16. Fetzers' Claims: No Basis in Fact

We have seen that the mosg spectacular of the Detzrer claims have no basis in fact and would have served no end for either side, not for the government and not for those who believe that the government faked tthe raw fiim. much earlier those opposed to the Report had proven that there was much that is wrong in it and in what is said to support it.

We have also seen that the Fetzerßs had made a real effort to prove the Report wrong but they made no effort to prove Oswald innocent. They reflec t no interest in that, except as it may be secomd hand in proving the Reppport to be wrong. 283A here

The Fetzers bbegan with what was called "theories" and for the most part were not even thatx, having no basis in real ffact at all. As, in a few of the innumerable available instances we have just seen. Besides that this case requires fact, the truth, for the people to know what happened.

This gets back to what I tametried to get AAguilar and Mantik several years ago, to understandt that much as they believed they understood, they lacked the necessary understanding Eoof the little-known and established fact of the assassination, what was ~~stached around~~ here and theire, in the vast accuumulation of what was just junk, a great ~~vasy~~ accumulation of what was no more than junk and distrac tion that was accumulzated instead of the fact that would have been the end product of any real investigation, the investigation that was never made, the investigation that was ruled out in the very earliest adys after President Johnson's approval of what, for lack of a better name, we are calling the Katzenbach conspiracy.

But the fact is tthat there were at least two other conspiracies along the same line that preceded the one Johnson ~~it~~. We have seenn one, that of the Navy, which burned the real, the lonly real autopsy report and hid the notes on which it had been ~~was sup pposedly~~ baase and uNundertook, to ~~the~~ the degree possible, ebeginning as soon as Ruby killed Oswald and eliminated

~~If~~ Proving the Reort to be wrong really required that, without campaigning, for him, with Oswald dead in particular, the effort to prove be made that the Commission and the Report were wrong and really did frame him where it was appropriate, make the case for Oswald's innocence because, with knowledge of the actyal evidence, for Oswald's innocence, is found in the actual, official evidence.

This also makes the real fact of the deliberate corruption of the assassination case easier to understand.

Particularly with the Katzenbach memo, which grew into a major conspiracy, publicly known but not mentioned by anu of the Fetzers. Or, left by the Fetzers not to be known, what should be understood so that their readers could understand that it was national policy for there to be no actual investigation of the assassin and that regardless of whther or not he was innocent the assassination would be blamed on Oswald

Then, at about nine the Sunday night two days after the assassination, on November 24,1963, as we saw in the Secret Service records of Johnson's communications before his phone-tapping system was in place, Johnson communicated this to Hooveer. So, almost immediately, it was orders to the FBI, It had become national policy. But this was not ciommunicated to the rank and file in the FBI.

any trial and with that sought to eliminate any trace of the conspiracy that, without any doubt ay all, frok the very beginning, ~~was an~~ obvious. From the first reports it was apparent that there had been a cp sconspiracy and for reasons unknown but can perhaps be guessed, the Navywanted there to be no belief that there had been a conspiracy ~~and~~ no proof of it, either.

(62-109060 Not Recorded, 6/4/64, also in a 94 file.)

As Hoover told William Manchdester in an interview for Manchester&'s book, he moved into the case immediately though he had no right to do that, no authority for it. What Hoover did not tell Manchest, not, according to the eight-page memo on that meeting by Cartha De Loach, who had arranged it, the name of the FBI's game is control and Hoover and his closest could exercize whatever control wanted to exercise from inside.

A more than adequate understanding of the FBI's determined effort to see to it, to the degree possible then for the FBI, that nobody other than the safely-dead Oswald would be considered the assassin, the lone and unassisted assin, althuough the only evidence it had was not ecidence but was obviously planted, to frame Oswald.

At some level ~~the F~~ some in the FBI must have realized quite early that they would have little chance of getting past what had been planted so they decidedto go along with that, that being better to them than nothing at all, 284 A here

~~And~~ there s nothing at all ~~wa~~that I ~~remember seeing~~ in that third of a million FBI assassination pages I obtained from it, kicking and screaming, so to speak, in all those FOIA lawsuits I filed.But somehow, as those records do show, the entire FBI understood what FBW policy was, what was expected to them.

The complete bankruptcy of the FBI in its early assassination

Somehow the Secret Serbice seemed to ~~kn~~ understand this and by and large, went along with ~~of~~ it. But fairly early on, for all practical purposes, the FBI froze the Secret Service out of the supposed investigation, the only socalled investigation there was.

It was a shabby, shallow work of the cheapest propaganda, but it laid the FBI line down and all who saw or hreard about to recognized it was the FBI's line and knew that any open disagreement with it would bring FBI relatiation which, to anyone in government, could be very serious, with painful consequences.

although it knew only too well that McNaughton's criticism was justified, The FBI responded with an angry tirade against him despite the ~~high~~ relatively high rank he held and well as the FBI knew that its report disgraced it and was as worse than worhtless that it was.

work is clear, astoundingly and distressingly clear, in its report ordered of it by the new President as soon as he could the ~~af~~ evening he was back from Dallas. In the Commission's files it is identified as CD1. There is a volume on Ruby and several of appendix, but the meat is the first volume and it is so absolutely barren on the assassination that it has only two sentences, one incomplete, on the shooting in the assassination and in even that incredibly little on the assassination itself, the bankrupt FBI does not even give the cause of death-does not even mention all the known shooting! (white wash. page 195).

And that on the most subversive of crimes, the assassination of a President, the crime that is a de Facto coup d'etat whether or not a coup d'etat was in the subversive scheme. 285A here

That FBI report was not well liked because it was a nothing, nothing other than a diatribe against Oswald, and that distribe did not establish guilt. 285B here

But the FBI, over the years, has earned fear throughout ~~within~~ the government, so there was virtually no adverse comment on it because those who could have expressed a low opinion of it knew very well than in its own way the FBI would retaliate.

Of all the little there was on this in those vast FBI files the only low opinion was by the Defense Department geneal coulsel, MnNaughton. 285C

~~And~~, in its usual method with what to it are important politifal stakes, the FBI conditioned the public and media mind in advance with its leaks of what it wanted leaked while it kept secret what it wanted secret.

I know who did at least some of the leak-handlers were from one

, was, within the government, the most important one of several each of which was supported by smaller conspiracies. Examples of this are numerous in my printed books, quite a number being of the staff of the Commission, some by its members.

of those to whom he leaked. And although he was not just a plain, everyday FBI agent, he did not leak without authority. That he leaked and to whom he leaked were indicated in advance to him. The FBI made no mistakes in that direction. It leaked where it wanted to leak. And only there.

So the public and to the degree possible the media and the political minds were conditioned in advance with a nothing at all, with a barren, an utterly meaningless report, a diatribe of a save that where it counted the demeaning, the desire of the FBI was clear enough. It, too, diverted the government, few as were those who saw it.

The conspiracy represented by that Katzenbach memo, which in fact dates to midday Sunday, November 24, two days after the assassination (the typed copies were dated the day of copying, the early morning of the next day, Monday, the 25th). 286 1

The FBI feared embarrassment because despite its drumbeat of boasting through the media, particularly radio and TV the effect of which was to tell the country that there was no crime the FBI could not solve, it had not the tiniest smidgeon of real evidence of any kind on ~~the crime itself and it knew it.~~ this most major crime - the assassination of the President - a coup d'etat -

In going over a collection of about two inches of duplicates of FBI reports that I kept on my desk in the belief they would interest those who came to speak to me about the assassination, My friend, Dave Wrone, Wisconsin history professor, selected a smaller group he titled , "Hoover's hysteria." It was a justified title because for the first two weeks what Hoover said, particularly to the President, was that wrong, that mixed up and confused. That Hoover hysteria can be attributed to his knowledge that the FBI and he were lost, without the slightest idea of who and what were behind the assassination and with nothing but the flimsiest indication of any Oswald ~~involvement in~~ connection with the crime, so thin that it could not have survived examination by a defense counsel

in a trial if its use were to be dared when daring it would be foolish.

Which, thanks to Jak Ruby, there would not be a trial.

But Hoover was really shaken those first few weeks and the FBI's, paricularly Hoover's own records, make that disturbingly clear, that the head of the FBI could be so undependable and so hysterical blatant about it in such a crime, so dangerous a time for the country.

That should have disturbing, but not many people knew about it until later, and then only a few did.

This and so much like it is entirely lost on the Fetzers who say nothing about any of it and who wrote two books after it was public without mention of that Katzenbach memo and without menton of its effect on the entire country, particularly on everything related to the assassination and the ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ evasion of any real investigation by any part of the government, what was limited to an investigation of the innocent Oswald, who had nothing to do with the crime, accompanied with refusals to investigate what was real, not fiction, and the special meanings thag ~~was~~ were given to what was stated about Oswald,

Even what was connected to Oswald was not investigated honestly and was not reported honestly.

There is this and so much more like it that is missing in the essays of the Fetzers and is missing in what they reflect of their understanding of the crime and of its supposed investigation of which they write from their own flat-world society.

I recall nothing suggesting any awareness of this actuality, of the actuality of the official conspiracies, large and small, and their influence, indeed, their control over what was and was not done in the investigations, particularly their control over what was and was not done, and of what was and was not said.

288

Russell

How many other smaller conspiracies there wee, ~~like this,~~ we will ~~no~~ never know but there were many and there was no limit on who could and did participate in the, notoriously those of the government who had ~~to~~ the official duty to expose and prevent those smllr ~~expo~~ conspiracies — any conspiracies at all really,

Non would have succeeded without official support, most ~~ens;i~~ conspicuously with the assistance of then Commission counsel Specter ~~ARLEN~~ AND LAST IN A SERIOUS OF THOSE WHO MADE IT POSSIBLE PR, who PROTECTED AT like ARRB's Jeremy Gunn.

When by their actions, their failures, their personal covering up each became a conspirator.

(None of this would have been possible without the Specter/Commission invention of the impossible "single bullet theory" ~~so~~ which all knew was impossible.)

Where there was opposition to this ~~faxxxy~~ officially invented ~~official~~ fakery, one way or another it was wiped out. How that was done to two Democratic Commission Members, Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia and Kentucky Republican Senator John Sherman ~~Coopr~~ Cooper is set for in detail in my Manuscript, Senator Russell Dissents.

Russell and Cooper never did agree with that single-bullet fabrication and national disgrace, but that cannot be determined from what the Commission said and what it files hold.

The official record of this official disagreement, this official disagreement with that single-bullet monstrosity, was, officially, wiped out by the Commission. Russell spoke it and filed it but The Commission wiped that all out and did

Bur I have a copy of the carbon copy of what Russell prepared to deliver to his colleagues at the exective session he forced on September 18, 1964. The Commission met in that executive session

269 early and unanimous

but in violation of its agreement to have stenographic transcripts of all their executive sessions, particularly in history. The Commission saw to it that the official reporter was not there to take down and make that transcript and it does not exist.

Nor, according to the Archives, does the ribbon copy of Russell's statement he read to his colleagues at that September 18 executive session.

Nor does Russell's second such disagreement, also written out in advance, his refusal to agree that there had been no conspiracy. I have a copy of his file carbon copy of his refusal to agree with that Commission "conclusion" which was, in fact, just made up without any real investigation, and of his refusal to agree there had been no conspiracy.

Let us hope that thee has been nothing like this in our history and that it is not duplicated again in the future!

What happened to the autopsy report and to the other autopsy records, including the notes, also were parts of conspiracies, It was all public and neither the Fetzers nor the ARRB not the HSCA did what each should have done about them. Some did what they should not have done, perhaps still more conspiracies. 290 next

290

Once I published the actual "certified" and "verified" signed and receipted proofs that the autopsy notes and other original autopsy records had been preserved it was known within the government that those notes dared not be seen because they are not the basis for the replacement autopsy report that Humes drafted as soon as he knew that Oswald was dead and that there would be no trial. He then had to destroy the real autopsy report (as he did) because IT, inevitably, held what could have been used by the Oswald defense and could be taken to indicate has innocence and that there had been a conspiracy to kill. And, in order that the real and existing notes not be compelled to be produced in any of a number of FOIA lawsuits, including several of mine in which they had been withheld, Humes had to change what he said and beginning then he lied and said he had burned those notes. After they were hidden. I have herein copies and dated receipts I obtained—official

It was perjury but the government by this time also had to worry about the public reaction once it became known that the government had lied about the assassination of the President and that had been the government's practise and policy regardless of who was president, regardless of which party was in power.

~~The HSCA knew the truth, having gotten it from me.~~

The ARRB also knew the truth for the same reason. In addition, T. Jeremy Gunn personally knew the truth for more than that same reason. ~~In addition~~ he discussed it with me.

And both the House assassins committee and the special board created and empowered to be certain that all relevant records were disclosed failed further, as I know because it began that effort with me when Gunn was general counsel and He phoned me in the effort. He wanted the raw material of the study Howard Roffman had made for me of the factual information (in his replacement autopsy report) for which Humes had no known source.

~~other t. an the missing notes.~~

As ~~Dun~~ Gunn knew from having been here, I cannot safely go to our basement, have not been able to for about a decade. I had to remind him of this & and to invite him or anyone else he might send to go to the basement and borrow that ~~work.~~ retrieve and information I also told him how to reach Rodffman and obtain that ~~information~~ record from him.

Gunn thanks~~ed~~ me and I never heard from him again.

He sent nobody here to obtain that detailed research and he made no mention of it in his examinations of Humes in the stenographic ~~copis~~ transcripts of which I have ~~and have~~ used them as the basis of a book ~~man~~ manuscript in which I detail the ARRB's effort to entice Humes to give still different sworn testimony which the ARRB could hope to use to to wipe ~~a~~ all of that ~~yjay~~ out and to cover up ~~for~~ umes in particular and for itself by leading him into still another perjurious account.

It ~~is a~~ now apparent that Gunn's call to me was not so that the ARRB could use Howard's fine and dependable work. It was rather, to be certain that I would not be able to embarrass it by producing that work to expose what the ARRB, Gunn in ~~art. a/a~~ particuler, were up to in their ~~ass-d~~ additional covering up when they went to uncover all ~~of~~ the rest

~~add some statistics from Howard's report here~~

I repeat the essence of what Howard's careful research proved and what Gunn decided he had to hide, had to suppress and did suppress. The full account from which this is selected is in Post Mortem, pages 255-6:

indent single space

> Howard's factual listing is 15 single-spaced typewritten pages. To make this study and comparison, he isolated every single statement of fact in the typed autopsy report. He then sought for each fact or even an approximation of it in each of the other sources, the so-called notes. This leaning-over-backwards is an effort to be as fair as possible by including all that any carping critic might later complain should have been. However, it is obvious, with only these so-called notes as sources, unless some notes had been destroyed at some point, there could have been no other sources for the holograph than there were for its typed version and no other sources for the two much-later panels to draw upon.
>
> Howard's study shows a statement of a total of 88 facts. Of these, only 24 are in the "notes". Sixty-four statements of facts in the autopsy report are not in any of these "notes"!
>
> Because this is the autopsy of a President, because the credibility of the official Report on his assassination, that of all the Commission and its staff, the Department of Justice, all those medico-legal eminences and, indeed, of the military, too, hangs on this alone, let me express these shocking figures in two other ways.
>
> Of the "facts" stated in the autopsy report, almost three out of four have no existing source. The percentage is just under 73 - 72.7 percent.
>
> Or, putting it the other way, of what is represented as fact in this autopsy report, only one in four exists in any existing written source!

Again, all public and all not reflected in what the Fetzers wrote. Not reflected in their thinking either. Rather than being at all critical of what both the HSCA and the ARRB did-and did not do, they are gung ho! for both and entirely without criticism of either.

And still again they reflect no understanding of the evil this was for bboth bodies if it was not also criminal.

293 mwt

That was the only response Blakey could make to factual criticism of what he was doing. For what he was not doing that he was supposed to do, several received major newspaper attention. The truth was about an FBI informer and what he did that Blakey could not use because that FBI informer became a Blakey informer, made a series of four page-one stories for the St. Louis Post Dispatch. It also received that kind of major intentions in other cities when the Post-Dispatch syndicated it.

Blakey could make no better a comment than he did. That comment said much about Blakey and his committee and it was said by Blakey.

At a number of points and on several issues the Fetzers unreservedly express their high opinion of both the House assassins committee and the Assassination Records Review release board. No more dramatic demonstration of assassination ignorance is possible becuuse from the first both smeared whitewash generously.

Both undertook, to protect official miscreants to the degree possible for each, all the government failures and dishonesties of which they were full enough aware.

Take the House assassins for one example. There are so many that were publicly available criticism I was the sources who never once asked that my name be withheld for a series of newspapers articles that pointed out HSCA's factual errors.

There came a time when General Counsel Blakey was asked by a reporter if he had any comment to make on these criticissms that were attributed to me.

Enraged but unable to fault a word I had said, Blakey , out of control, replied,"Weisberg? Weisberg? He can kiss my ass!"

George Lardner, of the Washington Post,asked me if I objtected to that being used."No, not at all. It is Blakey describing and defining Blakley," I replied.

293a here

And the Post did publish it. Blakey Being Blakey.

The one following example I believe is sufficient for it to serve as a self-portrait of the House assassins being themselves and assassination the truth about the assassination (and its investigations) It is selected from many selected because it holds the most competent testimony on what was lied about officially-and because it was suppressed by those House assassins. It is the secret testimony (they took from) of the late Dr. John H. Ebersole. He was the sole radiologist for the autopsy at the Navy hospital on whose staff he was.

2 944

This was proof of Humes' perjury in insisting to the Warren Commission that he had spoken to Perry only once and that ~~one~~ alleged one time was allegedly the day after the assassination.

This, however, is not the only proof of ~~that~~ Humes' perjury which his role and his orders required of him. The repeated-in-variation versions of ~~that~~ his perjury was protected by the ARRB as it had been by the HSCA, Both of which were held only in the highest regard by the Fetzers. Reflecting their understanding, their taste and how their minds work on this subject.

2 95 follows

2 95 follows

Blakey wanted Ebersole's testimony very much, if only so that he not be accused of not taking the significant ~~testmo~~ testimony, as the Warren Commission had been.

But he knew in advance that he would not want to publish it, so Ebersole's testimony was not taken before the committee ~~and~~ it was not at an open hearing ~~and~~ not in any HSCA office, and he suppressed it

~~Instead,~~ it was held, in private, at the National Archives.

And then the transcript was kept secret.

Until ~~the HSCA~~ it was forced to be disclose it under the 1992 Act ~~which required the ARRB TO SEE TO SUCH DISCLOSURES~~.

Disclosure was as quiet as possible, not a word about that secret hearing now disclosed for the first time. I deal with it in the Afterword of NEVER AGAIN:"! (pages 465ff). So, the Fetzers knew about it.

One of the major controversies for the Fetzers is where the President's head wound really was. I do not recall that any one of the Fetzers quoted the autopsy pathologists on this but ~~they~~ those pathologists did give graphic testimony on that,

When the House assassins' medical panel questioned Ebersole, the ~~dead~~doctor who was required to examine it closely in order to take his X-rays of it, Ebersole could not have been more pointed or specific in what he testified to: ~~it was~~ that the bullet had come from the side" (page 476).

Ebersole had been asked by the medical panel chairman, Dr. Michael Baden, where he saw the wound in the X-rays he took, so there was at least one X-ray which depicts this ~~unequivocally~~.

With a perjury ~~perhaps~~ rap being avoided against Humes by the House assassins committee, as it had been by the Justice Department and the Warren Commission, as it also later was by the ARRB,

2948 follows

295

at sevral points in his testimony, to quote from #I NEVER AGAIN!

"at several points Ebersole ~~tezzzzzed~~ attested than in his presence Humes phoned (#Dallas doctor Malcolm)Perry during the autopsy."

(emphasis added)

He placed the time at about 10 or 10:30 the night of the ~~aiutupsy and the~~ autopsy, those phone calls from the phone in the autopsy ~~that z~~room.

295 (C), here

The Fetzers were also high on the ARRB because, at least in major part, it did its assigned job and saw to the disclsoure of all assassination classified ~~relevant~~ records that had ~~been~~ and could disclose. suppressed. The ~~est~~ published ~~e~~ estimate of what the ARRB had disclosed are in the millions of #pages. The ~~#e~~ figure used more often, as I recall it, was four that mil|i|on. ~~Th~~That volume must, necessarily, be largely composed of plain pages were disclosed,

crap. There never was that much information about #the assassination accumulated by the# governmnt ~~that worked~~ working under that Katzenbach conspiracy memo (approved by the President) and that enormoue volume of the irrelevant is an effective mask ~~for the~~ obscuring the relatively little that had real relevance.

One ~~#e~~ of the nastiest and one of the most dishonest, earlier, ones during the board's life, I #wrote a book ~~books~~ about. ~~and one after it~~, wh

One was about the high impropriety and ~~hi~~dishonesty and #manifestation of ignorance of one of the Fetzer's ~~single~~ prized Board Member, Kermit Hall, ~~who~~ He came to the board when he was dean of the Ohio State University at Columbus, Ohio. ~~The other~~, after I wrote another ~~one~~ of these several ~~many~~ suppressed transcripts had bee~~n~~ given me.

I did ~~a book~~ the first on Hall, titled Bogus. I did ~~another~~ the second on the incredible and rather open Gunn effort to ~~clean up all of~~ wipe out Humes perjury so there would be no temptation to charge him with it. The transcript# of Gunn's questioning is astounding, #what he was up to was that transparently wrong, #and unprofessional.

Hall, not averse to personal publicity, marked his appointment to the board in a local TV newscast. In it he stated that his highest ~~asset~~ qualification as a board member was his ignorance. Rather a startling bit of bragging for a professional educator. Before long he had arranged for added publicity in which, without so intending, he proved how ~~correct~~ correct he had been in describing his ignorance as his highest qualification.

How it was arranged I do not know but Hall was selected to make what in Maryland is an important and prestigious legal speech. After he made that speech it appeared as an article in the Maryland Law Review.

It was an attack on critics and criticism of the official investigations of the JFK assassination. The credits in that article suggest that he had all the real work for him done by those under him at the Ohio State University.

It was an indecent, arrogant and hardly impartial diatribe in polite language. It was also improper given Hall's position in the board that was to see to the disclosure that was also sought by those he criticized in in his speech and article.

I wrote a book-length criticism of his law-review article. I sent a copy to the dean of that law school and a copy to the ARRB. Neither sent even an acknowledgement and there was no protest, complaint, denial or rebuttal from Hall. As the law required of the ARRB that book manuscript is in the disclosed Board records at the Archives. A man from England who is interested in the assassination and in my writing about it told me he checked and found it there.

The Fetzer praise for the ARRB says nothing about what it is properly subject to criticism for doing, from arranging for free and extensive publicity for assassination nuts from coast to coast to partisan speeches

and articles not consistent with the Board's mission to the highly improper, if not illegal undertaking to protect Humes from the penalties due him for his repetitious and inconsistent perjuries in his major role in seeing to it that there would not be any acceptable solution to the assassination of President Kennedy, which was also help in hiding what ~~could~~ might be learned about the real assassins. and the coup d'etat What the Board, Gunn in particular, did, was not one of the mandated duties of the board. But he got away with it.

~~But it and he got away with it.~~ We have examined only a small proportion of what the Fetzers wrote that is subject to criticism. In general the lack of understanding reflected in some of this criticism had to influence what they understood, how they understood some of it and what they could understand in their writing about it.

The Fetzers have and they are entitled to ~~hav~~have their own points of view but thinking and seeing differently does not relieve them of the responsibilities all non-fiction writers have, to be fully truthful and in a book on this subject, to be fully and truthfully informative to their readers.

A Presidential assassination and a coup d'etat, which they never mention, are not fun and games. Nothing can be more serious in this country and no subject requires of writers greater responsibility and understanding. None requires more seriousness of purpose or any greater effort to meet all the many traditional obligations of writers who seek to inform their countrymen on any serious subject.

We have gone into only some of what is relevant to what the Fetzers wrote and about which their work is often barren or misleading

This is not a subject on which anyone can write safely when he is a subject-matter ignoramus, as Fetzer is. It is not an appropriate

subject for a subject-matter ignoramus like Fetzer to ~~seek~~ exploit/a personal publicity, as he did, when he is not a sbject-matter expert, as ~~Fetzer~~ he certainly is not. Nor is it ~~one~~ a subject on which there should be any bragging solely for personal publicity and then of the most questionable nature.

The school paper of the University of Minnesota at Duluth, the Statesman, for January 27, 1999, after Fetzer's first collection of the essays of others appeared , had this five-column headline page one about him and his book:

"JFK cover-up exposed by UMU professor," Fetzer.

The subhead is, "Fabricated evidence links Kennedy assassination with the federal government." And ~~in~~ the carryover it has the headline, "JFK cover-up discovered." Not until then, if that is what Fetzer did?

Unless staff writer ~~Zaxh~~ Zack Johns made it up, his obvious source was Fetzer. About whom it says so much more need not be added on this

Fetzer also organized a convention of supposed fellow assassination experts who met at his university. From the reports that reached me, they were as "expert" as Fetzer is.

~~That~~ All this is not scholarship. It is using the great tragedy of the assassination for the indulgence of a personal yen for personal attention regardless of the cost in seriously misinforming the people who yearn for the truth denied by feeding them what is not assassination scholarship, what is not fact.

Of which the Fetzers have none to give or to share.

It does not expose those in the government who did not do what they should have done when they did not meet their official responsibilities then or since then. It tends to make martyrs of them and to

excuplate them. That is not what should happen to those who fail to meet their responsibilities at the time of such great tragedies or thereafer.

Even Fetzer's titles are misleading.

There is no such thing as "Assassination Science." He made that up because he thought title was a title that would sell books, books in which there was nothing at all about "assassination Science" or even about assassination that report on any kind of science.

The title he made up for his second book is "Murder In Dealey Plaza." That is where the assassination was but there is remarkably little in the book that is about that murder. The book is largely of errors in the investigation not all of which is correct, as to a limited degree, we have seen.

Even Fetzer's titles are the opposite of scholarshuip while he poses as a real scholar, never omitting that Ph.D . and all that. In his determination to add al l the titles those whose names are mentioned he added "M.D. to one in which he sought to make a doctor of a lawywer.

This is not the kind of publishing that informs people, gives them an understanding of the horrible thinkg that happened to them and to their country.

To a much less degree than s possible we have shown that much of the well-intended effort of some of those whose essays Fetzer gathered together and published is not accurate. That kind of publication is not helpful to anyone except the miscreants who did not do what they should have at the time of the crime and since them. It certainly is not good for the people to be deceived or misled in any way and when what the books stir them up

as is possible with some of the campaigning, like the inflamatory nature of ~~dfalsel~~ falsely alleging that the back of the President's head had been blown out and that to hide this the X-rays were doctored, patched not to show it, and all that has been added to the earlier fictions about the Zapruder film allegedly being altered, can be inflammatory and have, while stirring some people up, also misled them.

This is not scholarly, either.

Nor is it truthful, no matter how intensely the Fetzers who believe it do believe it.

There is no acceptable substitute for truth and giving people what is not true with the representation that it is ~~trye~~ true does harm, not good, save to the degree it lines pockets with money.

Which then helps nobody else and gets all sorts of competitive untruths going, with people believing them, and being misled.

As stated earlier, there is so much that is so wrong about these books that Fetzer has put together to get himself some free personal publicity that books could be written about them but I add only one item and make special reminders of two matters of importance that were known well before Fetzer got off on his assassination kick and are not mentioned.

In connection with that hangup on the allegedly patched head Xray there is reference to ammunition that is ignorant, not factual. This includes the impossible, that a 6.5 metal fragment was placed in the head to suggest that it is a bit of that 6.5 mm. Mannlicher-Carcanno ammunition which was manufactured in the United States, not abroad, as alleged. Going along with this there is not a word about what head X-rays show, forty dustlike particles. ~~The~~ Some X-rays were taken before the autopsy examination was begun

and some were taken well before the examination was completed. There not only was no need for any such trickery, which also risked being detected by others in the autopsy room floor and the larger number who were observers. If indeed it had been possible.

But what is important and is, again, missing, is the fact that the designed of military ammunition, under the Geneva convention on humanitarian warfare, makes such minute fragmentation impossible. It cannot have been from any of that military ammunition, period. It has to have been "soft", not "hardened" ammunition. Like is used in hunting of in varmenting.

It happens that once such bullet killed Martin Luther King,jr. It hit him in the jaw and exploded with the butt end going farthur into his body, coming to rest juxt just below his scapula or his shoulder bone. That fragment consisted of the butt end of that bullet, with a thin piece of the casing still attached to it. The ~~rewt~~ rest, most of that bullet, was gone with that explosion.

The pattern of those dust-like particles that cannot have come from military ammunition is officially said to be, in the replacement autopsy report made necessary by the improper if not also illegal destruction of the original autopsy report as soon as it was known that Oswald was dead and that there would be no trial, is said to be from back to front. I consulted an expert and he pointed out that ~~that~~ the fragment path was also from front to back and that the pattern itself more strongly suggests that it was, in fact, more likely from front to back.

As I published before the assassination bug bit any of these Fetzers. And with that soft ammunition coming from the front and exploding, there is no certainty that any of it would blow the back of the head out, as did not happen in the Kennedy assassi

nation, despite the contrary beliefs collected and listed by Afuilar.

Then there is the exculpatory character of the pictures none of the Fetzers sought after I published the leads on them, the leads by means of which I got to see both kinds of the exculpatory pictures one of which, taken after the fatal shot, showed not even a hair out of place in the President's head and not the tiniest bit of blood there, either

Despite the repeated Fetzer impossibility, alleging that courts are bound to take testimony and regard it as superuor to pictures under any circumstances, thee can be no refuting of those frames of the Zapruder film that were not included in the original FBI examination as it was conveyed to the Commission. (And the courts have not and cannot rule that sworn-to perjury is superior as evidence to competently takes, clear and unaltered photographs, of which all of those the Fetzers ignored are.

The other previously unknown pictures but were suggested in my 1966 Whitewash II address the first serious questioning of the content of the earliest assassination picture on the news wire, the one special picture taken by AP Photograoher Ike Altgens about half-way throught the assassination. Photo editors believed that this Altgens picture showed Oswald in the western end of the main TSBD doorway, stairs. The FBI said it was not Oswald and that it was a fellow Worker, Billy Lovelady. In the first part of this that I published in 1966 it seems pretty clear that the shirt on that man in that Algens picture was Oswald's and could not have been the one the FBI said Lovelady was wearing. The Mrs. Lovealady phone me and tried to see me the shirt he was actually wearing that day. As we have seen She described

to me a rather distinctive shirt that I described in my 1967 Photographic Whitewash. Later, when there was again attention to who the man in that doorway was, I was reminded of an amateur motion picture that had been ignored because it was overexposed. However, when I had that film examined, there are in it several photographs of Lovelady in a shirt of that unusual patterm described to me years earlied by his wife

With the man in the Altgens picture in a shirt that matched the pattern and even the flaws in the shirt in which Oswald was arrested and with Lovelady in that unique shirt described earlier by his wife, it certainly seems that at the time of the assassination Oswald was on the first floor watching the motorcade and thus could not have been on the sixth floor shooting the President. There is confirmatory testimony some of which I published as early as 1967. There is also additional confirmatory evidence from the Commission's own records that I have used in several of these books written to bring some of this ignored evidence to light. In addition, on the day of the assassination, Robert MacNeil, then of NBC News , later of the MacNeil -Lehrer Report, said that Oswakd was on the first floor and showed him where a telepjone was. So alsodid the program diretor of the nearby radio satation, WEAT, state that Oswad also showed him where he could find a phone.

With Oswald not the assassin, all of the work that those of Fetzers did seems to be pointless. However, in order to be certain of their own work, they should have at leeast have tried to establish whether or not it was relevant.

As they never did.
And as it sems not to be.

Then there is that special highlevel conspiracy that on paper is that unusual if not entirly unique paper version of it known as the Katzenbach memo. That was disclosed, was publicly available only a short time after these Fetzers first got started. They made no search for it when it was availabl in the FBI's public reading room.

And it says, pretty clearly, that they were going to appoint Oswald the lone assassin which meant he would have to be framed , Clesrly, with Oswald not the assassin, books written by those who did the possible checking have no possible relstionship with the manufactured case against him and all of those the Fetzers are close to a total waste. They cannot do what the Fetzers wrote them to do and what the Fetzers conjecture has no meaning.

= Which, were tis not true, would still be a not unfair evaluation of both of those books Fetzer put together almost entirely with the work of others.

JFK cover-up exposed by UMD professor

Fabricated evidence links Kennedy assassination with federal government

Also: Mann Duel with "Statesman" 11/22/94

By Zach Johns
Staff Writer

Startling new evidence has been found about the assassination of John F. Kennedy. The team of researchers who made these discoveries was organized by Dr. James H. Fetzer of UMD's philosophy department, who presented this information last Wednesday evening at a lecture in Kirby Ballroom.

Fetzer and his colleagues have found new medical evidence that conclusively shows JFK was shot from two different directions, therefore making the "lone gunman" theory impossible and a conspiracy definite.

This is underscored by new evidence brought forth by Fetzer's team that JFK's autopsy photos and X-rays had been fabricated. In recent years many conspiracy theories have abounded, charging everyone from the Cubans to the mob to the Soviet Union with the crime.

Fetzer says fabrication of the autopsy X-rays can only point to a cover-up from within the United States Government.

One member of Fetzer's group is Dr. David W. Mantik. Mantik is a Ph.D. physicist and M.D. radiologist who traveled to Washington D.C. and examined autopsy X-rays and photographs in the National Archives on four separate occasions.

He says that even when he first looked at the X-rays with his naked eye, there seemed to be too much contrast between the light and dark sections in relation to X-rays he had been used to seeing.

He applied a special technique known as "optical densitometry" to study the X-rays. That technique had never been used before on JFK's X-rays. Using this technique Mantik discovered that the autopsy X-rays are composites — superpositions of more than one image — and thereby altered.

Mantik's discovery also provides powerful evidence of two bullet wounds to the head, while the Warren Commission states there was only one.

In addition, on the basis of his study of the chest X-ray, Mantik discovered that the "magic-bullet" theory is impossible because, according to his calculations, the bullet would have to have struck Kennedy's spine.

The X-rays show no damage that would have been caused had the wounds been inflicted the way the official report describes them.

In combination with other evidence, these findings indicate that President Kennedy was hit at least four times: once in the throat (from in front), once in the back (from the rear), and twice in the head (once from the front and once from behind).

The Warren Report and HSCA report, both of which affirm that he was hit only twice, therefore, have been completely discredited by Dr. Mantik's discoveries.

An associate member of Dr. Fetzer's team is Dr. Robert B. Livingston. Dr. Livingston has reported a conversation he had the day of the shooting with Commander James Humes, who headed the autopsy team at Bethesda Naval Hospital.

Livingston, who was the Scientific Director of both the

JFK to 4

New Findings in the Assassination of JFK

- Autopsy X-rays and photographs proved fabricated.
- Magic bullet theory proven impossible.
- Kennedy hit at least four times: once in throat (from front), once in back (from rear), twice in head (from front and rear).
- Autopsy drawings and photos of Kennedy's brain concluded to be of a brain other than JFK's.

man. At that moment, Livingston says, their conversation was interrupted. After the pause, Humes said, "Dr. Livingston, I'm sorry, but I can't

Hospital testified that they saw cerebellum protruding from the wound in the back of the President's head. But the autopsy photographs show

received some international attention, a more comprehen-

JFK to 11

In the carry-over the paper actually stated in 1994, in saying in it's headline "JFK: Cover-up discovered, Over three and a half decades after the assassination Fetzer has just "discovered" that "cover-up"