

Mortal Error, check biblio for which of my books he used. Text refers to two, p.26.
He there lists a pamphlet as a book, ^{is} ~~of~~ he did not even see it. Ray March's
The Bastard Bullet.

24. He says the Dallas doctors "initially told the press that the frontal wound in Kennedy's neck may have been of entry." This is false and he is repeating ~~and~~ something for which he has a source. The transcript from the "White House of what not all the Dallas doctors said but what two of them said and said three times in that one press conference is that the front neck wound was without question from the front. Dr. Perry said it and ^{he} was confirmed by Dr. Champ Clark.

"The Bethesda autopsy itself was conducted by a doctor who had virtually no experience with gunshot victims." The chief prosecutor had no such experience but one of his two assistants, Colonel Pierre Finck, was chief of the Wounds Ballistics Branch of the Army. Only gunshot wounds.

"...what possible reason, critics asked, would the doctor have for burning his autopsy notes two days after the operation [sic] was complete?" His source note, 26.

There is no source note for this. "Critics" did not "ask" ^{alone} and I ^{also} went into that, but it was not his notes that Humes certified he had burned but the first draft of his autopsy. ^{he} burned that as soon as he knew there would be no trial. This appeared ^e in Post Mortem ^{in 1975} only and that is not "critics asking." The answer why is also there: to convict the man who be be the lone accused, Oswald, by changing what the ^{original} ~~autopsy~~ said to point at him.

What Donahue then says are "troubling questions" are not that when compared with others and mostly are not, period. Some can be "troubling" to ~~Donahue~~ Donahue because of his ignorance of the established fact. The five questions he gives do not get to the assassination itself. They are literary scrimshaw.

212 There is no way in which only "the diameter of the entry wound proved" or could have proven "that Hickey fired the last shot." There is also not a scintilla of proof that Hickey fired any shot. Donahue makes that up by misrepresenting what he says he observed in the Manchester book.

213 Donahue says he came to see me because I "might be able to offer some insight or evidence that could help substantiate Donahue's theory. But Howard was skeptical." In this he says explicitly that he was interested in nothing but support for his fabrication and that he was not interested in knowing a thing about the established fact. Continuing with nothing omitted in quotation, "He'd read several of Weisberg's books and had long marvelled at the author's lack of knowledge about firearms and ballistics - ignorance that allowed Weisberg to conjure up a hail of bullets from the ^{of} gassy koll and elsewhere in Dealey Plaza."

The last part of this quotation is a deliberate lie. There is no such thing as my having written about any "hail of bullets" from anywhere. Donahue made this up for his own reasons, such as my not giving him proof of his fiction. My books by this time, he gives the date as 1985, where seven. He refers to two, the first two, which date to 1965 and 1966. He did not make it a point to keep up with the fact of the assassination as it became available.

With regard to my alleged demonstration of my alleged "lack of knowledge about firearms and ballistic," which is another Donahue fabrication, my books are limited on this entirely to the official evidence itself. I made no pretense of knowledge of either ballistics or of firearms. Moreover, Donahue kept himself ignorant of what I had in fact written about those matters.

He refers to my FOIA efforts to get the scientific evidence disclosed as a single lawsuit when in fact it was two of them as is in detail in my Post Mortem which was published a decade before Donahue came to see me. (page 20),

He says of that one lawsuit, which was in fact two (page 20) that "Government attorney's responded by arguing that revelation of the test results was not in the 'national interest,' though they never explained why."

The latter is a lie Donahue made up, as he made up so much.

First of all, there ^{were} not "government attorneys." There was but one ^{in that first case.}

He stated to that court that the determination that disclosure would not be in the "national interest" was by the attorney general. That attorney, whose name is Robert ^{is} Verdig, also provided an FBI affidavit making this claim for the FBI. If Donahue had not kept himself in ignorance of the established fact of the assassination he would have seen this in my 1974 Whitewash IV, on pages 173-5 and 187-8, which includes that affidavit in facsimile. ^{my} Among the reasons to which Marion E. Williams of the FBI Lab swore are that disclosure "would seriously interfere with the efficient operation of the FBI and with the proper discharge of its important law enforcement responsibilities." Some of what he swore to is preposterous, but he did swear to it as a reason for not disclosing what I sought, that it would "lead to unwarranted invasions of privacy" which would lead to abuses and even that it could lead to exposure of confidential informants" and even to "blackmail."

He follows this with, "Eventually, though, the Justice Department relented and released several documents that they asserted were responsive to Weisberg's demands." This also is not truthful in any part.

The Justice Department-which was not the sole defendant - did not merely "relent." ^{investigatory files} The Congress, citing this lawsuit in its earlier form as the reason, amended FOIA to make FBI and similar records accessible under FOIA. In short,

rather than Justice merely relenting, the Congress passed a law requiring the FBI to make disclosure to me.

Donahue then says, his lack of knowledge of what he writes about being clear, and nothing is omitted in this quotation, "Unfortunately the only information from the spectrographic tests included in these papers were unidentified, partial, and therefore meaningless numerical notations made during the procedure." Again, no single part of this is true. Donahue, for his own reasons, just made it up. When he was here he could have examined what was disclosed to me but he chose not to and instead tried to convince me that what he made up ^u of nothing was the fact. He looked at nothing ^u I'd gotten when he was here and he wrote that he had seen what ^u I got by those ~~lawsuits~~ ^{lawsuits} takes up 60 four-drawer file cabinets. In a thank you note with which he and his wife returned a picture I loaned him, dated October 30, 1985, his wife added that they were "looking forward to our next visit - at which time I would be interested in looking thru the FBI files." *Donahue wrote what he did without looking at what I got!*

The second defendant was the successor to the Atomic Energy Commission, then ERDA or the Energy Research and Development Agency. ^{accumulation} The lawsuit was not limited to the results of the spectrographic testing. It included the results of the nuclear activation analyses and on that alone ERDA made a single delivery to me of not the "several documents", which is according to Donahue all I got in that lawsuit. One single delivery to me was three inches of documents and photographs - that Donahue did not trouble himself to look at.

In that lawsuit I also deposed four FBI Lab agents. ~~He~~ Donahue makes no mention of this or of what we learned from them. He did not bother to look at the transcripts of those depositions- or ^{at} the documentation then provided.

"The spectrographic tests included in these ^e papers," with which Donahue refers to what he described merely as "several documents," he says are, among other things, "unidentified." This is a lie and a very important lie- but again, when he did not even bother to look at them how could Donahue know what I got or what it did and did not consist of or include? He merely made it up to suit his prejudices. ^{and needs} Each and every one of those spectrographic test papers that I obtained does include the proper identification of what was tested. ^r It also includes what is sought by spectrographic testing, how much of each identified substance the test reflected as being present. ^{save for one} I got even copies of the spectrographic plates, save for one that the FBI said no longer exists.

^{Quite} ~~More~~ a bit more than "several documents" ^{u-12} were disclosed to me in that lawsuit and if Donahue had had any interest in what I had obtained he would have

found it in file drawers labelled with the case number of that lawsuit, CA 75-226. He also would have found duplicate copies of some of those records filed by subject in what I refer to as my "subject" file.

What Donahue make no mention of, what was disclosed to me about the neutron activation analyses- and I did write about all these things in Post Mortem which, perhaps because it has ~~several~~^{several} hundred pages of facsimile reproduction of official documents, did not interest Donahue-ranges from quite a stack of the adding-machine tapes yielded by the NAAs to copies of the pictures of the paraffin casts and to the results of the nuclear activation testing of the paraffin casts made of Oswald's face and hands and of additional testing done with regard to that at Oak Ridge.

This and much more, including several hundreds of pages of questioning of those four FBI Lab agents, comes out in Donahue's version as no more than "several documents."

On page 213 Donahue referred to what he described as my "ignorance." He *there* also said that he "had long marvelled at the author's [my] lack of knowledge of firearms and ballistics." He knew about this, obviously, without having looked at anything in the case records. But if he had, he would have seen that I had no hired expert witness, that I provided the only ~~affidavits~~ affidavits I used in that case, under penalty of perjury with each one, and was not refuted by any of those many FBI agents in its fable lab when doing that was much in the FBI'd interest. It made no effort to refute me even when I alleged that its agents perjured themselves!

Instead it told that court that I "could make such claims ad infinitum since he [I] is perhaps more familiar with events surrounding ^{the} this investigation of President Kennedy's assassination than anyone now employed by the FBI."

The Department of Justice and the FBI stated to that court that I knew more than anyone in the FBI about the assassination and Donahue says I'm "ignorant."

When he knew without looking at a single piece of paper when he was here and had free access to all of it and without reflecting any knowledge of even the existence of the books I published that go into this and into more, including the medical evidence with facsimile reproduction of documents that are relevant in his concoction and of which he knows, at least reflects knowing, not a thing.

Donahue says in a typed manuscript prepared before this book, of which he gave me a copy, that his source on his Hickey fabrication was William Manchester's Death of a President (page 22 of that paper.) He says that "Manchester described one of the Secret Service bodyguards in the 'Queen Mary' [of the follow-up

Despite his writing a book supposedly about the JFK assassination Donahue is a subject-matter ignoramus. His book reflects this and so do a few selections from it supposedly relating to me. He also reflects this in other of his writing that I have and in his letter of October 30, 1995 to me. In it he says, "There is material you may have such as the FBI shooting team report. ^{This} has never ^{even} been mentioned in ANY publication yet I know one was made."

There was no "FBI shooting ^{team} team" to make any report. There was one provided for the effort to duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald but it was not of and it did not include anyone from the FBI. They were National Rifle Association men, all professional shooters, and rather than not being "mentioned in ANY publication" they are included in the published Commission testimony of Ronald ~~Simmons~~ Simmons, weapons evaluation expert, U.S. Army Weapons System Division, in Volume III, pages 4141ff. And rather than not being "mentioned in ANY publication" this is reported in the first book on the Warren ~~team~~ Commission and the assassination, my 1965 Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report. Which Donahue says he read and used. The results of that "shooting team" ~~report~~ failed effort to duplicate the shooting attributed to Oswald is on page 26.

If Donahue were not so determined a subject-matter ignoramus he would have seen this reported in the Warren Report itself, on page 193. If he had turned that page he would have seen on the next page that three FBI agents did not make any ^{effort} effort to duplicate the shooting attributed to ^{Oswald} Oswald and the results of what they did are also there, on page 194.

St. Martin's Press president Thomas McCormack is quoted by the Baltimore Sun as saying that "if anyone else could have come up with material that would have invalidated the ^{theory} theory" of the Donahue book it published "it wouldn't have been published."

There is no peer review mentioned in the book or in this or any other story of which I know. There is no mention of St. Martins having bought any "information that would have invalidated" what cannot reasonably be called a "theory." But if they had consulted Books in Print they would have learned that I published more, much more, on the subject than anyone else. And they did not ask me. Or anyone else of whom I have heard.

McCormack told the Sun that ^{some} some of the matters that were persuasive are "Testimony placing the AR-15 rifle in the agent's hands in the immediate time frame of the ^{third} third shot."

That testimony does not exist.

Also, "testimony from ^{several} several ~~witnesses~~ witnesses that the sound of the shots came from the cars." I recall no such testimony.

He also found persuasive that of the empty shells found on the sixth floor "one, severely dented and beat up, suggesting that it was a 'practise' shell that Oswald ^{had} used in his chamber to protect his firing pin when dry-firing, a common shooter's ~~trick~~"

Neither McCormack nor Donahue offer any evidence that there was ever any Oswald "dry-firing" of that or any other ~~the~~ rifle.

But- and McCormack has his own firearms expert, Donahue, on whom to draw - if there had been any such Oswald "dry-firing" practise with that dented shell, it would have required real magic. With that dent that empty shell could not have fit into the ^{chamber} breech. It could not have been used in "dry firing" by anyone, for the simple reason that it could not fit into the breech with that ^{determinity} large dent.

Donahue, ballistics expert that he says he is, should have known that the only way in which, other than having no connection with the rifle, that dent could have been made in the throat of the empty shell is by excessively rapid ejection from the rifle. That would throw it back against the follower and it is the impact of the empty shell on the follower, after firing, that made that dent. Or could have.

I am ignorant, Donahue's word, and I know ^{this} ~~that~~ he is the expert and he does not.

Donahue is quoted in that same Baltimore Sun story as saying that "The Carcano jacket contains only copper." If he had not known this not to be true, expert that he says he is, if he had looked at the records I got in that lawsuit he pretends yielded only a "few documents" he would have seen the listing of each of the elements of that jacket. As I recall there are four, of which copper is only one. I am certain that it is not ~~the~~ true that "The Carcano jacket contains only copper." It is made of a copper alloy. As Donahue should know.

Autopsy notes:

Donahue can't even stewart straight.

He says that the autopsy was conducted by a ^{single} ~~single~~ doctor when there were three (page 24). He says that doctor burned his autopsy notes.

The fact is that if Donahue had not kept himself ignorant of the disclosed official fact of the ^{ass} ~~ass~~assination and ^{its} ~~its~~ investigation he would have known that in 1975, ten years before he was here, ^I published, in facsimile, a series of receipts for those autopsy notes, beginning by the head of the Navy hospital, then including the Secret Service and the White House physician, all after that alleged burning (which as Donahue does not say was as soon as it was known that Oswald was dead and there would be no trial) and even included the possession of those notes by the Warren Commission when it questioned ^{those} ~~that~~ doctor, ~~James~~.

all those receipts ⁺ published in facsimile.

It is all in Post Mortem, which was published in 1975.

Donahue's tears because allegedly my records had no home:

He says (pages 214-5) that when he was here, through lunch, I "complained bitterly about the University of Maryland's refusal to accept the donation of the thousands of assassination-related documents he'd collected over the years." He also says that "More than anything else, the Donahues felt sorry for Weisberg as they ~~drove~~ drove home that evening. Here he was a man over seventy years who'd given a good part of his life to studying the Kennedy assassination, Now that his health was failing, the state university couldn't care less about his painstakingly ~~amassed~~ ^{amassed} ~~amassed~~ collection of assassination documents and, to top it off, his conclusions about how Kennedy ~~lies~~ ^{died} were flat wrong."

I have no reluctance in castigating every word of this as a deliberate lie. I never offered my records, which are in the hundreds of thousands of pages rather than the thousands, to the University of Maryland. I had no interest in them being there. I wanted them where there would be expertise and where I knew there was interest in them.

THERE NEVER WAS A TIME WHEN THEY DID NOT HAVE A HOME!

And not one that I sought.

As of now, if for any reason the long-standing arrangements that were agreed to years before Donahue was ever here are not kept, others have ~~asked~~ asked for them.

I also never offered my records to the university I attended although it teaches a course supposedly on the assassination.

Quite the opposite of this deliberately vicious lie I never had to seek a home for them. I was asked for them, including by several I turned down.

What Donahue ^{made up} made up is that, made up. There is no basis for it and there never was any basis for it, as he would have known if he had taken the time to learn what the disclosed official evidence establishes. But he made up his fiction by deliberately distorting and misrepresenting what William Manchester said and because I could not validate his fabrication and instead told him that it was impossible and ~~referred~~ ^{referred} referred him to the existing official evidence that proved it was impossible he had to unload these vicious lies in retaliation.

Also a vicious lie is it to say that my "conclusions about how Kennedy died were flat wrong." My work is limited entirely to the official records. There is no theorizing in it. I never reached and I never published any "conclusions about how Kennedy died for them to be "flat wrong."

The obviousness of this lie is as apparent as is the subject-matter ignorance that exudes from it.