me wonder if they haven't done the same thing about others..."

Dr. Stewart quoted a friend, Dr. James Corrico, who worked on the President's body at the hospital, as saying the President's personal physician handed him a quantity of the drug, Solu-Cortex, a cortisone-like medication, and told him "to put it into the IV (intravenous solution). "That's a drug usually given to Addison's Disease patients," Stewart said, "not gunshot victims."

The doctor continued: "A lot of us were concerned about the autopsy. The Dallas County coroner (Dr. Earl Rose) was planning an autopsy and we were told he had a sub-machinegun thrown on him and told not to touch the body. It's the law there that anyone- a hobo up to the President- who is killed must be given an autopsy before the body is taken from the county."

Dr. Stewart said he was also at the hospital when Lee Oswald was shot.

"They brought him in in desperate straits and he died about an hour later without saying a word," the doctor stated. "He was given 14 pints of blood and vigorous surgical treatment, but died from blood loss shock." The bullet fired by Jack Ruby penetrated Oswald's left lung, spleen and left kidney, he added.

Asked about the controversial "pristine" bullet the Warren Commission claimed passed through the President, struck Gov. Connally in the back, smashed his wrist and then buried itself in his left thigh, the Gallatin physician said, "I haven't seen the bullet, of course, but it wouldn't have been very pristine. The X-rays showed fragments of lead in the governor's thigh, for one thing."

"It leads me to wonder, Stewart said, "I would like to see someone penetrate all the subterfuge and the smokescreens thrown up about all this. I think they would do much better to start counting motives than bullets. I lived in Dallas four years and the people there are no different than anywhere else; some of them are bad, but most of them are good people and the 'climate of hate' that has been kicked around so much just didn't exist."

Dr. Stewart has high in his praise for three articles by Henry J. Taylor published recently in THE BANNER pointing out that Oswald was not, as he has been pictured, a "nut," but a hard, dedicated Communist.

"I wish Mr. Taylor would be encouraged to do more along this line," the doctor continued. "Had this knowledge been widely accepted three years ago, I'm certain that the whole course of American history would have been changed. However, it still isn't too late for adequate understanding to be of value."

Several Parkland Hospital physicians, nurses and witnesses to the assassination indicated, in statements to reporters at the time of the investigation of in actual testimony before the Warren

Commission, that the President sustained a frontal wound in the upper left octant of the head. This theory was ignited by the commission itself and not mentioned in the autopsy report from Bethesda Naval Hospital.

Two witnesses to the shooting, James Altgrens and Norman Simalis, both near the President's car, made statements they saw a wound on the left forehead.

Dr. Robert McClelland of Parkland Hospital stated in a written report that death "was due to a massive head and brain injury from a gunshot wound IN THE LEFT TEMPLE." Doctors Geisecke and Jenkins told the commission they "noticed a left frontal wound" and several other Parkland physicians and a nurse who attended the doctors described a similar wound. Father Oscar L. Huber, pastor of Holy Trinity Catholic Church, Dallas, who administered last rites over the President, was quoted as saying he "noticed a terrible wound over his left eye."

Most of the physicians questioned by the commission were of the opinion that the throat wound was an entrance wound and that the massive damage to the back of the President's head was an exit wound.

Analysis of the famed Zapruder film of the assassination indicated the President was knocked backward and to the left by the impact of one bullet, defying Newton's law of conservation of momentum, if all shots had been fired from the rear as the commission claimed. Tissue from the victim's head splattered a motorcycle officer riding behind the car.

No less than 64 witnesses to the shooting claimed shots were fired from the "grassy knoll" in front of the Presidential car. Some of them claimed to have seen smoke rising from the area and at least two testified they smelled gunpowder in the vicinity, where officers converged when the shots were fired.

A 1/30/1967 newspaper article by Henry J. Taylor mentions an exclusive interview with Dr. Stewart. The article does touch upon the question of a left temple wound, but Stewart himself is only quoted in relation to his treatment of the dying Lee Harvey Oswald ([Link 1](#) [[link 2](#)]).

Dr. Stewart was quoted in the [Lebanon Democrat, 3/30/1967, JFK shot from the front, speaker tells rotary, cites coverups and deception](#) by Carl Wallace:

"The President of the United States was definitely shot from the front and this fact has been covered up by the Warren Commission and the family," Dr. David Stewart told the Lebanon Rotary Club Tuesday at its noon luncheon.

Dr. Stewart, who now lives and practices medicine in Gallatin, was on duty and one of the attending physicians at Dallas' Parkland Hospital when President John Kennedy was brought there on November 22, 1964.

Another thing kept secret was the fact that the President could have possibly been suffering from Addison's Disease.

"Because of the actions of the President's White House physician on the trip with him, we at Parkland felt that the President was suffering from this," Dr. Stewart said.

The Doctor was quite critical of the apparent coverups by the family and Bethesda Naval Hospital. He said there were many things overlooked by the Warren Commission when they investigated and

that the whole, complete story has never been told. He quoted the Warren Commission as saying in Texas that it might possibly be seventy-five years before the complete story is known.

"If the family and the naval hospital will hide certain facts that we at Parkland know about, then it is certain they will hide other facts," he added. To illustrate this point he noted that certain files were destroyed, x-ray films disappeared and the family was given custody over the autopsy reports.

Before the President's visit Parkland was chosen as the hospital to be used in case there was a need while in Dallas.

"Just as soon as the President was shot, they knew exactly what to do and where to go," Dr. Stewart said. At the time the President was brought to Parkland, about lunch time, all of the chiefs of departments were on hand. "There was no lack of competent help," he said and added "If it had been fifteen minutes later, it might have been a different story."

He described in detail the wounds President Kennedy received. He told the club the President had three visible wounds and was in a desperate condition. "He was not dead when he arrived at Parkland and our main objective was to clear the airway which we did and to stop the hemorrhaging. However, before the hemorrhaging could be stopped, the President died," Dr. Stewart said.

The wound in the left front was definitely entered from the front, Dr. Stewart said. One of the basics for diagnosing the frontal entry was the fact that tissue and brain particle was found on the motorcycle officer who was to the rear of the Presidential car. "Why they have never said anything about this is hard for us to understand," and added "That much has been covered up in the entire matter." He also noted that all of this was told to the Warren Commission but apparently they weren't interested in it.

OTHER DETAILS he commented on like this:

That he helped take care of Governor Connally and that he was shot separately and apart from any bullet that struck the president.

Original notes at Parkland have been destroyed by fire. After the President had left each doctor on duty wrote in long hand his account of the activities at Parkland.

That Oswald was on the way by the most direct route to see Jack Ruby when he was (sic) killed by Officer Tippit. Oswald was later shot by Ruby and he too was brought to Parkland where he died.

He said that Attorney General Jim Garrison's probe into the Kennedy assassination is a fraud.

Dr. Stewart was introduced by a former classmate, Dr. James Bradshaw of Lebanon. A question and answer period followed the speech by Dr. Stewart.

From Dr. Stewart's appearance on the Joe Dolan Show, KNEW radio, Oakland, CA, 4/10/1967:

Dolan: Dr. Stewart

Stewart: Yes, sir.

Dolan: Good morning, Dr. Stewart, thank you for being with us.

Stewart: Good morning to you, Mr. Dolan.

D: Dr. Stewart, I am surprised that the national media have not picked up the statements that you made in Tennessee about your attendance at the Parkland Hospital when President Kennedy was brought in. Doctor, will you tell us about that please in your own words.

S: Well I could say briefly that I was attendance at the time. Primarily my time was spent with Governor Connelly and later with Lee Oswald. Another group of physicians was taking care of the President on his entry to the emergency room, but of course I am aware of their findings as such.

D: In particular, doctor, I'm concerned with is that statement about the shot coming, one of the shots that tore the President's head off, on the side of his head, was coming from the front.

S: Yes, sir. This was a finding of all the psycians who were in attendance. There was a small wound in the left front of the President's head and the and there was a quite massive wound of exit at the right backside of his head and it was felt by all of the psycians at the time to be a wound of entry which went in the front. And this was later cooborated, I think, by the films which showed the President with a rather violent lurch backward. This was in the movie, you will remember.

D: I remember them well.

S: And there was blood and brain substance found on one of the policemen riding behind on a motorcycle.

D: Behind and to the left.

S: Yes. And so we felt that this rather completely substantiated the finding that this was a left frontal entry wound. And we felt, of course, that the lethal wound had come in from the front.

D: Now, doctor, that would be the right front entry wound?

S: It came in from the left front and exited at the right back of the head and there was a massive amount of brain damage back there.

D. Now doctor, this is of course even the laymen unfamiliar with rifle shooting knows that if a bullet goes into a bag it leaves a very very tiny smooth hole when it comes out the other side. It usually leaves a jagged gash. So this squares with that what we know about a rifle bullet, doesn't it?

S: That certainly does.

D: Now, doctor, you're familiar I presume with Mark Lane's RUSH TO JUDGMENT?

S: I have not read it, but I'm somewhat familiar with it.

D: Well, doctor, he was one of the first to raise the specter in some of the inconsistencies in the accounts about the President's death. And then after the official report, the Warren Commission Report, predicated everything on a single bullet theory. Then, of course, Mark Lane's RUSH TO JUDGMENT looked more and more accurate. Well, anyway, he talks about the bullet, one of the bullets coming from the front from the grassy knoll. Are you familiar with that theory?

S: Yes, sir.

D: And, doctor, would you say that from what you know of the wound in squares with the grassy knoll theory?

S: Yes, sir. I certainly would. Now, the exact position of the marksman that fired the bullet I wouldn't know. But I would say that it would be from the bullet and having been of course familiar with the area in Dallas, I would say that the most likely place would have been from the grassy knoll.

D: Now doctor, let me put it to you in a negative fashion. You asserted that positively, let me put it this way. Would it be virtually impossible from all of your knowledge of anatomy, the entrance wound and the exit wound and the splattering of the blood and the brains and the motorcycle policeman to the left rear and so on, wouldn't it be virtually impossible for a marksman in the sixth floor of the book depository to have created that kind of a wound shooting from behind?

S: Yes, sir. It certainly would. and this is the reason that so many people are now thinking that although almost assuredly Oswald was involved in this thing, the people who know the most doubt seriously that he was the one who fired the lethal bullet.

D: Doctor, can you- do you have any speculation as to how or why the Warren Commission would have overlooked so obvious and substantive a fact as that?

S: The only thing that I can figure is that the motivation behind why the President was assassinated has to be considered. And if there were a case where a single man had become somewhat psychotic and had done it alone I could see no justifiable reason at all to hide any of the facts behind it. However, if this was a conspiratorial affair which it seems to me that it was, then there might be reasons that they would find it necessary, perhaps even for their own protection, to hide certain of the facts.

D: Well, doctor, I'm not going to draw any further philosophical implications from this about a free people and our knowing the facts. I would like to ask you a few things more - in your special area. to you hold with the- well obviously, you cannot hold with the magic bullet theory, that one bullet entering down between the President's shoulder blades came out his throat, into Connelly, out of Connelly, into his wrist, out of his wrist and ended up in his thigh. You don't hold with that theory?

S: No, sir.

D: Now, doctor, was the bullet, the so-called magic bullet that was discovered in the Parkland Hospital under a stretcher, is that the one that was supposed to have ended up in Connelly's thigh?

S: I don't know. We didn't see that bullet. You know that both the President and Governor Connelly were, of course, on separate stretchers and I don't remember any of the physicians at Parkland seeing that particular bullet. Of course, they were much more intent, all of us were, in their wounds rather than finding the bullet and so I really don't know. The governor did not have an intact bullet in his thigh. There were only a couple of fragments, metallic fragments from the missile there. and the hip thigh was explored surgically to ascertain that there was no major vascular nerve damage in that thigh and there was not any. But the bullet itself may or may not... really I can't comment on that because we didn't see it. I only know that these are relatively small fragments that were present in the Governor's thigh.

([Transcript \[link 2\]](#))

Dr. David Stewart wrote, in a [12/11/1981 letter to researcher Harrison Livingstone](#), “*On the Joe Dolan show, I meant to indicate that there was never any controversy concerning the wounds between the doctors in attendance. I was with them either separately or in groups on many occasions over a long period of time. Concerning Exhibit F-48, there is no way the wound described to me by Dr. Perry and others could be the wound shown in the picture. The massive destructive wound could not remotely be pulled together well enough to give a normal contour to the head that is present in this picture*”.

Researcher David Lifton corresponded with Dr. Stewart in 1982 and 1989 (Lifton, [educationforum.ipbhost.com, comment 370979, comment 371024](#)). More details may be revealed in Lifton’s upcoming book, “*Final Charade*”.

On 12/1/1971, researcher Harold Weisberg interviewed Parkland Drs. Charles Carrico, Robert McClelland, and Malcolm Perry. Referring to Carrico, [Weisberg’s personal notes](#) read “*saw no wound left temple*”. Then, as summarized in Weisberg’s book *Post Mortem*, 1975 edition:

[...*Epilogue*, p. 376-377]

From Carrico’s office in Room 208, I went to the sixth floor, where Drs. Robert N. McClelland and Perry have offices opposite each other. McClelland was in, Perry was then not. McClelland was pleasant, greeting me cordially. I asked him about his contemporaneous statement, that “the cause of death” was “a gunshot wound of the left temple” (R527) He does remember it and began an apology by saying “it was a total mistake on my part”. His explanation is that “Ginger”, Dr. Marion T. Jenkins, called the spot to his attention. McClelland seemed genuinely disturbed about this. He was bitter that the New Orleans assistant district attorneys had asked him about it and self-satisfied with how he talked them out of calling him as a witness – by telling them he would swear it had been a “total mistake”.

I asked him why he never corrected this alleged mistake, especially when he was deposed and Specter, having avoided it with obvious care, asked him instead if there was anything he had said that he wanted to change or anything he wanted to add (6H39).

McClelland had no answer. So I asked him how he know it was, in fact, a “total mistake”. He then shifted to this position: “I don’t know that it wasn’t and I don’t know that it was”. We both realized this was a far cry from his opening, “it was a total mistake,” for almost immediately, and without vigorous questioning, he was admitting openly and without leading questions that it might not have been any mistake. A bit embarrassed, he formulated still another position, “I presume it was a wrong assumption.”

He was anxious to complain about Garrison and his assistants, and I listened to a long, bitter and irrelevant diatribe, which seemed to satisfy him. When he ran down, I asked how he would or could now account for such an error, if error it was. He then conjectured it was a spot of splattered blood. Perhaps an experienced surgeon and professor of surgery cannot tell the difference between a bullet hole of entrance to which he attributed the crime of the century and a spot of blood. I found it not easy to believe. So I asked him how he came to realize that perhaps he was in error. That it turns out, was not anything he had seen or of which he had personal knowledge, but the autopsy report taken around and shown by the federal agents! It was not in the autopsy report so it was not true, regardless of his own professional observation and opinion.

There was another obvious question and I asked it: Had he, Jenkins, or anyone else wiped this alleged spot to see if it was no more than a spot of blood or to see if it was a bullet hole when all

knew there would be an inquest which would have to establish the cause of death? His answer was simple, direct and unequivocal: “No.”

I reminded him that Jenkins also had testified to the existence of this left-temple wound. McClelland had no explanation.

Jenkins was not available. His second reference to this under oath was remarkably detailed and precise in locating the alleged wound in the left temple (6H51). This followed immediately upon an off-the-record “discussion” with Specter, the content of which Specter described as “on a couple of matters which I am now going to put on the record” (6H50). With regard to Jenkins’ professional belief and observation of the carefully described and oriented left-temple wound, Jenkins testified, “you have answered that for me”. This is one way of conducting an “investigation” with the lawyer telling the expert witness what to say and believe.

Thus it is clear, regardless of whether the doctors’ observations were correct or in error, on what could have been a vital element of the evidence, the only doctors who have personal knowledge have no basis for denying their immediate, competent, professional and unsolicited observation, that there had been a left-temple wound of entrance and that it was the likely cause of death. Instead, they were told by Specter and federal agents what to say and believe and what not to say or believe.

From Dr. McClelland’s appearance on the 1976 CTFR radio program *Thou Shalt Not Kill*:

Narrator: Another curious aspect of this case. Fact: Parkland doctors have never, for whatever reason, never viewed the autopsy and supportive evidence. In the course of our year-long investigation, we found only two of the dozen doctors willing to even talk about the case. Dr. Robert McClelland was one of two surgeons who noted a gunshot wound to the left temple. While in Dallas, we attempted to question him further. He would only answer one question: why the Parkland doctors refused to get involved.

Dr. McClelland: There are very few left, the department split up, and everybody feels the same way- put yourself in their position for twelve years, that's, you know. And nobody's trying to hide anything, it's just a pain in the ass, you know, to have people bugging you all the time when it's all been laid out, and what's gonna be known as far as we're concerned is known. So, that's kind of the position that everybody's at. And everybody's busy and working hard trying to keep up with our other duties and we just don't have time to mess with that.

Q: Do you feel that the situation was resolved to your satisfaction?

Dr. McClelland: Ah, yes, and that's all I can talk about it, I'm sorry. Bye.

([Audio, 3:47:13](#))

Later on, McClelland would support the theory of a head shot from the right front ([JAMA, 5/27/1992, JFK's death - the plain truth from the MDs who did the autopsy \[text\]](#); 4/6/1991 Dallas conference [[video, part 2](#), 44:09, 1:22:51]; *High Treason 2*, 1992, Chapter 5. *Bethesda Naval Hospital*, p. 138; 10/1/2002, 11/30/2002 interviews by Vincent Bugliosi, [Reclaiming History, 2007](#), Book One: *Matters of Fact: What Happened, Kennedy's Autopsy and the Gunshot Wounds to Kennedy and Connally*; [D Magazine, Nov. 2008, The Day Kennedy Died by Michael J. Mooney](#); [McKinney Courier-Gazette, 1/28/2012, Surgeon recounts JFK operation by Chris Beattie](#); [Undated talk, uploaded to Archive.org 2/15/2012](#); TCSS conference, 2012 [[video, part 3](#)] [[part 5](#)]; 2/21/2013 talk at the 15th annual Gathering of Eagles conference in Dallas, TX; [Dallas Morning News, 6/21/2013, Lee Harvey Oswald gets hung jury at mock JFK murder trial by Jennifer Emily](#);

[9/24/2013 interview, Sixth Floor Museum](#); [10/24/2013 lecture at Baylor University](#); [Undated presentation, uploaded to Youtube 11/22/2013](#); [2013 interview on Televisa](#); [2014 talk at UT Southwestern](#); [10/5/2015 drawing 1 \[link\]](#); [10/5/2015 drawing 2 \[link\] \[link 2\]](#); [11/12/2015 interview at Allen Public Library](#); [12/22/2016 drawing \[link\]](#); [2016 speech at Berkner High School](#); [2/28/2017 drawing \[link\]](#); [4/6/2017 drawing 1 \[link\] \[link 2\]](#); [4/6/2017 drawing 2 \[link\]](#); [4/10/2017 drawing 1 \[link\]](#); [4/10/2017 drawing 2 \[link\]](#); [6/14/2017 drawing 1 \[link\]](#); [6/14/2017 drawing 2 \[link\]](#); [7/17/2017 drawing \[link\] \[link 2\] \[link 3\]](#); [2/16/2018 drawing \[link\]](#); [Undated drawing 1; Undated drawing 2 \[link\] \[link 2\] \[link 3\] \[link 4\] \[link 5\] \[link 6\]](#); [Undated drawing 3 \[link\] \[link 2\] \[link 3\]](#); [Undated drawing 4 \[link\]](#); Undated drawing 5 [\[link\]](#); Undated drawing 6 and letter [\[link\] \[link 2\]](#); [Undated audio at studentsforrenew.org](#)). He also said that there could have been a small wound in the front of the head which he failed to notice (12/1/1971 interview by Harold Weisberg, *Post Mortem*, 1975 edition, p. 376-377, Epilogue; 4/6/1991 Dallas conference [\[video, part 2, 44:09, 1:22:51\]](#); Bugliosi, 10/1/2002, 11/30/2002 interviews, [Reclaiming History, 2007](#), Book One: *Matters of Fact: What Happened, Kennedy's Autopsy and the Gunshot Wounds to Kennedy and Connally*; TCSS conference, 2012 [\[video, part 5, 4:33\]](#); 9/24/2013 interview, Sixth Floor Museum [\[video, 23:34\]](#); 2013 interview on Televisa [\[video, 14:45\]](#); [10/5/2015 drawing 1 \[link\]](#); [10/5/2015 drawing 2 \[link\] \[link 2\]](#); [2/28/2017 drawing \[link\]](#); [4/6/2017 drawing 1 \[link\] \[link 2\]](#); [4/6/2017 drawing 2 \[link\]](#); [4/10/2017 drawing 1 \[link\]](#); [4/10/2017 drawing 2 \[link\]](#); [6/14/2017 drawing 1 \[link\]](#); [7/17/2017 drawing \[link\] \[link 2\] \[link 3\]](#); [2/16/2018 drawing \[link\]](#); [Undated drawing 1; Undated drawing 2 \[link\] \[link 2\] \[link 3\] \[link 4\] \[link 5\] \[link 6\]](#); [Undated drawing 3 \[link\] \[link 2\] \[link 3\]](#); [Undated drawing 4 \[link\]](#); Undated drawing 5 [\[link\]](#); Undated drawing 6 and letter [\[link\] \[link 2\]](#)).

From a report on Dr. Jenkins' 11/10/1977 interview by the House Select Committee on Assassinations:

Dr. Jenkins attempted to explain (on his own initiative) Dr. McClelland's Warren Commission testimony that the President had a wound of the left temple. He said McClelland did not personally see the wound and misinterpreted Dr. Jenkins' feeling the President's left temple for a pulse as indicating there was a wound there.

([HSCA Vol. 7, p. 285 \[text\]](#))

From a 1/11/1978 interview of Dr. Malcolm Perry by the HSCA:

PERRY: [...] Normally, what we do -- well, normally, yes; but normally just one of us. Normally, the guy -- myself, for example, since I ostensibly was responsible for the surgery and the rest of it, normally the guy who's attending and who's doing the job writes a summary about it afterwards for the record. The reason all of us did was we thought it might be important -- more than the usual -- to have a good record. I'm not sure it served its purpose. I haven't read everybody's, but I've read some of them and I found they didn't correspond with what I remembered.

PURDY: Do you remember any in particular?

PERRY: No, no, but I remember the stuff about Bob McClelland's. We talked about that later because we talked about the thing in the temple. And we all kind of laughed about that but I just, you know, Bob was told when he joined in there and like me he didn't spend much time because he saw I needed help. And when he started helping me with the trache, he asked where he was shot. And somebody told him he was shot in the left temple and he accepted that as being true, when actually it wasn't true and I think Bob wrote that down -- or if he didn't write it down, he told somebody that, which was interesting. But, you know, you get naive and trustworthy and that's a bad way to be.

([HSCA Vol. 7, p. 292 \[text\] \[audio\]](#))

From a [2/9/1979 letter from Dr. Jenkins to researcher John Lattimer](#):

[...] I exercised no thought at all about entrance and exit for the head wound. In retrospect I think I automatically accepted the fact that if a bullet came from the back to traverse his neck, another bullet came from the back to go through the skull.

[...] You will recall the big commotion stirred by Mr. Garrison, the District Attorney of New Orleans, who was trying to bring to trial conspirators whom he named. One of his statements which was repeatedly quoted was that bullets entering the President's body came from more than one direction. After much publicity was given to this thesis, I learned from a member of his staff that for indirect reasons he was expecting me to be the primary witness for the fact that the shots came from at least two directions. Apparently Mr. Garrison or members of his staff, in going over the many reports made to the Warren Commission or elsewhere, found that Dr. Robert N. McClelland, a member of the surgical staff who arrived in the trauma room after resuscitation efforts were well under way, asked me what were the President's injuries. Evidently, just as I answered, '...and a gunshot wound to his head,' I moved my left hand so as to place my left middle finger on the President's temporal artery in feeling for a pulse. Dr. McClelland tells me he thought I moved my hand there and with a finger indicated the site of a bullet entrance, and I believe he offered this in testimony at some point. After I recounted this to the representative from Mr. Garrison's office I was asked for no further testimony.

In 1979, Dr. Jenkins was interviewed by Harrison Livingstone. As summarized in Livingstone's 2004 book *The Radical Right and the Murder of John F. Kennedy*:

As I remembered my meeting with him in 1979, when he had me lie down on a table and demonstrated the wounds (he did this with Ben Bradlee Jr. when my Boston Globe team went to Dallas to check my work), he said that he "thought" there was an entry hole in the left temple, but he was evidently mistaken.

([Link](#))

This reference to Dr. Gene Akin is listed in *JFK: From Parkland to Bethesda* by Vincent Palamara, 2015:

6/28/84 FBI Memorandum, SA Udo H. Specht to SAC, Dallas, re: interviews with Akin (RIF#124-10158-10449)---"On 6/18/84, the writer and SA DOUG DAVIS interviewed an individual who stated he was formerly Dr. GENE COLEMAN AKIN, the senior resident anesthesiologist at Parkland Hospital, Dallas, Texas. AKIN stated that he was on duty at the hospital on 11/22/63 when President KENNEDY was brought in the emergency room. AKIN stated that the FBI interviewed him during the 1963-1964 period concerning any of the observations he made on 11/22/63. AKIN stated that the "historic accident" of being present in the emergency room on 11/22/63 changed his whole life in a negative way. He feels that the governments on both a federal and state level have harassed him since that time. He stated that he quit practicing medicine in 1979 or 1980 and that DEA took his narcotics license away. He has never recouped the money it cost him to practice medicine because of government interference with his own destiny and self-initiative. He has been on welfare since 1980 and feels it is now the government's obligation to take care of him. He claims that his sister had him committed to Terrell State Hospital and he was incarcerated in that institution from March 9 through May 25, 1984. He stated that it took him that long to convince the doctors that he was not a "nut." AKIN is in the hospital for heart by-pass surgery on 6/20/84 and he has also

been diagnosed as having renal cancer. AKIN also stated that he had his name changed to SOLOMON BEN ISRAEL and he was interviewed in Room 439, St. PAUL's HOSPITAL, Dallas, Texas. AKIN ranted and raved about government injustice and conspiracies against him and behaved in a general aberrant manner. His mannerism in communicating, in the opinion of the writer, gave him or the information he was trying to relate no credibility whatsoever. The writer attempted to listen to him for over one hour. AKIN made efforts to contact the Dallas news media in order to tell his story, but apparently received very little favorable response. The writer made efforts to get AKIN to tell his story. AKIN kept ranting and raving about items from the right to the left of the political spectrum. AKIN did finally say that when he saw President KENNEDY in the emergency room on 11/22/63, he thought he saw a bullet entrance wound on the President's forehead. The President was covered with blood in the head area and the back of his head was blown wide open. AKIN feels that his observation as to the possible entrance wound on the President's forehead is significant and that he did not mention this item when he was interviewed in 1963-1964 because he did not want to be killed by any conspirators. AKIN stated that if this entrance wound was not documented in the Presidential autopsy, then plastic surgery was probably conducted to cover this up. AKIN made available a cassette tape recording of items he recorded himself during the past few days. The tape recording was reviewed by the writer and contained no information whatsoever concerning AKIN's comments about the assassination of President KENNEDY. [redaction: at least one paragraph] At 1:45 pm, 6/28/84, AKIN telephonically contacted the writer and stated that he checked himself out [of] St. Paul's hospital to [be] re-evaluated as to what to do about his medical condition. He stated that he was calling from the Dallas County Jail and that he had been arrested on 6/26/84. He was unspecific as to why he was arrested, but he indicated that it was some type of fraud charge and alcohol might have been an issue also. He wanted the writer to get him out of Jail and that it was all the FBI's fault that his troubles are continuing. AKIN became extremely verbally abusive and the writer terminated the call. [redaction: at least a few sentences; end]"

([Link](#))

A report on an earlier 1981 interview with Gene Akin by Ben Bradlee of the Boston Globe likewise noted "*Akin recently legally changed his name to 'Solomon Ben-Israel'*".

The transcript of Dr. Akin's 3/25/1964 WC testimony does not specifically describe any small wounds in the head:

Mr. SPECTER - With respect to the head wound, Dr. Akin, did you observe below the gaping wound which you have described any other bullet wound in the back of the head?

Dr. AKIN - No; I didn't. I could not see the back of the President's head as such, and the right posterior neck was obscured by blood and skull fragments and I didn't make any attempt to examine the neck.

[...]

Mr. SPECTER - How many bullets were involved in the wounds inflicted on the President, Dr. Akin?

Dr. AKIN - Probably two.

Mr. SPECTER - Have you ever changed any of your original opinions in connection with your observations of the President or any opinions you formed in connection with what you saw?

Dr. AKIN - You mean as to how he was injured?

Mr. SPECTER - Yes, as to how he was injured.

Dr. AKIN - Well, no; not really because I didn't have any opinions, necessarily. Any speculation that I might have done about how he was injured was just that, it was just speculation. I didn't form an opinion until it was revealed where he was when he was injured and where the alleged assassin was when he fired the shots, so I didn't have any opinions. It was my immediate assumption that when I saw the extent of the head wound, I assumed at that point that he had probably been hit in the head with a high velocity missile because of the damage that had been done. The same thing happened to his head as would happen to a sealed can of sauerkraut that you hit with a high velocity missile.

Mr. SPECTER - Did you have any opinion as to the direction-that the bullet hit his head?

Dr. AKIN - I assume that the right occipitalparietal region was the exit, so to speak, that he had probably been hit on the other side of the head, or at least tangentially in the back of the head, but I didn't have any hard and fast opinions about that either.

([WC Vol. 6, p. 63 \[text\]](#))

Not only does Akin's WC testimony transcript not include any mention of a small wound in the head, but Akin said the large wound looked like it could have been caused by a bullet striking tangentially.

A taped interview with "Gene Akin" by a team from the Boston Globe was summarized in Harrison Livingstone's 1989 book *High Treason*:

[...Part II: The Medical Evidence, Chapter 2p: *The President's Head Wounds And The New Evidence Of Forgery, THE HOLE IN THE BACK OF THE HEAD*]

Dr. Gene Akin was an Anesthesiologist at Parkland at the time. He told the Warren Commission that "the back of the right occipital-parietal portion of (Kennedy's) head was shattered, with brain substance extruding."⁴³ "I assume that the right occipital parietal region (right rear) was the exit"⁴⁴ Akin reaffirmed this to the *Globe* team and basically did not accept the official picture. On seeing the sketch, he said, "Well in my judgment at the time, what I saw was more parietal. But on the basis of this sketch, if this is what Bob McClelland saw, then it's more occipital."⁴⁵ Akin further said that Dr. Kemp Clark saw the entry wound in the temple.

This is yet another such reference to Kemp Clark, the first being the 11/27/1963 article by Arthur Snider which said "*Identification of two points of entry, the throat and the skull, was made by Dr. Kemp Clark, neurosurgeon, and Dr. Tom Shires, chief of surgery at Parkland Hospital. They said neither bullet was recovered in the hospital emergency room. One bullet was said to have emerged from the left temple*" (Fort Worth Star-Telegram, *Movies Reconstruct Tragedy* by Arthur Snider, 11/27/1963 [[link 1](#)] [[link 2, The Akron Beacon Journal, 11/28/1963](#)]).

In the afterword of Livingstone's 1989 book *High Treason*, there is the sentence "*The first doctor to see what he said was a bullet entry wound near the left temple was Dr. Lito Porto. This was described by Dr. Robert McClelland in his report*" ([Link](#)). This is the earliest known reference to Dr. Lito Porto being in Trauma Room One. There is no elaboration or reference to where this information came from, but one paragraph before does start with "*Dr. Ronald Jones told me that the large hole was directly in the back head. "He had a lot of damage to the scalp. It was blown away."*".

Along with a 6/23/1990 letter, Dr. McClelland wrote on a copy of his original hospital report “*This is my statement to the Secret Service. There was no wound at the left temple as First thought - simply much blood clot in that area*” ([Link](#)).

From McClelland’s appearance in the Journal of the American Medical Association, 5/27/1992:

[...] McClelland had originally mistakenly written in his hospital chart that the wound to Kennedy's head struck the *left* temple. This error, as published in the Warren report, later prompted a call from the office of New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison, who wanted to bring him to New Orleans in 1969 to testify in the conspiracy trial of Clay Shaw. McClelland recalls, "Well, when I told the investigator that I had made a mistake in 1963, there was a sudden silence at the other end of the line."

([JAMA, 5/27/1992, JFK's death - the plain truth from the MDs who did the autopsy \[text\]](#))

In 1992, Dr. McClelland was contacted by researcher Brad Parker. As summarized:

[...] Dr. McClelland's report reflects a "...a gunshot wound of the left temple" (CE 392:17WCH 12), a mistake which would follow him for years. Dr. McClelland, however, explains the mistake in quite different terms: "I wrote that down (in my report) because Jenkins has said that there was (a wound there in the left temple), and I knew that he knew that there was a bullet hole there, and that fit with that larger (posterior) wound" (emphasis added) (McClelland 09-10-92)

([Kennedy Assassination Chronicles, Volume 3, Issue 1, Spring 1997, p. 7, Dr. Robert McClelland in Trauma Room One by Brad Parker](#))

Gerald Posner, in his [1993 book Case Closed](#), described an interview with Dr. Jenkins:

[...Chapter 13. “*He Had a Death Look*”]

In his original report, McClelland said there was a wound to the left temple, one that does not show up on any autopsy X ray or photograph. This has caused some to charge that Kennedy was shot by a second gunman from another location at Dealey, and that the autopsy team either negligently or intentionally overlooked that wound. “I’ll tell you how that happened,” Dr. Jenkins explained to the author. “When Bob McClelland came into the room, he asked me, ‘Where are his wounds?’ And at that time I was operating a breathing bag with my right hand, and was trying to take the President’s temporal pulse, and I had my finger on his left temple. Bob thought I pointed to the left temple as the wound.”

In a [November 1993 presentation](#), Dr. Jenkins indicated that he believed the fatal head shot could have come from behind.

In an [undated presentation uploaded to Youtube on 9/26/2013](#), Jenkins continued to argue in favor of the official story, referencing information from John Lattimer.

Dr. Jenkins passed away on 11/21/1994 ([New York Times, 11/23/1994](#); [Baltimore Sun, 11/23/1994](#); [Buffalo News, 11/23/1994](#); [Associated Press, 11/23/1994](#); [Findagrave.com](#)).

A Parkland employee named Dr. Donald Seldin would later claim to have seen Kennedy's body. Dr. Seldin wrote, in a 8/27/1998 letter to Vincent Palamara, "*The bullet struck the President in the forehead and literally exploded in his skull, so that the entire frontal, parietal and temporal bones*

were shattered...I believe that the official story is accurate in all details" ([Link](#)). Perhaps the "forehead" reference is too vague for Seldin to be considered a "proper" witness in regards to a small frontal head wound.

On 8/27/1998, the Assassination Records Review Board held a group interview with Parkland Drs. Charles Baxter, Ronald Jones, Robert McClelland, Malcom Perry, and Paul Peters. As transcribed:

MR. GUNN: [...] Then to Dr. Jenkins he refers -- this is from packet [MD 96](#). He refers to a great laceration on the right side of the head temporal and occipital. He also says the cerebellum had protruded from the wound.

In his testimony to the Warren Commission he said that -- on Page 48 he thought that this wound in the head was a wound of exit, although he wasn't sure. He said, quote, "I really think part of the cerebellum, as I recognized it, was herniated from the wound." He then said that, "I thought there was a wound on the left temporal area right in the hairline and right above the zygomatic process."

From Page 51 of his Warren Commission testimony he says, "Because the wound with the exploded area of the scalp, as I interpreted it being exploded, I would interpret it being a wound of exit, and the appearance of the wound in the neck, and I also thought it was it a wound of exit."

Finally in his testimony to the House Select Committee on Assassinations he said, There was one segment of bone blown out. It was a segment of occipital or temporal bone. He noted that a portion of the cerebellum, lower rear brain, was hanging out from the hole in the right rear of the head.

[...]

I'd like to start out -- and that's the last major part that I hope to play in this discussion. I'd like to start out, if we could -- and maybe just start with Dr. Jones and then just go down the room -- of first where you were in trauma room No. 1 and what kind of view you had of President Kennedy in trauma room No 1, Dr. Jones.

DR. JONES: I was on his left side below the arm looking to my right I could easily see the neck wound I could not see in much detail the posterior wound, but did not see any flap of skull or anything laying out to the right side I saw relaxation of the facial tissues & perhaps of the hair, and I remained on the President's right side during the entire resuscitation attempt.

MR. GUNN: Did you ever go around and observe the left side?

DR. JONES: Left side. Excuse, I was on the left side.

MR. GUNN: Okay.

DR. JONES: Was I saying right side?

MR. GUNN: So all of your view was of the left side?

DR. JONES: All my view was from the President's left side.

MR. GUNN: Okay. Did you ever go around and observe the right side of the -

DR. JONES: I did not go around to the right side.

MR. GUNN: Could you observe any posterior wound on -- of the head from the left side where you were?

DR. JONES: At one point after we had completed the insertion of the chest tubes, IV, and tracheotomy, I looked up over the top of the President's head and from that view was all that I saw. But with him flat on the table, I could not appreciate the size of that wound but did not see a lot of skull or brain tissue on the table, some maybe, but not just a tremendous amount and certainly did not see a flap turned on the right side.

MR GUNN: Were you yourself able to identify any cerebellum or cerebrum tissue on the table?

DR. JONES: If there was I thought -- from my vantage point, I thought that it was a very small amount.

MR. GUNN: And were you able to identify one form of brain tissue versus another?

DR. JONES: No -

MR GUNN: Okay.

DR JONES: - but did see the very small wound which I thought was an entrance wound to the head. That was pretty clear.

[...]

DR. McCLELLAND: Let me just tell you that Paul brought it up.

Dr. Jenkins, when I came in the room, told me as I walked by to come up to the head of the table and he said , Bob, there's a wound in the left temple there. And so I went to the table and I thought, you know, knowing nothing else about any of the circumstances, that's like that (indicating).

MR. GUNN: Just for the record, you're pointing in with your -

DR. McCLELLAND: Yeah, the left temple -

MR. GUNN: -- finger at the left temple and now the back o the head.

DR. McCLELLAND: -- came out the back. And there was a lot of blood on the left temple. There was blood everywhere, but there was a lot of blood on the left temple, so I didn't question that. And in fact, in something else -- Pepper testified somewhere else, he denied that he said that to me in the Warren Commission. And I told him -- I said Pepper, don't you remember? No, I never said that, Bob, and I never said the cerebellum fell out. Well, yes, you did, too, but I didn't argue with him.

But the upshot of it is what that led to was Mr. Garrison's case in New Orleans, and he put together a scenario where he thought someone -- because of what I had said about the left temple bullet -- was in the storm sewer on the left side of the car and fired this bullet that killed the President, another gunman. He didn't say that Oswald was not there. He just said there was another gunman. And so he never contact -- Garrison never contacted me until it was essentially time to have the case in court.

DR. PETERS: Clay Shaw.

DR. McCLELLAND: Right. And so I got a call one morning and it was from his office -- one of the people in Garrison's office, and he wanted to know if I would come to New Orleans and testify. And I said, Well, you know, it's odd that none of you had talked to me before this. I've been hearing something about it on television and whatnot. And they said, Well, we assumed that you still believed that the course of the bullet was as you said in your written testimony right after, and I said no. And his voice went up about three octaves and he said, What? And I said no, and I explained to him that I had learned other things about the circumstances at the time and that Jenkins had told me I didn't see any wound here. I was just stating what I had been told and that I wrote that down in my written statement right after the assassination. And so that was -- kind of took the wind out of the sails in that particular prosecution.

DR. JONES: I have two comments relating to this, what's just been said and my comment. The afternoon of the assassination we were up in the OR and Lito Puerto -- I think it's L-i-t-o, Puerto, P-u-e-r-t-o -- was in the OR -

DR. PETERS: Neurosurgeon..

DR. JONES: -- and he said he was -- that he referred to the President -- because he had been down there and he said, I put my -- he was shot in the leg. I said, he was shot in the left temple. He said, I put my finger in the hole, and I think that was part of --

DR. McCLELLAND: I never heard that. That's news to me.

DR. JONES: And so -- in fact, I told Mr. Haron the other day -- I gave him Lito Puerto's name and his telephone number. I said you know if you're going to have the group down here, why don't you get Puerto down here to clarify that comment, if indeed that were the case or it's not the case But I think that was part of where some of that came from. The other comment that -- to clarify what I said regarding Arlen Specter, I'm saying [sic] that he pressured me because that was after the testimony that I had given. I think what he was implying was that -

DR. PERRY: Discretion.

DR. JONES: -- that you - you could get people to testify that the President had been shot from the front.

DR. PERRY: He was asking you to be discreet -

DR. JONES: I think that's right.

DR. PERRY: -- not to -- not to talk too much.

DR. JONES: Not to talk about -- he didn't say don't -

DR. PERRY: He didn't know you weren't going to talk about it.

DR. JONES: -- don't say what you think, but he suggested that I not talk about what he was telling me.

MR. GUNN : Okay.

DR. PERRY: He didn't know you weren't going to talk about it anyway.

DR. JONES: Not for 35 years.

MR. GUNN: I think that each of you has now responded to the question about whether you had felt any pressure except for Dr. McClelland unless I missed that.

DR. McCLELLAND: I felt no pressure.

MR. GUNN: No pressure? Did anytime -- anything ever happen subsequently to the Warren Commission where you felt any pressure from anyone, the Government, to testify one way or the other about this?

DR. McCLELLAND: No.

DR. JONES: No.

MR. GUNN: You're all shaking your heads Dr. Peters, is that --

DR. PETERS: No, I've never felt any pressure. The only -- well, fine.

DR. McCLELLAND: When did Lito say he did that?

DR. JONES: It was that afternoon.

DR. McCLELLAND: That afternoon.

DR. JONES: It was my -- it was that afternoon, and I believe we were upstairs, but he had mentioned that he had put his finger into the -- and he was sort of known as the guy that went down and put his fingers in missile -or bullet --

DR. PETERS: Brains.

DR. JONES: -- wounds, and that was his comment at the time.

DR. PETERS: where's he practicing now?

DR. BAXTER: Arlington.

DR. JONES: I believe he's in Arlington. I don't know if he's in active practice but he's listed -- still listed in the state medical association.

DR. BAXTER: He is. He's still in practice.

(Transcript [text])

Dr. Ronald Jones never elaborated on what he said, in regards to “*All my view was from the President's left side*”, “*...but did see the very small wound which I thought was an entrance wound to the head. That was pretty clear*”, or about Dr. Lito Porto and “*The afternoon of the assassination we were up in the OR and Lito Puerto -- I think it's L-i-t-o, Puerto, P-u-e-r-t-o -- was in the OR -*”, “*...he said he was -- that he referred to the President -- because he had been down there and he said, I put my -- he was shot in the leg. I said, he was shot in the left temple. He said, I put my finger in the hole...*”. None of Dr. Jones' other recorded statements reference a small frontal head

wound ([WC Vol. 20, p. 333, 11/23/1963 hospital report](#); [WC Vol. 6, p. 51, 3/24/1964 WC testimony \[text\]](#); 11/10/1966 interview by David Lifton, *Best Evidence*, 1980; [1981 Boston Globe interview report](#); Jan. 1983 interview by Lifton, *Best Evidence*, 1992 edition, Afterword; KRON, 11/18/1988, *JFK: An Unsolved Murder* [[video, 30:40](#)]; Interview by Boston Globe team, Livingstone, *High Treason*, 1989, PART II: *THE MEDICAL EVIDENCE*, Chapter 2: *The President's Head Wounds and the New Evidence of Forgery*, *TESTIMONY OF PARKLAND DOCTORS AND NURSES*; 4/5/1991 interview by Livingstone, *High Treason 2*, 1992, p. 106-107, Chapter 4. *Parkland Memorial Hospital; Killing the Truth*, 1993, p. 717, Appendix J, *Encyclopedia of Medical Events And Witness Testimony*, *THROAT WOUND*; 6/19/1992 presentation and 8/10/1992, 3/4/1994 correspondence with Brad Parker, [Kennedy Assassination Chronicles, Vol. 1, Issue 1, 3/30/1995, p. 23, A Conversation With Ronald C. Jones, M.D.](#); 4/14/1992 interview by Gerald Posner, [Case Closed, 1993](#), Chapter 13. "He Had a Death Look"; 10/13/1998 letter to Vince Palamara, *JFK: From Parkland to Bethesda*, 2015 [[link](#)]; [BUMC Proceedings, Vol. 12, No. 2, Apr. 1999, Assassination of a President](#); Interview by William Clifford Roberts, 8/1/2001, [BUMC Proceedings, Vol. 15, No. 1, Jan 2002](#); [CNBC, 11/21/2003 interview by Brian Williams](#); [Interview by Larry King, 12/23/2003](#); [Sixth Floor Museum, 9/24/2013 interview](#); [Sixth Floor Museum, 11/20/2013 panel discussion](#); [CNN, Nov. 2013 interview](#); [CBS, Face the Nation, Nov. 2013](#); [JACS, Vol. 218, No. 4, Apr. 2014, The President's Been Shot and They Are Bringing Him to the Emergency Room](#); [Undated audio, uploaded to Archive.org 10/1/2015](#)). Jones said, in his 3/24/1964 WC testimony, that he initially wasn't sure of which direction the head shot came from, and initially speculated that a bullet entered the throat and coursed upwards to exit the head ([WC Vol. 6, p. 51 \[text\]](#)). In later statements, Jones seemed to support the idea of a head shot from behind ([Sixth Floor Museum, 9/24/2013 interview](#); [JACS, Vol. 218, No. 4, Apr. 2014, The President's Been Shot and They Are Bringing Him to the Emergency Room](#)).

Vince Palamara had some brief contact with the son of Dr. Porto:

8/31/98 letter to Vince Palamara from Dr. Boris Porto, Lito's son--- "Vince, Lito is my father! Call me and I'll give you info.-Boris";

9/6/98 call to Dr. Boris Porto from Vince Palamara; 9/8/98 call from Dr. Boris Porto to Vince Palamara (relaying info. from his father)- His father said that "he needs to keep his mouth quiet" but referred me to Drs. Charlie Baxter and Jim Carrico; Boris: "he was there...he was the neurosurgery chief resident, the first one to come out of that program"---Kemp Clark was "overseeing my father";

(Palamara, *JFK: From Parkland to Bethesda*, 2015 [[link](#)])

On 10/1/2002 and 11/30 2002, Dr. McClelland was contacted by researcher Vincent Bugliosi. Bugliosi summarized, in his [2007 book Reclaiming History](#):

[...Book One: *Matters of Fact: What Happened, Kennedy's Autopsy and the Gunshot Wounds to Kennedy and Connally*]

It was getting late in the evening, Dallas time, but before I ended the interview I reminded Dr. McClelland of the fact that in his Parkland Hospital admission note at 4:45 p.m. on the day of the assassination, he had written that the president died "from a gunshot wound of the left temple."¹⁶⁵ "Yes," he said, "that was a mistake. I never saw any wound to the president's left temple. Dr. Jenkins had told me there was a wound there, though he later denied telling me this."* [...]

From Dr. McClelland's appearance in [D Magazine, The Day Kennedy Died by Michael J. Mooney, Nov. 2008](#):

Jenkins had his hands full, but nodded down to Kennedy's head. He said, "Bob, there's a wound there." The head was covered in blood and blood clots, tiny collections of dark red mass. McClelland thought he meant there was a wound at the president's left temple. Later that gesture would cause some confusion.

[...]

The doctors were taken upstairs to fill out brief reports for the Secret Service. Each was instructed to write about a page describing what had happened. McClelland was the only doctor to mention a wound in the temple, the place he believed Jenkins was nodding at earlier. He would later clarify for the Warren Commission that he did not see such a wound. He would give his testimony to the assistant counsel of the President's Commission, Arlen Specter, four months after the assassination.

[...]

From a 2009 interview of Dr. McClelland by Canadian radio broadcaster Brent Holland:

Q: Was there any wounds to the other side of his head, his left side?

A: Well, I was told that there was by Dr. Jenkins when I came into the room.

Q: Oh, is that right?

A: Dr. Jenkins' hands were busy, so he couldn't point really, but he nodded his head in what I took to mean the left temple, and he said 'Bob, there's a wou- there seems to be a wound there in the left temple'. Well, his head was covered with blood, and I couldn't see anywhere in the left temple, but I wrote that in my immediate impressions that I wrote down after we left Trauma Room One, immediately after we left there. The Secret Service men gave each one of us a sheet of paper and asked us to write down our immediate impressions of what we saw and did in Trauma Room One, and that was like fifteen minutes after we left down there, and those- In fact, if you look at the New York Times condensed version of the Warren Commission, those things we wrote down were photocopied and reproduced in that New York Times abridged version of the Warren Commission that the New York Times put out.

Q: Sir, when you were looking at his body, did you notice any other wounds in any other areas of his body?

A: No, and we didn't go over his body, all over his body, and we did miss a wound, as we learned the next day from the pathologist at Bethesda Naval Hospital. We missed the wound in his back, but he had no other wounds, and as it turns out, that wou- there was no- apparently, there was no wound in the left temple as I mistakenly was lead to believe by Dr. Jenkins. And he first said that there was a wound when he first- Dr. Jenkins first testified to the Warren Commission, he had said that he thought there was a wound in the left temple, he didn't necessarily say he saw it, but he also told- told the Warren Commission investigators in his initial testimony that he had told me he had seen a wound in the left temple. However, in subsequent testimony, he denied that [chuckles] and forgotten what he said in the first of his testimonies to the Warren Commission. But that's what he did say to me, but both of us were apparently mistaken about that.

([Audio](#), 14:35 [[audio 2](#)] [[audio 3](#)])

On 10/24/2013, Dr. McClelland spoke at Baylor University. When asked if he saw any gunshot wounds besides the small one in the throat and the big one in the head, he said "*No, I kind of messed things up there myself. When I walked in to the room, Dr. Jenkins was sitting there working*

the breathing machine on the President, and his hands were busy. And as I walked in to the room, he nodded toward what I took to be the President's left temple, and he said 'Bob, there's a wound there', and I thought he meant here [points to left temple], and I wrote that down in that little assessment that the Secret Service men asked us to make right after the thing, and then I later found out by talking to Dr. Jenkins that that wasn't- he meant he was trying to signal that there was a wound- I'm not sure where he was signaling for the wound, but it wasn't in the left temple and there was no wound in the left temple, but that got in to my statement and I had to do some backpedaling on that when I was quizzed at the Warren Commission by- Arlen Specter was the person who took my testimony for the Warren Commission" (Video, 44:49).

In November of 2013, Dr. Porto spoke, in Spanish, to W Radio, XEW-AM, Mexico City about being at Parkland Hospital on the day of the assassination.

On educationforum.ipbhost.com, 9/7/2018, researcher Stuart Wexler posted this comment:

I reached Dr. Porto via an intermediary. He is not keen on speaking about the subject. But he told said person that the damage was extensive, but concentrated on the right rear parietal region of the skull. Trying to get more, but I am not confident.

-Stu

Father Oscar Huber

Oscar Huber was a Catholic priest who administered last rites to JFK at Parkland Hospital. Huber was quoted in an article which appeared in the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin on 11/24/1963:

"The President was lying on a rubber-tired table when I came in," Father Huber said. He was standing at his head. Father Huber said the President was covered by a white sheet which hid his face, but not his feet. "His feet were bare," said Father Huber... He said he wet his right thumb with holy oil and anointed a Cross over the President's forehead, noticing as he did, a "terrible wound" over his left eye.

Father Huber was contacted by researcher Shirley Martin. Mrs. Marin's association with Huber was summarized in the 2007 book *Praise From a Future Generation: The Assassination of John F. Kennedy and the First Generation Critics of the Warren Report* by John Kelin:

Chapter 13

The First Anniversary

The approach of Thanksgiving 1964 found Shirley Martin readying her family for another trip to Dallas. It was nearly one year since President Kennedy had been shot to death there, and Shirley wanted to be in Dealey Plaza to observe the first anniversary.

"Will be thinking of you at 12:30 Sunday," she wrote to Vince Salandria.¹

Salandria had by this time become one of her favorites in her widening circle of critic-friends. "Vincent Salandria as you know is about the best man I've heard about since Mr. Kennedy died," she wrote enthusiastically to a contact in Mark Lane's office. But she tempered her enthusiasm: "He did not care for Mr. Kennedy and that makes me want to pull his nose sometimes."²

The Warren Report had been available for nearly two months, and the Hearings and Exhibits were about to be published. Like all of the early critics, Shirley was eager to read the twenty-six volumes. "Got a card from the government printing office this morning saying I could have my toys if I'd send \$76 immediately. Mark lifted it out of my hand and said: 'I'll mail the check before noon ... you have gone too far to back out now.'"³

Just before they left, Shirley received an urgent message from Salandria: "It is my fervent hope that this will beat your departure for Dallas," he began. "Presently I am doing some work which can turn out to be important on the shots. A good Catholic family can be of immense help. Here's how ..." ⁴

Salandria reminded her of some published comments by Father Oscar L. Huber, the pastor of Holy Trinity Catholic Church in Dallas, who had administered the last rites to President Kennedy. "He said he wet his right thumb with holy oil and anointed a Cross over the President's forehead," The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin had reported, "noticing, as he did so, a 'terrible wound' over his left eye."⁵

It was this account of a "terrible wound" that so interested Salandria. Like the President's throat and back wounds, the location of the wound to his head was a matter of dispute. Citing one of the emergency surgeons, the Warren Report described a large, gaping wound on the right rear portion of Kennedy's skull. Salandria's own research, including the seemingly indisputable Zapruder film frames published in the October 2, 1964, issue of *Life* magazine, supported a hit to the right side. But almost nothing at this early stage was certain; indeed, another of the emergency surgeons reported a wound on the *left* of JFK's skull. "If Father Huber recalled correctly," he wrote Shirley on November 19, "and if he was quoted correctly, then Dr. McClelland's statement on pages 526 and 527 [of the Warren Report] to the effect that 'cause of death was due to massive head and brain injury from a gunshot wound of the left temple,' is an accurate representation of what happened.

"Can you see Father Huber?" Salandria asked. "Can you check his recollection? Can you determine whether the government agents explored the wounds with him?"⁶

Mrs. Martin said that she would try.

November 22, 1964, fell on a Sunday. Houses of worship throughout Dallas experienced higher-than-usual turnouts as worshipers came to remember President Kennedy. A multi-denominational service at the Cathedral of the Sacred Heart, dedicated to JFK, was hailed as a milestone — "an historic moment in the religious life of the city," according to the executive director of the Greater Dallas Council of Churches.⁷

In Dealey Plaza, where the assassination had taken place, an estimated zoo people gathered to commemorate the first anniversary of President Kennedy's death. Floral tributes crowded the colonnade area of the concrete pergola along the top of the grassy knoll; one of these recalled the words JFK had spoken at his inauguration four years earlier: "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."⁸

The crowd watched the large clock on top of the Texas School Book Depository tick off the minutes to 12:30 p.m., the approximate time of the fusillade. And at 1 p.m., the time that Kennedy was pronounced dead a year earlier, automobiles in the plaza area slowed to a halt; heads were bowed and prayers whispered; tears slid down faces.⁹

"No need to tell you it was hard to be on Elm at 12:30," Shirley Martin said afterward. "Teresa cried hard."¹⁰

The Martins arrived back in Hominy late Monday night. Thanksgiving was just a few days away, and a busy week was made busier by the installation of new carpeting scheduled for the Martin home. But on Tuesday, November 24, Shirley found time to write Salandria about the matter he had so fervently written her less than one week earlier.

"Saw Father Huber on Sunday," she began. "Went to mass there. Yes, your story is accurate although Father Huber makes gentle disclaimers against it. He says when he entered Emergency Room #1, he pulled the sheet just to the edge of the President's nose and then he saw what he assumed to be a bullet entry hole above the President's left eye. He says he spoke to Mrs. Kennedy, left Parkland, returned to his parish (which ironically is only a few doors from General Walker's), where he told his fellow priests that the President had been killed by a bullet into the left temple area.

"Father Huber says he never told this to the press. However, he supposes that someone to whom he spoke may have relayed it to the newsmen. The next day, Father Huber says he learned that the assassin had stood behind the President, therefore negating the possibility that what he saw had been an entry bullet wound. At once, Father Huber realized that what he had seen was only a 'blood clot.'

"He has brainwashed himself. The FBI have never spoken with him, nor did the Warren Commission approach him for a statement of any kind"¹¹

Salandria had already written about Father Huber's originally published statements in his Legal-Intelligencer article published a few weeks earlier. In spite of his "gentle disclaimers," Father Huber seemed to confirm his original story to Shirley. And so his observations were repeated in a later article, written after Salandria had seen the twenty-six volumes, with the added comment that "Father Huber was not called as a witness. Nor was Dr. McClelland asked for an explanation of his designation of a wound in the left temple as the cause of death."¹²

[...Notes]

CHAPTER THIRTEEN — THE FIRST ANNIVERSARY

1. Shirley Martin to Vincent J. Salandria, undated letter, probably mid-November 1964.
2. Shirley Martin to "the whole office" of Mark Lane, undated letter, probably late 1964 or early 1965.
3. Shirley Martin to Vincent J. Salandria, undated letter, probably mid-November 1964.
4. Vincent J. Salandria to Shirley Martin, November 19, 1964.
5. *Evening Bulletin* article quoted in letter, Salandria to Shirley Martin, Nov. 19, 1964.
6. Vincent J. Salandria to Shirley Martin, November 19, 1964.
7. *The Dallas Morning News*, Nov. 23, 1964, and *The Dallas Times Herald*, Nov. 23, 1964.
8. *The New York Times*, November 23, 1964.
9. *Ibid.*

10. Shirley Martin to Vincent J. Salandria, November 24, 1964.

11. *Ibid.*

Some time later, Huber was interviewed by Mark Lane, author of the book and documentary *Rush to Judgment*:

Q. Father Huber, when you anointed the President's head with oil, did you notice any mark which, at that time, you believed to be a wound?

A. Well there was interrupted by background talking

Q. (Repeat) Father Huber, when you anointed the President's head with oil, did you notice any mark which, at that time, you thought was a wound?

A. Well, his face was covered with blood and there was a blotch of blood on the left side of his forehead which I thought could possibly be a bullet wound, but I learned later that it wasn't, certainly wasn't, that it was all a mistake on my part

(background conversation about answering too quickly)

Roll 20 Take 85

Q. Father Huber, at the time that you anointed the President's head with oil, did you notice any mark on his head which you then took to be a wound?

A. Well, his face was covered in blood, and there was a blotch of blood on the left forehead which I, at the time, thought possibly could be a bullet wound, but I learned later that it was not, that I was entirely mistaken, because he had been shot in the back of his head. I did not see any- really any wounds on him- because I only uncovered his face to the tip of his nose. I learned later that the bullets came out, perhaps at the jaw, I don't know [...]

[...]

Reel 20 Take 87

Q. Where were you, Father Huber, when you heard that the President had been assassinated? Did you notice any mark on the President's head when you anointed him with oil- a mark which might have been a wound? When you anointed the President with oil, did you notice any mark on his head which might have been the result of a bullet wound?

(Repeated)

Q. Where were you when you first heard that the President had been assassinated? When were you, Father Huber, when you first learned that the President had been assassinated? When you anointed the President's head with oil, did you notice any mark which might have been the result of a bullet wound? Did you notice any mark which might have been the result of a bullet wound? Did you notice any mark on the President's head which might have been a bullet wound when you anointed his head with oil, Father?

(technical conversations - "this might have to be redone in the studio because of background noises")

(Wisconsin Historical Society, USMss, 117AN "Rush to Judgment" Box 60, Folder 1)

When interviewed for the 1967 book *The Scavengers and Critics of the Warren Report* by Richard Warren Lewis and Lawrence Schiller, Huber denied any knowledge of a wound on the left side:

[...II. *The Housewives' Underground*, p. 58-59]

Mrs. Martin made her third pilgrimage to Dallas on November 22, 1964, the first anniversary of Kennedy's death.¹⁶ "Men are wonderful," she declares, "but it takes a woman to do all the boring work."¹⁷ I had an interview with Father Huber, which I don't think too many people have had. He had a very interesting story to tell. He says the Commission never asked him any questions. No one asked him any questions—the FBI—no one. Father Huber said that when he went into the room to give the last rites, he said Kennedy had a wound on the left temple. And he said: 'Of course, you could see this enormous exit.' He said he was quite sure that this was the exit [wound]. He said [the shots were fired] definitely from the front. And he said: "Then I heard on TV that night that the assassin had fired from the rear.' So he said: 'I just put that out of my mind. If the assassin was in the rear, how could I have seen a shot in the front? So it must have been just a blood clot.' " 18

The Very Reverend Oscar Huber, pastor of the Holy Trinity Church in Dallas, possesses a very different recollection of his participation in the events of November 22, 1963. "As I walked in [to Trauma Room One at Parkland Hospital], I saw the President lying on an emergency table," he says. "I noticed that his extremities were extremely white and the thought came to me: 'There's no blood in this man.' He was covered with a sheet from his head down to below his knees. The President's wife was standing at the right side of the President and I walked around her and expressed my sympathy briefly and immediately gave Conditional Absolution to the President.¹⁹

"I removed the sheet down to the tip of his nose and I anointed him with the Holy Oils, giving him the Extreme Unction, as we called it at that time. It is now called the Sacrament of the Sick. And [then I] put the sheet back over his face. I did not know where he had been shot, where the bullets had struck him and I had no thought of looking for anything like that. His face was covered with blood, but I saw no wounds. I'll never forget the occasion." 20

"Father Huber had rationalized to the point where what he believed to be an entry wound would become immediately a blood clot to him because the Establishment had told him that the assassin had stood behind," Mrs. Martin theorizes. "Which is really too bad because Father Huber is a very dear, sweet man and he really believed, you know, that he had seen a blood clot. And I am sure he did." 21
Father Huber denies ever having been interviewed by Mrs. Martin.

[...Notes, CHAPTER II, p. 185]

8. Authors' interview, Shirley Harris Martin.

9. *Ibid.*

10. *Ibid.*

11. *Ibid.*

12. *Ibid.*

13. *Ibid*

14. *Ibid.*

15. *Ibid.*

16. *Ibid.*

17. *Ibid.*

18. *Ibid.*

19. Authors' interview, Father Oscar Huber.

20. *Ibid.*

21. Authors' interview, Shirley Harris Martin.

Although the author claimed that Huber denied being interviewed by Shirley Martin, this denial was not directly quoted, or heard in the audio excerpts which were released (*The Controversy: the Death, the Warren Report, 1967, Capitol records, Probe* [transcript, partial]).

In response, Shirley Martin published an open letter in the Midlothian Mirror, 2/14/1967:

An Open Letter to Father Oscar Huber

(Who administered the last rites to President John F. Kennedy)

Oh, Father, I am so sorry you don't remember my children and me. Richard Warren Lewis, author of "The Scavengers" (New York World Journal Tribune, 1/22/67) writes:

"The priest (the Very Rev. Oscar Huber, pastor of the Holy Trinity Church in Dallas) denies ever meeting Mrs. Martin or having any knowledge of such a wound (over President Kennedy's left eye)."

Yet, I and my children (Victoria 21, Teresa 15, Steven 12, Mike 11) interviewed you on November 22, 1964, at which meeting you detailed for us what you thought to have been a bullet hole over President Kennedy's left eye on November 22, 1963. (A story quoting you in this regard appeared in the 11/24/63 Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin.) The children and I had gone to Dallas for the purpose of honoring President Kennedy at Dealey Plaza on the first anniversary of his death. We attended mass that day (a Sunday) at your church; I introduced myself to you as Mrs. Mark Martin from the parish of Father John Ceffi, Hominy, Oklahoma. You led us into a study which was to the left of a fairly long hall where we sat and talked for at least twenty minutes. On a desk you had a number of copies of an article you had written called "President Kennedy's Final Hours, November 22, 1963," and you told us you wanted very much to send a copy to Mrs. Kennedy, but that you were hesitant about approaching her. "Do you think it would be a good idea?" you asked. You were concerned about mailing to her in time to have the anniversary postmark on the envelope. We assured you that with Mrs. Kennedy's sense of history, your thoughtfulness would be appreciated. (You then gave us a copy of your article which we still have.)

At this point you described for us what you thought to have been a bullet wound over President Kennedy's left eye.* "I took the sheet down to his nose," you said, "and I saw what I immediately thought to be a bullet hole on his forehead, above his left eye. I told a number of people when I got

back that this must have killed him, but that night I heard that the man was behind him in the building, so I knew what I had seen was a blood-clot." "No; no one has come to see me about it. No one. "

We also talked at length about your boyhood. You told us the sight of the President's blood had not bothered you because as a young man you had participated in the slaughter of pigs and were accustomed to seeing blood "all over the place." You then described an accident you had once attended, concluding: "No, no. The sight of blood never bothers me at all."

How can you deny, Father, that you met us or that you described for us what you thought was a bullet wound over President Kennedy's left eye? Richard Lewis (a sophisticate with a blind faith in the priesthood?) has used your denial of us to slander all my efforts on the Oswald case. He writes: "The graying Agatha Christie fan (has) conveyed her frequently misleading reports to fellow investigators... "; and I am told that Mr. Lewis plans a book (Dell, 300,000 copies) in which he will persist in his libel against the investigators.

Consequently, Father, your denial of the children and me may lead to trouble yet. We are not accustomed to being called liars, either by a priest or a Hollywood "journalist."

(Mrs.) Shirley Martin

Owasso, Oklahoma

cc: 500

2/14/67

*A number of witnesses, including Dr. McClelland, Parkland Hospital, testified to seeing a bullet wound over President Kennedy's left eye. Thus the pertinence of Father Huber's story.

([Scan 1](#) [[scan 2](#)] [[scan 3](#)] [[scan 4](#)] [[scan 5](#)])

More commentary from Mrs. Martin, as summarized in *Praise from a Future Generation*:

[...Chapter 25. *Counterattack*]

From Beverly Hills, Schiller and Lewis traveled to Oklahoma to interview Shirley Martin. Mrs. Martin generously offered to pick them up at the airport. "Schiller called himself 'James Bond,' she reported to Sylvia Meagher. As they drove back to Hominy, they asked Mrs. Martin whether she had any dogs; pleased, she replied that she had twelve. "Lewis made me promise to lock up all my dogs before he would even get out of the car."22

In their magazine article and book, Schiller and Lewis made much of Shirley Martin's meeting with Father Oscar Huber in November of 1964. Father Huber had confirmed to Mrs. Martin that the newspaper article that said he had seen a "terrible wound" over the dead president's left eye was correct. But according to Schiller and Lewis, Father Huber denied that he had ever met Shirley Martin. His denial was not quoted directly; Lewis merely wrote that he denied it. But Huber was quoted as saying that President Kennedy's "face was covered with blood, but I saw no wounds ... I did not know where he had been shot and I had no thought of looking for anything like that."23

"I was angry," Mrs. Martin recalled many years later. She could not understand why Father Huber would deny meeting with her. "If you can't trust a priest, who can you trust?"24

"He didn't know my sister had a tape recorder with the microphone wired through a purse handle," Teresa Martin added. "I suppose it's possible he forgot us or maybe just found it awkward later when confronted by it."²⁵

Shirley later replied with "An Open Letter to Father Huber," which was published in the *Midlothian Mirror* and in *Latitudes*, a small arts magazine published in Houston. She said she regretted Father Huber did not remember her or her children, then recounted their meeting in great detail. "You told us the sight of the President's blood had not bothered you because as a young man you had participated in the slaughter of pigs and were accustomed to seeing blood 'all over the place.' You then described an accident you had once attended, concluding: 'No, no. The sight of blood never bothers me at all' ... we are not accustomed to being called liars, either by a priest or a Hollywood 'journalist.'"

"The meeting definitely happened at his church," Teresa Martin remembered many years later. "I remember him touching his forehead in describing Kennedy's wound. He was an animated little guy."²⁶ "We both agree," Shirley said of herself and Teresa, "that Huber was one of ten thousand priests — pathetic, shabby, pitiful."²⁷

[...Notes, Chapter 25]

22. Shirley Martin picks up at airport, they ask about dogs: *A Citizen's Dissent*, p. 182. "Schiller called himself 'James Bond— and "Lewis made me promise..." Shirley Martin to Sylvia Meagher, undated letter, probably January 1967.

23. *The World Journal Tribune*, January 22, 1967.

24. Shirley Martin interview, June 23, 2000.

25. Teresa Martin interview, June 16, 2000.

26. Teresa Martin to author, via email, June 16, 2000.

27. Shirley Martin to author, via email, June 23, 2000.

In a 8/18/1970 letter to researcher Stephen Davenport, Huber wrote "...*His forehead was covered in blood - his eyes were closed as if he were asleep - I did not see any bullet holes in his face or in his forehead, as far as I could see...*" ([HSCA 180-10084-10143](#)).

Whether it was a bullet wound or a "blotch of blood", the public record is not 100% clear if Oscar Huber was talking about Kennedy's ANATOMICAL left. But, consider that his interviewers would've had an incentive to know which side of the body he was talking about. And consider Teresa Martin's 6/16/2000 email to John Klein saying "*I remember him touching his forehead in describing Kennedy's wound. He was an animated little guy*".

Hugh Huggins

Hugh Huggins, AKA Hugh Howell, AKA Jim Huggins, claimed to be a former U.S. Marine sergeant and CIA officer. When interviewed for the 1993 book *JFK: Breaking the Silence* by Bill Sloan, Huggins said that on the day of the assassination, he was personally instructed by Robert F. Kennedy to investigate what happened. He reported being there to see the body at both Parkland and Bethesda hospitals. To many readers, Huggins' story might seem "too good to be true" because

it includes so many conspiracy talking points published long before – George de Mohrenschildt, Guy Bannister, David Ferrie, Clay Shaw, a wound in Kennedy's left temple, a blow-out in the rear of Kennedy's head, a shipping casket in the Bethesda morgue, extra bullets recovered, etc. Huggins also said that he personally knew Lee Harvey Oswald, that he personally knew the men who shot JFK, and that numerous attempts have been made on his life. There appears to be no documentation for these claims before Sloan's book.

Huggins upon approaching the autopsy room was not allowed to enter until the Secret Service and military guards were assured and it was confirmed that he was Robert F. Kennedy's personal representative at the proceedings. "After that I wasn't interfered with. I was allowed to observe the whole procedure, examine the wounds, and remain present for the entire autopsy. I referred all questions to Bobby, who was in a waiting room not far away." [...]

[...]

[...] But he had been in attendance at other autopsies, and because of his above average training in weaponry, he had the knowledge of ballistics and bullet wounds. He states:

"I distinctly saw an entry wound in the left temple. To my knowledge, only two other people besides myself have admitted to seeing the wound. It was assumed to be a blood clot by the doctors at Parkland, but it was an entry wound, and it could not have been fired from the rear."

"The bullet from this wound exited the right side of the president's head, blowing out a section of the skull and obscuring the entry wound of a second bullet that struck him from the right front almost simultaneously. There were two large separate holes in the upper right side of his head, separated by about three-quarters of an inch of bone matter and skin tissue" [...]

(Sloan, *JFK: Breaking the Silence*, 1993)

A partial audio recording of an interview with Huggins: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RTHfITp7-TQ>