2. "Smoking Guns in the Death of JFK"

Fetzer presents his collection as a work of scholarship, including those he describes as the best-qualified in the country. On the first page of his preface, in the first ~~paragraph, in the first~~ sentence, he states that "during the past decade - especially since 1992 - enormous advances have been made in unravelling one of the greatest crimes of our time, the assassination of President John F. Kennedy." He follows this with "we know vastly more now than we ever have before and we are learning more every day. ...Indeed, unravelling the has provided an access route to understanding the conspiracy " (page ix). SOA here

Before addressing what Fetzer said it may be helpful to have in mind what the definition of scholarship is:"learning; kmowledge acquired by study; the academic attainment of a scholar."

That "attainment of a scholar" is something Fetzer and his essayists avoid. To meet that they have to show that they have established fact about the assassination that had not been established, and none of them do that. It can be argued that they came to the same conclusions by other means, but that does not tell us more "about the death of President JFK", the presumed purpose of the book, as quoted above.

Fetzer says that "enormous advances have been made in unravelling the greatest crime of our time" but after reading his book I known of no "enormous" advance," nond toward solving the crime, none that helps understand it. Nothing along this line is new. That Fetzer can say this and that his essayists do not disagree with it means that they are ignorant

In terms of the purpose of ~~the~~ Fetzer's book, not a word of this is true, and even without the limitation of the purpose of the book, this also is not really true. For Fetzer to write this he is, and there is little limitation ~~on the~~ justified use of the words, ~~he is~~ either a world-class subject-matter ignoramus or he is being untruthful for his own purposes.

Fetzer states of his book, subtitle and on the cover, that it tells people, "What We Know Now ~~Than~~ About What Happened That We Did'nt Know Then About The Death of JFK." There is nothing new in this book ~~W~~"about the death of JFK." There is much that isn't - and is long public

Still agzin and close to evermre, the same ~~quesk~~ questions, is ~~he~~ Fetzer ~~tis~~ this ignorant or is he that dishonest.

of what was and had been public long before, to use that same phrase, they had been bitten by the assassination bug, or they are less than honest in accepting and adopting from Fetzer's boastful claim.

It also should be understood that there is nothing in Fetzer's book that qualifies as "vastly more" knowledge of the crime" or that provides anything new in "unravelling the cover-up," most of which is entirely ignored in the book and there is not a single word that provides any more "understanding of the conspiracy," of which they reflect no understanding at all.

With this much from Fetzer's first two paragraphs it is obvious that he is a subject-matter ignoramus, as stated earlier, dishonest, or both.

For a professor who boasts endlessly of his Ph.D making allegations in which he really boasts, without the most elemental knowledge of what was known, amounts to deliberate dishonesty. Whether it is to puff himself up, to give himself a standing as an assassination expert that he does not have after doing two books allegedly on the subject, or to sell books by serious misrepresentation - to defraud those who buy the books.

Unaware of his subject-matter igmorance he again boasts that he served as a catalyic agent by ~~nurturing these by~~ nurturing, promoting and directing many of these efforts (page x).

That is quite an accomplishment when he had no idea what he was doing when from the depths of his ignorance, and it is certain than none of this can apply to those he says correctly are most important in his book, doctors Aguilar and and Mantik.

After more boasting that is not in accord with the fact, the well-kmown fact, again raising the question does he speak

from his omnipresent subject ignorance or is it another of his endless exaggerations and falsehoods.

As he bables along he says that "The present volume deepens our past findings", which it does not do in any sense about the assassination. He then claims that new evidence to which they had access "substantiates our previous findings," those findings not stated but they are not about the assassination itself.

Much of this book is on the alleged "fabrication of Xrays... photographic fakery and the destruction and alteration of other critical evidence." This is true. The purpose may be presumed but it is not stated other than in the subtitle. Nor does the book state that these alleged tricks with the evidence altered the Warren Commission's conclusions.

While the alleged purpose of this alleged trickery can be presumed, it is not, to the best of my recollection, spelled out.

Nor is there any proof that what is in this book, if true, was needed for that alleged purpose.

As it was not, whether or not these outstanding scholars were aware of it. Had not been needed for years.

Next he says that the disclosures forced by the 1992 Act enables us to understand in rather precise detail how the cover-up was conducted."

Again this is another unintended admission of subject-matter ignorance because many years a earlier the details of the cover-up were dug out by other than historians, other than professional scholars were published and then and

since then the Fetzers were and they main ignorant of that. (Otherwise they have no book)

But the more than adequately rexposed cover-up, after a quarter of a century, to which only now the Fetzers claim knowledge does not keep Fetzer's promise in his book to tell us "what we didn't know about the death of JFK."

But in their claim to be reporting on the cover-up for the ~~first~~ first time, a reasonable conclusion when Fetzer makes no reference to any earlier ~~rp~~ reporting of it, the Fetzers do not get close to the nature of the already disclosed cover-up that was, as was reported long before the ~~pre~~ Fetzers, and at the highest levels.

In the Fetzer belated view the cover-up was by a virtual army (page x).

In his own field, ~~wje~~ where he got his Ph.D., Fetzer slips up in saying that "The principle of scientific reasoning known as Occam's Razor says that simple theories should be preferred."

Occam's Razor is a relatively recent novel!

William Occam, also spelled Ockham, was a medieval British philosopher. He did not write any novels, did not incorporare his thinking in any novels, and he referred to thinking, not theories. Seek the simplest solutions is an encapsulation of his philosophy (page xi).

Fetzer then pontificates that "What properly counts as evidence' in this case, however, turns out to be a complex ~~quet~~ question, where our most important conclusions have involvd discriminating between authentic and inauthentic evidence... where ~~[x-ed out]~~ much of the evidence is a blend.... (page xi).

Again the unintended flaunting of subject-matter ignorance. Fetzer is not he first to expose what he efers to as "inauthentic" evidernce, as he and his were far from the first to expose what can be called "fraud" in the official evidnce, For this kind of Fetzerism quoted his boast is nothing but hot air unless he does whathe does not try to do, what he and the other Fetzers cannot do, show that what he says he brings to light was in any way new. The most can be said for it is that it is a different form of the already thoroughly exposed "inauthentic evidence."

If as he does not. Fetzer knew his stuff he would have known that long before him and his the Report of the Warren Commission was thoroughly destroyed, proven to be false, even that Oswald was not any "lone assassin."

Still again he boasts in ignorance

And still again his boast does not in any way report "what we didn't know about the death of JFK."

He repeats what much of the more serious but also dated and not new in his volume says, that the Zapruder film "was faked." Not knoew, if true. But what none of his thinkers professional scholars faces or in any way addresses, what was accomplished by this alleged faking of the film because in its alleged "faked" form it does refute the official "solution," what the Warren Report says (page xii).

These scholars who write about the cover-up, of thirty-five years earlier, do not says why anyone would fake a film to make it accord with the official explanation and instead fake it into the destruction of the official explanation of the assassination. its is supposed to support.

This, too, is subject-matter ignorance and that ignornce is the basis for the claims for his collection that Fetzer makes. Not one of his contributors knows enough about what preceded them by decades to understand that what they think is new is not new, with the possible exception of its form, but it adds nothing essentially new to what was widely and well published and understaood long before they believed they were pioneers.

There is more, much more, than an exposure of Fetzer's hot air, his baseless claims and his lofty boasts and bragging when he does not know what he is talking about and does not and cannot meet his promise on his cover and in his subtitle: he cannot, so of sourcse he does not, say as much as one word about "what we didn't kmow " avout the assassination.

If he and the othee Fetzers scholars had wanted to go into that, much, very much, was long available to them in books that, in fact, they shun.

What Fetzer's Preface alone warns is that we cannot take a word of his seriously without confirmation, and neither his word not that of his associates can be taken without substantial independent confirmation from other sourfes, not from any of Fetzer. They all clearly have the same hangups. This does not mean that tjey always lack truth. But what we have in these few pages seen of their "editor" and what wa we have seen in their writing is all meshed into Fetzer's gears and that means would not be independent confirmation.

Which for the most part is impossible anyway.

They are all out of their depth. And they did not begin at the beginning.

Extra Space

Writing about those who without ny question at all are scholars but are also assassination buffs as Johnny-Come-Latelies and as subject- matter ignor- amuses may sound ~~like~~ excessive but it is the literal truth.

Some of ~~them~~ them, like so many others, particularly those who did come lately, began with an idea or two that they equated ~~with~~ with reality, with fact, when they had no basis for any such judgement, when all or most of what they knew ~~they~~ came from earlier commercializations and exploitations of th great tragedy of the assassination of the President, ~~followed y several~~ more, ~~and and, with~~ They had little or no knowledge of the fact that had then been esablshed and had been supressed by the media but was public and did exist although They knew little or nothing about it. ~~the~~ They immediately regarded themselves as what I call Sherlock Holmes returned. Their amateur Sherlocking struck them as really hot stuff when ~~at~~ its best it duplcated, in different form, what was ~~assocla~~ assassination old hat. Some of them did have some knowledge of this but they just ignored it and then they got ~~dow~~ carried so far away that they regarded as enemies those who had spent most of thirtyfive years sudying the assassination and to a degree, whathad been written about it.

Indeed, some of the more intense of these scholars ~~got~~ got carried so far out that they regarded those who had been working in the field all those years as government agensts'

Two examples regard men with much better than aerage educations. is a Harvard man with a law degree Harrison Edward Livingston, when he ~~confrnt~~ faced from me what destroydestroyed his favorite assassination mythlogy, one ~~that~~ that was ruinous to two successful book he had written,

then wrote a book in which I and others were national enemies.

One of his manufacted lies ~~and that is~~ which are necessary when these people face ~~th~~ reality, that they were out of their depth and not in contact with assassinati~~a~~ reality, is that the late oil magnate, H.L. Hunt, ~~was~~ he was the chief assassin ~~and that~~ allegedly I worked for him, neither true, nither ~~with~~ the slightest connection with reality.

Another and a more recent on was reported to me by my lo~~j~~gtime friend, my friend of more than thirty-~~f~~five years a~~nd~~ and one of the ~~ongest~~ veterans to research the assassination, Hal Verb, o~~f~~ San Francisco. It is what one the Fetzer~~w~~s, Dr. Gary Aguilar, asked him, which is a ~~f~~irm of ~~t~~telling him, what borders on the irrational.

Gary
~~Gay~~ is a fine and a successful doctor in San Francisco and, as indicated above, he is one of the Johnny-Come-Latelies who pay no attention to ~~w~~hat was pu~~b~~lic and established by official fact before they developed teir assassination interest often ~~had have~~ their ~~ju~~ judgement overwhelmed ~~by~~ their high opinion of what they are so overwhelmed by facts into. Hal told me that the last time he and Gary spoke, long ago, Gary asked him if he was working for the FBI.

Many of the assassination nuts have ~~tha~~ opinions like that. ~~Li~~ in Livingsone is so far gone, for ~~exa~~ illustration, that although he knew I had sued the ~~gover~~ government a dozen or more times, he regarded me as an enemy. ~~and~~ He had seen the six~~t~~y file cabinets of a third of a million pages that had been secret~~e~~ He worked in thse files and ~~sent paid and~~ sent another to do that for him. He was actually crazy ~~e~~enough to actually believe and say that I ~~w~~s was an assistent to the ~~chi to him~~ man he actually called the chief of the assassina!

There is not much than can be done to bring these people

Unless they begin by considering Livingstone crazy, if they believe him, how can they not be confused when he says that the man who wrote nine assassination books and sued the governmnt at least a dozen time to force it to disclose assassination records it was keeping secret, was actually an assistant assassin?

58 58

back to relity becaue they not ~~only~~ love where they are, they do believe that they ~~alone~~ alone understand what they write and speak about, that they alone are in cintact with reality.

And when a respected and successful doctor can ask one of the first critics of the Warren Report if he ~~is an FBI, agent,~~ works for me, how far gone otherwise responsible people can get when that assassination but bites them should be apparent. ~~To those not bit on by that bug or from those who did not catch the infection from them~~

These Fetzers and what they write abound in illustrations.

It will not be possible for me to detail all of them but there will be enough to make it apparent that these scholars, rather then being responsible critics of the great tragedy that also was a coup d' etat, which none of them ~~here~~ said, have inflicted ~~idea~~ ideas of what they have done, what they think and what they write. and what they think it means

In terms of what serves the govrnments interest because of what government did and did not do at te time of the ~~assas~~ assassination since then, nothing hlps the government preserve what it made up and palmed off on the people and on history, (as confusing the people. These people help it.

These Fetzers ~~is~~ helps the government by confusing the caring people even more than th government did. 58A here

Some of the Fetznerian scholars refuse to pay attention to duslosed documentation that ~~undermines~~ refutes what they say and believe. their position, except when, as the Fetzners do in this book, they adopt it and present it as their own work.

So, these rmarks about them are not prejudice, not exaggrations and are not intended as insults.

The word reminds me of another indication of the thinking

of these people, how their minds work when they think and speak of criticisms of their work.

A few years ago what called itself the, as best I now recall, the Committee or Council on Political Assassinations, made an award to me. Gary Aguilar made the presentation in my absence. A videotape was made and given me. And, again literally, he referred to my informing those who asked my opinion that they were in error as "insults." Fact made no difference, even to a respected professional man as responsible as Dr. Gary Aguilar.

There will be more that refers t these newcomers who have the infection from that bug but this bit here is to give the reader reason to believe that what I write is the reality of what has developed. Reason to regard it as record. I wrote the book on the subject. It is first, highly critical of many people, particularly the Warren Commission and its staff and federal agents, all by name, as I also did in eight later assassination books, not one of it has a single "theory" or conjecture in it and, in thirty-five years, I have yet to get single phone call or single letter from any one of them complaining that I had been unfair or inaccurate in what I wrote of theim.

Then there is the fact that the FBI told a federal court as we have seen, that I knew more about the assassinatin than anyone working for it.

And I was able to obtain all those thousands of suppresed government assasskination papers, mostly from the FBI.

Which was made possible by the Congress's opinion of the case I made in an early one of those FOIA lawsuis I filed against the FBI. almost as though the congress passed a law to make it possible and told me to do what I then did.

But the assassination was what the official seen professional

scholars never have called it, a coup d'etat, the most subversive crime in a democratic society. History deserves, at the very least, truthful account of it. I have devoted almost forty years, years of the most intensive work, to an effort to make an accurate record for history. I have no desire for any part, no matter how minor, to be other than as accurate as it can be; no desire to undermine any part of it, and no ned to build a reputation for ms myself.

For years I have refused TV invitations without the assurance that it would not be misused to make the assassination nut seem to be reasonable and right when they are not.

The Fetzer books abound in proof of my references to it and to the Fetzers. So many proofs it will not be possible to include them all. But my copy of their book is underlined with a highlighter so that any who may use that volume later will have their attention drawn to this abundance of the Fetzers' dubious or incorrect statement in their book

extra space

After his Preface Fetzer has what he calls a Prologue. He gives it a Title, "'Smoking Guns' In the Death of JFK" (pages 1 fff).

Nothing in it is personal. I have nobody to get even with. There is no vendetta. Fact is fact and history needs it sorely. History did not get fact from either extreme.

Not a single one of those "Smoking Guns" does what Fetzer says he thinks his book does, tell us what "we didn't know" about the assassination.