

3. Fetzer Displays His Scholarship

Fetzer begins his "smoking guns" ~~chapter~~ essay with a quoted definition of "smoking guns," from the Webster dictionary. It is, "any conclusive evidence that proves guilt or fault." ^{Remember "conclusive" &} It is appropriate ~~that~~ that we begin examination of his eminent assassination scholarship, ~~with~~ ^{and understanding} the scholarship that told him he knew ~~enough~~ enough about the national tragedy not only to write about it himself. No, not ~~that~~ ^{only that} also. His scholarship enabled him to, ~~also~~ responsible Ph.D. that he is, to be "editor" of a collection of essays by other ^{similar} ~~similar~~ experts and scholars.

He begins this essay with a subheading ~~entitled~~ titled "The ARRB", with a comment on himself as the "organizer and moderator of the Twin Cities conference" to which he had invited more than a dozen of the more accomplished students of JFK's assassination to serve as speakers and commentators in an effort to broaden and deepen our understanding of the event, especially those of the ARRB" (page 1).

With Fetzer's well-portrayed assassination scholarship I am confident that with his as moderator and with those ^{he} ~~wh~~ would have selected as "the more accomplished students of the assassination, it would have been an entertaining, if not an informative gathering, albeit not on "the death of JFK".

Fetzer's next subheading is "The Warren Report" ^(page 2) and following that, "The HSCA" (pages 25). Under "HSCA" there is a demonstration of the fineness of detail in Fetzer's ~~sch~~ assassination scholarship, where he refers to the medium-powered Mannlicher-Carcano rifle Oswald allegedly used ^{as} (a "high-powered rifle" (page 3).

Then his "smoking guns" begins (page 3. ^{They/o} ~~Yjey~~ continue

through ~~the~~ ^{three} page 15. They begin based on ~~the~~ hypotheses Fetzler presents immediately before ~~the~~ "smoke". They are, basically, two conjectures about Kennedy being hit in the back of the head and that the bullets were all fired by Oswald with that "high powered rifle". We are left to presume that these can provide the new evidence Fetzler promised in his Text ^{on his cover} and in this ~~the~~ chapter title that will tell us what he says is new in the "Death of JFK."

Fetzler's first "smoking gun" relates to the last of these hypotheses, that one of the high-powered rifle. He says that that is impossible and this is more than enough ~~to~~ ^{to} attention to it.

The next "smoking gun" is that "The head shot trajectory is ⁱⁿ consistent with the position of the head at the time of the shot" (page 4).

Smoking gun 3 is that "The weapon used was not even a rifle...." (page 5).

The ^{next} ~~most~~ ^{numbered} "smoking gun" Fetzler has a short text (pages 5-6) titled The Death of Deception, which certainly is not any smoking gun, whether or not ~~the~~ ^{the} assassination deception is or ever will be buried.

Then, under another subheading, "Other Smoking Guns", is ~~the~~ that the World War II military bullets ~~could~~ ^{could} not have caused the explosive damage" (page 6).

His ^{first} seventh smoking gun is that "The axis of metallic debris is inconsistent ~~with~~ ^{with} a shot from behind but ^{is} consistent ^{with} a shot that entered the area of the right temple" (page 8).

Next, "The official autopsy ~~report~~ ^{is} ~~and~~ ^{con-} ~~even~~ ^{tradi-} contradicted by more than 40 eyewitnesses...." (page 7).

~~Next~~ ^{is} Seventh that those ^{is} eyewitness reports were "rejected" (page 8).

nine is that "Those who took and processed the autopsy photographs claim that parts of the photographic record have been altered, created or destroyed (page 9).

65 A here
 The eight^h relates to the Fetzerian belief that two different brains were used in the JFK autopsy (pages 8-9).

Ten
 Ten is that the Zapruder film ~~was~~ and others "were extensively edited," (pages 10-11).

Eleven is that the of ~~left~~^{official} conclusions "contradicts" ~~as~~ a radio report^s that there had been "two shots from the front" (page 10).

Smoking Guns 12 is that "The (fabricated) X-rays, (altered) autopsy photographs and even the (edited) Zapruder film) were ~~improperly used~~^{improperly used} to discredit eyewitness reports" (page 11).

~~Page 13~~ Smoking Gun 13 says that the motorcade route was changed at the last minute and yet the assassination occurred on the part that had been changed (pages 11-1).

Smoking Gun 14 says that "Secret Service policies for the protection of the ~~President~~^{of the President} were massively changed during the motorcade in Dallas" (pages 12-13).

Smoking Gun 15 "rules out" ^{as reasons} the mafia, ^{pro and anti-Castro} the Cubans, ~~and~~ the KGB and the rest is rather weird. (page 14).

Then comes Smoking Gun 16, ~~followed by~~ "Other Sources follow, but ~~many~~ sources of what is not stated,

Then another subhead "Then and Now" and to them we pay more attention because they provide an insight into ^{subject matter knowledge, his} Fetzer's scholarship and more. So there can be no question, such as was he quoted correctly, we include all of this in facsimile so that there will be no basis for any such question: . I copied pages 14 and 15

There is too much in these "smoking guns" to go into without doing a book on this essay alone but this then changes.

when I first read them and then I copied pages 64 and 118 because they are relevant. We see them later.

But before proceeding to the so-called "smoking gun" to which we pay more attention, a few comments on the earlier ones. ~~that~~ We do not skip them entirely ~~because they do help evaluate Fetzer's knowledge, understanding, scholarship and what is always appropriate, his judgement.~~

First, a general observation. I do not recall a single citation to the Warren Report or to the evidence in its twenty-six volumes. I did not keep records as I read because I never dreamed that anyone, particularly not one who can't breathe without boasting of his scholarship, would undertake to criticize so vast a work without having it to use as at least the basis of his criticism and to be able to quote from it what he criticizes in it. This can be wrong but what ~~would not be wrong would be~~ ^{is not wrong is what I do say:} If Fetzer has the Warren Report and its twenty-six volumes, ^{which} are a minimum ^m requirement for the criticisms he has collected and published and through which he presents himself as a legitimate critic, he does it with ^{very few} so few citations to the Report and its vast appending of an officially ~~est~~ ^{estimated} ten million words, ^{There is} with so little reference to them ^{- if any -} that it leads to the belief that he does not have them ^{This means that he} and bases his criticism on secondary sources that by and large are undependable. And for some, saying that they are ~~und~~ ^{praise} undependable is to compliment them.

To put it bluntly, he cannot make legitimate - of even accurate - criticisms of the Warren Report and its appended evidence without having them both ^{Fetzer's} and his work ~~indicates~~ ^{indicates} that he does not have them ^{and} ~~them~~. ^{do not know them.} That being the case, and particularly keeping in mind the simply fantastic number of factual errors in his writing and in

what he collected, the Ph.D. of which ~~s~~ Fetzter is so proud ~~and~~ which he never ~~so~~ stops flaunting, does not in this represent doctor of philosophy. It re presents Phony Deal.

It ~~really~~ means that Fetzter is a fraud with a loud mouth and no limitation on his misleading ~~and~~ misinforming people, people who for so long have ^{yearned} longed for truth, for what they can depend on.

And to mislead on this subject, so ~~impor~~ important to the nation, particularly to the young, is the equivalent of a crime,

In Fetzter's ~~so~~ second "Smoking Gun" he refers to the ~~of~~ drawings of the President's injuries that the "Warren Report used instead of pictures. They first appeared in the ~~the~~ 1965 book, the first book, Whitewash, and thereafter ~~is~~ a number of books which, like Whitewash, commented on them along with citations to the official records. But in his ego, in his self-promotion instead of proper scholarship, Fetzter refers his read ^{ers} to his uninformed and Johnny-Come-Lately and very, very inaccurate and mistitled Assassination Science. About which, I repeat, he was so inaccurate I wrote a book on it for history's records (page 4).

His subheading on page 5 ^{so} is at the very least premature on the Assassination of President Kennedy that it is inappropriate ~~and~~ ^a deception. It is The ~~XX~~ Death of Deception.

Deception on the subject is so alive ⁱⁿ Fetzter's ~~own~~ essay ^{that} in his books ^{abound} in it.

In his fourth "smoking gun" ~~Fwtzter~~ Fetzter refers to the ammunition allegedly used in the crime to say that one round of it was found

"on a stretcher" ^{at} and Parkland hospital. He also ~~says~~ refers to the magic bullet, Exhibit 399, as the only one. None of this is true. Specter tried hard to get the man who produced that bullet from the ~~hospital~~ hospital to say he found it on a stretcher so that the Commission could ~~honestly~~ pretend that it was found on Connally's stretcher, ^{his is} a dishonesty on which ~~the~~ Specter's imagined single-bullet ^{theory} hangs and it is not true. It also is a dishonesty on which the entire one-assassin official conclusion hangs. ~~And~~ And this Ph.D. of a non-expert ^{and criticizing me} makes so simple and basic a mistake when he is allegedly reporting on the mistakes of officialdom.

Here and elsewhere, remember his definition of "smoking gun." It is basically "conclusive evidence." Another word ^{absolute} for that is truth. ^{It is} ~~absent~~ ^{as it is} here and throughout in ~~8~~ Fetzter's ~~criticisms~~ criticisms.

Fetzter's Smoking Gun 14, which makes the most serious criticisms of the Secret Service some of whose men lay their lives on the line to ~~protect~~ ^{protect} the President. He says, without a single source cited, that "More than a dozen Secret Service policies for the protection of the President seem to have been violated during the motorcade in ~~the~~ Dallas, including no protective ^{ec} military presence; no coverage of open windows; motorcycles out of position; agents not riding on the Presidential limousine" and others, all unreal and all grossly unfair.

Also, all plagiarized, taken from the well-intended belief of my friend former Colonel Fletcher Prouty. Fletch was on his way to antarctica, ^{was} was in New Zealand, when the President was assassinated.

If the Army called all its men in from all around the ^c world even then could it cover every window ^{when} when a president went to New York City, to Chicago or Los Angeles to protect a Presidential

motorcade? It could ^{o have ed} not cover all windows in Dallas, either.

A "military presence", also is meaningless unless the military cover ^{ed} ever window and roof on the motorcade route and then, somehow, shields ^{often} the ~~often~~ speeding president .

What else Fetzter plagiariz^s ~~is~~ from Fletch or the many who quoted him is likewise unreal. He is stretching if he steals this ^{one} ~~one~~ and presents it as his own "scientific" work and Thinking, as he does.

Fetzter closes his ~~na~~ Smoking Gun 14, which alleges that the cars in the motorcade were not in the proper order, which this time he credits ^{it} to the former critic, Richard E. Sprague, ~~saying~~

Here again we appear to be confronted with one more indication of consciousness of guilt, which we must add to the indications of Secret Service complicity in the death of JFK" (page 13?).

This ^binamous and baseless allegation, that the Secret Service was part of a conspiracy to assassinate the President, was part of a coup d'etat, has no ^q basis in fact at all. Without citing it Fetzter refers to his ^q Part II (pages 12/ff).

Some of the Secret Service agents in that ^o ~~motorcade~~ ^{could} almost lost their lives almost crushed to death! and at least three are known ^{to have} with no public announcement made, ~~of a minimum of three~~ suffered serious psychological problems. At least one, as of ^{my} ~~my~~ last knowledge, had to be in a nursing home, could no longer safely live with his wife and family. (I provided him with counsel so he could obtain relief from a horrible libel, which he did.)

This, a natural produce of ignorance and wrongful ambition, is the most horrible kind of whoring with out history ^{that} ~~that~~ taints

This taking from others generally results in an increase in ~~what is~~ madmade up as each would-be Sherlock Holmes adds ~~the~~ what he ~~thinks~~^{thinks} is probably true and isn't and in the end, often the original and wrong-headed ~~source~~ is no longer identifiable. The result is an enormous amount of fiction that those who ~~have~~ not taken the time to master the established and available fact do not-cannot- recognize ~~as~~ assassination fiction. And joins all ^l else that confuses the people and tends to protect what the government said that is not true and, unfortunately, the government ~~knew~~^o ~~is~~ not true.

1+

of the whoring with out history, which taints so much of the uninformed, the baseless, the ignorant writing that has as its ~~in~~ intended product fame or fortune for those who write ~~the~~ those books, those who mislead and misinform the ~~the~~ caring people, those who for the most part make it up as they go and as he have seen that Fetzter, did, take it from others ~~who~~ who were uninformed, ignorant ^{and} in other ways were not in a position to write ~~proper~~ ^{honest} and accurate criticism.

70A ^{have} Generally, and this applies to Fetzter, too, as we shall see, ^{common} ~~common~~ sense ^{also} is missing. For example, in the false and defamatory Fetzter plagiarism ~~sited about~~, on the ~~sequence~~ ^{and the removal of the plastic top from his limousine,} of the vehicles on the motorcade, who is to refuse to do what the President says?

As when he ~~ordered~~ ^{alter} the plastic top ~~was~~ removed from his limousine ~~with~~ the rain ended.

He had gone to Texas for the ~~so~~ people to see him so, he wanted to be seen. And it was a fantastic success ¹ until he was assassinated in the middle of it.

-This is not legitimate criticism. It is first plagiarized and then is outrageously defamatory.

The indecent and dirty-minded Fetzter ~~knows~~ ^{of} no inhibition in his ~~besmirching~~ ^{cause or justification,} others, without case, but in his unscholarly and dishonest quest for the cheap fame and perhaps ~~fortune~~ fortune he seeks from his ignorant exploitation and commercialization of the great tragedy of ~~the~~ ^{negation of} the assassination of the President:

71

Smoking Gun #15: Neither the Mafia nor pro- or anti-Castro Cubans nor the KGB could have done any of these things—much less Lee Oswald, who was either incarcerated or already dead.

The complicity of medical officers of the United States Navy, agents of the Secret Service, the President's personal physician, and other representatives of the Pentagon, the FBI, and the CIA provides powerful evidence that can serve as a premise in the appraisal of alternative theories about the assassination of JFK. Neither the Mafia, pro- or anti-Castro Cubans, or the KGB could have fabricated autopsy X-rays; substituted the brain of someone else for the brain of JFK; created, altered, or destroyed autopsy photographs; or subjected motion pictures, such as the Zapruder film, to extensive editing using highly sophisticated techniques. Nor could any of these things have been done by the alleged assassin, Lee Oswald, who was either incarcerated or already dead.

The only theories that are remotely plausible, given these evidentiary findings, are those that implicate various elements of the government. It was a crime of such monstrous proportions and immense consequences that the clearly most reasonable explanation is that elements of the government covered up the crime because those same elements of the government committed the crime. For the CIA to have brought these effects about on its own, moreover, would have required medical officers of the U.S. Navy, agents of the Secret Service, and the President's personal physician, among many others, to have been working for or otherwise under its control. While the CIA has repeatedly demonstrated its abilities in bringing about changes in governments around the world—and no doubt elements of the CIA were involved in planning and covering up this crime—it looks as though it could not have done this one on its own. (p 93 13-14)

I did not include to include this until I reread what I had highlighted. Aside from the assassination ^{of} ~~abloney~~ in this Fetzer is again laying responsibility for the assassination on public servants and in the ~~act~~ actual evidence, which he is ^{so} ~~do~~ grossly Ph.D.ed ignorant, ^{for it} There is ~~no~~ rational basis ^{at} all.

The alleged counterfeiting is basic in the Fetzer writing and book. But even if true it does not warrant ~~the~~ interpretation Fetzer give. it.

What he says, and again his omnipresent ignorance dominates his wrong-headed thinking, is that those who covered up the evidence of the assassination were responsible for the assassination. His words are "committed the crime" (page 14).

^{Aside from being false and useless}
(This is both ignorant and stupid. The ~~prime~~ cover up was in the autopsy. What I published on this, in 1965 and 1975, is completely accurate. It has never been refuted ~~not~~ nor ~~have~~ I had a word of complaint from those I name~~d~~ as responsible for

that covering up.

Prime in it was "umes. Next, both involved~~ed~~ were Boswell and Finck. As Finck testified in New Orleans, the orders ~~they~~ ^{not to do a complete autopsy were} got ~~was~~ from the admiral in charge.

Each and every one of these military ~~me~~ and medical people were in Washington, not in Dallas, so they could not have been among the assassins.

Add all of those on the Warren Commission^{com} who covered up, and others throughout the government including, as we come to it the deputy attorney general of the United States, the man who articulated it, and it is apparent that Fetzner is a king-sized dope, subject-matter ignoramus and unconscionable exploiter and commercializer in his cheap seeking of the fame to which he is outrageously unjustified.

This one of his smokeless "smoking guns" is entirely fabricated and he made it ~~o~~ on the basis of his subject-matter ignorance and ~~his~~ take this literally, his stupidity.

Note ~~that~~ that neither here, nor before this, nor after it does this phony scholar cite a single source! Such outrageous accusations, perhaps the worse that can be made in this country, without even a phony source in the outrageous phoney supposed assassination literature most of which is worse than trash, and he bcasts about his Ph.D. so totally that it is to wonder if he takes it to bed with him.

^{More} ~~is~~ ^{than} uscholarly ~~in~~ this (as well as elsewhere, throughout) it is not easy to be. And ^{Ph.D. ed} Fetzner is that unscholarly.

As well as more defamatory.

Defamatory with his sole basis his subject-matter ignorance. This is also true of what follows:

Fetzer describes Liz Smith as a "columnist." No more.

Another Walter Lippman she is not.

She is a Hollywood gossip ^{columnist} ~~columnist~~.

So, when Twyman's book impressed her, ~~she~~ and she said so in a ^m ~~column~~ ^{column}, that was a real break for Twyman's sales but it was no confirmation of any kind for a single word that Twyman said, *as wrote*.

His is a costly and an attractive book. It is well illustrated.

It also is based on subject-matter ignorance, not on ~~fact~~ ^{fact} fact.

I have written a book for history on it and jointly with Fetzer's ~~mis~~ Assassination Science, which it is not. Not with any ^g ~~meaning~~ given those words,

Jack Valenti is Fetzer's straw man. What Valenti thought of Twyman's ripping off of the mind while he ripped off the pocket has no materiality at all,

Fetzer conjectures about conspiracies, large and small, again having no authority. He conjectures also that most of the conspirators might have been eliminated right away", to keep things quiet." He also conjectures that ~~some~~ ^{all made up, all bases, in a senseless} may have escape."

Fetzer uses an unfortunate selection of words in his ridiculing of his straw man, Jack Valenti: "Of course, that presumes Valenti knew what he was talking about." These are the kidest words that can be said of Fetzer. In fact, applied to Fetzer, as we see and see again and again, they ~~are~~ ^{are} applied to him, a compliment.

(Indicative of the "scholarship" of Twyman's book is what Fetzer quotes from him: "...eight names of ^{prominent persons who} ~~prominent~~ ~~who~~ have talked, including Mafia dons Carlos Marcello and Santo Trafficante, Jr.;

73

Smoking Gun #16: Many individuals knew details about the assassination before and after the fact, all of whom viewed Lee Oswald as no more than a patsy.

One of the more amusing events involved in assassination studies occurred when Liz Smith, a syndicated columnist, apprised her readers that, although she had always taken for granted that *The Warren Report* (1964) was right and that Oswald had been a lone assassin, after reading Noel Twyman, *Bloody Treason* (1997), she was no longer sure. This provoked an outraged response from Jack Valenti, the Hollywood Czar and former aide to LBJ, who proclaimed that there was a simple way to know for sure no conspiracy had been involved, namely: that, if there had been a conspiracy, someone would have talked—and no one has talked! The possibility of a small scale conspiracy or that most of the conspirators might have been eliminated right away to keep things quiet may have escaped him, but for a conspiracy of any magnitude—involving dozens and dozens, if not hundreds of people—what Valenti said may have seemed to be right.

Of course, that presumes Valenti knew what he was talking about. On a single page of *Bloody Treason* (1997, p. 285), for example, Noel lists eight names of prominent persons who have talked, including Mafia Dons Carlos Marcello and Santo Trafficante, Jr.; right-wing extremist Joseph Milteer; mobster Johnny Roselli; high ranking CIA official David Atlee Phillips; his old boss, Lyndon Baines Johnson; CIA contract agent and professional anti-Communist Frank Sturgis; and Sam Giancana, who confessed the complicity of the mob in collusion with the CIA to his brother, Chuck. If Valenti cared about the truth in a matter of this kind, then he might have wanted to read Twyman's book before he set out to trash it, or visited his local book store and picked up a copy of *Double Cross* (1992). (v. 2. 14)

~~Exciting as would her book have been, Brown did not get commercial publication for it. Ev en though she repeated alleged what may have been true, th t she had been the bedmate of the vice pr4sident of the United SaStates who had become the presi- dent. Why she ca did not get geher fame and fortune from sharing those bed but obe thing is reeasonable certain.~~

~~Harry Livingstone printed her book. I have a copy and I read it and wrote a bood avout it for the record for history~~

~~Her bo ok lacks credibility.~~

~~Not because she said she slept with the vice-president/ President . The reason is t at rpretty much else in it has no credibility at akkall. Particularly what Fetzer makes out to be the m inthing in it~~

74 follows

~~rightwing~~ ~~extre~~ mist Joseph Milteer ; mobster Johnny ~~Har~~
~~Roselli~~; high ranking CIA official David Atlee Phillips~~Phi~~ 22
 Phillips; his ~~old~~ boss, ^{old} Lyndon Baines Johnson; CIA contract
 agent ~~and~~ professional anti-^{Communist} Frank Sturgis; and
 Sam Giancana, ^{who} ~~who~~ confessed ~~in~~ the complicity of the mob in
 collusion with the CIA to his brother Chuck."

A We address this, not a word of which is true as Fetzer says it.

Nest he says, again with words so appropriate to him as he
 makes more racks about Valenti. "Ig Valento cared about t~~x~~
 about o truth..."

Fetzer implies that the eight he names from Twyman,
 who had and could not have had an dependable source for the
 fiction he misused to escexcite people, as he excited Fetzer,
 "talked" about the assassination. Each or those that Twyman uses
 was at least second hand to Twyman. Or, at least third-hand to
 Fetzer. But the scholar, ~~Fetzer~~, Ph. ~~AD.~~ and all ~~o~~ of that, ^{does not}
~~omit~~ any of this. And he does not say, if Tywman knew, what they
^{Or to whom,} ^{first-hand}
 allegedly talked about. Not one knew a word about the assassination.
 some is lifted from their writing and in one case from a ~~xxx~~
 secret tape.

What Marcello and Trafficante talked about was the possibility
 that they might be blamed for the assassination, with^h which they had
 had not^hing to do. They said it in the presepresence of Trafficante's
 lawyer, who was an FBI informer. So what we know about that is what
 the agency wrote about what the fink lawyer told him. Not even hearsay,

Milteer also goes nabacl~~k~~ back to my early writing. He was
 connected with a small extreme right-wing group. He was expected
 to start a racist commotion in Mimai so the Miami police^d use as an
 informer ^{one} who was so undepend ble the FBI fired him as an FBI

symbol informer, Willie Somerset ^{He} allowed the Miamo police to put a tape recorder in his refrigerator and that yielded a tape in which Milteer conjecture on how a President could be killed. All ~~else~~ about this is mythology exaggerated by ~~ass-~~ assassination mythologists. I obtained ^{and verbatim} ~~was~~ used part of that ~~tape~~ ^{but not as fact, which it wasn't,} tape transcript, along with several FBI recprds on Milteer, who was a blowhard. My use of those records was in criticism of the FBI's investigations of The JFK and Martin Luther King, jr., ^{Codes} and there is no other legitimate use of hem.

Like those before it, this is a fraud ¹ Fetzter's and before him Twyman's are fraudulent misuses,

Roselli was used by the CIA in an effort to get Kennedy killed. The CIA was asked to do that by Eisenhower, ^a but ^{that} unscuccessful effort was not Kennedys and no Kennedy knew a thing about it until it got to be public over anything ^{but} approved spook procedures. Rosselli enlisted Giancana who, it ~~had~~ happened had a girl friend, Phyllis McGuire of the then famous singing McGuire sisters. He got the CIA's honcho on this deal to have her ⁱⁿ ~~separate~~ ^{Dan Martin's} boyfriend's ^{Room bugged.} Vegas bed. The bugging of ~~Dan~~ Martin's room was discovered and the bugger, who worked for a Miami ~~detective~~ detective agency, told all to the local police and to get him to keep quite, the ineffecient bugger was let got.

I have the results of three official investigations on this, including that of the FBI. ~~None~~ None includes any actual effort to kill the President. Only mafia talk of it. But Roselli himself did not talk ~~to~~ to anyone. When he was in trouble he sent his lawyer to speak to the government and again, I have the records, including the FBI's.

There was no connection of any kind with the assassination .

So that Roselli talked has no me real meaning, no connection of any kind with the actual assassination.

Phillips was ~~all~~ never Roselli's boss and neither Twyman nor Fetzter gives any source on this myth, whether it originate by Phillips or by Twyman or by Fetzter.

The inclusion of Lyndon Baines Johnson is based on a book by a woman who claimed to be his former girlfriend ^{her book} wrote and could not get published until Harry Livingstone ~~public~~ published it for her, Texas in the Morning. It is not a credible effort ^{and used it on himself} to exploit and commercialize the assassinate and if she was Lyndon Johnson's former girl friend, ^{on} what she writes lacks credibility.

Frank Sturgis knew nothing ^M about the assassination. If he said anything to anyone that can be distorted into this Twyman misuse, his reputation for not being credible applies.

Giancana could not have "confessed the complicity of the mob in collusion with the CIA to his brother ⁴ Chuck" because the mob had nothing at all to do with what the CIA asked of a single mobster, Roselli, through an intermediary. Whether or not it had anything to do with this failed CIA, not mafia, plot to ~~get~~ JFK killed, using Chuck Giancana as a source is more than another confession of subject-matter ignorance, all this existing in disclosed official records, it is also to use a cheap ^{effort} effort to profit from ^{on the} the assassination of Giancana and the chopping up of Roselli's body, presumed to have been by the mafia because they talked about other things to government.

Or, there is not a word of truth in the Twyman excerpts that, for once, Fetzter ~~credits~~ gives credit to as his sourcee.

Twytina Fetzzer asked if Valentⁱ cared for the truth. It is
overwhelming that Fetzzer does not, made no effort to learn it
and yet is impelled by what he refers to as the scholar in
him to ~~write~~ ^u collect ~~two~~ ^{the ext} books on ~~an~~ ^{shockingly} extraordinarily important
subject ^{about} on which he is ~~really~~ ignorant.

Right after the last of Fetzzer's smokeless smoking guns he
has less than a page under the subject Other Sources? (page
(14-15)). He does not say sources of what:

*Mildent
single
space*

These are hardly the only persons to have talked about the assassination. Jim
Hicks, for example, who bears a striking resemblance to someone photographed
outside of the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City impersonating Lee Oswald, was
photographed in Dealey Plaza with an antenna hanging out of his pocket and
claims to have been a communications coordinator for the killing. Charles
Harrelson, serving a life term for the assassination of a federal judge with a high-
powered rifle, once confessed to having killed Kennedy, by which I take it he
meant he had fired the fatal shot. Chauncey Holt, a counterfeiter who worked as

a contract agent for the CIA, has told me he was instructed to bring 15 sets of
forged Secret Service credentials to Dealey Plaza, which he dutifully prepared, but
that, in light of his extensive experience with the underworld, he thought it was not
a mob hit but rather a military operation. I now suspect that Chauncey was cor-
rect. The role of the Pentagon in this affair certainly deserves further investigation.

And there are others. Perhaps the most interesting is Madeleine Duncan
Brown, a former mistress of LBJ by whom she had a son, who was not LBJ's only
offspring out of wedlock but was his only son. Among the fascinating details she
conveys in a book of their affair, *Texas in the Morning* (1997), is that Lyndon told
her, at a social event the night before the murder at the home of oil baron Clint
Murchison, that after tomorrow he would not have to put up with embarrass-
ment from those Kennedy boys any longer. And that, during a New Year's Eve
rendezvous at The Driskill Hotel in Austin, when she confronted him with ru-
mors (rampant in Dallas at the time) that he had been involved (since no one
stood to gain more personally), he blew up at her and told her that the CIA and
the oil boys had decided that Jack had to be taken out—which is about as close
as we are going to get to the font (p 290 14-15).

Will again, Fetzzer is writing about ^{what he knows nothing about} (and ~~from~~ ^{he} and, does not

dare provide citations to the assassination slop with which
he has filled his ssassination-ignorant head. He dares not say,
if, indeed he knew, that the ^{made up} ~~the~~ Hick fiction was invented by

(I was there when he did it) Jim Garrison and that Hick's life ended, as I recall, in a mental
hospital. There was, indeed, no communications center for the
assassination and none was needed. But if there had been, the
last place it would have been would have been in Dealey Plaza. More@-

over, if it had had any radio, that imaginary communications center, ~~it~~ and if it had had an aerial, the last place it would have ~~been~~ would have been more or less hanging out of Hick's left back pocket. It also would not have been so stiff that it zigged and zagged. It would not have been of stiff wire but it if it had been any kind of wire it ~~would~~ have been invisible, not advertising for an arrest.

What Garrison made up was an aerial was an ~~imp~~ ^{imperfection} in the picture.

Besides all of this, if Fetzner had any of the common sense he asks of others, could he possibly believe that if there had been the totally unnecessary communications center, Hick ~~it~~ would have hung around at the scene of the crime some time after the crime?

~~Crazy~~ Crazy of Garrison and crazier of ~~Fetzner~~ Fetzner.

Nobody was photographed "impersonating Oswald" outside the Cuban embassy in Mexico City. *Fetzner's ignorance still again. Not Cuba!*

It was outside the Soviet consulate and it was ~~not~~ ^{not} impersonation of Oswald or anyone else. The only real resemblance of what Fetzner has filched from one of those slopbuckets sold as books on the JFK assassination resembled Oswald only in being a man and ^{being} (in man's clothing).

The CIA was photographing all who entered and left that consulate with an automatic camera that malfunctioned regularly. The consulate staff had requested its replacement several times but CIA headquarters did not replace it until embarrassed by the malfunction and by providing the Warren Commission with an obviously wrong picture.

The Ph. D. Fetzner is like ^{two} a pig. He ~~loves~~ ^{loves} (slop and ^{assassination}

like either the real pig or Orwell's he ^{does} ~~sewa~~ not question it
 In fact he lacks the intelligence ^{of} ~~of~~ question ^{what} ~~what~~s sounds fishy
 and ~~the~~ lacks the subject-matter knowledge to know that it is.

Harrellson did say that he had been an assassin but he retracted it.
 It was not so. He was a confessed killer but he did not kill

Kennedy and there is not an indication of any kind that ~~he did~~ ^{he could have}

If Fetzer had not also been a fool he would not have swallowed
 the slop he attributes to Chauncey Holt, who ^{later,} ~~he~~ presents as one
 of the tramps and as his great achievement. It was all fiction.

But again no common sense as well and no knowledge, if the
 CIA had wanted identifications on its ^{as it would not,} ~~assassins~~, the supposed
 purpose of Holt's allegedly being there, he would not have
 been loaded with fifteen false CIA identifications to be
 captured with him ^{or} ~~on~~ the bodies of the supposed assassins.

Fetzer also says he agrees with what Holt told him, that it was
 "not a mob hit but rather a military operation". Does our scholar
 provide any details of his ~~alleged~~ ^{being} source? No. ~~Being~~ ^{Being} a Ph.D.
 he ~~needs~~ ^{needs} no support for a complete fabrication by which he was
 suckered,

Evidence? No Fetzer-like ^k Ph. D. needs any evidence or support.

If those Fetzer says talked about the assassin, "Perhaps
 the most interesting is Madeleine Duncan Brown, ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ ^{XXXXXXXXXX} fascinating
~~details~~ former mistress of LBJ by whom she had a son.... Among the
 fascinating ^{details} she conveys in a book of their affair,
Texas in the Morning (1997) is that Lyndon told her, at a social
 event, the night before the murder at the home of oil baron ^e Clint
 Murcheson, that tomorrow he would not have to put up with ^e embarrassment
 from those Kennedy boys any longer."

This is not, as anyone with the most rudimentary knowledge of

the assassination would know, the ~~only~~ myth made up about
 the social event ^{to} which no important ^{Man} would take a mistress with
 him and ~~to~~ provide very damaging gossip. Other such fabrications
 involved Ruchard Nixon and J. Edgar Hoover.

Fetzer does not give the publisher of her book that on
 such details has no credibikity at all. It could not be published by many a
 real publisher so Harry Livingston, ^{(who also is both kinds of a pig and who also}
 (who also swallowed that slop, *did it.*
 It
~~Livingston~~ also ^{is} far from the only slop ge relished), (We see more
 of Livingstone, much abbreviated, below.)

Can anyone imagine that anyone at all, particularly the
 vice president whoo would become president by it, would tell
 anyone at all that the assassintion of the President would ~~be~~
 on the following day! ^(if he could have known?)

Nobody can believe that and nobody in publishing did.

Nor could it be believed ^{"the CIA and} that ^{the} oil boys had decided
 that Jack had to be taken out." ~~To~~ To which impossibility
 Fetzer adds his own ignorance: "which is about as close as we
 are going to get."

This is the same Fetzer who elsewhere atributes the
 assination to the military.

Under the subheading Then and Now Fetzer ends his smokeless
Smoking Guns essay continuing to make crazcks ~~agais~~ against this
 straw man, Jack Valenti and in doing that amakes more of a fool of
 himself and adds to the abundance of proof that he is a subject-
 matter ignoramus:

Having known Chauncey Holt and having talked with Madeleine Duncan Brown, no doubt I have cognitive advantages that Jack Valenti does not enjoy, simply because I know more about the case than he does. Although many Americans know that there are excellent books on the assassination—including Harold Weisberg, *Whitewash* (1965), Mark Lane, *Rush to Judgment* (1966), Josiah Thompson, *Six Seconds in Dallas* (1967), Sylvia Meager, *Accessories After the Fact* (1967), James Hepburn, *Farewell America* (1968), George O'Toole, *The Assassination Tapes* (1975), Gary Shaw, *The Cover-Up* (1976), Peter Model and Robert Groden, *JFK: The Case for Conspiracy* (1976), David Lifton, *Best Evidence* (1980), Jim Garrison, *On the Trail of the Assassins* (1988), Jim Marrs, *Crossfire* (1989), Robert Groden and Harrison Livingstone, *High Treason* (1989), Charles Crenshaw, *JFK: Conspiracy of Silence* (1992), Harrison Livingstone, *High Treason 2* (1992), Robert Groden, *The Killing of a President* (1993), and Noel Twyman, *Bloody Treason* (1997)—to mention 16 of the best—they do not realize how much we know now on the basis of scientific findings.

In defense of Judge Tunheim, of course, the objection could be raised that he had his hands full with more than 60,000 records and might not have had any opportunity for reading other work on the assassination, even Stewart Galanor, *Cover-Up* (1998), a work of less than 200 pages that conclusively refutes Warren Commission and HSCA findings. Although he was Chair of the ARRB, it might be argued, he cannot be expected to have read everything ever written on this subject. And, indeed, that is not an unreasonable point to make for any American citizen. Let me therefore close with a recommendation. Start with Galanor's *Cover-Up* (1998), as I have done here; then read the book you have in your hands; and finally turn to *Assassination Science* (1998). You are entitled to know what happened to your country on 22 November 1963. As Charles Drago has eloquently observed, anyone sincerely interested in this case who does not conclude that JFK was murdered as the result of a conspiracy is either unfamiliar with the evidence or cognitively impaired. (1992, p. 15)

Fetzer opens with additional mocking of himself in the form of boasting. He boasts of knowing two of the man^y/phonies, ~~the~~ Holt and Brown. That he knew ^{ed} ~~this~~ fakers leads him to say tht that "gave ^{him} a "cognitive advantage that Jack Valenti does not enjoy simply because I knew more about the case than he does. " With the sample we have seen of Fetzer's ~~acknowledgment~~ "acknowledge," if Valenti knows not a thing he is less misinformed about ~~the~~ "the case" than Fetzer, who finds it ^{im}possible to get anything straight and not to be suckered, such is his "knowledge."

Another illustration of this follows immediately where Fetzer lists what he calls some excellent books. Of my eight he lists only the first. ~~When~~ When he gets to the late Sylvia Meagher, he spells he name wrong, reflecting his lack of familiarity with her and her great book. The he gets to "James Hepburn, Farewell America."

That book is a fake book by ~~SDECE~~ what was then known as SDECE. It is the French equivalent of the CIA!!

There is no James Hepburn. He told me that he adopted that name because he was hung up on ~~The~~ movie star of that period, Audrey Hepburn. ~~The~~ "James" came from the French, "J'aime," which means "I love." Of his many names I knew him as Herve Lamar.

The book was made up, apparently, to suck ~~ed~~ Garrison into endorsing it, as he did. But the spooks wanted more, his endorsement of a movie they made up. The details are not important here but in summary I was responsible for Garrison not seeing and not endorsing that additional spook fakery.

Some of Fetzer's "cognitive advantage" of which he is ~~also~~ proud/.

He lists as "excellent" Lifton's monumental fake ~~of~~ the impossible snatching of the President's body, Best Evidence, which is neither.

The rest are all basically conjectures and are not factual and not based on the ~~not~~ confirmed ^{available} official evidence. One is ~~not~~ ^{not} even on the assassination. It is supposed to be on the many theories but it is ignorant about them. Jim Marrs' Conspiracy, of which Fetzer has to be entirely ignorant to think so well of it, actually ~~we~~ can't even get those theories straight. ~~In~~ it he also can't keep the ~~people~~ ^{too} straight, ~~neither~~. Yet Fetzer ~~is~~ includes it among the "16 of the best."

As he concludes this added self-condemnation as the fake "expert" he ~~pretends~~ to be, toward the end of his next and long chapter ~~he~~ recommends his previous fake scholarship with the ~~meaningless~~ ^m Assassination Science, as a book everyone should read. He then says, and this refers back to his other few recommendations, including to his own fakery, "You are entitled to know what

happened to your country on 2 November 1963." From anything Fetzler wrote and said, that is not possible.

As we see herein.

There is more, much more, but this is a more than adequate sample of Fetrow, ~~his~~ his smoking guns and his Ph. D., to leave it without question that after two books he remains a subject-matter ignoramus with a sick ego and spectacular stupidity, his sole qualifications for his being an "editor," and his sole qualifications for his being ~~what~~ what he was, a collector.

He is ~~the~~ man who, if he were faced with a certified truth about that tragic assassination would regard it as untrue. All that is in his proud head is fiction, assassination theories in the exploitation and commercialization of other assassinaion nuts. Smoking Guns, Ph.D. and all that.