Gary Shaw
PO Box 722
Cleburne, TX 76033-0722

12/16/94

Dear Gary,

Glad to know it was not Kizzia who did not respond. But we all forget.

In your 12/12 you ask about the paraffin tests. They were NAAs, done at Oak Ridge, and I went into that in the last part of Post Mortem, as I now recall. It was not an FBI report. Rather was it what I got from then ERDA, formerly AEC, in the same lawsuit. It was ruled out and when they delivered that batch I was satisfied for them to be out. I have that stuff, about three inches of it, with beautiful photos of the casts, in the basement, in the file on that lawsuit, and I cannot get thdre now. But if anyone wants to come and do the searching and make copies, fine.

I have no problem with the corrections. I'll write and ask that they be made. Without any real hope now that they will even publish the book.

I never heard of the Open Archives Press Crenshaw mentions. Who is it, where, and can they get distribution?

You asked for suggestions about the statements. I have only a few. I do have a major question and I can see how it can be rejected, refused and refuted. I do not think it is necessary to be entirely unequivocal and the back of the head being blown out, as it wasn't. I assure you they can produce the Zapruder film to show that after the fatal shot the back was intact, with no trace of blood there or on the short collar. This is what made Crazy Livingstone decide that the film had been faked. I think that was impossible. Crenshaw would look terrible if they were to produce those frames, as they can if they know, and they can know.

The pages of his JAMA statement are not numbered. On the fourth, 19 lines down, I suggest that the sentence after "1963" begin with "Unlike." Two lines below that I suggest "toward" instead of "in" the back of the head.

In the statement for the News, page 2, line six, I suggest" some" before assassination researchers because that is not accurate as relating to all. 10 lines up, I suggest adding at the end of that sentence something like "and some of the official evidence ignored by government apologists says and proves this."

On page 4, line 3, Clark was at that press conference and agreed with all Perry said. So I suggest that after "he" and before "descfibed" insert "and Dr. Clark".

I have a serious question about the next paragraph, the middle one on this page. I do not believe it is necessary, am a little leery of the number 40 and have substantial doubts about what some of the corpsmen said. Some claim to have been misquoted. This can be an area of weakness. Never having seen those News stories I may be wrong in thinking this is not essential but I think that eliminating what they can object to or disprove or raise questions about can reduce the problems you seem to anticipate. Some of this a applies also to the next paragraph. There is no need to put the News in a position to

argue that instead of seeking correction the statement seeks to argue a point of view. Also, this is probably much longer than they'll consider, so making your own excisions is preferable.

Like on top of 6, lines 1 and 2, I'd end the sentence with "two assassins" and eliminate what they'll not like and will contest, what I believe is without question true but wonder if it helps here, Oswald was not an assassin, as you've seen to a degree in the ms. I thank you for returning.

On the last page, 7, why start an unnecessary argument by including Ruby in the lone-nut theory. It is not necessary and also weakens this. It also gets onto the area of theories rather than fact and cannot be proven. It cannot even be stated with evidence that would convince many people. I mean evidence, not reports or beliefs.

His phone calls are not evidence and despite the popularity of the mafia did it theory there is absolutely no evidence that it did and there is pretty much what most people would find persuasive indicating that did not happen.

Some time ago, without response, I suggested to Gary Aguilar that he and the others who protested to AHA write and demand to know the total costs of all of this, an explanation of how the AHA could besmirch itself this way, how it can engage in such journalistic endeavors for which it was not prepared and had made no effort to be prepared, and to raise questions about getting rid of both the men who so disgraced their professional association. I suggested that for after the statements are published, not before.

Good luck!

Harold