

Dear Dave,

3/4/97

I think you should rethink what you have written about Hall and should not assume that the OAH Newsletter would not consider using any of it. If you embarrass them enough they might if what you send is not too long or too nasty. What Hall did is so very bad it is not necessary to offer opinions that can turn OAH people off. And I think you should not argue that Oswald was not the assassin. It is enough to say that without establishing who the assassin was there is no way of deciding what is and is not relevant. You can illustrate this with what you use, the tests for the Commission that prove the best shots in the country could not duplicate the shooting it attributed to the differ Oswald.

Not that it does not belong but that it makes for too much length I think you should drop reference to Accessories. Ditto for Holland other than to perhaps refer to him as a subject-matter ignoramus who seeks to impose his political views and preconceptions as scholarship, which it is not.

I think you should strengthen the Russell part and include Cooper by the stark statement they refused to ^{absolutely} agree with the basis of the report, were deceived and misled into believing what was not a compromise was that and then use the Cooper oral history for a direct quote. That should have appeal to honest professional historians. ~~Perhaps~~ include also part of the transcript I sent you, ~~EBT~~ and Russell. It is when you depart from this that you can get in trouble. Russell was not dying of cancer and it was not in his last weeks. It was emphesyma. And he lingered for some time.

You can abbreviate and I think should abbreviate such things as Cuba. Eliminate the cap pistol verbosity and say that "C"anaza is quoted as saying the opposite and that Castro would have had to be insane to consider getting rid of his own real protector who could protect him as Khrushchev could not. On Khrushchev it is enough to say that he obviously did not prefer the known hawk Johnson to the known dove JFK and therefore would not have had JFK killed to have to face LBJ and the hawk.

You have factual mistakes in the bugging part that can be eliminated by the simplest presentation of it, that the CIA disclosed that the mafog plot was of the Eisenhower Nixon administration of the ~~the~~ August before the election that JFK won. With perhaps a quote from what I sent you from the CIA.

Even if in shorter form OAH does not use it it will be more effective in any copies you distribute.

Mistakes like the FBI did not trace the bugger in Vegas. A maid caught him. With what this above says about Cuba and Moscow you need much less on Mexico. It is enough to say Hall is even wrong on why Oswald went there. It

was ~~not~~ to go to the Soviet consulate but to the Cubans for a visa to Cuba.

Don't argue conspiracy with the Magic bullet. The Russell stuff is enough on that but add anything else at that point, which can reduce length. You do not need the ~~DJ~~ report and it said what is more important than that the bullet struck bone in JFK's chest. You need not go into that. If you want to add anything pick the ~~razier~~ quote on marks on it up from WW and cite what he said, not WW.

On the evidence, p. 9, the Report "does not include the results of ~~the~~ scientific tests that were made or the ~~the~~ death certificate which the Commission had and suppressed." Quote it with the Russell stuff, as briefly as you can.

Hooover did not say that nothing should be kept secret. ~~He~~ in fact did keep secret from the Commission. ~~He~~ said that nothing should be withheld from the FBI records the Commission wanted to use - publish.

That Hall was picked by his peers can be taken the wrong way. I'd refer only to his obligations ~~on~~ ^{after} accepting the appointment. *Not to be ignorant after so long!*

We do not know much about existing information the board can bring to light so I'd eliminate that, p. 11. Not necessary to indict.

Forget Posner, the Elders and Peter the Great, and it was not Sunday night, p. 12. It was as soon as they knew Oswald was dead there would be no trial, *a little after noon*

The outline of the report was drafted before the Commission took its testimony ~~bit~~ before it had any evidence. It got some from the FBI. But is this necessary or will it be better shorter and harder? *Or omitted?*

...I got this much done before leaving a bit late for my early-morning walking and shopping. Yesterday and today are not easy days but I expect to read and correct and perhaps add to this after I return from an extra blood test. I broke a tooth that requires dental surgery. That requires speeding up the time it takes my blood to clot. The change in dosage prescribed by the family doctor did not work and neither the dentist nor I am confident that it will have by today. So, the dentist ordered the extra blood test. If the clotting time has speeded up enough he'll do the work this afternoon when he can squeeze it in. For the dental work I must premedicate with an antibiotic by two hours and then repeat six hours after that dose. Meanwhile, Lil has an eye examination at Johns Hopkins that I can't be at. Her cousin is driving her. Nerves on the left side of her face ~~stitch~~, etc., and interfere with her vision. Their effect has ~~not~~ extended into her cheek.

I have had ~~trouble~~ ^{trouble} sleeping lately because the bitch who thinks she is both the Queen of Shriba and Hemingway reincarnated has refused to give me the disk

for the Prouty book. I paid her too much, for what I should not have paid her, paid her for correcting mistakes she made after I told her repeatedly not to make any changes, we had no words, and I suppose her ego was offended when I had to tell her to stop because I'm better off with the work not being done than being done that way. I have to write her later today and tell her that she either returns my property or I charge her with theft.

To make me feel worse about this I was reminded yesterday that we have a middle-aged woman friend who has not been working for a while and who would probably have enjoyed doing this work. She phoned yesterday and the next will be for her. Including what Bill's paralegal has and has said nothing about if she is not interested. I have to write Bill about that again.

Almost time to wake Lil and get going myself. She worked on her tax work too late last night for a medical exam and trip today so I want her to sleep as long as is safe, not to have to rush.

She did get a set of seeds with starter box for the peppers and the cherry tomatoes she has each year, the tomatoes in a five-gallon bucket. They are doing remarkably well so maybe we'll have better luck this year with better plants. The extent of our gardening now!

If I did not make it clear in the rush when I started on this, I believe you do not need all you included and that what you do will be better, more effective, without some of it and without those cracks for such a publication. I believe the rest should be as brief as you can make it. And that the few documents you have or the appropriate pages of them be attached.

You might ask at the end what in the world Hall was doing since he was placed on the board and how with his ignorance covering the field pretty well he can serve at all in any of its functions other than as a rubber stamp.

In haste
Herold

Dear Harold

Enclosed is a draft of my response to the Kermit Hall shame in the OAH Newsletter.

I send it to you to read, IF you have the time. I see already some things I ought to rephrase etc. One thing bothers me is the vocabulary and felicity of expression so as to remove one handle the historians always employ in dismissing criticism. This is probably insurmoutable for one loses the punch often in trying to do this.

I use Priority Mail to get around the week end and slow surface turn around time. I think I will have time to redo a couple of more times before finishing it up in ten days or so.

It is a bad ^{OAH} article.
^

I am hunting for McCloy and the Nazis.

Regards,

David Wrone

P.M. 2/26
P.N.'e'd 3/3/97

Draft #1
2-25-97

Shortly after Dean Kermit Hall's appointment to the Assassinations Records Review Board he appeared on a Columbus, Ohio, television station. He remarked that his biggest asset for that job was his "ignorance." A remarkable comment in itself but his article in the *OAH Newsletter* establishes that he has preserved his postulate of proper procedure. However, nothing within the article demonstrates that this *a priori* condition proved to be an asset of any kind.

1. Dean Hall begins with the assumption of Lee Harvey Oswald's guilt and does not address any of the existing and public *official* evidence. Without an independent evaluation of the evidence, particularly of the crime itself -- of which there is not a word in what he wrote -- he and the review board members have no way of knowing what does and does not relate to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. On the one hand much information that the intelligence agencies may consider relate to the assassination may have no relevance at all. On the other hand much information that they do not see to be pertinent can well relate to it.

To the extent the board does not confront or address the *facts* about the crime itself it tangles itself in the secrecy quagmire. If at any point the board has examined the *facts* its public statements fail to mention it. In Hall's article it does not exist at all. It is not mentioned or even hinted at.

2. Dean Hall writes in terms of conspiracy theories or non-conspiracy theories. But this is a profound misconception of the nature of what is at issue. Conspiracy is not a question of theory, it is a question of fact, a reality established as a clear and abiding truth through the centuries of arduous historical work and

daily affirmed in the courts. The critical literature, of which Hall has been careful to preserve his ignorance, clearly distinguishes between fact and theory. That he has preferred to avoid knowledge with the consequences of that act, while an unprofessional step and terribly damaging to the faithful performance of his work, is his decision alone. It was not forced upon him.

The Congress defined the board's task to make the *fact* available. When Hall finishes his duty he will not have the remotest notion of what the assassination *fact* is.

3. Hall's ignorance displays itself in a most obvious manner when he writes that the Warren Commission and its Report "stand at the center of almost all Kennedy conspiracy theories." But they also stand at the center of all consideration of the evidence of the crime itself. It is that evidence only, not any theory, that can be the basis for believing that there was or was not a conspiracy to murder President Kennedy.

His most glaring ignorance of the evidence is found when he attributes the shooting to Oswald. The Commission's published evidence thoroughly *attributed it to Oswald* demonstrates that the best shots in the country could not duplicate the shooting. Thus, on this basis alone, that *fact* sustains a conspiracy. To call that a "theory" is untenable. This evidence is clearly discussed in the first book he mentions but obviously has not read, *Whitewash*, not *White Wash*. [Incidentally, federal officials, attorneys, and agents of investigative agencies, as well as private scholars supporting the Commission and critics have never found a factual error in the book. None exists.]

4. Hall says the Report appeared "One year after the assassination." In fact the Government Printing Office printed it a few days shy of ten months after the assassination.

5. Hall mentions three books as early books on the assassination. He omits the significant and important *Accessories After the Fact* by Sylvia Meagher and includes what is not a book on the assassination, *Contract on America*. The latter is a book supposedly on the Mafia, which contains scanty theorizing without any basis in fact that the Mafia killed JFK. The author is, as are most theorists, profoundly ignorant of the assassination evidentiary base.

6. He refers to Max Holland without citing his source, an article in *Forbes* magazine, to support his assertion that the assassination and the secrecy surrounding it roots in the Cold War. In fact there is not a single thing about the murder to justify the belief of its relationship to the Cold War or to secrecy. This also had nothing to do with any attitude Hall says the Commission adopted to have its Report believed. The Commission had no choice but to impose secrecy because its work could not survive critical examination by responsible informed scholars. Why? It did not investigate the crime and it had not intended to investigate it.

An example of Holland's scholarship that so appeals to Hall is expressed by his claim the Commission was right because it was wrong. Holland's argument, devoid I stress of any fact and reason or of any connection with fact, is that the Commission erred in preserving secrecy, but in fact was right because the secrecy should have been preserved. This is the sole basis for the Hall fiction that the Cold War dominated all the Commission did and did not do, the fiction he takes from a subject-matter innocent Holland who utilizes idle and baseless political speculation as a substitute for fact. This fact we must recall awaits in scores of printed volumes of evidence and microfilmed materials as well as in archives, available to any who will sit on the hard oak chairs for many weeks and perform the grit labor of the scholar.

7. Hall is not aware that three members of the Warren Commission refused to agree with its basic conclusion, the same conclusion he gives to the readers as presenting a fact, that of the magical single bullet. The single bullet component cannot be dignified by being called a "theory." It is a baseless invention of a ruthless, callus Procrustean nature coming from desperation about hard facts that could not be confuted and that do not sustain a conclusion of a sole murderer. Without the single bullet the Commission would have had to conclude there had been a conspiracy. Yet, on something so absolutely critical to the Report and to history Hall is dead wrong.

Commission Member, the conservative Senator Richard Russell of Georgia, refused to sign the Report without having his dissent from the single bullet conclusion recorded. Thereupon the Commission surreptitiously and clearly altered the record of his dissent, a fact that when he much later discovered it so shocked and outraged Russell that during his last weeks as he lay dying of cancer, in correspondence with the author of *Whitewash* urged him to continue his efforts. Had Russell lived he would have supported the *responsible* critics. This has all been published. Much other information sustains Russell's refusal to accept the ballistics of the shooting, including his September 18, 1964, telephone call to President Lyndon B. Johnson where he expressed his dissent.

None of this is of merit to Hall in his precipitous, blind, and uncritical embrace of an artfully crafted historical fiction as reality, surely a proof patent that his avowed original condition of grace, ignorance, is not a sustaining value in carrying out his sworn duties.

8. The questions of sources and methods, to which Hall refers frequently, has nothing to do with the facts of the crime. They have to do with theories about the crime. They have to do with preconceptions that are not based on the fact of the crime.

9. Hall says that the "research community asserted that the government itself had been implicated in the deed." But as it is not possible to regard all who disagree with the official "solution" as a "community," which they are not, so also is it not possible for him to say what is false, that many them from the beginning believed that because of this secrecy "the government itself had been implicated in the deed." *All* the critics did not, although Hall says they did.

10. Hall writes that while "the Commission had access to high quality intelligence, it did not receive everything. The CIA, the FBI, and Attorney General Robert Kennedy failed to reveal information that would have helped identify a motive for a conspiracy."

With regard to the motive. A motive cannot be "identified" until after the *fact* of the crime has been established for a motive can only come into existence as an inference, a derivative, a secondary consideration derived from a primary condition of fact. Neither Hall nor his board intends to do that, or is capable of doing it, or is, he states, charged with doing it.

Hall discloses a distemper in his judgment and ignores the firm and well-known historical record to heap calumny on the Kennedys, conduct unbecoming to a scholar and a historian. An illustration of this political slander is his statement that the "Commission never discovered the existence of Operation Mongoose, a covert scheme concocted by JFK, his brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy and the CIA to assassinate Fidel Castro with the help of organized crime." Over this, he says "several years later, critics of the Warren Commission had a field day."

With respect to Mongoose. According to then Defense Secretary Robert McNamara Mongoose, a cap pistol fray with Cuba between the Bay of Pigs and the Cuba missile crisis, was not set up to get Castro assassinated.

With respect to attempts to kill Castro. According to the CIA itself, JFK had nothing to do with "concocting" it; could not have had a connection with it, and the Kennedys had no connection at all or of any kind with the CIA mafia plot. The plot occurred before JFK was president. And, if the Commission did not know this it was because it wanted not to know it. In point of fact the man who supervised the CIA at the time of its murder role was a Commission Member, Allan Dulles, apparently immune from Hall's criticism.

Only many years after the plot ended came disclosure and that by accident. In late April 1962 ^{B2} Las Vegas police caught a wiretapper the CIA used to do a favor for the mafia, which led to the plot becoming public. The wiretapper was John Balletti. Both the FBI and the CIA had disclosed files on it the Commission did not ask for or want. 2
,
2
x

That mafia plot, according to CIA records ^{and} the AG files ~~and~~ the Commission could have had if it had asked for them, and Robert Kennedy would have provided them, show the Eisenhower/Nixon administration hatched the plot. Only six persons knew of it, all within the CIA, and that orally on a need to know basis. They offered the gangsters \$150,000, which in fact they refused to take to do the job (it is bizarre, thugs having higher ethics than Eisenhower/Nixon and the CIA)! This occurred in August, 1960, *before* the election of JFK. JFK could not have concocted it. The Kennedys had nothing to do with it and knew about it only after it was exposed. Outraged by the startling news of the Balletti tap on a mafia's cheating girlfriend's room, which the FBI had traced to the CIA and kicked up the mafia plot on Castro, Robert Kennedy ordered the CIA to explain it. On May 7, 1962 the CIA briefed him and then on his orders followed it up with a May 15 report. [DJ 82-46-5]

It is shocking that a professional historian, dean of a major university, can write so unequivocally on something so defaming of a President's character and

our history based on nothing but ignorance of what is publicly available unless his political prejudice gives it motive.

11 Hall errs in saying only "recently" disclosed documents reveal the CIA's efforts in support of the Commission and against critics. *Twenty years ago* the CIA disclosed voluminous records on its activities, which I and many have had for a score of years, and which are also in the CIA reading room.

12. He writes: "Oswald's time in the Soviet Union and his trip to Mexico City to visit the Soviet Embassy only weeks before the murder pointed to communist intrigue."

This statement can only be true with the assumption of Oswald's guilt. The Commission's own records, save to those who have carefully avoided them, prove that Oswald was not and could not have been the assassin. Nor did he have any relationship with the murder whatsoever.

There will be undoubtedly widespread refusal to believe this but it is the fact. It is published fact. In a fair and responsible forum it is unassailable. No one from the Commission or the CIA or the FBI has ever undertaken to refute the fact.

Hall is incorrect to say, as he does, that Oswald went to Mexico "to visit the Soviet Embassy." He went there to go to the Cuban consulate and it was the Cuban consulate that sent him to the Soviet embassy. Only those who shy from the subject-matter do not know this.

13. Hall says that "the so-called magic bullet passed through the President and Governor John Connolly [sic] with a minimum amount of damage."

He introduces confusion here. Does he mean damage to the bullet or to the man? The passage inflicted no damage to the bullet, a condition according to the FBI's Commission testimony itself that was physically impossible. Which means,

to those not acquainted with the fact, the bullet could not have inflicted the wounds and multiple shooters are required to have caused all the wounds.

In the fiction made up by the Commission to make it appear that there had not been any conspiracy, this one bullet inflicted all seven officially admitted injuries on both men and in this history allegedly demolished bones on the governor's chest and wrist. According to the Department of Justice panel examination of the autopsy film the bullet also struck bone in the President's chest. All this without a scratch on the bullet, which the FBI testified is impossible. The Commission's own experts told them this was impossible. Besides, some Members refused to agree with the undamaged bullet's history. For a member of the records review board to be this ignorant of something so basic, this long after accepting that responsibility is really disturbing. All of this of course has been published and the board staff is aware of it.

14. Hall says the "latest techniques corroborate the Commission's findings." This is absolutely false. He gives no source. None exists.

15. He writes, "The report was a mound of facts that obscured Oswald's motivation." Of course he has again assumed Oswald's non-existing motivation. But without Oswald being the murderer, without his having that alleged motivation, what relevance is all of this invention of Hall's.

He misleads on "the mound of facts." The Report was far from a mound of facts on the assassination. Of its 912 pages, not 888 as he states, only ninety pages address the murder. The rest is padding. That it contains the impressive 6,000 and more footnotes is tinsel devised to simulate scholarship for acceptance of the Report by the scholarly community and the press. For example: That in 1941 Oswald called his dog Sunshine or that President Garfield rode a trolley car or that Dallas night clubs employed hootchie-kootchie girls does not relate to the murder

ABC
chest
& wrist

non-fatal

of President John F. Kennedy. But the Report gives each of these fillers a footnote.

The ninety pages are not factual in any sense responsible historians regard and utilize facts. For example, every map contains fundamental errors; every photograph relating to the crime itself has been clipped, altered, mislabeled or otherwise corrupted in ways to mislead. Hearsay is constantly substituted for expert testimony. Chain of possession of evidence is asserted to be untainted and clear when it is either corrupt or unknown. It has no death certificate (which contained information that confirmed a conspiracy). *does not include the results of* It eliminates the absolutely ~~key results of the~~ scientific tests ~~done on the bullet fragments~~. Hypothetical and ~~often wrong~~ reenactments are used as a substitute for the absence of facts. Only a handful of Procrustean selected witnesses from the many hundreds are used. Etc.

16. He says the secrecy of federal agencies prevented the Commission from responding to their "detractors." Again, relevance only with the assassin established as a matter of fact. Besides which he errs again. The Commission decided to proceed in secrecy with what would have been done entirely in public at a public trial if Oswald had lived. So the Commission employed the secrecy, by this I mean the main and the important secrecy. The Commission used secrecy to protect itself from a legitimate and proper examination of its work and findings by historians, the press, and the public.

17. Oddly, Hall does not know that after the Cuba missile crisis Castro wanted to keep JFK alive. JFK guaranteed to protect Cuba from any invasion. This is something no one else on earth could do. How is it possible to believe that with this the case, as it so very publicly was and is, Castro would want anything at all to happen to JFK? Hall further does not realize Khrushchev preferred the dove JFK to the hawk Johnson. War production was bankrupting the Soviet Union. After the Cuba missile crisis the relationship between JFK and Khrushchev changed

radically and they exchanged about forty letters (kept secret on United States and not Russian insistence) as they groped toward peace. How could the Soviet premier prefer any other president to JFK with his change in their real relations?

18. The findings of the official investigations did not inspire Oliver Stone. Stone's abysmal conception is quite independent of all official investigations. He saw the possibilities in Garrison and his terribly flawed book and added the unfactual Marrs book to the mix.

19. Contrary to Hall's assertion no vital national security secrets exist that need to be kept relating to the assassination. The allegations have to do with irrelevant preconceptions and what are dignified by being dubbed theories. There can be no legitimate claims to protect sources and methods. Note how the agencies themselves regarded the subject. When this question reached FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover he said ^{nothing from / should be} the FBI had ~~nothing~~ to be kept secret. Furthermore, any examination of what the Commission published leaves this without question. No FBI redactions appear in their numerous published materials. *in 26 volumes*

But again, no reasonable judgment can be made independent of the fact of the crime and that is totally missing in this article.

20. It is arrogant and indecent for Hall to quote Mencken saying that "The violence of the National Appetite for Bogus Revelation" is what makes the subject of the assassination so much of interest and of such controversy. To the contrary. It is the absence of any credible fact linking Oswald to the crime and the federal denial of the fact of a conspiracy in the face of an overwhelming amount of definitive evidence, ~~carefully and scientifically tested~~, that sustains the interest and not any bogus information that rouses the public. Other than from the government, that is.

I must say Hall is correct in saying that people do not trust their government. But he does not realize that he is adding to that lack of trust.

21. Without any known effort by this board to bring forth any withheld *fact* of the crime itself it will not be able to bring all the existing information to light. The board has bogged itself down in the irrelevant that is withheld and has done not a thing to establish the *fact* without which it cannot do its job. While it is a fact that the Commission and government never officially investigated the assassination and indeed never intended to that does not mean relevant and withheld information does not exist. ?

22. The alleged "high quality" intelligence information to which the Commission had access had no more connection with the crime than JFK's shoe size. But where the best of possible sources on Oswald when he lived inside the USSR was available to the Commission, it did not call on or listen to Yuri Nosenko. A defected minor KGB official, for a short period of time Nosenko had the KGB Oswald file and read it. And, what did Nosenko have to say that the Commission chose not to touch for it would be incompatible with its politically determined findings? Among other many things he related the Russians found Oswald was so poor a shot he could not hit a near rabbit with a shotgun and that the KGB thought he was a U. S. sleeper agent. *might be*

23. This article does not reflect the thinking of a professional historian. It rather is the mind of an entirely uninformed person as well as an expression of all of the irrational conspiracy theories that are gratuitously substituted for fact and reality about the murder of the 35th President.

But when this type of thought comes from a professional historian, one picked by his peers to assume rare obligations and one who felt he could accept and meet those responsibilities, how can the people of the nation ever be other ?

than disenchanted with their government and not trust it? How can they be other than confused?

24. The statement that Oswald had no relationship to the assassination and that no credible evidence connects him to it is difficult for many to accept as a serious conclusion. It so clashes with common knowledge it is seen as extreme. The comment seems to fly in the face of received knowledge and an implacable peer consensus.. Especially do persons have a difficult time understanding when they have read or know by a review of Posner's *Case Closed*. Top historians reviewed Posner in glowing terms in the popular media, several urged him for the Pulitzer and for other prizes, and in other ways touted him. Yet, the hard reality is it ranks as most factually flawed book ever written on the JFK murder. And, in this field that is an achievement. Among subject-matter experts the word Posnerian has come into use to categorize modern historical writings that massively falsify the evidentiary base to promote a political argument. Roughly, it is in a class with *The Last Will and Testament of Peter the Great*, *The Donation of Constantine*, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, and [German reasons for invading Poland, 1939?].

25. The federal decision to place all blame for the murder of President Kennedy upon Oswald without an investigation came on Sunday night, November 24, 1963, when acting Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach ~~at his home~~ drew up a "Memorandum for Mr. Moyers," Johnson's aide, which he had typed, dated, and dispatched the next morning. He stated that "The public must be satisfied that Oswald was the assassin; that he did not have confederates who are still at large; and that the evidence was such that he would have been convicted at trial." This was before the investigations had been completed, the tests conducted, witnesses located and interviewed, the physical evidence assembled, and leads run down.

The federal position never wavered. The Warren Commission drafted the outline of their Report before it ~~had examined its first piece of evidence,~~ ^{stark as first testimony} concluding in advance that Oswald killed JFK. The Report followed the outline and carried out the political assumption. It is too complex to discuss, an illustration must suffice. Without a rifle Oswald is not an assassin. When 100% of the evidence holds Oswald ~~that~~ did not carry a rifle to work that day -- every eyewitness, Randle, Frazier, Dougherty, and Marina Oswald; every physical fact, building, bag, tape, car seat size, oil, rifle length, finger prints; and arm length; every photograph, the Black Star one; and every forensic test, oil, prints, and tape - - the Commission concluded he had. To accept the Report you must also.

26. Whether by innocence or arrogance of station, ~~probably the former~~, I have found over the years that for some odd reason many individuals take personal affront to a critical examination of the government position imposed upon the assassination and use false and tangential points in attempting to refute my observations. While one would assume objective historians of all people would approach an old murder dispassionately, many do not. Normally I cannot be allotted additional space to defend myself from spurious and false data ^{in response} and am left hanging in the wind, apparently wrong; I of course welcome good corrections. In the case of a dissenting response I invite readers to write me [no e-mail or fax] for a copy of my certain rebuttal.

Sincerely,

David R. Wrone

Professor David R. Wrone

1518 Blackberry Lane

Stevens Point, WI

54481