

4. The beginning of Kurtz, ^{clipping} unintended by Kurtz

Asking if what Kurtz produced is a supermarket tabloid in the form of a book may by some be taken as a contrived slur ^{or} wisecrack but ~~that~~ that is not the truth. First of all, it ~~is~~ Kurtz who, in the course of puffing himself up and fattening his ~~slushy~~ book treated fiction as nonfiction, plays, poetry and novels as legitimate sources of fact about the assassination of a President of course, ^{of course,} when they are not.

Some of what he has written is what ^{some of these} the tabloids, might well have rejected.

It is ludicrous, as will become clear.

Kurtz presents himself as a subject ^{matter} expert when he is anything but that. Reading a couple of books and reading some official records does not make ^{legitimate} for expertise. Whether or not Kurtz is a legitimate expert ^{is} not decided by his inflated opinion ^{of} himself and ~~of his intellect~~. It is decided by fact and that is what we consider, as we have been. When Kurtz makes out that he exhausted the 125,000 page of FBI records he says are in his college library and when he ^{was} finished that and writes his book and in his book ^{does not have} he has not ^{many} included any meaningful source notes on that, ^{which are the} not any means of locating and examining the record he ^{says} pretends he has quoted correctly, that is not what an authentic expert would do. Or an honest one. Or an informed one, who is capable of that simple ^{criticism} ~~criticism~~ that children in high school know they have to make and ^{they} do make. Kurtz as the self-proclaimed expert ~~cannot~~ did not in all the words he produced that at least in his ^{representation} pretense are largely based on ^{those} this FBI records not only does know how they are filed and can be retrieved, he ^{refers to} does not even know what to call them. So he just calls them FBI records and pretends that is ^{it} sufficient when he knows very well that it is not. ^{36 + here}

We have not seen all like this, but we have seen more than enough to let it stand for itself and be interpreted by other than ~~of~~ Kurtz and the Kurtz reflection of the Kurtz scholarship, for ~~it is~~ that. "obody had a ^{pistol} point at his head to compel him to produce this debasing of scholarship, with all the

which there are bulletins

If by any chance he does not, then he has even less basis for his claim to expertise and to being a legitimatr subject-matter expert.

There are standard abbreviations used in citing all he cites and in not one instance does he use any of them. This ^b particularly true, as we have seen, with regard to the FBI's records about which he boasts so much.

trivia, fantasy, conjecture and imaginings that he presents ^{as} and wants taken as scholarship when it is the opposite of serious, responsible scholarship

No, this is not intended as a baseless slur or a wise crack. It is what and that

Kurtz himself makes a leg legitimate question, ~~as~~ question ~~that~~ is answered by Kurtz in his ~~own~~ in ~~his~~ own book and/his own peer review.

Kurtz ~~was~~ ^{is} so carried away with his own sense of what he regarded ^{as} as his knowledge and his wisdom that he did what as a scholar he should have known not to do, ^{to} treat the supermarket tabloids, the ^{assassin supposed assassination} nonfiction that is fiction that are fiction (which applies to more books that Kurtz realized), the fictionsthat are fiction and more that is at best trivial and irresponsible in even the pretense of ~~responsibility~~ responsibility and seriousness on a subject that is the most serious.

In the so-called peer review, what Kurtz did that is not factual, ~~and~~ not ^{and} true was aimed at preventing the publication of Wrone's book. Whether or not that was ~~Kurtz~~ Kurtz' vengeance over their ~~do~~ controversy of years earlier, that controversy should have led Kurtz to decline the ~~offer~~ offer. In getting ^{Wrone book} the ~~Wrone book~~ ^{Wrone book} rejected Kurtz hurt the country more than he hurt Wrone. He also saw to it that there would not be another book that proved his was at the very best, of no value and on so serious a subject, anything that ^{denies} ~~denies~~ ^{and} ~~denies~~ the people fact, truth rather than conjectures and what is imagined, is a disservice to the country and is not what can with honesty be considered scholarship, leave alone the special and to ^{Kurtz} ~~him~~ exalted non-scholarship of his book and his peer review.

In addition, denying publication to the Wrone factual and responsible history of the Zapruder film also protects the fictions that were so successfully ^{exploited and} commercialized by those about whom ^{Kurtz} ~~Kurtz~~ writes with approval of the ^{my} ~~and~~ their work.

(They were the closest police of any kind to the President. ~~in~~ They were the best of eyewitnesses. Two reported what the Commission did not want to hear so only the other two were Commission witnesses. Kurtz does not mention any of ~~the~~ these four best of witnesses. The two the Commission ignored, Jim Chaney and Douglas Jackson, saw and reported what the Commission did not want believed. Kurtz has ~~no~~ ^{the same} better reason for not mentioning their names. I did and I reported what they did see and said they did, ~~in~~ NEVER AGAIN! on pages 394-5 and 398-403 ^{what} ~~but~~ they did say, ~~see~~ which is supported by other witnesses and evidence, ^{destroys} ~~is incongruous to~~ the solution the Commission made up, as it ~~is to~~ ^{does} Kurtz'd conjectured solution.)

We ignore many errors that are not important and need not be taken as an indication of Kurtz's subject-matter ignorance. For example, on the second page of his text (page 4) he says that "Leading the motorcade was an escort vehicle driven by Dallas Police Chief Jesse Gury, followed by several motorcycles..."

The Secret Service "pilot" car led the motorcade and sometimes flanking the Presidential ~~limousine~~ ^{him} ~~was~~ sometimes a little behind ~~it~~ were four Dallas motorcycle police. 39 above

More indicative of ignorance rather than ^{of unprofessional} ~~possible~~ haste is what Kurtz next says, referring to Roy Kellerman, who sat next to the driver of the limousine, that Kellerman was "the head of the Secret Service White House detail." (p#?) That "detail" was ^{then} headed by Robert Inman Bouck.

^{These} ~~This~~ mistake ^{as do many} that follow, including what is cited next, raises questions about how much work Kurtz do for himself in preparing for his book and how much he picked up from other books rather than the actual evidence itself. It is not easy to believe that Kurtz did his own work and that he handled the actual raw material in the form of all those documents he claimed to ^{have} exhausted (and without exhausting ^{responsibly} them he could not even think of writing an informed and accurate book) and made ^{these and many} ~~his~~ serious ^{like} ~~mistakes~~ as those that follow:

indent
smile
space

When the motorcade left the airport, the Secret Service decided not to use a clear, bullet-proof plastic "bubbletop" shield to cover the limousine" (page 4).

It was before the limousine left the airport, the decision was Kennedy's ^{not} that of the Secret Serv Service, and that bubbletop was not bullet-proof". (page 4).

It is not easy to believe that Kurtz did any real research on so complicated a subject and be en so uninformed he could make serious mistakes, like this one. Whatever his intention in this, which is entirely wrong and ~~never~~ ^{not} had the slightest foundation in fact, Kurtz seems clearly to ^{N/} hint that by making the wrong decision, removing that bubble-top, the ^{N/} Secret Service had the President killed

because it removed what would have protected him, that "bullet-proof" bubbletop, ^{which was} ~~not~~ "bullet proof".
The fact is that Kennedy ordered the removal of that bubble-top so he

When Kurtz is this ignorant of the ^{officially} established and readily-available fact of the assassination and so much more like it that is included in those FBI records available ^{to him} as ^{is what} the rest of my FOIA litigation, which he never mentions, *well available* that means, scholar that he is, that he had no interest in the established and official facts of the assassination and was chasing his own ^{chimera} ~~quest~~ of his visualizing himself as Sherlock Holmes returned. His book abounds in evidence of this and in the "mistakes essential to their being believed."

would get more exposure, that exposure being the reason he went to Texas, against all the advice given him. ^{pgs} 39A here

On the next page:

single
sprung
walk

Unaware that he was recording the most graphic and sensational piece of film in history, Zapruder maintained a steady focus on the limousine. Through the camera lense, Zapruder saw the President grimace in pain as the limousine emerged from behind a street sign (page 5).

It is not possible to read Zapruder's Commission testimony (VII H569ff) and believe that he was "unaware" of the importance of that film. He testimony is clear on his

reporting what the government did not want in its evidence. I quote from his testimony as I quoted him in my first book, in Whitewash, because Kurtz was critical of it and because when Kansas University Press asked him for

(When college was not in session.)

quotation of what he believed is wrong Kurtz begged off with a couple and said he was too busy for more. (All the few he specified were in Whitewash, so, with most people, any way, it might be believed that Kurtz read at least a little of that first book on the assassination. The first Kurtz's allegation of the few he produced to justify his claim that mistakes run throughout all my book is:

undent
single
space

Abraham Zapruder... got \$25,000 for his film and gave it all to the Tippits. As Wrone himself points out, Zapruder received much more than that and he did not give it to the Tippits.

Well, Zapruder himself testified on this and as of the time Whitewash was completed, mid-February 1965, no other information was available on that. What Zapruder testified, as Kurtz should have known it if he read that testimony and certainly should have known if he was to criticize others about saying this, on/of those criticized being Wrone, about whose book Kurtz was doing a peer review that could keep it from being published. Here are Zapruder's words (VII (H 7H576-7):

undent
single
space

I received \$25,000, as you know, and I have given that ^{to} the Fireman's and Policeman's Benevolence with a suggestion for Mrs. Tippit.

That "Benevolence" did give that \$25,000 to Mrs. Tippit, as the media of that time praised Zapruder forever and ever again.

That book, as Kurtz does not say, was completed ^{only} five months after the report was out, ^{only} three months after the twenty-six volumes were published.

Aside from the fact that I quoted Zapruder accurately, no other information was available for ⁹ years. *As Kurtz should have known.*

With this kind of reason raising questions about whether or not Kurtz had and read those twenty-six volumes and with this more recent reason to believe that he did have and read, "Whitewash," I quote several passages from it addressing what I quoted above from the Kurtz book, in particular what Kurtz says about the President not "grimacing in pain" until after, in the Zapruder film, he "emerged from behind the Street sign," (Kurtz never ^{told} his readers that there were ^{close-together} ~~two~~ ^{the original edition} street signs of which of the two he talks about.

In the first of these quotations from "Whitewash," which includes the ^{pages} ~~pages~~ from the testimony it cites:

indent single space

Zapruder even informed the Commission that he saw the President's waving motion with his hand turn into a grasping at his neck (7H571). He even called to the attention of the Commission something wrong at this precise sequence in the footage (7H573). He had been shown a few frames beginning with 185 and was testifying about them when he said, after looking at 185 and 186, "Yes; this is before - this shouldn't be there - the shot wasn't fired was it? You can't tell from here?"

The lack of response from Assistant Counsel Liebler was noted by the court reporter: "Mr. Liebler. (No response)."

Zapruder then continued, "I believe it was closer down here where it happened. Of course, on the film they could see better but you take an 8-mm. and you enlarge it in color or in black and white, you lose a lot of detail. I wish I had an enlarger here for you" (7H573).

His offer was never accepted. The Commission did not want this clarified. He was not even asked anything about the characteristics of his lens or other such elementary technical questions! (Whitewash 48).

Again, addressing Kurtz's honesty, ^{also his} ~~whether or not~~ ignorance:

indent single space

Zapruder was explaining how he took his pictures. "I was shooting through a telephoto lens ... and as it (the Presidential car) reached about - I imagine it was around here - I heard the first shot and I saw the President lean over and grab himself ... (7H571). Lawyers know very well that such words as "here" in testimony relating to a location reflect nothing on the printed page. When they want the testimony clear, they ask the witness to identify the spot meant by "here". Zapruder was not asked to explain where "here" was. But the startling meaning of Zapruder's testimony is this: He saw the first shot hit the President! He described the President's reaction to it. Had the President been obscured by the sign, Zapruder could have seen none of this. Therefore, the President was hit prior to frame 210, prior to frame 205, the last one that shows the top of his head, and the exact point can probably be reconstructed from another unique quality of the Zapruder footage the Commission saw fit to ignore entirely. ^{in Whitewash 77}

40 + key

This is confirmed by other official evidence and by other film, like the fifth of the Willis slides that are in the official evidence. I brought this Willis confirmation of a shot before Frame 210 to light in Whitewash II, which was published December 2, 1966.

41 follows

If there is any uncertainty about what Zapruder was testifying to it is because the Commission did not want it clarified, not wanting that testimony at all. But the most reasonable interpretation of what overwhelmed ^{Zapruder} (as he relived those painful moments is that ^{he} ~~Zapruder~~ testified that he saw the President struck before Frame 185, This use of ^{Zapruder's} testimony ^{- in 1945 -} ~~as the first suggestion~~ that the President was struck before Frame 210, which the Commission says was when the first shot struck him. When the student of Nobel Laureate physicist Luis Alvarez took what I reported here, for the first time anywhere - up with him, Alvarez spent some time on it and, using the same word I did in referring to the unintended motion ^{as Zapruder} ~~as Zapruder~~ reacted to the horror he was seeing, magnified by his zoom lens. Kurtz has the article Alvarez wrote on that in his bibliography on page 270. It was published in the Journal of American Physics Journal of Physics 44(1976) 813-271.

Kurtz then makes use of the totally undependable Howard Brennan whose undependability is certified by the Commission, which made that apology as it used him, having no real witness and admitting that. For example, Brennan testified that after the shooting, in fright and to protect himself, he drove behind the wall near ^{where} ~~which~~ he was, as the Zapruder film proves he did not do. If Kurtz did not perceive the official proofs that at the very best Brennan could not be trusted, they are reported in what he has to have read for him, scholar that he boasts of being, to make the criticisms he did of Whitewash. Where they appear ^{in his} on ^{76, and} pages 24, 34, 39-42, 99, 105/207.

Kurtz also says that Brennan "ran to a nearby law enforcement officer and gave him a description of the rifleman." That no officer testified to this is not confirmation of it. Nor is it confirmation that, if Brennan actually "ran" ^{only} across the street, that it took fifteen minutes for ^{him to do and provide the} that alleged description ^{- which is} to be broadcast on the police radio, as the published radio logs establish.

In fact, the police insisted that they did not know who provided that alleged description, which is not a description of Oswald, as Kurtz does not say. Try - neglects to mention?

not of Oswald

Kurtz's next authority is "Amos Buins, a fifteen ~~15~~-year-old boy."

Kurtz then says that Buins "also saw the sixth-floor rifle, ~~and~~ fire a shot at the President (page 6). How dependable was Buins? He told the police that the shooter he ~~if~~ saw was both a black ~~man~~ ^{man} and a white man and the Commission itself said what Kurtz does not say, that it did not depend on the Buin "testimony."

If Kurtz did not pick this up from the Report, he could have in what he has to have read before he could criticize it as he did, Whitewash (pages 43 and 105).

Making it up as he goes, Kurtz says that policeman Garrison Baker was rushing to the roof of the TSHD "because he wanted to get to the roof in order to get a panoramic view of Dealey Plaza" (page 11). ^(commented by Kurtz) According to the Commission and Baker's testimony (Whitewash pages 36-46, 111 and 112) it was because all the birds on the roof took off with the shots and Baker saw that.

Kurtz says that it was after Building Manager Roy Truly identified the man Baker saw in the second-floor lunchroom as Oswald and after they had left the lunchroom that Kurtz says that man, Oswald, then and only then ~~he~~ did, he "purchased a coke and slowly walked toward the front of the building." It is my recollection that Oswald had the Coke in his hand when Baker confronted him and I'm not taking the time to check that because I remember quite clearly that Kurtz made up entirely what he says that Oswald did, walk to the front of the building. The only evidence on what Oswald did is the testimony of Mrs. Robert A. Reid (Whitewash, pages 38 and 110-2). She said that Oswald left that lunchroom, which was at the very back of that building, by the side door, which leads to a conference room, not to the front of the building, ^{which was on the floor below that one.}

Kurtz made this up to, like the Commission, be able to put the assassin hat on Oswald.

The "impact" of the ~~the~~ fatal bullet, according to Kurtz, had knocked him

(the President) face down on the rear seat. But according to the Zapruder film, that impact "knocked" the President ^{against} the back of the seat with considerable force. He then fell over onto his wife, who was at his left, ~~not~~ ~~flat on his back in the rear seat or floor.~~

According to Kurtz, " Blood and brain tissue were splattered all over the rear seat and the trunk of the vehicle," as Kurtz uses this, and nowhere else (page 7). The actual evidence, and again, Kurtz claims to have exhausted the unidentified FBI records he fails to identify by referring to them as just that, ^{shows?} the spray ~~was~~ in all directions. One FBI chart of where they fell has them going over the windshield, which ~~is~~ ^{and} is in the front, depositing on the hood cover over the motor. That chart also shows them getting up underneath the sun visors ^{on the windshield.}

The profundity and the determined ignorance of all that is well-known and ~~officially~~ the official evidence with which, one supposes, anyone writing a book should be familiar, is what, for his own purposes, Kurtz continues to make up:

incident
by the
of the

Just as the nurses finished removing Kennedy's clothing, Doctors Carrico and Malcolm Perry arrived" (page 7).

^{wrote} The actual rather than the Kurtz's ^{fied} testimony, and how Kurtz could write anything at all about the assassination without the most detailed examination of the evidence of the killing is not easily understood, is that Carrico was the only doctor to see Kennedy before ^{any of} his clothing was removed and what Carrico told me is that he ordered the two emergency-room nurses to remove his clothing in the usual, emergency-room way, ^{to} cut off what they could ^{safely} cut off and to unbutton what it was not safe to cut. Perry came in later but Carrico was assigned there. I go into this in detail at several places in Post Mortem. Its index reflects ^{not Carrico's} ^{is} testimony on pages 131, 357-8, 375-6, 378, 554 and 598.

43 A follows

(The removal of the clothing at that time is limited to what the President
wore above his waste.)

44 follows

If it is beginning to appear that Kurtz's errors are endless, that is close to the truth. We do not address all of them. That would be too much, & would require too much and ~~would~~^{it} is not necessary with the volume of those that we do address. Along with an illustration or two of Kurtz's literary kleptomania that he refers to as his ~~scholarship~~ scholarship. Like his saying on the next page (page 8) that Dr. Perry saw that the small hole in the front of the President's neck "was round, had a small ring of bruising around it" which Perry recognized" as "a bullet entrance hole..." Kurtz's citation to this is to Perry's commission testimony in Volume III on pages 372-5.

Only Perry did not testify to that before the Commission. He had already had a stomach full from swallowing what he had been given clearly to understand was not wanted. The only time Perry let slip what Kurtz attributes to his testimony is when interviewed he. He let that slip out and the only place known that to be publicly available in in Post Mortem.

This is to say that the only place Kurtz could have picked up what Perry told me was in the book in which I reported it or from someone else who spotted it and told Kurtz about it.

Still making it up, Kurtz said that Perry made a large slit for the tube to assist the President in his labored breathing was "by making it large enough to put the tube in" (page 8). The trouble with this is that it did not require a slit two inches long "to put the tube in."

Adding to his baseless improvisations and fabrication, Kurtz ends this paragraph saying that Perry "extended the tiny [bullet-] hole to the large, jagged size of the tracheotomy," same source citation.

A "tiny" bullet hole, which is round, is not "extended by running a slit two inches long through it. The slit was not "jagged," as the ~~post~~ autopsy pictures of it I have leave without any question at all. ³ it was, after all, a cut with a surgery-sharp scalpel. ^{And} and that slit itself is not "the large, jagged size a

tracheotomy." That slit was not "jagged," as the autopsy pictures of it I have leave without question. A tracheotomy does not require a "large" slit or a "large, jagged" slit and the slit itself is not the process of the tracheotomy.

In the next paragraph (on page 8) Kurtz refers to Dr. Kemp Clark as "a neurosurgeon." In fact Clark was not merely another Parkland neurosurgeon. He went there to be ^{u.} "chairman of the ~~division~~ division of Neurosurgery" (6H 19).

That is to say that he was chief of ^{u.} Parkland's neurosurgery.

How Kurtz could have missed this if he made a real study of the real evidence rather than making up what he preferred is not easy to see. Or believe. *But he did that.*

Apparently
This is apparent when on the next pages Kurtz refers to Malcolm Kilduff as "~~President~~ Presidential adviser." Kilduff was of the ^{White House press} public information office, the one from that office who that day was with the ~~motorcade~~ President on that Texas trip. The publicist is not the "adviser."

In that same paragraph on that same page Kurtz says that "The slain president's entourage refused to permit the body to leave their possession."

That "entourage" included a number of women all of who were ^{publicly} silent on this. The decision, which was to take the body back to Washington, was by ^{the Gen} top Secret Service and the basis for that decision was that Mrs. Kennedy would not leave "the body of the slain president" and they wanted her and the entire party out of Dallas and out of Texas as fast as possible. So, as scholar Kurtz does not say, they ~~too~~ took the body with them by force and ~~more~~ in violation of the only applicable law, Texas law, ^{of} assassinating a President then not being a federal crime.

~~In~~ In the next sentence ~~the~~ Kurtz, making it merrily up as he breezes along, says that "A local undertaker donated a coffin..." He did not and he was paid for it, after which it was riddled with holes and dropped into the Atlantic so ~~that~~ there could not be any inappropriate commercialization of it.

Kurtz says that "At the same time" as what he times in the preceding paragraph, or ^{about 12:45} at 4:25 p.m., "other officers combed the railroad yards next to the Grassy Knoll. They discovered three suspicious men hiding in a boxcar. The officers arrested

the trio trio and led them off. (page 9) Kurtz' source not for this, is "Report of Roger Craig to Dallas County Sheriff's ~~Office~~ Department, 23. Nov 1963, WC Records, NA". (Kurtz is wrong by more than an hour.)

As we have seen, in the over-abundant deposit of the Commission's records ^{was} first made accessible at the Archives, the officially-given size being more than ~~20~~ two hundred cubic feet, and that has since been enlarged, a source ^{on} ~~not~~ like this does not enable following up ^{on} Kurtz or checking him out and, as by now should be without question, if there is anything that Kurtz requires it is checkⁱⁿ out.

Craig has nothing at all to do with the arrests. Those ~~2~~ men were not "hiding" in the boxcar in which they were found. They were winos and they were in ^{drinking} that boxcar not to be caught and picked up. It also was much later than ^{12:45} ~~4:45~~ when the police got that far away from the TSB in their area search. That part of the railroad track was not "next to the Grassy Knoll." It was two and a half blocks south of the TSB and a block to the west of it. That means it was also more than two blocks from that Grassy Knoll. Photographs of them taken as they were led off the tracks, which ~~were~~ meant past the front of the TSB, were taken about an hour and a half after the ~~assassination~~ assassination.

All of this and more is in those "FBI Records" that Kurtz claims is a source he exploited at his college library's collection of them. Those investigative reports are in that file because + forced an FBI investigation of the fact that the sketch of a man said to have been the King assassinat^{ion} suspect was a sketch made of the smallest man in that trio. Beginning with my giving the FBI one of those pictures that got to be known as "the tramp pictures" and a copy of that sketch, that and the Dallas investigation, are in both the FBI's King ^{Dallas} and Kennedy assassination records. ^{46A here}

That Kurtz missed all of that and made ~~these~~ these mistakes does not persuade that he made the hurchlean use of those files that he gives the impression he did.

Deputy Sheriff Luke "ooney did not see "chicken bones scattered all ove ^v ~~the~~

and as Kurtz does not say, those files are public because I sued for them
in long, costly and arduous litigation, ^{that the FBI Stone called} cas ~~e~~ 75-1996 ~~q~~ and 78-0320.

"When he checked the front of the sixth floor. They were in the paper bag in which Bonnie Ray Williams brought them to work with him.

"Boone and Deputy ~~the~~ Constable ^{Weitzman} Seymour found a rifle hidden under a stack of boxes near the stairway at the northwest corner of the sixth floor." (page 10).

And that "stack" was of ~~boxes~~ ^{as} ~~was~~ inside a roughly square of cartoned ~~books~~ and inside that barrier, which Kurtz does not say, was never fingerprinted, the rifle was underneath the overhand of two cartons, resting neatly upward as though it was ^{on} display, with both the bottom tips of the butt and the muzzle resting neatly on the floor. Or, it had not ~~yet~~ been ~~to~~ tossed in ^{allegedly} while Oswald was in flight. If not from any other source ~~Kurtz~~ should have known this from my publication of the official exhibit which shows it, on page 211 of the original printing, after page 184 in the Dell reprint.

Skipping a few more Kurtz demonstrations of what he really means in bragging about his scholarship, at the top of page 11 he says that when Connally was wound ^{by} a bullet ^{it} "bounced against his fifth rib" ~~W~~.

In the official account, that bullet smashed four inches of Connally's fifth rib, as I quoted that official evidence first on pages 16 and 17 of Post Mortem and then often throughout that large book. Smashing a rib is not the same as whatever Kurtz may have had in mind when he ~~said~~ ^{made up} that bullet "bounced" off of ~~hit~~ while allegedly going parallel with it and exiting under his right nipple.

Kurtz says that ~~the~~ ^{Hospital engineer} when Garrell Tomlinson got into an elevator [he] noticed an empty stretcher on it. Tomlinson removed it from the elevator... He saw another stretcher already in the corridor. Tomlinson left and returned. He saw the first stretcher blocking the corridor. Apparently someone had used the men's room and pushed this stretcher out of the way. Tomlinson pushed this stretcher against the wall next to the ~~one~~ ^{one} Connally one. But when the stretcher bumped against the wall, a bullet rolled out. Tomlinson immediately called

O.P. Wright, the hospital's security director, who came and saw the bullet on the stretcher" (page 11). For this he cites ^{one or a very few} Secret Service report, The Warren Report ~~at page~~ at pages 80 and 81 and the utterly meaningless "WC Records", not any one of which ^{say} sets what Kurtz attributes to them. ~~and~~, of course, there is the Tomlinson testimony Kurtz does not mention. Not that he did not have good, if not exactly scholarly reason, ^{to} not to mention it. Tomlinson's verbatim testimony is in Volume ⁶ beginning on page 128. ^{Tomlinson absolutely} ~~he~~ also ^{vehemently} not only refused to say what Kurtz attributes to him, ~~he~~ refused rather eloquently. I quoted and referred to his testimony in Whitewash on pages 161-2 and 178.

Tomlinson testified that he could not- and thus would not- ~~identify~~ ^{stretchers} which of those two ~~elevators~~ he took off the ~~the~~ elevator (6H132). That, ^{testified at the same place,} Tomlinson, is "also what I told the FBI" and the Secret Service when they questioned him much earlier. Specter pressed hard to get Tomlinson to say what is an absolute essential for the single-bullet conjecture that is an absolute requirement of the mistitled "theory." It is not a theory because a ^{theory} requires a factual basis. ~~It~~ was and remains an invention. After ~~this~~ diligent Specter ^{is} failed effort Tomlinson drew it to a close with this pointed testimony:

indent employee

"I'm going to tell you all I can, and I'm not going to tell you something I can't lay down and sleep at night with either" (page 134).

He added another problem for the Commission ^{and} ~~and~~ the Kurtzes who followed it in insisting that he had no idea at all ^{of} ~~where~~ the elevator stretcher came from, not even the floor from which it ~~came~~. And that was about the end of that effort (page 134).

From this we can see that when Kurtz says that Tomlinson pushed the ~~the~~ stretcher against the wall next to the ^{common} ~~common~~ one, according to Tomlinson himself, the only source, that is not true.

It also is not true that when the stretcher bumped against the wall a bullet rolled out. (How can a bullet roll "out" of a stretcher, anyway?).

What ^{testified} Tomlinson testified to is that a doctor moved ~~of~~ the unidentified

stretcher away from blocking the passageway, ~~if~~ a bullet rolled out from underneath the mattress on it, ~~Not from~~ ~~the~~ ~~mattress~~ but from ~~under~~ ~~it~~. Ordinarily it would be impossible for a bullet to get out of a human body in which it was ~~is~~ imbedded and ~~can~~ get, ~~an~~ ⁴² assisted ~~to~~ under that mattress. The obvious explanation is that a human hand placed ~~it~~ it there.

There is more ~~that~~ that is ~~is~~ ~~very~~ wrong, very wrong, with what Kurtz says and wants believed and is not in accord with the officily-established fact. ~~Like~~ ~~that~~ ~~bullet~~ ~~is~~ ~~on~~ ~~the~~ ~~floor~~ ~~when~~ ~~Wright~~ ~~got~~ ~~there~~ ~~he~~ ~~saw~~ ~~the~~ ~~bullet~~ ~~on~~ ~~the~~ ~~stretcher~~. Tomlinson ~~let~~ it lay where he saw it, on the floor, and that is where Wright got it, from the floor. But with Kurtz getting this much of one witness testimony so very wrong, with all that is wrong being consistent with the Commission's need and the need ~~he~~ he has for what he ~~made~~ ^{made} up, he just made up what he wanted the ^{Fact} truth to be, rather than what ~~the~~ ^{It} truth was, and that, too, is a fair sample of the Kurtz scholarship as he depicts it in his book.

~~and~~ with this much encapsulating what is so very wrong with the ~~fact~~ Kurtz's first ~~one~~ pages, it is ~~appraent~~ that a close commentary that omit s nothing wrong or questionable in his book would be a practical impossibility.

Kurtz ends this page and begins the next with his account of a man who said he was FBI trying to force his way into the ^{an} Truman room in which the when Secret Service agent Andrew Berger ~~is~~ guarded that door. President's body was. That man FBI man "did not relent until Berger received help from another agent, who led the protesting individual away".

What Kurtz omits in this ^{is} ^{one} ^{by} ^{the} ^{Secret} ^{Service} is that the man, who was an FBI agent, did not end his efforts until he was struck and floored. ^{That} caused a smaller and separate investigation that ordinarily a scholar would not miss in the Commissions and FBI files or in the published testimony and exhibits. *As Kurtz does.*

Of all the many sources Kurtz could have cited for that matter, he limits his source note to "Report of Agent ~~Bar~~ Berger, ~~WC~~ Hearings, XVIII, 795" (page 244).

Kraft refers to only one FBI agent who did identify himself, SA Vincent

Brain. As the Berger report Kurtz cites, which is of two pages, not Kurtz's single page, make clear, when Berger asked ^{Drain} him and a doctor friend who ~~was~~ accompanied ^{him} to leave, they went, peacefully, to the end of the corridor (V 18H 795-6). That Berger reports makes no reference to the flooring of any FBI agent, which a number of other ^a accounts do and is the reason for the separate investigation of that.

new chapter

~~He ^{scrip} slip a little more of what Kurtz writes that is not in accord with known well-known and oft-repeated official evidence and he ^{then} (says)~~

indent single space

Earlene Roberts worked as a housekeeper at 1026 North Beckley Avenue, a house converted into single rooms rented by young men. At about one o'clock, Mrs. Roberts saw one of the tenants, Lee Harvey Oswald, enter the house and hurry upstairs to his room. A minute or two later, she heard the "beep-beep" of an automobile horn outside the rooming house. Mrs. Roberts looked out the window and saw a Dallas police car parked in front of the house. Another minute or two later, Oswald came down the stairs and left through the front door. Mrs. Roberts again looked out the front window. She no longer saw the police car but observed Oswald standing at a bus stop. She noticed that he now wore a jacket (he wore none when he entered the house). The time was 1:03 or 1:04.^{35 (p 24 & 24)}

50 B follows

~~Kurtz's source cited for this is "WC Report, # 183-5" (page 244). Page 164 is ~~is~~ taken up with a picture, the first four lines at the top of page 164 and the last eight on page 165 are all the report has at that point on Mrs. Robert and what she saw and did not see and short as that summary is, it contains much that can be relevant that Kurtz omits.~~

~~Roberts did not see Oswald "hurry upstairs to his room" and she could not have because Oswald's room was on the first floor.~~ *50 A here*

~~It is true that she heard the beep of a police car but it is also true that she did ^{the} best she could with imperfect vision to identify that police car. She said she'd made ~~a~~ out the number 10 but not more.~~

~~The number of the Tippit car, visible in a great number of pictures of it, was 10. All the investigations ^{were} was of cars with three digits so, naturally the investigation's turned nothing up.~~

~~Not having been up the stairs, if that house ^{and rented} had rooms on a second floor, Robert could not have seen "Oswald come down the stairs." Kurtz made that up too.~~