

discussion about what is not available, Lee is told, "Sorry, but keep in touch." With that, Lee is seen leaving a telephone booth eating a peanut butter sandwich and musing to himself about how good the Russian welfare system was.

When I ask, "How did you like the scene, you say, "It's ok, but Robert Odum was an FBI agent and did not work at the Texas Employment Commission." You are right - I'll reshoot the scene."

This time, when the operator, at the Commission, answers the phone and Lee asks for Robert Odum, the operator is seen connecting Lee with Bardwell Odum at the FBI office on Commerce Street. The "spooks" probably refer to this as a "patch-call." The rest of the scene remains the same, peanut butter sandwich and all.

Far fetched? Not at all. If you were in possession of Oswald's address book and you wanted to get in touch with the person whose name appears above the RI 7-71 number, you probably would ask the operator for Robert Odum, as Lee did in the make believe scene in Part II.

Take a look at the page in Oswald's address book, and try to explain to some one, who doesn't know FBI Bardwell Odum from Robert Adams at the Employment Service that they should ask for Robert Adams, based on what they see on the page.

I personally believe that Oswald's employment, or lack of opportunity to be employed, was controlled by individuals responsible for his eventual presence in the TSBD on November 22, 1963. And, if this was the case, it is my opinion that Bardwell D. Odum should not be overlooked as the "handler" and the man for the job.

FETZER'S FOLLIES CONTINUED: A REPLY

BY
Hal Verb

"It's what you learn after you know it all that counts."
- W.C. Fields

I must say that, when I read Fetzer's 5 page dissent or rebuttal (see "Fourth Decade". May 1998) which was his "reply" to my article in the January, 1998 issue (wherein I critically reviewed both Fetzer's Assassination Science and Twyman's Bloody Treason), I was in no way surprised that he would respond but my immediate reaction after reading Fetzer's treatise was three-fold: (A) first, I now know better what the famous British philosopher, Bertrand Russell, truly felt and meant when he once wrote: "I have suffered a great deal for being misunderstood, but I would have suffered a great deal more if I had really been understood!"; (B) second, Fetzer's reply represents a classic text-book case of distortion, misrepresentation, misinformation, subject matter unawareness, and a very clear avoidance of substantive issues I've raised (whether intentional or not). This will be thoroughly discussed in my refutation herein. To just cite one example very briefly: there is the argument I presented on precisely when the first shot occurred in the JFK assassination, and the absolutely crucial relevance of this to the question of film alteration and photo and x-ray forgery; and (C) my third reaction to Fetzer's commentary was that his "arguments" left about as much impression on me as that by a sore thumb on a prayer or hymn book.

In a very real sense, Fetzer's diatribe upon my competence and credibility was predictable since it continued a pattern he has exhibited and maintained ever since I confronted him (and Dr. Mantik) at the Dallas Lancer JFK Conference in 1996. For readers of this journal who may desire to be reminded of some of the accusations made against me, recall that in Fetzer's May, 1998 article, among the many words or phrases he uses, he describes me variously as "blinded"; "dreadfully unquali-

Hal Verb
PO Box 421815
San Francisco CA 94142-1815

fied"; "hopelessly inadequate"; "superficial"; "sailed over (Verb's) head"; "cheap shots" and that my criticisms are "simply false". This short list is by no means all that Fetzer stated about me but it gives, at least for first time readers, a pretty good idea of Fetzer's frame of reference. As I will demonstrate, none of these charges upon inspection will withstand the very rigorous requirements of factual standards.

To return to the Dallas Lancer JFK 1996 Conference: again, for those who may or may not have been present (a video version should be available for proof of what I have to say), during a question and answer period after Fetzer and Mantik spoke, I challenged both and stated that I didn't believe in film alteration theory and that I rejected several of Dr. Mantik's claims. I further added that I would answer both in a paper or abstract that I would publish. Fetzer responded to me by calling me "irrational" and stated this without even knowing precisely what my dissent was based on! (I had to wait a little over a year before my refutation was published in the *Fourth Decade*, but part of my delay in doing this was due primarily in waiting for Fetzer's and Twyman's books to appear so I could properly debate the issues).

In his reply to my article, Fetzer has argued by following a numerical sequence dealing with eleven points in my refutation which he has numbered as beginning with (0) and ending at (10). I've no quarrel with this arrangement and will follow this numbering system throughout my article.

Before doing this, I wish to take vigorous exception to themes he raised against me at the very beginning of his reply. This concerns the paragraphs he addressed about my remarking in the Jan. 1998 article that the two books I reviewed were described as "complementary" to each other. The other theme or comment he discussed concerned my "sincerity" and "seriousness" and its relationship to the JFK case. One other theme is Fetzer's taking me to task for having "concentrated" on the areas of film, photo and x-ray alteration to the exclusion of other issues raised in both books. These issues revolve around "proofs" as to the nature of the conspiracy and what political forces were behind it. This exclusionary method on my part represents an "indulgence" to air my personal views on matters of "special interest", according to Fetzer.

On this issue of "complementarity" and what a reviewer chooses or chooses not to review, Fetzer elsewhere notes that "sometimes the referee takes the measure of the book and sometimes the book takes the measure of the referee." I take this to mean, if I correctly understand what Fetzer is saying here, that this time the referee (Verb) has been given a knock-out punch if not a TKO (technical knock-out) in arguments advanced by Fetzer.

But it is important to explain the many reasons why I did concentrate on the alteration and forgery issue (readers will probably suspect why if they will note my reference to the Lancer Conference above) and this will be explained. Before I do so, I wish to raise an objection to Fetzer's rigid literary laws of reviewing and how books are to be reviewed.

The great literary reviewers of the past when writing on scientific subjects chose those areas found within the contents of the book especially appealing or of interest to them. They had no need and maybe not even a desire to review the entire book. One thinks of such eminent scientific writers of the past such as Havelock Ellis or J.B.S. Haldane and more recently of works by Steven Gould and Carl Sagan.

But I had more compelling reasons for why I chose to dwell on the issues of alteration and forgery than the above. I once had dinner with Twyman at one of these Dallas JFK Conferences and we discussed the issue of film alteration (actually it was only the Zapruder film since the other films weren't mentioned.) While not going into any great detail on my differences with Twyman, I told him I was in total opposition to the Zapruder film being altered. At no point in our discussion did we mention the nature of the conspiracy or who were the principles behind it. No discussion on this point whatsoever! Twyman told me then that he was working on a book and that I should wait until I saw his evidence before I concluded further. I replied that, of course, I'd await publication and that when this occurred I'd critically examine it and if I had any objections he would hear from me.

One can see from this brief history above that my "concentration" was on Z-film alteration and forgery and when you combine this with my vow at the 1996 Lancer Conference that I'd write a critique of what Fetzer and

Mantik had to say (where neither of the two raised the issue of the nature and members of the conspiracy.) Is it any wonder that in my review I would "concentrate" on an aspect which Fetzer, Mantik and Twyman have all raised?

So far, if Fetzer is keeping score, there are no "false" statements presented herein and the video tapes and a private conversation can readily be consulted to confirm this.

With respect to Fetzer's point about my "sincerity" and "seriousness" which he acknowledges but then states that these characteristics by themselves wouldn't solve the case: this commentary is gratuitous on the part of Fetzer and, indeed, is totally unnecessary and does not help his cause, they are irrelevant to our discussion and the substantive issues I'm raising. During the 35 years I've studied this case I have interviewed sincere persons, liars, misinformed people, the serious and the insincere and I always look for what the evidence is that can be backed up. If they are insincere or non-serious, that is their affair. My sole concern is what can be documented and proven. Or, as the great English writer, Samuel Butler, once put it: "I don't mind lying but I hate inaccuracy!"

Let us now address the eleven points raised by Fetzer against me, starting with point (0) which concerns his contention that I "misquoted" him when I referred to the Cabell brothers as being "two rich and powerful right-wing politicians against two powerful left-wing politicians." (See page 13 of Fourth Decade, Jan., 1998) But turn to page 371 of Fetzer's book and you'll see that Fetzer is wrong once again. While I didn't describe the left-wing politicians as both rich and powerful in the above sentence and left out the "rich", I did do this two sentences later wherein I stated that they were "rich left-wing and powerful politicians". My meaning of this statement is very clear: it was a case of two rich and powerful right-wing politicians against two rich and powerful left-wing politicians.

Fetzer then faults me for having been mistaken as to who the two rich left-wing politicians were. Had Fetzer stated that the two were brothers without naming them I would not have mis-identified them as being President Kennedy and LBJ. Fetzer himself admits to having caused all this confusion since he didn't spell out who these

men were. That Fetzer meant the Kennedy brothers but didn't put it in his text will explain the confusion but this by no means settles the matter as we shall see.

Nowhere in Fetzer's entire book does he describe Robert Kennedy as a "left-wing" politician. Of the 5 references to RFK, none deal with his political ideology or thinking. None! The reader can easily confirm this. However, in my Jan., 1998 Fourth Decade review, readers will recall that, in Fetzer's description of this supposed right versus left adversarial relationship, I said his designation of who the leftists were was a real "howler". With Fetzer's substitution of the leftists as being the Kennedy brothers it now becomes more than a "howler"—it assumes the quality of political misrepresentation and a misreading of history. Indeed, if Fetzer was skating on very thin ice before, he now has plunged into a political quick-sand of his own making. Fetzer may teach "assassination science" in his science courses, but how would he fare in a political science course describing "left-wing" politics?

John Kennedy as a left-winger? Is this the same President who allowed the invasion of Cuba to occur (he could have stopped it); a President who pushed a "missile gap" crisis; a President who continued a military build-up of the US military (whose legacy is continued to this day); and a President who allowed the CIA to roam all over the world conducting its nefarious deeds; all while promoting such bally-hooed and propagandistic efforts as the "Alliance for Progress" which provided Latin American countries with military aid together with "economic assistance?"

As a dreadful example (one of many) of Kennedy's "left-wing" legacy, let us consider what JFK considered as "constructive" advice to a military mission to Colombia. One document that has surfaced reads that "as necessary (there should be) executive paramilitary, sabotage and/or terrorist activities against known communist proponents." (Here read "known communist proponents" as being peasants, union organizers, human rights activists, etc.). With "left-wing" politicians like these, who needs such right-wing ones as the Cabell brothers?!

In so far as Bobby Kennedy is concerned, he approved this Colombian plan along with his brother. And if this "constructive" advice Bobby approved of is true, then

any argument positing him, too, as a "leftist" is a cruel joke and tragedy regardless of his behavior after his brother was killed since the relevant time period we're concerned with here is prior to the JFK assassination.

A recent book on RFK, incidentally, portrays him as being essentially conservative and not even liberal. A review of this book appeared in the NY Times Book Review and it was done by George Will, who agreed that RFK was conservative; and Will is one of the leading conservatives in the U.S.; who would know better than he does?

Or read, for that matter, a book on Martin Luther King, Pillar of Fire by Taylor Branch, a Pulitzer Prize winner in which he describes the relationship between RFK and King. Branch has commented that, contained within his book, is "one of the most poignant moments in Bobby's life, when in RFK's own secret oral history that would not be released until his death, he said he never had a conversation with Martin Luther King on any topic other than communists and what to do about them."

You can describe LBJ as being right-wing, but it is to be noted that historically it was LBJ who pushed through and passed a civil right act early in his administration and that kind of political behavior, most historians agree, would not have been possible during the so-called "left-wing" reign of the Kennedy brothers.

To continue with Fetzer's numerical order and my reply: (1) Fetzer faults me for contesting the validity of the Evelyn Lincoln letter published in both Fetzer's and Twyman's books in which she stated her belief as to who the conspirators were. Although I didn't raise the issue of why this letter-as opposed to so many others-appeared when it clearly has nothing to do with scientific evidence, my central point was its validity. I didn't state the letter was an outright forgery-I simply questioned what I considered were "problematic and disturbing" elements I found. That is all! Of the six objections I raised on this (0) point, there is not a single false statement. Although I noted that the letter to "Dear Richard" appeared without the usual full address, I had only asked "why?" Fetzer's reply on this is that it didn't appear because Fetzer wanted "to preserve the anonymity of the recipient." This is a perfectly reasonable thing to do, of course, but Fetzer's explanation here is given in reply to me and is not in his book. That reason should

have been given and so stated in his text and was not, thus, showing a bit of unnecessary sloppiness by Fetzer for not including this exclusionary reason. Again, here, as in point (0), there is not a single false statement made in the six objections I raised.

One final note on this point and its relevance will have to be determined by the reader of this article. In the very last sentence of the third paragraph dealing with Fetzer's defense of the Lincoln letter, he states "her opinions are especially noteworthy in view of her past position among JFK's most trusted aids." This "most trusted" theme may have to be seen in a different light when one considers a recent article (S.F.Chronicle, 3/17/98) in which Evelyn Lincoln received "harsh criticism" from Kennedy's children for her handling of "treasured mementos" belonging to JFK. A statement released by the children condemns her for having "breached both the public trust and that of our family."

(2) Fetzer notes my objection to Twyman's handling of the first shot evidence wherein I found an obvious contradiction. I pointed out that on page 98 (and here Fetzer finally caught me in an error, since I should have listed this as page 99) Twyman states regarding the Willis #5 photo: "this photo was taken an instant before (my emphasis) Kennedy was first hit." Since we now know that Willis #5 is equivalent to Zapruder frame #202, it is very clear that it is Twyman who says this (read it for yourself). The photo on page 99 is marked exhibit 10-1 which is not the Warren Commission's numbering system. It is Twyman's numbering system before we proceed any further. As I will note in my other points soon to be addressed, it is my contention that JFK was struck first (and, indeed, the very first shot) was at the equivalent of Z-189. For the sake of argument, clearly if one accepts this photo taken by Willis at Z-202, it necessarily follows that it had to be a photo taken after the first shot. One can draw a line graph showing what Twyman is saying here and there should be no confusion, one would hope, so far.

I then cited Twyman's reference to Zapruder frame 188 (see Twyman, pages between 144 and 145) wherein Twyman states that "the sound of the first shot was indicated to be at approximately this point (between frames 186 and 202) by the Betzner photo and Willis photo, one taken before (my emphasis) and one after (my em-

phasis again) the first shot."

Again draw a line graph and one can line up with Twyman's having Betzner (at Z-186) whose photo is "one taken before" the first shot (which I agree with) and then Willis (at Z-202) who is lined up (by Twyman) as "one after the first shot." If Fetzer still insists and asserts that this is not a contradiction, he must be using a different dictionary than the one I use and one like no other on the face of this earth!

As if Twyman hasn't already muddied the waters by now, just think of what Fetzer has to say about all this as he rises in defense of Twyman; he reports that I missed Twyman's "meaning" because (Twyman) "regards these photos as more or less bracketing the first shot." If by "bracketing" Fetzer is referring to Twyman's parenthesis where he writes "(between frames 186 and 202)" this "bracketing" still leaves Twyman as stating the Z-202 Willis photo is after the first shot. A contradiction is a contradiction. How can anything be clearer than this where in one place Twyman says "before" and in another place Twyman says "after"? I don't wish to leave the readers of this section with any further paradoxes but in that same discussion of Z-188 Twyman asserts the following: "Gerald Posner says the first shot was fired before frame 166. He may be right on this point. Michael West, D.D.S., says the first shot was probably fired at Frame 152. He may also be right."

To top all of this off, Twyman states that "virtually all researchers agree that the first shot or explosive sound occurred well before Kennedy passed behind the freeway sign, and that if it was a gunshot, it missed." But a few sentences later on the very same page Twyman states that "for (his) purposes" he'll go along with the Warren Commission conclusion which is that JFK was "first hit somewhere between frames 206 and 210." This first shot performing such acrobatics as striking and missing, hitting early and hitting later, is doing more gyrations than the famous and so-called "magic bullet" dreamed up by Arlen Specter!

On this latter point about frames 206 and 210: most assuredly the Warren Commission did not say what Twyman says; and if Fetzer and Twyman want to hold to this position so much for their "reconstruction" of the crime of the century.

So there you have it, dear readers, if contradiction

doesn't apply then confusion reigns!!

It can be seen from the above that Twyman has provided us with several different scenarios on a first shot. And Fetzer castigates me for "concentrating" on this aspect. The Twyman scenarios of which one, all or none Fetzer must come to some semblance of agreement on or just throw up his hands as being an utterly futile endeavor to engage in. At this point I can honestly say that I do not know where he stands. In so far as the timing with respect to the first shot as Twyman indicates we have Zapruder frames 152 (possibly); 162 (possibly); before 202; after 202 and then last, but by no means least, a consideration of frames "somewhere between frames 206 and 210." Apart from this mish-mash of evidentiary material there is the added burden of trying to figure out whether the first shot hit or missed at any one of those frames!

Believe me it is not my intent to confuse the reader in following all of this and it does sound bewildering, especially to the novice; but there are even more points to consider as we travel along this strange super-highway leading to the truth.

By the way, on Twyman's comment that "virtually all researchers agree that the first shot or explosive sound" was a "missed" shot, do not count me in with these researchers! I will have more to say on this later, but I will point out here that, at a Washington, D.C. JFK Conference in 1994, I presented a talk and a paper providing compelling evidence demonstrating why the first shot was not a missed shot. I offered time for anyone who could've challenged this and no one did. It may be that both Fetzer and Twyman were not at that conference but if they were, they presented no challenge. (A video version of what I've stated here is available and it will, again, clearly show that there is not one false statement that can be attributed to me!)

Fetzer also belabors me for what he considers my "sarcastic" comment about Twyman's use of Posner to fixate on the timing sequence of the first shot fired (Posner said this occurred before frame Z-166). Yes-sarcasm was a definite intention on my part directed not only at Twyman but also at Posner where Posner cites no source for his claim (one critic has dubbed Posner as "no source Posner"). Fetzer's complaint against me here is that—just because Posner is being used on this point alone

doesn't mean we have to rely on him always or on other points—misses the point. I don't agree with Posner on this point alone but Twyman mistakenly does and then cites him as corroborating Twyman. Twyman had the obligation to know why Posner took the position he did before accepting him. Fetzer may still wish to defend Twyman on this point but it cannot be because Posner has proven his point. He hasn't!

Regarding Fetzer's final comment on columnist Liz Smith and my comment on understanding how she could be "totally confused again" by the Twyman book: if she'll read my criticisms above and what is yet to come and she can reasonably "explain" to me where no contradictions or confusion resides after having "praised" his (Twyman's) book, I'll be only too eager to listen. And in so far as Fetzer noting that Smith's column appears to be "the first national forum" to praise Twyman, would Fetzer have applauded Smith had she praised Posner's work in her column because it was a "national forum?" Perhaps we have a new cultural phenomenon for the 1990's: a gossip column as a national forum! Wouldn't Fetzer have been more pleased if Assassination Science and Twyman's work had been reviewed in the scientific literature?

(3) This point deals with some comments I had made about newsman Walter Cronkite where I disputed Twyman's description of that eminent newsperson as one who "studied the JFK assassination perhaps harder and longer than any other network person" and I pointed to a 1967 CBS four part series of the JFK case which made Cronkite look like a veritable fountain of knowledge on the critical and controversial issues. I noted that an aide (a highly respected reporter) said Cronkite didn't see the script until moments before the program

Fetzer claims I took "matters out of context" because I didn't refer to Twyman's belief stated in his text wherein he says that he believes Cronkite was "manipulated" and that the reference by Twyman concerned a 1988 Nova documentary filled with errors and distortions. According to Fetzer, all this "appears to have sailed over Verb's head." But this didn't "sail" over my head. I knew of this Nova special and had read Twyman's remarks. My reference to Cronkite dealt solely with Twyman's saying of Cronkite that he "studied" and worked "harder and longer" than other newspersons. It is Fetzer who is taking things out of context now. I chose the 1967 se-

ries deliberately because it was just a few years after the JFK event and an image of Cronkite had already grown up about him and this image still persists up to the present time. By 1988 (the Nova show), he is revered by many as a treasured icon and his reports during the JFK controversy played no small role in helping to build it regardless of the Nova documentary.

(4) We now come to the evidence provided by Ron Hepler as to his reasons for the conclusion that John Connally was hit by two shots after the fatal head shot (or shots) occurring at Zapruder frame 313. In Hepler's analysis these are pinpointed at Z-315 and Z-338. (I note that, in Fetzer's paragraph of his rebuttal to me, he apparently may have had his own misgivings on Hepler since of all my points he cites this very one where I "might be correct" while faulting me for not providing supportive evidence). Moreover, this seeming reluctance on Fetzer's part to wholly identify with the Hepler thesis may be indicated by Fetzer's drawing attention to Dr. Mantik as having proposed a different scenario altogether for the wounding of Connally. On page 308 of Fetzer's book Mantik states that a shot at Zapruder frame 276 "most likely ... was the shot that hit Connally." And earlier, on pages 286-287, Mantik indicates that a shot may have hit Connally at Z-276 or earlier. (Naturally, all these differing versions will have to be resolved between Hepler, Twyman and Fetzer; and I'll be looking forward to that resolution and to see Mantik's contribution).

In my January, 1998 article I faulted Hepler for using Groden's reconstruction of the crime wherein I stated that his (Groden's) methodology was "utterly flawed" and therefore can't be used. True enough, I provided no details about rejecting Groden, but I didn't want to engage in a lengthy analysis of Groden's work since it was Hepler's I was concerned with. Without, again, going into any great detail, let it be noted that Groden's scenario establishes up to as many as ten shots being fired. And his placement of the first shot is one that is a missed shot and a first shot long before frame Z-189. For me to have successfully argued against both Hepler and Groden would've exhausted the space considerations for my article and I decided not to do so.

To cite two extremely important inadequacies about the Hepler thesis of two shots striking Connally after the fatal head shot (or shots), consider these: (A) what about

Governor Connally's own recollection of events wherein he points out the Zapruder frame and selects the frame (or approximate frames) at which he was struck occurring in the late Z-230's and before 240? Can we dismiss this so easily, especially when we learn that in April, 1964 at a Warren Commission meeting Connally had the opportunity to view the Zapruder film and examine individual slides? Uncannily (and why not, he was there), he pinpointed the exact frame JFK was hit and pointed to Z-190! And this was before there was any HSCA study and certainly before the Stroschio study as published in Fetzer's book. Indeed, Stroschio's study provides support for the hit on Connally in the late 230 frames (for those unfamiliar with the Stroschio study), his graph shows movement by Zapruder, around Z-239 to Z-242—all compelling evidence for a shot striking Connally just prior to these frames. See page 343); and (B) on page 243 in Fetzer's book, Hepler recalls for his readers Connally's wife's testimony before the Warren Commission and her efforts to protect her husband. He notes that "Nellie's left hand can be seen grasping the Governor's left arm into her lap at frame 273 (my emphasis)." But two sentences before Nellie has said: "...and I thought if I could get him down, maybe they wouldn't hurt him anymore (my emphasis). So I pulled him down in my lap."

As anyone can plainly see (without looking at the Zapruder film), frame 273 is before frames 315 and 338 (the alleged frames at which Hepler claims Connally was hit). Moreover, Nellie's testimony that she didn't want to see her husband hurt "anymore" means he already has been hit and clearly "hurt" and all this occurred at a frame well before frames after the fatal shot or shots. You cannot have it both ways!

(5) Next we come to a discussion of a chapter by Chuck Marler dealing (partly) with the claim of "alteration" in the Stemmons freeway sign which appears in many frames of the Zapruder film. Fetzer, in an attempt to provide reasons for why the sign could have been "enlarged", claims that I argued that the "first bullet may have been fired" at an earlier time (than frames 207 to 222), "possibly even before Z-189". He then says that this is what Twyman and Posner also appear to believe; which makes it appear as if Fetzer is linking me with both Posner and Twyman. Readers may draw that infer-

ence from what Fetzer says here, but this is not what I believe and he misrepresents my position completely. Either Fetzer has grossly missed the point about my argument or he does recognize what my point is, but refuses to answer the argument.

I noted and Fetzer cannot have failed to notice that, in my Fourth Decade article, I pointed to the fact that JFK "can be seen reacting to something just immediately after (my emphasis here) frame 189." It is this very frame at which Kennedy is hit for the first time and my secondary claim is that it is also the very first shot. For the sake of argument I said that, whether JFK's reaction is to a sound or hit, the timing of the frame is highly significant here if, as Fetzer and others allege, the reason that vertical, horizontal and composite editing are undertaken is to eliminate features in the film pointing to conspiracy, then the crucial frames for this to occur must be at 189 and all frames up to 207. At that particular frame, JFK disappears behind the sign. For Marler and Fetzer to argue about events occurring between 207 to 225 (when JFK is hidden) makes their contentions a moot point because it is too late—the damage has literally all been done and is there for all to see (including the conspirators allegedly examining the film)! Again, and it bears repeating, to ignore this as Fetzer does is either a gross misunderstanding of the evidence or shows that he is aware, but to answer my objections would place his entire argument in severe and total jeopardy.

Some readers may ask why I do dwell on this aspect of Zapruder frames 189 to 207 and where is my basis and evidence for this first shot claim. Very briefly: there is the Z- film, Mr. and Mrs. Connally's testimony, Seth Kantor's notes, the Hartmann-Scott- Alzarez' (HSCA) study and my own interview of witnesses. That's just for starters—there is a lot more!

(6) This section deals with the head shot (or shots). Fetzer notes correctly that both Mantik and I agree that there were two shots to the head and Fetzer also notes that I didn't indicate the time interval between shots whereas Mantik does. I didn't indicate this interval, but for anyone who has spent time studying the Zapruder frames and who doesn't believe in film alteration, it should come as no surprise that the frames of strikes are Z-312 followed by Z-313 or nearly simultaneous. Obviously such a time interval precludes necessarily a lone

assassin firing. In my analysis the first shot comes from the rear of the motorcade (but that does not mean that this originated at a 6th floor window) and strikes JFK in the back of his head and the subsequent second head shot comes from the knoll area (but not necessarily from behind a picket fence). This shot strikes JFK on his right side as a tangential blow blasting that area of his skull outward. Again, to repeat that which seems obvious, if my scenario is correct there is definitely a conspiracy.

As can be seen from the above, our double head shot thesis differs as to the time interval (referring to my time interval hypothesis and Mantik's counter-proposal). Mantik's time frame runs as early as Z-306 and extends to about Z-321 to (possibly) some frames thereafter (but unspecified by Mantik). (Curiously enough, when describing these two head shots on page 287, Mantik has the first shot as (striking) the "right occiput" and, on the second head shot, he has it striking the "right temple/forehead-the right occiput is blown out." You'll note here the usage of the word "right" several times which is precisely the word I chose and used in my original article in the Fourth Decade. Fetzer's "reply" failed even to fully acknowledge my point but I'll have more to say on this. See my point #10)

At one point in his argument about film alteration, there appears this comment by Mantik: "...the FBI made extensive efforts to capture all possibly relevant photographic evidence." As that fine critic, H.L. Mencken, used to say, "es ist zum lachen" (it is to laugh). Just read Harold Weisberg's excellent study of the film evidence in his Photographic Whitewash and it will amply demonstrate how "extensive" the FBI's efforts were. The exact opposite of Mantik's claim is the reality. One only has to cite the Nix and Bronson films for starters.

Fetzer makes references to a "surprising absence of descriptions of a head-snap" by certain viewers of the film. Mantik for his part (page 302) points to the Nix film and describes it (the head shot) as: "a distinct head snap is also visible". He repeats this "head snap" scenario four pages later where he again says that the film "does show a backward head snap". Mantik claims (as does Fetzer) that there were witnesses who never saw this "head snap" and also that certain witnesses ("eight to ten") reported hearing or seeing another shot after the head shot.

Again Fetzer faults me for not having mentioned these "reports" but my emphasis was directed towards saying that the Zapruder film already contained evidence of two head shots (in my analysis, strikes at Z-312 and Z-313). Somehow this was left in by the conspirators who were busy altering other parts of the film! Their hand has been caught in the cookie jar twice and they haven't learned their lesson! And the Nix film (supposedly altered) left in the evidence of a "backward head snap" which suggests strongly that a shot entered frontally and not from the rear. Why would these "alteration experts" so adept at changing films, x-rays and even bodies allow such things to occur? And if they did alter the areas I'm discussing, leave a trail of evidence for conspiracy? Can Fetzer or anyone else avoid answering these questions, or are they "hopelessly inadequate to the task"?

Insofar as the numerous "witnesses" cited by Mantik on the "spread" of the head shots (see pages 289 to 292), the problem posed here is that, without the Zapruder film being shown along side of witness statements, there is no way to corroborate whether that witness would or would not reflect differently on his or her statements. That's why we have cross examination in court trials.

Let me illustrate this point where an example of "leading the witness" applies. Mantik notes Zapruder's Warren Commission testimony (page 289): "Well, as the car came in line almost ..." Immediately thereafter, Mantik puts in brackets: "[i.e., Z-313]". However the Warren Commission Volume (vol.7) does not have this bracketing included; and it is very clear that it is Mantik interpreting this as Z-313 and not Zapruder. That Mantik interpreted this undoubtedly, in my view, is because his thesis is a second head shot well after Z-313 and would be desirous of placing JFK further down Elm Street than he already actually is. Note also (and perhaps more significantly) that Mantik has conveniently left out Zapruder's immediate comment after "the car came in line almost" and this is: "- I believe it was almost in line; contained further along and within this very same sentence (and also omitted from Mantik's citation) is this: "- I imagine it was around here." Zapruder's "belief" and "imagining" could have been straightened out as to what precise frames Zapruder meant but Wesley Liebeler on behalf of the Warren Commission, who was questioning him didn't do so. And in the case of Mantik's "evi-

dence" we have the same right to question his procedure to advance his arguments.

Towards the end of point (6) Fetzer takes me to task for spending an inordinate amount of space on asking why Mantik didn't list Zapruder frames before Z-250. Defending Mantik, Fetzer says these frames are "of scant relevance to Mantik's work on the film." The relevance of frames prior to Z-250-in case my argument is still sailing over Fetzer's head-is being ignored (first by the conspirators and now by Fetzer and his supporters). Since Fetzer has called into question the limitations of my "methodology," what can he say in defense of his clear avoidance of the critical issues?

Most ironic of all is that, when Fetzer does discuss my handling of shots prior to Z-250, he muddies the water considerably. He notes that I corrected Mantik about when the first shot struck JFK (I said Z-189 and Mantik agreed with me). This occurred at the Dallas Lancer 1996 conference and Fetzer was at Mantik's side!

Fetzer then goes on to say that Mantik's talk was "never intended as a disagreement with Verb" making it appear as if Mantik and I were in some kind of debate which, of course, we were not, and the clincher to all this is that Fetzer points out that Mantik "applauds" my analysis but the only "analysis" I offered at Lancer was to correct Mantik's erroneous Z-frame time placement when JFK was hit (repeated twice by Mantik). If Mantik agreed with me then and does so now, since according to Fetzer, Mantik "applauds" my analysis, don't both Mantik and Fetzer realize that this is the very crucial frame I've been referring to all along and that it is this very frame where no alteration occurred, but by Fetzerian logic is required to have taken place?

Although Fetzer makes no comment of his own or Mantik's "agreement" (with my first shot analysis) he seems totally unaware, again, of the severe implications that his unawareness leads to and which is totally destructive of his (Mantik's) case for alteration. Is Mantik (and this necessarily includes Fetzer) now prepared to say there is no agreement and, if so, why?

Fetzer, in a sentence immediately thereafter, contends that I "misinterpreted" Mantik's "meaning". But, if Fetzer is still referring to the 1996 Lancer conference, I understood the "meaning" only too well. Obviously the "meaning" was to advance the argument for editing the

film to conceal any possible conspiratorial features. On the other hand, if Fetzer isn't referring to the Lancer event, it would appear as if Fetzer's "meaning" remark relates to his discussion about the alleged JFK "limo stop". However, I didn't raise this "stop" issue in point (6) in any event, so I could not have missed any "meaning" here either.

As long as this question of a limo stop has arisen, I should note here that when he, Fetzer, discusses it, his choice of words is rather curious; for he describes it as "the limousine stop (or near stop)". So whom do we choose among those witnesses to reach a conclusion-only those who claim the car stopped because their observations neatly fit in with the theme of Z-film alteration since the film does not show the limo stop?

Remember that funny line in the Marx Brothers movie, "Duck Soup", when a woman is confronted with a "fake" Groucho Marx and she can't believe it is him. The fake Groucho says, "so who you gonna believe-me, or your own eyes?!"

This point (6) was prompted by Fetzer's comment about my spending some time on what Dr. Mantik had to say about frames in the Zapruder film prior to Z-250 and one can see from the above my reasons for addressing the issue. But there is another irony (and life is always filled with them) before putting this argument aside. At a recent JFK mini-conference held in San Francisco (May 23rd) hosted by Dr. Aguilar, Dr. Mantik was present and I, again, questioned him as to his thoughts on frames prior to Z-250 with a focus on the first shot hypothesis around Z-189. He replied that he was not familiar enough to make any comment and he also remarked that he didn't know what Fetzer's position on this was either!

(7) This point deals specifically with the "three tramps issue" which, as I've stated before, simply will not die. It reminds me of the "face on Mars" controversy or the various "alien abduction" scenarios. Of all the eleven points I dissent on in my Fourth Decade article, this one elicited more paragraphs from Fetzer than any other and it seems to have exercised his pique at me. I will not repeat here the many reasons for the evidence that the three tramps have been identified as Abrams, Gedney and Doyle as opposed to the gentlemen Fetzer proposes. But I will recall for the readers (and for Fetzer) that the Rockefeller Commission in the 1970's had established

that these "tramps" could not be linked to JFK's murder, and this comment by me seems to have sailed over Fetzer's head since he makes no mention of it. There are details about what the Rockefeller Commission found and subsequent events which I did not cite, but I focused on the evidence that the LaFontaines found. Fetzer's argument in this respect was that "mere pieces of paper can be faked" and therefore can't be relied upon.

But my argument was based on other data than "mere pieces of paper" and, again, for space limitations, I did not include them in my original article. But now that Fetzer is again calling into question what evidence is out there to refute his claims, it will be mentioned. And it is evidence that Fetzer can hardly be unaware of.

In attempting to refute me, Fetzer alludes to the LaFontaines book, *Oswald Talked*, and says that "records to which Verb refers do not appear there." But I never said that they were in their book and their book was not even mentioned by me! What is truly funny here (and another of those delicious ironies) in Fetzer's misuse of that book is that, years ago, I published a very critical review of this very book disagreeing with the book's central theme (among others). This review appeared in a British magazine, so it probably received very little notice in the U.S. I do, however, agree with the LaFontaines as to who the tramps were.

As to Fetzer's reliance on "studies" made by Lois Gibson, described by Fetzer as "perhaps the nation's leading forensic artist" (which she may well be); this led to her identification of one of the tramps as not being that offered by the LaFontaines. Fetzer says he is convinced that Chauncey Holt is one of the tramps because, after long discussions with Holt, Fetzer says he "walks the walk, and talks the talk." This "walking and talking" bit mystified me as I recalled that all the photos of the "three tramps" are stills and I am unfamiliar with any motion picture film version let alone a sound version. If Holt was truly there, can Fetzer provide us with a smidgeon of detail as to what these three discussed while they are "walking" their way in police custody? If you have seen Oliver Stone's film, "JFK," you'll note that one of the tramps there "signals" a passer-by as their paths cross. Did Mr. Holt know of this episode as he was "walking the walk"?

Researcher Marin Shackelford informs me that, in re-

sponse to Fetzer's "rebuttal" of my article, he put on the internet (where, incidentally, Fetzer first replied to me) information which Fetzer has completely ignored. These include the following: televised interviews with Doyle (one of the tramps): that there was a print interview with a still-living member of the trio and, finally, that there was family confirmation of the identification of all three from Dealey Plaza photos. It is curious to note Fetzer's failure to address these points in his "rebuttal" to me or has this evidence gone into another "black hole" within Fetzer's memory where no facts can ever emerge?. Let the reader decide who is dealing with fact or fiction here and draw the necessary conclusions.

(8) This point relates to the argument about whether or not the Stemmons sign was altered in the Zapruder film. There is some confusion on the part of Fetzer wherein he states that (Verb) "assumes that Mantik has proposed that the Stemmons sign was altered after Z-207." I made no such statement; however, what I did say was that a "question arose" about the "possibility" of sign alteration. I was trying to point to the Stemmons sign argument because various proponents of film alteration had aired this view. When I did quote a phrase that the reason for sign alteration was to show it had been elevated in order to obscure JFK, I noted that this point was raised in my point (5) and this was Chuck Marler's contention, not Mantik's.

You'll note, however, that, once again, I raised the specter (no pun intended) of that crucial first shot evidence and its specific relevance to film alteration. The phrase I used was "excessive movement in the (Zapruder frames 190's)", and - true to form - Fetzer again dodges the issue. Now my argument is flying over Fetzer's head at warp speed!

Fetzer then faults me for not having raised the issue of the Nix film and its use or non-use in the recreation of the crime. Mantik says that descriptions assigned to the Nix film in a specific report are not consistent with it and that it may well be the "babushka lady" film instead. While one can argue the merits pro and con as to which film is being utilized, my arguments were based on an analysis of the Z-film not the Nix one, so I had no need to refer to it.

Fetzer again assails me for what he considers my "pre-occupation with the shot sequence," as if this "preoc-

cupation" were not essential to my argument about what really occurred on November 22, 1963 regardless of one's belief in conspiracy or no conspiracy. He claims this "distorts (my) judgment" about other issues raised in Twyman's book and, finally, says my being "blinded" (to first shot evidence timing) is "irrelevant to Twyman's proof of Z-film alteration". This easy dismissal of my argument by Fetzer reveals the limitations of his methodology-not mine. For, now, if nothing else his approach is, to use his phraseology, "painfully apparent". If this is not an "elementary matter," what other meaning can be attached to these words?

Apart from this quick dismissal by Fetzer, he winds up misrepresenting my position entirely on the first shot when he declares that "he (Verb) and Twyman both think (the timing of the first shot) was around Z-152." But nowhere in point (9) nor in the entire article did I make that statement, and I certainly don't believe it! Whether Twyman does (finally) believe this will have to be elicited from Twyman himself and here, again, one can refer to my point (2) above wherein Twyman is all over the map on what he does believe! This erroneous linkage between Twyman and myself on the part of Fetzer reveals a profound misreading and misunderstanding of the primary evidence and throws a considerable amount of light on how he handles this and other issues.

(10) Here, and on my final point, I am attacked for my stance on what I have termed "the back of the head argument," which Fetzer says I'm "dreadfully unqualified to examine". As Fetzer is entirely aware, it is not only doctors who have participated in this argument but lay persons as well. I will grant here that Fetzer may not be alluding to my professional "qualifications" since I am not a doctor and I certainly don't presume to make medical opinions about bodily injuries such as those sustained by President Kennedy. My specific approach has been a very rational consideration: the reliability of witness statements as compared to Z-film, photographic and x-rays, authentic evidence.

Fetzer rightly notes that I questioned whether witnesses did actually describe a "back-of-the-head blow-out" and recalls for his readers that I cited several statements by witnesses who did not use this language (I mentioned four Parkland Hospital doctors and two Secret Service personnel wherein I emphasized that the "right side" of

the head was blasted). At this point I expected Fetzer, since he mentioned these six witnesses, would show where I went wrong on them-if, indeed, I had. So what does Fetzer do? He totally ignores their reports and they, like other denials, are once again entered into the black hole of Fetzer's memory, a pattern all too revealingly clear when he has to face even his own evidence! Isn't this kind of behavior exactly what critics have raked the coals over with the FBI, the Secret Service and other government agencies we've all come to know only too well?

With respect to the six witnesses who described a "right side" head injury I could've cited more such as: Akins, Ebersole, Rudnicki, Baxter, Stewart, Altgens and O'Neill. The list, or course, is not endless, but by now the reader has gotten the drift of my argument and the point will not be belabored.

Thus, when Fetzer cites Groden's The Killing of the President (pages 86 to 89) and says that no one "could reasonably be persuaded by what Verb has to say here" it isn't Verb alone who's calling attention to the "right side" but all these six witnesses I've previously cited and the additional ones I've named here in my reply. Fetzer's page references most probably refer to the numerous individuals shown pointing to heads but we have every right to query any of these individuals as to their precise meaning and memory recall. "Back" is not "right" and "right" is not "back".

Fetzer also maintains that I ignored the prologue contained within his book where Dr. Gary Aguilar's "collation" of witnesses provides a listing of about 40 witnesses who allegedly reported a "back of the head" blow-out. There is a slight error on the part of Fetzer here, for the "collation" is not in the prologue section, but mention of it does appear elsewhere on page 355. However, there is no listing given of who these 40 witnesses are; so the reader has no opportunity to render any judgment.

While I do not have handy at this moment a copy of Dr. Aguilar's abstract on those 40 witnesses, I have heard him discuss this in Dallas and at various times in San Francisco. I last confronted Dr. Aguilar in San Francisco at the mini-conference on JFK and pointed to the four doctors mentioned in my Fourth Decade article and asked if the four doctors were included in his collation and he replied "yes-they are". These four indicated a "right side" injury not a "back" one and I did not query

Agular about the additional ones I have now included. From my point of view, to state that virtually or nearly all witnesses are saying the "same thing" does not hold up. In a court of law proceeding, it wouldn't either.

And who of us, among members of the JFK research community, does not remember when we castigated Warren Commission attorney Arlen Specter for substituting "neck" for "back" in support of his absurd single bullet theory explaining the non-fatal first wounding of President Kennedy? He palmed this off on the Warren Commission as if he were herding a bunch of elephants running across a freshly painted sidewalk and not a single member of the Commission nor its staff publically denounced him for doing this. That's in the historical record for all to see. Should researchers and what they have stated not also be subjected to critical examination as the Warren Commission has? The answer should be obvious.

In conclusion: to paraphrase a well known phrase, perhaps the business of science is too important to be left to the scientists.

Back in the late 1960's, I taught a college course on the JFK case at San Francisco State University. If a student in that course had advanced a particular argument and a reply was offered in rebuttal and that student had stated that the reply was "irrelevant" but refused to explain why it was irrelevant, he probably would've flunked my course. This "irrelevance" comment would be rejected just as quickly as if someone had said he (or she) had to leave the class at that moment in order to attend the maiden voyage of the Titanic!

History is often a harsh judge and when the axe falls on myths, falsehoods and outrageous beliefs, that axe cuts swiftly and deep. I believe it was the writer, Oscar Wilde, who said it well when he wrote that the only obligation we owe to history is to change it.

That's the obligation all of us owe as serious students and researchers. I take that obligation very seriously; otherwise history is rendered meaningless.

Or maybe that brilliant Defense Attorney, Clarence Darrow, was right after all, when he said that the only thing we learn from history is that we don't learn from history. Can history absolve us? Only time will tell. I rest my case!

THE ZAPRUDER FILM: MEMO TO THE FILE

by

Harrison E. Livingstone

We examined most or all of the 8mm copies of the Zapruder film held by NARA during a number of visits in January and February this year. Accompanying me were my colleagues Doug Mizzer, Daryll Weatherly, and Officer Matthew Branham, Baltimore City Police. We are preparing a series of charts with measurements and other data on each of the films.

1) We found several films with the number 0186 printed on their leaders. This number was not punched through except in one case, (Secret Service No. 2; 87.010) and were otherwise printed on the film from original perforated copies, presumably, indicating that these films are not the copies made by Jamieson in Dallas on November 22, 1963. Also, they do not have the number "0183" printed on them, which, according to an affidavit made by Kodak November 22, 1963, they should have *in addition to the later numbers*. They are not the Jamieson copies because they have no sprocket hole images in the motorcade and Dealey Plaza sequences and the film is entirely black to the left of the "septum." Jamieson insists that the contact printing process used by his technician, Marshal Collier, would have copied all of the intersprocket areas we know are on the original film and which are on the present copies of the "home movie" which Zapruder took shortly before on the same roll of film. This film is documented by NARA as having been made by Life and given to the Secret Service. Why would they do this when they had two of Jamieson's copies? Both originals appear to have been substituted for by the two made by Life. Did the Secret Service damage them? The bottom line is that the disappearance of the Jamieson copies makes it impossible to compare the intersprocket areas with the "camera original" film.

2) One film, titled "Secret Service Copy No. 1" (87.010) had the number 0183 printed out, but not punched through. This purports to be a copy made from the original but is not a first generation copy because the sprocket areas, as in the above films, are completely black. This

Harrison E. Livingstone
P.O. Box 7149
Baltimore MD 21218