

Kurtz's Brief answer to Questions onto OUR READER form:

"...3. In some places the scholarship is sound, in others, it is quite weak ..." No specifications here but it does include "SEE ATTACHED."

In 6 Kurtz says "that I strongly urge UKP to encourage Wrone to make the necessary changes to put it into publishable form. " By this Kurtz really means for the Wrone book to say what Kurtz wants said, regardless of the established and known official fact, rather than what Wrone wants to say. In this as in many of his other generalities that are unsourced and undocumented Kurtz himself raise questions about whether his word can be taken and whether, after publishing a book supposedly on the assassination of President Kennedy, Kurtz has mastered the established, official and available evidence rather than propaganda about it. His book documents that he is not an authentic expert and if he is asked to produce citations for his personal cracks, which he makes with no pretense of any support for them, it is without question that the record he makes on himself in this also establishes that he is not an authentic assassination expert and dotes on some of the more irrational of the suspicions that, although referred to as theories, are not theories at all. They are fabrications, inventions, without any actual support for them.

In 7. Kurtz again says that if Wrone converts what he wrote into what Kurtz ^{wants} it should be published, but only if he does that, Doing what Kurtz recommends ^{own} would convert a work of nonfiction into the kind of fiction Kurtz's ^{one} book is,

Next Kurtz has what he titles his "General Commentary" on what Wrone wrote.

Kurtz's criticism under "Organization" is again that Wrone did not write what Kurtz would have written.

The Kurtz criticism under "Head Shots" is again Kurtz wanting Wrone to write what he would write and omit what he would omit. He also wants Wrone to depart from the established official evidence and, as Kurtz himself did, go for the street information that has no validity. Kurtz is clearly not familiar with the great amount of official assassination evidence that Wrone reviewed and from which he selected what he wanted to say because it is the official evidence and because that official evidence is other than the evidence used by the Commission and the major media. Kurtz's uncritical use of this kind of street information resulted in a disaster in his own book. Here he demands the same mistake of Wrone, who limited his sources pretty much to the official evidence or uses of it by others. It is not "theories," not conjectures, not manufactures but the ignored official evidence. Mostly ignored by those.

This Kurtz unscholarly attitude persists in his paragraph "Citations and Bibliography."

That paragraph holds no support for the usual Kurtz crack that he is "well aware of Wronne's infatuation with the works of Harold Weisberg ⁴ but since this manuscript concerns the Zapruder film, he needs to demonstrate a thorough knowledge of the literature that discusses the film in some detail." Here again Kurtz demonstrates his preference for the made-up trash supposedly about the Zapruder film and actually what assassination nuts have made up the the subject-matter ignoramuses, like Kurtz, prefer. There is no point in giving any even slight credibility to that intellectual trash. Wisely, Wronne does not. Nor does Kurtz specify what he has in mind. Not even in his endless cracks at me, the one who has limited himself entirely to the official assassination evidence in his books and on this film. Kurtz says that there are "countless sources on the World Wide Web" that Wronne omits from his citations. As he should have because what I have seen of that and what Kurtz apparently likes of it is trash, not evidence, made-up junk, not established fact.

Kurtz is either dishonest or he is ignorant of the basic work I did on that film and made available to Wronne. It was I who discovered that it had been damaged and how it was damaged, with what consequences, for example. We come to more of this, ^{Kurtz's} additional reason for Wronne not making use of the official evidence I made available to him.

Under "Other Interpretations" Kurtz lists ⁵ those he thinks and says that Wronne should have drawn on for their interpretations. I had contact with three of those five and they broke off when I proved that they were wrong. They preferred attention to being factually correct. The serious mistakes in the works of Mantik and Groden are dealt with in several of my unpublished manuscripts. Groden did two outrageously ignorant books and I devoted one of those manuscripts to his fabrications and his mistakes. Before the distributor of Groden's videotape settled a plagiarism case out of court I wrote that Groden "can't even steal straight." Aside for the many and serious factual errors in what he wrote Groden drew extensively on the uncredited work of others and this literary theft is what Kurtz wants Wronne to use rather than the established official evidence.

Kurtz again exposes himself as devoted to the assassination trash when he says, that "It is imperative for Wronne to discuss those interpretations of the Zapruder film." By this he is really demanding that Wronne go for all that made-up and impossible assassination trash that Kurtz likes and is not within the concept of the book Wronne wrote.

Again, Kurtz's real complaint is that Wronne did not write the kind of book that Kurtz would have wanted him to write preferring, as Wronne does,

the actual official evidence to these childish fabrications that, when fact is not a consideration, can be made to seem to be quite attractive—but are fictions.

Kurtz then has what he titles his "Reviewer's Assessment" of the book. So used is Kurtz to what is not real that he refers to what Wrone wrote that proves there was a conspiracy to his "thesis." It is not that and despite Kurtz's misrepresentations of what Wrone did write the ^{fact} ~~fix~~ does establish that there was a conspiracy. It does not and Wrone does not say that it identified the conspirators.

Kurtz also alleges that Wrone must "make numerous substantive changes in the manuscript" because "there are too many factual errors." That Kurtz's word for it because he cites not a single alleged factual error. He also claims that "There are ~~too~~ ^{too} many statements that border on the libelous."

I ~~read~~ ^{read} the rough draft of the Wrone manuscript and neither of these criticisms has any basis in fact. What is more likely is that Wrone did not approve the assassination nuttiness to which Kurtz had always been devoted.

Kurtz then lists "some of the major parts of the manuscript that need revision." First is page 6, paragraph 2. Rereading this citation serves to establish that whether or not Kurtz and others like him, what Wrone states is well-established truth. If Kurtz does not know that those Wrone names and more did dishonor the ^{notation} ~~notion~~ that is merely another tribute to his subject's matter ignorance.

Then, "P. 7,1,6 - 'the blossoming Truth in the hinterlands.' Wrone's hero, Harold Weisberg, lived [sic] in Frederick, Maryland, hardly the 'hinterlands'"

I have a city of Frederick mail address but I live on the side of Gambrill mountain, not within the city of Frederick. The deer come up to our home as they feed and the Canadian geese and the Mallard ducks make nests on out five ^{acres} ~~acres~~ each year. (~~I did not find the cited words on the cited page.~~)

Kurtz's next criticism is, "P. 39, II, 4-6, "The second shot missed..." The Warren Commission never said that the ⁴ ~~second~~ shot missed. The evidence is inconclusive as to whether it was the first, the second or the third shot which missed. "Warren Report, p. 111."

In addition to not being able to understand official and established assassination fact, Kurtz is not able to understand plain English. If the Commission's Report does not have the second shot missing, then the Commission could not have concluded that there had been no conspiracy, that Oswald alone fired all the shots. Despite the assassination junkies of more recent years, it was only the first shot that the Commission dared claim inflicted all seven non-fatal wounds on the President and on Governor Connally and the Zapruder film leaves it without

question that the Commission's ~~shot~~^{third} shot exploded in the President's head. Thus, when the Commission could no longer avoid the shot a spray of concrete from which wounded Jim Tague slightly, that had to have been the second of the admitted three shots that were, in the official account, fired that day and at that time.

What follows is "P. 40, 3rd Par., 1.5 - 'Oswald would be firing down at a steep angle. This is incorrect. The angle was 17 degrees, 43 minutes, and 30 seconds, hardly a steep angle.'" In this Kurtz presents himself to also be an expert on rifle firing. A downward shot from more than 66 feet up in the air and at a target moving away from about 200 feet distant on the ground is firing "at a steep angle," according to the actual experts who offered any opinion. Because Kurtz cites no expert opinion he is again presenting himself as an expert in a field in which he lacks the basic knowledge. Because Kurtz is not an expert on such matters what other criticisms he makes of this nature will not be addressed absent ~~another~~^{need} to do so.

What follows is Kurtz's foolishness in presenting himself as such an expert when in fact he is ignorant of such matters. Kurtz says that with one shot fired at frame 237 and the next one "after frame 255," then Oswald "had sufficient time to fire the two separate shots and wound Connally twice." The actual time represented by those Zapruder frames is a trifle more than a single second and despite Kurtz's later misrepresentation of the actual results of the actual testing done by the country's very best shots with the Army staging those tests, even under greatly improved conditions this shooting attributed to the Oswald who had not handled a rifle in years, was not possible for the country's very best shooters. This kind of serious and basic error is typical of Kurtz's criticism as it is of his writing in his book, and detecting these errors is not easy for ~~anyone~~^{those} who might be used as a subject expert making a peer review, professionals who are used to accepting those presented as experts as real experts and who lack the skills and the knowledge necessary for making judgements about the assassination and what is written about it, officially and unofficially. Kurtz is so ignorant of the subject matter about which he writes and here offers criticisms that come from his ignorance ^{that} in his own writing he has the shot that allegedly hit the President in the back of his neck ^{going} upward in the President's body when it allegedly originated more than 66 feet in the air.

Kurtz is no less ignorant of motion pictures, as he demonstrates in "P. 45 2, 'The film establishes a shot at about frame 190.' The film does no such thing. As Wrono himself admitted [sic] on p. 42, frame 190 is blurred. There is no evidence from that frame that JFK had been hit." In this Kurtz sets himself up against Nobel Laureate Luis Alvarez, who stated that the fuzziness was from

the unintended jiggling of the camera in reaction to hearing a shot, This is what Wrone is writing about, as others have, going back to my 1965 book.

These not being serious enough flaws for the Kurtz who pretends to be an unquestionable expert on all matters on which he is not expert, he continues to demonstrate his addiction to making up for criticism what is not in the Wrone manuscript, that with bullets fired from front and back at frames 312 and 313, "It is physically impossible to have such synchronization. Humans simply cannot respond that quickly." What need for any "synchronization" was there in firing at a visible target who had already been fired at and struck? This is part of the street-talk assassination mythology to which Kurtz is addicted. The actual evidence, the actual official evidence, leaves it without any question at all that the President was fired at from both front and back, as even the House assassins committee, the work of which Kurtz likes, stated. There need not have been, as New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison said there was, any communications system. When the target would be hit, ^{to} fire is all the instructions, if there were any, that ^{were} needed.

In Kurtz's next incorrect criticism he again flaunts his ignorance of the actual official evidence and of the Zapruder film itself in, "P 46,4 - 'film shows the back of the head intact.' This is not accurate. The back of the head appears in only two frames, or in one-ninth of a second. Those two frames [which Kurtz is careful not to identify with their frame numbers] are not sufficiently sharp and clear to state that the back of the head is not damaged'." If this flaunting of his professional ignorance is not enough for Kurtz he adds to it that "it is presumptuous to assert, solely on the basis of two frames, that the back of the head was intact."

Because Kurtz's knowledge is limited to the small fraction of the official evidence that had been withheld and I and another critic forced out in the FBI's disclosures of December 1967 and January 1968 as well as any of the Commission's published work that he did not misunderstand and/or misrepresent, and he did both, I offer an explanation of Kurtz's ignorance and of his failure to keep informed in the field in which he claims expertise.

Life magazine made 35mm slides of each frame of the Zapruder film the Commission indicated it wanted. The frames of that film were given their numbers by FBI Laboratory agent Lyndal Shaneyfelt. What the magazine duplicated for the Commission extended to frame 343. But in the black-and-white copies of the color film the FBI prepared for the Commission, which was to publish in ~~two~~ black and white, not in color, for his own reasons Shaneyfelt stopped at frame 334. When I called this to the attention of the National Archives, it was embarrassed, it

wrote me an apology and it invited me in to examine those nine frames that the FBI, whether by accident or intent, had suppressed from any Commission close study and from publication in the exhibit of which they are part, Exhibit 885.

I accepted the Archives invitation and projected those slides onto a screen that was about five feet wide. The clarity is startling in that great magnification. And almost immediate when individual frames are examined, here frame that take only a ninth of second, the time Kurtz has claimed is impossible for clear understanding, the back of the President's head is clearly visible. At this point in that film the President is thrown violently backward, against the back of the seat, and he has begun to fall over to his left, onto his wife. As he twists in his fall, for that ninth of a second the back of his head is clearly visible. Not a hair seems out of place. There is no visible hole, ~~no~~ no visible blood on the back of the head or on the clearly visible ^{shirt} collar.

That ^{then} there is no visible ~~wound~~ wound or blood on the back of the head so relatively long after the fatal shot but in fact only very shortly after it is enough to destroy the conclusions of the Warren Commission. As the FBI knew because it imposed those conclusions on the Commission. So, there is basis for believing that the suppression of those nine frames by the FBI may have been intentional, but whether intentional or not, Wrono is quite accurate and as usual Kurtz is ignorant of what he writes about.

I have prints of those frames made from the Zapruder film that was on TV on public television. Kurtz has never come to examine my records, as I have always permitted all writing in the field (most of whom I know I will not agree with), with unsupervised access to my own work and to the third of a million pages of official records I obtained by FOIA litigation ^{Kurtz does not mention,} and to our copier. According to the disclosed FBI records, he got his university to buy only the first section of those FBI disclosures. In addition to all of those records I sued for and obtained the relevant files of the FBI's Dallas and New Orleans records and, as Wrono was able to examine and Kurtz did not, to the degree possible I made duplicate copies of what seemed to be the more interesting documents and filed them by subject, not as the FBI filed them, in the sequence in which they reached the file clerks.

On this I underscore that either Kurtz did not understand or he did not examine all that he had accessible, not like the above, what he ^{examine} did not although he could have. Kurtz has my Post Kortem. In it, on pages 580ff, I print in facsimile the report of the panel of medical experts the Department of Justice asked to examine the autopsy films and to report on them. That panel of the most authoritative of medical experts placed the wound that was fatal four inches higher than the autopsy report placed it, or not in the back of the head but "approximately

100 mm. above the external occipital protuberance," the bulging bone ^{near} ~~opposite~~ which in the Warren Commission case it was allegedly located. Or, the report of that panel of experts is in accord with what the suppressed ^{films} ~~frames~~ of the Zapruder film show (page 590).

(Kurtz also makes ~~an~~ uninformed cracks about what Wrone wrote about the impossibility of the single-bullet theory made up, in defiance of the official evidence, by the Commission. In the official version that bullet passed through the President without striking bone. According to this same panel, on page 592 of Post Mortem, which Kurtz has, in the "neck region" the autopsy X-rays show "several metallic fragments" are present in this region. This is to say that Wrone is accurate and informed and his critics, Kurtz, is, as usual, not accurate and not factually informed.)

Kurtz praises shabby work on the assassination, but considering the book he wrote himself, this is not surprising. It was a very shabby book, at its best. It is the book of a preconception-dominated mind that has not done the work required to master the great mass of available official evidence. He says "P. 89 last l, 'shoddy workmanship...' This is an unfair scurrilous attack on one of the most respected works of ~~the~~ assassination scholarship." "Respected" by whom? By those who, like Kurtz, make up what they want regarded as evidence, as proof? By the mass of those who write other than fact and make up what they want to have believed? Most by far of what has been written about the assassination is shoddy, including the Kurtz book, so he is hardly informed enough to know what is and what is not "shoddy."

Kurtz again demonstrates his ignorance of the official "solution" and what it requires as he does his ignorance of shooting rifles: "P. 92, 2nd Par., II. 4-5- 'If a shot comes prior to 210 Oswald could not physically have fired it.' This is not true. He could have fired through the leaves of the oak tree. The gusty wind could have blown the leaves ^{out} of his line of sight. He could have fired from another window."

Imagining and making it up to suit his preconceptions and to ignore what is essential if the Report is to be believed, Kurtz has Oswald firing at random, when he could not sight the rifle because his view of the President was blocked by the dense foliage on that live oak tree. What in his subject-matter ignorance Kurtz also ignores is that if Oswald fired from any other window, all the ballistics evidence would have been different and on that basis alone the Warren report is disproven. He also ignores the fact that photographs prove that most of those other windows were closed and firing through closed windows shatters them.

Kurtz says that Josiah Thompson's Six Seconds in Dallas is "a truly outstanding work." Compared with most of the assassination trash that followed this is true but

with regard to what was new that Thompson brought to light this is not true. Most of his book had been published earlier. What Thompson did that was important was to have excellent artist's duplications of the parts of the Zapruder film that Thompson could not publish because of the copyright and the high costs of permission to use the film. In offering this opinion Kurtz again displays his ignorance of both the established fact of the assassination and of the literature on it.

This is glaringly true of Kurtz's statements in criticism of Wrono's correct statement that "No credible evidence connects him (Oswald) to the assassination." Kurtz ticks off, entirely uncritically and again displaying his ignorance of the official evidence that he avoided in his own work, what superficially would seem to connect Oswald with the assassination, but the actual official evidence is that the rifle was not and could not have been used in the assassination. In what Kurtz ticks off, like Oswald's prints on the rifle [Kurtz does not ~~say~~ say where] and the finding of the shells that had been in that rifle near that sixth-floor window, he fails to connect any of that with the crime, as the actual official evidence also fails to do and more, the actual and ignored official evidence is that the rifle was not and could not have been used in the crime. Interestingly, Kurtz makes no mention here of Exhibit 399, that so-called magical bullet, which was fired from that rifle, but what the Commission says of it is all made up by the Commission and is refuted in the mass of official evidence that is available to those who, unlike Kurtz, take the time and go to the expense and trouble of examining it. Unpleasant as it may be to even consider, the actuality is that that bullet was planted and what the Commission attributes to it ^{the} staff of the Commission just made up in accord with the official preconception which was agreed to, and this exists in that ignored official evidence ^{by} the Kurtzes of assassination mythology. (I published enough of this at the beginning of Never Again! Wrono saw those documents here, as Kurtz could have, and Wrono made copies of them, as Kurtz could have and many others did.)

It is false to say that, as Kurtz says, "Brennan saw Oswald in the sixth floor window just before and during the shooting." Not only is Brennan the most un-dependable of alleged witnesses, when he stated this before the Commission, as in to a degree he did, he was contradicting himself as of the night of the assassination, when he saw Oswald in a police lineup and said Oswald was not the man he said he had seen.

In his next criticism of Wrono Kurtz displays his ignorance of the Zapruder film! He says that "JFK could have heard the sound of the first shot, which missed [as in fact was not true], and raised his arms to protect his face." Aside from whether or not the photographed position of JFK's arms could have protected his face, he never got them higher ^{in front of} than the bottom of his nose and they

were in that fixed position for a relatively long time. He also had one clenched hand in front of the other, which was not a position for protecting the face. See Commission Exhibit 885, Volume XVIII, pp. 1 ff. This, too, is typical of Kurtz. As he made up the nonsense in his book he also makes up his criticisms of Wrone, without regard for the established official fact and generally in contradiction of it. This is not scholarship. It is assassination mythology.

Kurtz's criticism of Wrone's statement ~~that~~ that the so-called magic bullet was a shot from the front include^s his demand that Wrone state "What kind of ^ugun and ammunition were used?" and "where did the bullet go." He says that what Wrone wrote is "Another of those categorical statements."

With no bullet recovered and with the possibility that the shot, which, according to the only witnesses who ^wsaw that wound in the course of their medical efforts and before the body was altered was from the front, exited the back, although there is ~~no~~ known answer to the question Kurtz poses, the obvious possibility is that the bullet exited the back. And there were eyewitnesses ^{on the street and} who testified to seeing a bullet impact ~~behind~~ the limousine.

Kurtz is ludicrous and anything but scholarly and impartial in quoting Wrone as stating that Secret Service agent ~~Walter~~ ^WBennett ^{had} ~~seen~~ ^{saw} the shot hit the President about four inches down from his right shoulder. 'Bennett must have had magical eyes, to be able to see a bullet travelling at more than 2,000fps and see its impact (a tiny 6-7 mm. hole in the back of JFK's suit jacket'." The ^umost obvious refutations of this Kurtz criticism is that when the bullet impacts the impact is visible, with clothing, by the motion of the clothing in reaction to the force of the bullet. What the supposed assassination scholar Kurtz does not say is that a wound at that point on the President's body is confirmed not only by the required official body chart of the autopsy but also by the photographs taken during the autopsy. There is ample other confirmation in the official evidence.

In Kurtz's criticism of what Wrone wrote about the back of the President's head and clothing as depicted in the Zapruder film, which means at the instant of the assassination,, ^ywisely and ^usubject^uatter ignoramus that Kurtz actually is states:"P. 138, II 7-8- 'There is no blood on it [the back of JFK's head] or on the shirt collar.' Wrone cannot see the blood ~~in~~ in those two frames, but the blood is there. The back of the head was drenched with blood, as was the collar (front and rear). H. Weisberg, Post Mortem, pp. 597-8) '." What Kurtz avoids saying is that on those pages I published two photographs one of ^uwhat had been suppressed and I obtained under Foia. While what is important is that deliberately, because Kurtz certainly knew that the body bled after shooting, he misrepresents to make his untrue point seem to be true. Those pictures were taken after the corpse

had been moved and had been in many different positions, which made the blood pattern different, between the time Zapruder shot his film and the time, after the autopsy in suburban Washington, that those pictures were taken by the FBI.

It also is not true, as a glance at those pictures makes clear, that the collar was "drenched" with blood. Part of it has no blood at all on it and the other half has a few small spots on it. Both collar ends have blood on them but it cannot be said truthfully that the right side, as word, is "drenched" in blood.

What the supposed assassination expert, Kurtz, does not mention that the suppressed FBI picture of the front of the shirt proves that the official account of the assassination is false. In the official story a bullet entered the President's back and exited through his shirt collar and the knot of the tie. But, and this is quite clear, there are no bullet holes in either the collar or the tie.

Next Kurtz observes that saying that William Manchester lied is "potentially libelous". What he does not say is that if it is true that Manchester lied, it is not libelous. *Kurtz does not offer proof of libel, as he never does - and cannot.*

Kurtz is so driven to be critical of ^{be} Wrono that he is driven to question Zapruder's credibility. The only argument that Kurtz presents is that many of those who reported what they said they saw in Dallas that day "presented clearly erroneous account." This is always true but that many were not dependable does not mean that all were. Those many also did not have their eye on a lens that was focused on the President, with his camera magnifying as I recall by four times. Zapruder was one of the first actual eyewitnesses questioned by the federal agents and by the police and his account has always been the same. If Kurtz were not, and for the responsibility he accepted this cannot be emphasized too much, a subject-matter ignoramus, he would have known the the Zapruder credibility, of the ample confirmation of what he said and that despite the considerable effort to get him to change what he said. In fact, despite the importance of his film, he was not questioned by the Warren Commission until the month after it had planned to publish its Report- and then he was deposed in Dallas, with no member of the Commission present, with only the Commission lawyer, Liebeler, and the court reporter in the room with Zapruder.

Under "P. 147 - 1st. Par" Kurtz says "There is no evidence that the sound of a shot caused Zapruder to jiggle the camera at 190. In fact, the film contains numerous jiggles, so numerous that if each resulted from the reaction to a shot, the assassin(s) must have been firing a machine gun..." Here Kurtz presents ^{himself} as a psychiatrist and an expert on shock reactions and the time they take. Or even if they are repeated. There is "evidence" that the shot caused a visible, a jiggle reactions. There is reason to believe that. What Kurtz really means is that there is no proof of it and that matter not having been tested at trial there is

no proof. There is, however, ample reason to believe it. It is also repeated, after some of his students got copies of Whitewash in 1966 and questioned him about what I said in the first published reference to that jiggling, by the Nobel Laureate Alvarez, in response to his students' questions. This is well known and it is reasonable to believe that Kurtz also knew it, but he had no reason to believe that the University of Kansas press or any other reviewer would know that so he ~~said~~ ^{said} it because he just has to put Wrone down, Wrone not having had any use for Kurtz's book. And more than that in their history.

Kurtz also criticized Wrone for saying that in the official ~~the~~ "solution" Oswald had to be "firing through the glass" (P. 156 - Par. 1.5.) Kurtz then says that "The Warren Commission specifically said that Oswald sat or knelt when he fired and that he did not fire through glass." What Kurtz does not say is that the Commission's star witness, Brennan, also testified that he saw the rifleman standing up. We do not know how familiar, if at all familiar, Kurtz is with the actual Commission evidence, but we do know from his "review" that he is familiar with Whitewash, my 1965 first book. On page 207 of Whitewash I reprint an FBI picture ~~taken~~ ^{taken} for the Commission and published by it. That picture makes clear what Kurtz does not mention, how unusual that window and the others like it in the TSED really is.

The cartoned boxes of books that were there at the time of the assassination have been removed for this picture. Not "sniper's den" in it. Those cartons would have prevented any shooting from the kneeling or sitting position (See Whitewash, pages 204-5 for other official pictures of that window and that window area taken on 11/22/63 and known to Kurtz, according to Kurtz himself.)

Returning to the Commission picture of that window opened as photographs of the moment of the assassination depict, the sill is only about a foot above the floor and the wall is that thick. It would have been a physical impossibility to have even aimed the rifle at the president with the rifleman sitting or on his knees. If, with the length of his leg about twenty inches and with his face blocked partly from the telescopic sight by the bottom of the half-railed window the assassin could have aimed, he would have had to have most of his rifle outside the window and clearly visible with two shots to be fired after the first one, which did attract much attention. And remember, according to Brennan, regarded by Kurtz as a dependable witness, the man he claimed to have seen with a rifle was standing, and Brennan is the Commission's only claimed eyewitness. That meant the rifle had to have been entirely inside the building and not visible to those on the ground and that it had to have fired that bullet through both the upper and the lower halves of that window, or through two panes of glass.

Lacking a factual basis for his criticism but driven to be critical, Kurtz makes it up, depending on the fact that the UKP and the other reviewer lack this kind of detailed knowledge of the actual fact.

Kurtz cites what Wrono said about Gerald Posner, that he "lied," as "libelous?" Saying that Posner lied is far from libelous. I said much more than that about him, including that he plagiarized, in Case Open, and there has not been even an unofficial complaint from Posner, his publisher or his publisher's lawyer. Still again, Kurtz reflects his ignorance of the assassination except as he can twist the actual evidence to suit his playing of Sherlock Holmes returned. In what Wrono wrote it is correct to state, as Wrono does, that Posner lied. His other criticisms of Posner are truthful and are not libelous. This raises the question, is Kurtz this much of a subject-matter ignorant or is he this dishonest in his criticism that recommend against publication of the book without the introduction into it of what Kurtz believes and wrote and is not true.

"P. 162, 3rd Par., 1. 4 - 'a man without a ^{say} ~~sole~~.' This is hardly a scholarly judgement. A Higher Authority than David Wrono must judge the status of Posner's ~~soul~~. Only because he agrees with so much of Posner's ^{his and Wrono's} fictions or because from their past disagreement or because of his desire for attention can Kurtz say this. What Posner did is as reprehensible as it can be. He whored with our history for profit and glory and the reputation it got him for the future. He did this with what is perhaps the most subversive of crimes in a society like ours, what is a de facto coup d'etat, and he included ^{plagiarism} in the means he used, ^{and} plagiarism, which is thievery. Whether or not Kurtz agrees with Posner, this is a forced criticism of Wrono and for that a legitimate scholar, if not on ~~the~~ the assassination, has to have some inspiration or objective.

Next Kurtz objects to Wrono referring to the "Liver Stone movie, JFK, as of "80% false" in content. Kurtz then asks, "where is the documentation?" In this he ignores the Wrono footnote, to my extensive files on the Wrono movie. So, in asking the question Kurtz knew the answer. And if he had kept up on the controversy over the film, I began it. Not because I do not believe that Stone had the right to say whatever he wanted to say. It was because in announcing his film Stone told the country that in it he would tell the people "who killed their President, why and how." That is a total impossibility. I objected to Stone's lying to the people about what he would be producing. More because of his announced major sources. One was the Jim Garrison book, On the "Trail of the Assassins" and the other was the Marr fantasy titled "Conspiracy." I was there and I was involved in some of what Garrison wrote about, as cannot be determined for the Garrison book, his book on the one trail he never took, of the assassins.

It is not possible to speak too unkindly about what Garrison said and did and he would have done even worse if some of his staff had not enlisted my help in preventing what they had failed to keep him from doing. This and more like it is in those files that Wrone used and cited and Kraft pretends has no source. That cited source is a file drawer in length.

Marr, whose work has Kraft's approval, does not even pretend to be an expert on the assassination. His claimed expertise is on the so-called "theories," and he can't even keep them straight, as his book proves. Marr is not a legitimate source on anything related to the assassination. I knew his book would be so ~~bad~~ ^{bad} I declined a fat fee for a peer review of it because I knew the assassination nuts would be outraged and would try to make my life miserable. They'd have made it unpleasant. (Marr's more recent claim to expertise is on flying saucers.)

Kraft says that the second paragraph on page 164 ~~is~~ refers to the Stone film as "pro-establishment." There is not a single word that can fairly and honestly be so interpreted. But the film's attention in the major media did assure that it would attract large audiences and make money. (Which Wrone does not say.) That Stone was critical of the FBI and the Warren Commission does not mean he was anti-establishment or pro-establishment in it. Certainly ~~Kraft~~ ^{Kurtz} cites not a word in support of this made-up criticism.

At "P. 175, 1st Par., 1,9- 'Willis # 5 shows ~~that~~ JFK hit' It does no such thing. Willis #5 shows JFK from the rear, with only the top of the shoulders and the back of the head visible. No response to a shot is evident on the slide, even under 5x magnification." Here ~~Kraft~~ ^{Kurtz} exploits a typographical error that is contradicted by the full paragraph. Wrone meant to say something like "Willis #5 shows when JFK was hit," and that, without question, it does. That Willis picture, which by the agreement of the Commission and Willis, was taken in reaction to that shot, when Willis had not even had time to refocus his camera, by itself disproves the Warren report because it destroys what the Commission and its staff made up in making up the myth of the "missed" or the "magic bullet." With JFK shot before frame 210, as this one ^{slide} Willis film proves, destroys the Warren Report and the case against Oswald. As Kurtz knew, Wrone did write that "at 202 the camera comes down from his eye." Wrone then wrote that frame 203 was blurred and at frames 203, 204, 205 and 206 "the camera clearly continues to descend." This, of course, is the opposite of what Wrone wrote by mistake, a typographical error. But rather than missing another entirely unjustified basis for his criticism of what Wrone wrote, Kraft makes a big thing of the obvious typographical error. This, too, gives an insight into the Kraft mind and intention. What is obvious from all of what Wrone did write about this is not that the President was hit in the fifth Willis picture but that the picture is proof that the President was hit

before Willis took that picture.

Kraft objects to ~~XXXXXX~~ "P. 171, 1st Par., 173 - ' the dove JFK... the hawk LBJ' This is Wrones opinion. JFK nearly ~~de~~abled national defense spending, authorized the Bay of Pigs invasion... presided over the militant Operation ~~Mongoose~~MONGOOSE against Cuba, rattled sabres with Khrushchev in the Cuban Missile Crisis and approved (through Bobby) the repeated CIA/Mafia assassination plots against Castro - hardly a dove."

In ~~this~~ Kraft flouts either his deliberate dishonesty or his ignorance of the field of his specialty, history. He also does not understand that there were two Kennedy Presidencies, with the radical change coming with that unprecedented crisis of that missile crisis. It had Kennedy and Khrushchev not "rattling ~~sabres~~ their "sabres " but in desperation and in haste groping for a solution to that crisis that would keep them ^{their} at the ~~same~~ sides, not in hand, and in that terrible crisis, with a potential for death and destruction like nothing in history, they were both doves, no longer hawks.

What ~~Kraft~~ ^{Kraft} quotes is hardly a fair reflection of the actual Wrones paragraph. What ~~Kraft~~ ^{Kraft} wrote is also false, as he should have known if he is a real historian. Eisenhower ^{did} "authorize" the Bay of Pigs. Kennedy, when he had no real alternative and was seeking an alternative, did not cancel it. He inherited what Eisenhower created and as the historical record shows, did that and other things like it with the intention of leaving Kennedy no choice and with the responsibility for what the Eisenhower administration did.

It is false, from the available official record entirely false, that either through his brother or in any other way John Kennedy "approved" what Kraft refers to as "the repeated CIA- Mafia assassination plots against Castro." The proof that this is all false is in the disclosed JFK assassination record, what was disclosed to me by the Justice Department going automatically into the public reading rooms. It is also included in the annual State Department publication of official records.

First of all, Mongoose was not, as Kraft implies, a plan for killing Castro.

The CIA- Mafia plots were authorized by the Eisenhower administration. The ~~xxxxxx~~ first was authorized the August before Kennedy was elected, so he could not have "authorized" it. The second, and despite Kraft's ^{overwriting} only two such plots have been acknowledged, was by the CIA without any additional "authorization."

That Kraft could be so dishonest or so ignorant of his own field of expertise raises the most substantial questions about whether his word can be taken for anything on this subject.

There is what has to be regarded as deliberate Kraft dishonesty in "P. 173 - last sentence- 'Academics, lawyers and congressmen uttered not a single word [critical of

the government's lone assassin theory]] "This is simply not true."

It also is not what Wrone wrote!

What he wrote about in that paragraph is, Wrone's words, not Kraft's corruption of them, "the deliberate and sustained corruption of the file evidence by a federal commission investigating ~~the~~ a presidential assassination." Wrone then said that "would have been a great scandal." These are in the second and third lines of that paragraph. There is no reference to the "government's lone assassin theory" in this paragraph. And that was, of course, to Kraft's knowledge when he inserted what has to be regarded as a deliberate and intended defamatory lie instead of ~~WRONE'S~~ Wrone's own words.

The rest of Kraft's criticism is, of course, entirely irrelevant, although Kupferman was not reelected, as the chairman of the Senate's first intelligence committee, the Church ^{committee,} also was not reelected.

Like so much if this, it is not honest criticism.

Kraft criticized Wrone for saying that since 1959 Oswald had fired ~~weapons~~ ^{weapons} only twice. He asks, "How does Wrone know?" He adds that "There is evidence that someone closely resembling Oswald fired a European weapon ~~at~~ at a Dallas shooting range shortly before the assassination."

The number of people who fired a European weapon at a Dallas shooting range must be rather large, but there is no identification of any rifle in referring to it as "a European weapon," of which, in manufacture ~~rather~~ ^{rather} than in identification there are quite many. And if ~~Kraft~~ ^{Kurtz} does not know that what Wrone says is what the Commission also said, he is spending more time on his theorizing than in scholarship. If there is any legitimate complain about this rather ~~significant~~ matter it would be to say that the source should be indicated.

In ~~Kraft's~~ ^{Kurtz's} criticism of what Wrone ~~says~~ says in the first paragraph he lies about me and forces me to defend myself with criticism of ~~Kraft~~ ^{Kurtz}. If he were forced to defend himself on this criticism, as is true of much if not most of it, he ~~would~~ ^{would} find that impossible. He could not with fact rather than fancy, show what fact about the assassination and its official investigations the ~~six~~ authors, including himself, brought to light rather than in their writing repeating what had already been published. The AHA review of Kurtz's book is informative on this. Some have published the wildest fantasies and some are, literally, irrational, just plain crazy. The Lifton book had the largest sale and what it says that is fact about the assassination and its investigation had all been published years earlier, but Lifton would have it believed that he discovered sex and invented the wheel. What the assassination nut, like ~~Kraft~~ ^{Kurtz}, who is one, like about the Lifton book is his ~~impossibly~~ ^y fantasy that the President's body was kidnapped and altered

before it reached the Bethesda navy hospital, an absolute impossibility at each point in the Lifton fabrication. But if Kraft can consider the monstrous fabrication as adding "immeasurably to our knowledge," his words, he is not qualified for the ^{review} responsibility he assumed.

Hurt's book is largely a rehash of what had been published earlier. He asked me to read and comment on the chapters as he wrote them. Hurt's addition to "our knowledge of the assassination" is in his own and also totally impossible fabrication, the last part that he did not ask me to read and ^{d/}comment on in advance.

Or, Hurt added nothing that is factual and correct to what we know. This is true of all those Kraft names and he cannot defend his opinion, which is the basis of his criticism. Anyone who can read Livingstone's virulent denunciations of those who refuse to appoint King of the assassination hill is the victim of his virulent fabrications, ^{what} that the average high school student should be able to recognize as not factual, not true. "Nobody is more libellous, literally libelous, in writing in this field than Livingstone but Kraft approves his writing and does not refer to it as libelous, as he does to Wrono's, ^{which} that is not libelous.

In his continued personal attacks on me and my writing, ^{Kurtz} Kraft says that in footnote 7 on page 207 "Wrono claims that 'Weisberg's Whitewash is infallible. This is an outrageously false claim, originally made by Weisberg. His works, all of them contain numerous errors and inaccuracies. This is not intended to attack Weisberg." If it does not have that intent, why does ^{Kurtz} Kraft, who poses as an expert and writes as though he has knowledge of those allegedly "numerous errors and inaccuracies," include ^{even one alleged} an illustration of this serious charge to make about any works of nonfiction. Not only can Kraft not do this, he also misrepresents ^{Wrono} what ~~Kraft~~ really wrote to be able to indulge his nastiness, not scholarship.

What Wrono actually wrote is, "6 The best responsible examination of the Report is by Harold Weisberg, ~~is by Harold Weisberg,~~ ^{Kurtz} Whitewash (Frederick, MD, by the author, 1965), in which, after thirty-four years no error has been found."

What Wrono wrote is, literally, true, and ^{Kurtz} Kraft himself fails to note any such error. On all the years since that book appeared, not a single one of those of whom my books are severely critical in any Commission, committee or executive agency, has called or written me to complain that I was unfair or inaccurate in what I wrote of him.

This was not as hard for me as it was impossible for ^{Kurtz} Kraft in his own book because I did no theorizing and stuck to the official fact. Which almost nobody else, conspicuously ^{Kurtz} Kraft, did.

In saying that as a scholar Wrono eschews the theoretical in favor of the

assassination for what others make up Wrone has "tunnel vision," ^{Kurtz} is actually referring to what he does in ~~the~~ this supposed review, and in saying the others he has in mind made "equally significant contributions" he is equating fact with fiction which, without exception, is what all those he named did include. But ^{Kurtz} Kraft is so unfamiliar with those other works he does not even have the name of one of the wildest of those subject-matter ignoramuses, ^{right} ~~wrote~~. The name is not Felzer. It is Fetzer, and he also is a professional scholar. But not on the assassination or on its investigations.

^{Fetzer} He is one of the more ignorant, and in not recognizing this Kraft is again demonstrating that he is not up to the responsibility he undertook.

In the direct quotation of what Wrone actually wrote, it is apparent that Kraft could not quote it and then say what he did. So, he made up what he could misuse to deceive and mislead the Kansas University Press. I never claimed that I was infallible and I am aware of a few mistakes, very few, in all that I have written, but none is a serious factual error and what is perhaps the most significant of that few is in a direct-facsimile - use of an FBI report in which that mistake is made. It is conspicuous that in not a single one of his criticisms of me and my work does Kurtz include a single citation or example ^{or any proof of any kind.}

^{Kurtz} Kraft next says that, on page 208, Wrone is wrong in saying that the Commission never said that the second shot missed. In fact, while this may be literally true, the entire ^Rreport is built on the statement that the second shot did miss. Without that there could not have been the Report that was issued. It is not possible for an open and honest mind to read the two pages of the Report that Wrone cites without this being stated clearly enough, as Wrone writes that it does. If ^{Kurtz} Kraft read the source cited, he could not possibly ~~have~~ had an honest intention in his criticism. It cannot be missed, beginning with the first sentence on those cited pages,

^{Kurtz's} Kraft's criticism of what Wrone wrote in the first paragraph ^{of} page 213 can be made only by one who is a subject-matter ignoramus. Here ^{Kurtz} Kraft poses as a lawyer in saying that what Wrone wrote is "potentially libelous statements." Here, as he does consistently, ^{Kurtz} Kraft offers not only no proof but no reason to believe it. Truthful criticism is not libel. It if were the entire staff of the Commission and innumerable FBI agents would have sued me and ruined me.

Knowing full well that considerations of libel are severely troubling to any publisher, Kraft says that what Wrone wrote on page 214 is "Potentially libelous statements." To anyone not hung up on the wild theories about the assassination and not firmly based in the established and irrefutable fact, of which there is much, the ^{Kurtz} Kraft warning, which can be fairly interpreted as a

threat, what Wrone actually wrote is fair, is factually correct, and in no way does ^{Kurtz} Kraft justify his threat to the potential publisher that he will be sued if he publishes what Wrone wrote.

^{Kurtz} Kraft is critical of Wrone for what ^{Kurtz} Kraft says Wrone wrote on page 238, and Wrone did not say that, ^{Kurtz} Kraft's words of his criticism ^{are} that Zapruder "is an infallible witness." ^{Kurtz asks} ~~Kraft~~ as why Zapruder is infallible, which is the wrong question. What is correct is that he had by far the best view of what happened because his eye was ^{focused} focused on the President through the magnification of his zoom lens. As I recall the magnification was four times and his lens was focused at all times on the President. This ^{criticism} is at best petty stuff. Indulging in this kind of contrived criticism reflects Kraft's real intentions in what he says. It is because he has his own intentions that he is without citation to or quotation ⁱⁿ of a single one of his criticisms of ^{me} ~~me~~ and my writing.

That Kraft has improper objectives and is making up baseless criticisms if only to increase his volume of them is again illustrated in what he next says: "P. 332, 2nd Par. - 'He shot cold, not having fired a rifle in four years.' Wrone does not know this." But if Kraft were as familiar with the official evidence as he pretends, he would know that this is what the Warren Commission's records say. Without any disproof of which I know.

In his next criticism, on the same page, Kraft again raises questions about his subject-matter knowledge or his honesty in his "review." Literally, Kurtz lies in: "P. 332, 3rd Par. - 'The Aberdeen tests proved ~~that~~ ... that a conspiracy killed JFK.' No. These were ballistics tests, whose results are subject to opinion." [This is ~~an~~ an additional, a separate lie.] The director of the Aberdeen tests, Dr. Alfred Olivier, specifically testified that the single bullet was possible." ^{charge of those tests} Wrone's summary of the results of those tests is accurate, and from what he has cited, ^{Kurtz} Kraft knew that. So, he does not quote ~~Wrone~~ what Wrone said and instead quotes Wrone's summary. ^{Kurtz} If Kraft had quoted Wrone fully he would not have dared this deliberate effort to prevent publication of the ^{book} ~~book~~ and to seem to puff himself up as the expert he is not.

The first publication of the results of those tests is in the first of the Whitewash series, the 1965 book about which, without a single specification or a single citation Kraft has had much that is critical of it to say, on page 26. It cites sources if Kraft was at all interested in truth and he could have checked those sources. Later, when I had more time and more space I went into that in greater detail. I attach copies of both because ^{Kurtz} what I published later, in NEVER AGAIN!, ^{Kurtz's} omits what is ~~not~~ relevant to the point I was making and is true despite this unpardonable departure from the straight and narrow and the accepted standards of scholarship by Kurtz.

Kurtz says that Dr. Olivier was in charge of these ballistics tests, test to determine whether the shooting of the single-bullet theory was possible. He knew that when he ~~was~~ made up his entirely baseless criticism of what Wrone wrote. Olivier was in wounds, he headed wounds ballistee, as he testified. But Ronald Simmons was in charge of those tests, as he testified and as if Kraft had done the basic, the absolute minimum of real resaearch he would have known. In his testimony in Volume V of the Commission's hearings Simmons identified himself as "the Chief of the Infantry Weapons Branch of the Ballistics Research Laboratory of the Department of the Army" (attached page 441 of his testimony). Toward the bottom of page 442 Simmons testified that he had those test firing made. It was Simmons, not Olivier, who provided the Commission with the results of those tests, as quoted in NEVER AGAIN!

It is also a lie to says, as ~~Kraft~~^{Kurtz} does in his completely fabricatod opinion of what Wrone wrote, that those results "are subject to opinion." They are not if honesty is intended and to say they are is to impose upon the ~~trust~~^{truth} of those who are not subject -matter experts and seek the ~~trust~~^{truth} from reviewers.

At the least ~~Kraft~~^{Kurtz} is soon claiming expertise and knowledge he does not have and fabricates an opinion without the knowledge necessary for that opinion. In this he fabricates an entirely unfactual and unjustified ~~of~~^{criticism} of what Wrone used of what is uniquely my work. The beginning of it in on the inside back cover of Whitewash II. While in that I used an inaccurate FBI report as the basis of the evidence that it is Oswald in the ~~Altgens~~^{Altgens} picture, it was not, as Kraft says, that identification is by the face. When that Altgens picture is enlarged it can be believed ^{from the face} that the man in the doorway is either Oswald or Lovelady. But ~~despite~~ despite making little of it, what is definitive in making the identification is the short on that man.

Just as Photographic Whitewas^h was to have been published, all but the index having been printed, Lovelady's wife called me to say that on the day of the assassination her husband had not worn the shirt the FBI said he did. I printed an account of her call on page 294, in the space available at the end of that index. She told me that he had worn a shirt with large red and black checks and she tried to sell it to me for \$5,000.00.

When CBS-TV was preparing an assassination ^{ec} special, one of the producers of that show, Bob Richter, came to see me. What he asked was suggestions of what could make them good photo material and I suggested that he pose Lovelady in the shirt he was really wearing that day, where the government says he was in the doorway and from approximately the position in which Altgens was when he took that picture. Richter did photograph Livelady in that shirt and in those approximate positions.

in that doorway. The shirt is exactly what Mrs. Lovelady described.

Knowing that there was such a shirt I then tried to figure out what unknown or little-known pictures could have included that door way at or near the time of the assassination. I fixed on the first of the amateur films by those who organized themselves into The Dallas Cinema Associates to be able to sell their films, one of the 8mm reels taken by a man named Martin and whose pictures of the doorway are overexposed. But examination of that overexposed footage disclosed that short on a man who looks very much like Lovelady. That shirt cannot be the shirt on the man in the doorway in the Altgens picture and that shirt, in the Altgens pictures, has a pattern identical with the shirt Oswald was wearing when he was arrested. There is no proof that it was Lovelady in that picture and there is this reason to believe that it was Oswald.

There are other reasons to believe that it was Oswald, some of which I published and for Kurtz to say what he does about my writing he has to know of that FBI evidence which I published in facsimile, in Photographs Whitewash in particular, on pages 204-210 and 211. There are others who said they saw Oswald on the first floor just minutes before the actual firing, very few minutes. Kurtz's last criticism here is, "P. 404, 2nd Par.- Once again, Weisberg was not perfect and infallible. He made mistakes."

This does not make a case that anything Wrote wrote about "i. Harold Weisberg's Whitewash" is factually incorrect. It is not scholarly and it is not what should be expected in a review for a potential publisher. It is an unwarranted nastiness, not scholarship, in which Kurtz indulges for his own reasons and prejudices and it is less than a publisher needs for making a decision to publish or not to publish.

I have taken this extra time when I am past 86 and in bad health and rather feeble and limited because for the past seven years I have been using what time remains for me to making as much of a record for history as I can about the extremes of both sides in the controversy over the assassination in which I am the lonely man in the middle. Despite my feebleness I have, in unedited rough draft form, more than two dozen book-length manuscripts. Several are about 200,000 words long. After that review of Kurtz's assassination trash, a work that would disgrace a proud writer and does disgrace a professional historian, I ignored Kurtz and did not take time for a fair representation of what he and his book are. So, to a degree, this can also substitute for that. Thanks to Kurtz's personal excesses and departures from what is traditional in prepublication reviews, he makes the case that for whatever reason he is a deliberate liar. While this is a harsh comment, it is more than justified when what he has done has the

clear intent of discouraging publication of the book Wrone wrote.

It also is less than honest for Kraft to keep secret from Kansas that he and Wrone were involved in controversy many years ago, as they were at a Southern Historical Association convention in New Orleans. There Kurtz wanted to prevent the appearance of anyone who did not agree with his preconceptions of the assassination and its investigations.

If there are any ^Wquestions about this I will do my best to ^Wanswer them, as I will if any questions are prompted by this. I am not in a position to make a duplicate of that frame of the Martin DCA film but anyone who wants to can examine it and the Richter slide here. My xerox does not reproduce colors so that the checks are red and black will not be seen in a xerox.

Kraft ends with a list of works that he says discuss the Zapruder film. He does not make out any kind of case that those he lists, including his own, are by those with subject-matter expertise. Many are very poor, sometimes ludicrous works and one of those he recommends was the subject of a libel suit for its misinterpretation of the Zapruder film. The publisher settled, out of court, the suit by retired Secret Service agent Hickey who, ^Wsuch being the authors' expertise, ^Wclaimed that by accident an agent killed Kennedy.

Bonar Henninger is the ghost writer of Mortal Error, which that book is!

First of the expert authorities in ^{run 7/31}Kraft's Multimedia list is the comedian Dick Gregory. *a real scholar, a real authority!*

Kraft also includes gossip and ^Wdependable authority, as in criticising Wrone for not using, "COPA, Video Tapes of Annual Gingerences." His last words highlight his irresponsibility and his addiction to the assassination nuttiness of so many who imagine ^Wthemselves, as does ^WKraft, as Sherlock Holmes reborn: "Wrone should also run extensive searches on www search engines. Alta Vista alone has over 4,000 bits for 'Zapruder Film.'"

Alta Vista and www are responsible, dependable sources on such a subject?

This is the opposite of a scholarly approach.

I also note that there are other videos that Kurtz omits because they do not ^{TV}go for his fabrications and imaginings. One won the highest ^Whonor in the history division, the Golden Eagle. But that is not good enough for Kraft when he can complain because all the fabrications and imaginings he refers to were not used by Wrone.

It is conspicuous, and this bears on ^{Kurtz's}Kraft's professionalism ^Wis not also on his honesty, that for all his contrived criticisms of me and of my work he cites not a single illustration of his fabrications, none being possible or he would have used them, and ^Wcites not a single page as even illustrative of his made-up criticisms.

The anonymous review

This is a fair commentary and it lacks the prejudice of Kurtz's but while all that is says appears to be reasonable, it in fact undescroes the basic ~~fact~~, fact, that there are remarkably few people in the country who have taken the time to read all the extensive material necessary to a basic understanding of the realities and can know whether a belief or a conjecture is supported by the official fact. Some of this basic fact is hard for a professional scholar to believe because the real story of the assassination and its investigations is without precedent. For example, neither of these reviewers states or reflects any understanding of the fact that in our society an assassination of any President is a de facto coup d'etat. If the assassination has no such intent it does have that result. That was true when Johnson, who held many beliefs that were not Kennedy's, became President. ^{Johnson} ~~he~~ also believed that there had been a conspiracy and this is recorded in the disclosed official fact. But as is little known and not mentioned by either reviewer, he agreed on the night of the second day after the assassination to it being assumed that Oswald was the lone assassin and that without any real investigation having been possible for the government to say that the evidence ^{then} it had proved Oswald was the lone assassin when it had no such evidence— not then and not when the Commission issued its Report. In fact, it was never possible to place Oswald at the place from which the shots were alleged to have come at the time when they were fired, and he was not there then. The government never had a case that it could have dared take to court and this is without question, although the proofs are buried in the great mass of official ^{assassination} records most of which have nothing at all to do with the crime. I have copies of some of this documentation separated for copying and I would suggest that it be used in facsimile to make that information more readily available. I believe it has never been disclosed in facsimile and has rarely been mentioned in the media.

The reviewer's observation that Wronc did not conduct interviews of Church ^{const} committed house assassins committee staffs is correct but the reviewer appears not to have understood that Wronc limited himself to the official record and not the opinions of those who had their own and their committees' pasts to defend. With the Church committee the assassination subcommittee was headed by Senator Schweiker. The other member, Senator Hart, had nothing at all to do with it. Schweiker was dominated by the theories none of which had any validity in the existing, available and official fact and he ignored this existing evidence in pursuit of his fantasy. And got nowhere with all that silliness.

Finding out the truth is ~~more~~ more difficult now than the author would have

us believe. Wrone did not undertake to address the whole proof of the assassination. His is a study of the importance of the Zapruder film, of one aspect of the assassination and its investigations, one aspect that has never been addressed as he has, with the inclusiveness and the detail and the documentation of that important assassination evidence. But the fact is that as almost none who have written about the assassination understand, it is not possible for private persons to now investigate the assassination because the crime itself was never officially investigated. There is documentation of this and as suggested above, some of it might well be included, in facsimile.

The reviewer's illustrations of what he terms purple prose that are, on their face, reasonable, reflect the lack of knowledge of the extensive official fact, one of the problems created by massive investigation of the irrelevant that created a mass of irrelevant records and by the mass alone ~~were~~ ^{was} an effective denial of access.

The first is Wrone's statement that "the Church committee 'permanently dishonored the nation'." This refers to the Schweiker subcommittee and when only its interpretation of its obligations is considered the Wrone comment is not excessive. Schweiker began with impossible but attractive preconceptions and nothing else and went nowhere, going anywhere with those ~~notions~~ ^{baseless} being impossible.

The second illustration is of the attribution of shame to the CIA and an argument against believing this is that Wrone "claims that the CIA provided a strong criticism of the Warren Commission Report." That proof was not given to the Commission but was withheld by ~~the~~ the CIA until its disclosure was compelled by the Rockefeller commission. That Commission, headed by the former Commission assistant counsel, David Belin, in turn suppressed that proof. I did obtain it and I did publish it in facsimile in the 1976 reprint of "Photographic Whitewash" on pages 295 following.

This reviewer misunderstood what Wrone was saying in his comment that professors have been unwilling to criticize ^{ze} the government. Wrone did not mean it as a general statement. He meant as criticism related to the assassination and its investigations, and that is a true, an unexaggerated statement.

The reviewer believes that many professors "have failed to resolve the matter not for the lack of trying but because the discovery of convincing evidence has proven virtually impossible." This is a reasonable presumption but very few professors have made the effort and the few who have asked questions of me or have used the archive ^{make} freely available to all did not believe the official "solution" to begin with. However, other than in solving the crime, "the discovery of convincing evidence" that the government did not do

what the country expected it to do and that it did not solve the crime is so readily available that I have printed nine books on that, with hundreds of pages in facsimile, including records that were officially suppressed, ~~like~~ like those referred to above ~~and~~ like the death certificate. Imagine that in an investigation of a ~~murder~~ the official certificate of death was not only suppressed from twenty-one large volumes, it was hidden ^{in the files} so that researchers could not find it by a diligent search for it!

The reviewer's belief that there should be "added thought to the quick dismissal of a possible Cuban ⁹connection" illustrates how little understanding of the basic fact there is even among the better informed ^{of it}. For there to have been a Cuban connection that "connection" had to be able to do much more than shoot the President and much more than get away. That was impossible for Cuba or for most countries. Besides which no country would have even ^{dreamed} ~~dreamed~~ of using an Oswald as an assassin. He was, despite all the obfuscation, so poor a shot years earlier that ^{his} friends in the Marines testified that they credited him with hits when he missed in their target shooting. And even then Oswald was only a single point above the minimum required of all in the military. The corps' commandant rated Oswald as a "rather poor shot," as ~~Stro~~ ^{Stro}ne did report. But even more important is the fact that beginning with the solution to the Cuba missile crisis of October, 1962, not only what there considerable change in the policies of the Kennedy administration, that solution guaranteed Castro and Cuba against any invasion. That was a protection Khrushchev could not provide and his inability to provide that is what led to the introduction of Soviet missiles into Cuba. Castro would have had to be an idiot to kill his only real protection in the entire world! That solution was that the United States would protect Cuba against any invasion.

Senator Russell did believe that there might have been a Communist connection, as what Johnson said can be interpreted as meaning, but they knew only what they were given and aside from any preconceptions they may have had what was given to them led them to ^{these} ~~not~~ other beliefs. Neither was given all that was obtained, not any of the information that established the impossibility of the assassination having been a Cuban job.

On the Russell "terminally ill" comment, Russell had emphysema and there was no ^{known} ~~known~~ cure for it. But it does not kill instantly. It takes years. And as he told and wrote me, it limited what he could undertake after he knew how the Commission had violated its agreed-to procedures and had eliminated from its records the record of his disagreement he was making for history, for Senator Cooper and for himself. I also have documentation of this ^{from} ~~for~~ the Russell archive

at the University of Georgia at Athens. It is suitable for facsimile reproduction if the University of Georgia's permission is obtained. It includes an eloquent oral history by Senator Cooper/.

In the recommended use of picture, with which I agree, that use requires copyright permission and with the Zapruder family that means a very high cost, which is what they charge.

An illustration of how little the most intelligent have been able to learn about the actualities of the assassination and its investigation, this reviewer is "inclined to accept the unofficial conclusion of the House Select Committee ~~on~~ staff director that Oswald killed JFK under mob direction and with help." The fact is that Robert Blakey began with the presumption the assassination was a mob job and despite the great effort he made to prove it came up blank, there being, in fact, no reason even to suspect that the mafia had the President killed. Not in the established official fact. It is illustrative of the realities that are almost entirely unknown that the MSCA did not even get from the FBI, and this means after in FOIA litigation I had forced them into the public domain, anything like the volume of those FBI assassination records I had made public. I do not not have access to the files in which the FBI report on what the MSCA got from it but my recollection is that it got almost as many mafia records as it those said to be on the assassination. And those it got on the assassination were not much more than half of what I had obtained by that litigation.

The grim realities are not what an authentic and informed scholar would expect them to be- should be entitled to expect them to ~~be~~ be.

Thus, for example, the abundant criticism of government by scholars on other subjects is assume to be their criticism on this subject, and that is not what the record shows.

If this book is published ~~Wrong~~ will be only the third person who published a book about the assassination that is devoid of theorizing and restricts itself entirely or almost entirely to the official fact of the official investigations- and about which officialdom was often not correct in interpretation of it or in the meaning given to it.

While this may be hard to believe, that it is the fact is that all I printed on this in all those volumes is what the official record actually says and despite the uninformed slurs by Kraft, who confuses his likes and dislikes with evidence, with the passing of thirty-five years since the publication of my first book, not one of the Commission or of its staff, or of that House committee or its staff, has written or phoned me to complain that I was unfair or inaccurate in what I wrote about him. This, not the Kurtz fabrications, is the fact. It reflects the reality.