

Mr. Michael Briggs, editor-in-chief
University Press of Kansas
2501 W. 15St.,
Lawrence, KS 66049-3905 FAX 785-864-4154

Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr. Briggs,

On Saturday, the eighth, I received from Dale Wrone a copy of your letter to him of the third and copies of the Kurtz and the anonymous reviews of his book. He sought my advice on his response. I read what he sent me later that day and prepared a rough draft, which with me means a very rough draft, on Sunday, the ninth. It is more than twenty pages. On Monday, as I do on Wednesday and Friday, the first six hours of the day was taken by kidney dialysis. It weakens me and all I could do after that was write a ~~much~~^{much} shorter comment on the anonymous review, which is of an entirely different nature. I have not yet had time to read and correct it and forward both to Wrone. I go into time restrictions on me because you seem to have a deadline only ten days away and aside from being enfeebled by my age, I am almost 87, I also have a much more feeble wife to care for as best I can-she is much more limited in her capabilities and we live in the country. Today, at 7:45 a.m., I will be driven to the Johns Hopkins ^{Hospital} in Baltimore, where I am a hematology patient, for two consultations. The trip alone tires me excessively so I cannot expect to get more done after I return. But I feel the urgent need to write you at greater length than is usual because of the unusual position in which you are and of the deplorable situation in which Wrone is.

First, because you may regard it as a reason to believe that I may be prejudiced in what I say, I tell you that Wrone is and for years has been one of my dearest and closest friends. But I do assure you that what I say is not motivated by friendship or by prejudice.

I hope that my wife may be able to arrange for this to be sent you by E mail while I am gone so I also apologize for my typing and my writing. Neither can be any better, I regret. I also have to type with my legs elevated for medical reasons.

I asked Wrone if he would mind if I were to write you about the uniqueness of the special problem you did not know you faced and he agreed. I asked him to write you and ask that you ask Kurtz to provide you with the proofs of his most common criticism of the Wrone book, my alleged influence on him and my alleged numerous errors in what I have written and published, as Kurtz did not say, nine books and as any authentic subject-matter authority will tell you, they are the basic books on the fact of the JFK assassination and on its official investigations. In thinking this over I decided, without consultation with Wrone to write you

about Kraft's criticisms of me and of my work first of all because if you ask Kraft to do what he should have done and didn't do in his supposed review, provide specifics rather than giving his uninformed opinions as unquestionable fact, you will get from that your own evaluation of the dependence or the lack of dependence you can place on what Kraft wrote you. By this I am asking you to ask him to provide either a copy of each alleged error in my work or a clear and an accurate citation to it along with the proof, not any opinion, of the error he claims to find in it.

If he does this, as I doubt he will, you will get little or nothing other than an independent reading of Kraft on this subject and of his lack of real subject-matter knowledge, despite his having written a book supposedly on it.

Because of Kraft's slurs on me and on my work I provide what is fair and informed comment on his book and what addresses whether or not Kraft's slurs are anything at all like the reality, the reality that is in part represented by the copies of the official records that will be attached to this or mailed you separately if that cannot be arranged.

The first is the Journal of American History review of Kraft's book. It reports that as far back as then Kraft was engaged in disparaging the work of other Warren Commission critics. It states that there is virtually nothing of any consequence that is new and that the book's valid points come from the very critics Kurtz disparaged. Uncredited, that can be plagiarism. Aside from citations of a few of Kraft's many factual errors in his book the reviewer also noted that for there to be any possibility of the theory Kraft advanced after proclaiming that he never did that, "requires a feat of levitation that is neither recorded on any film of the assassination nor testified to by any eyewitnesses."

Also enclosed is a copy of a page of Kurtz's testimony before the Assassination Records Review Board by which Kraft asked to be heard. In it he goes big for one of the innumerable fictions of the JFK assassination, an alleged connection between the supposed Communist Oswald with the far-right extremist former FBI agent Guy Banister. Kraft states that he saw them together in New Orleans, when he was in college there. But what Kraft did not trouble to examine, the disclosed FBI New Orleans office assassination record which I rescued from oblivion by means of FOIA litigation, there is no FBI record of this self-proclaimed patriot, Kraft, ever reporting that to the FBI. Some patriotism, some caring about the President that is!

With regard to myself and my work, I established or helped establish several new precedents and based on one of my dozen or so FOIA lawsuits to make public what was withheld, the Congress amended the Act in 1974, its investigatory files

exemption, citing what I proved in one of my early lawsuits as requiring it. That amending of the Act is what made FBI, CIA and similar files accessible under FOIA.

Years before anyone else did it, when I was faced with FBI perjury in those lawsuits, I did not confront that hiding behind any lawyer's filing. I put myself under oath so that if I erred or lied I would be subject to charges of perjury and under oath attributed perjury to the FBI. The Department of Justice and the FBI "defense" against this specific charge of perjury is that I "could make such claims ad infinitum since he is perhaps more familiar with events surrounding the investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy than anyone now employed by the FBI."

According to the FBI and the Department of Justice I knew more than anyone working for the FBI but according to Kurtz my work is overloaded with errors--not a single one of which he cited.

It will also give you an understanding of what you got yourself into in what would ordinarily be a safe assumption, that a published college professor can be trusted to be accurate and honest, when you asked Kurtz for a peer review, if you ask him to rather than give his opinion of ~~perjury~~ libel in what Wrone wrote he provide you with the proof that Wrone did libel, as he did not. However, Kraft might not like what Wrone wrote, truth is not libel and in each of those cases, Wrone wrote the factual truth.

Kraft's inference that as scholarship or in writing there is an improper influence I assert on Wrone is an infamous lie. All he asked of me was that I read the book as he wrote it to be certain there is no error in it, a normal practice in non-fiction, normal, that is, other than among the Kurtz's. Wrone was not the first to ask that of me. One of those whose books Kurtz criticizes Wrone for not citing, the "Reader's Digest's" Henry Hurt, for one example, also did that. But what those who ask for a peer review have no way of knowing, there is not a word, not a single word, in the Hurt book, which was an entirely different book, that was suitable for use by Wrone. Kurtz cannot get it through his head that a few, a very few of us, adhere to and use the officially established fact rather than what we imagine in our writing.

Kurtz does not even address the entirely different book that Wrone wrote and instead is critical of the book he would have preferred that Wrone write.

If you have any questions or want any proofs, please ask. I do not have and cannot use a computer ^{but} another dear friend, Dr. Gerald McKnight, head of the Hood College history department, lives nearby and does. His phone number is 301-473-5639. I do not know his computer number. He lives on Shookstown Road, Frederick. I am certain he will not object and time now is very precious.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg *Harold Weisberg*

Hood College

401 Rosemont Avenue
Frederick, MD 21701
Fax: 301-696-3771

Date: 1/12/2000
pages, including cover: 29/16

TO: DAVID WRONE

FAX: 715 341 9592

FROM: Jerry Mc Knight

PHONE: (301) 473 5639

MESSAGE:

This Fax to Be Picked up 1/12/2000
by DAVID WRONE

****IF YOU ARE HAVING PROBLEMS RECEIVING THIS TRANSMISSION
OR DID NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL 301-696-3685****

The# Briggs 1/3/00 letter

Briggs likes the book, thinks it is an important[†] addition to the assassination record for history, but aside from his belief that some of the words should be changed to eliminate sarcasm and the like, he is clearly influenced in his belief by the Kurtz skilled ax job which was clearly designed to discourage publication and which is almost entirely ^{Kurtz's}unfactual, coming from ~~his~~ own addition to assassination mythologies. One conspicuous example of this is the Briggs unquestioning acceptance of the entirely undocumented and entirely untrue allegation that the manuscript is or approaches libel. *Only one ignorant of the actual fact or one with his own agents would say that.* Briggs says that the reviewers "focus on what they consider factual errors," and this, too, reflects the influence of the Kurtz fabrications. His most common criticism of this kind relates to me and to my work, but in not a single instance did Kurtz provide an example of what he says is an error, abundant error in his fabrication, of my work. Nor in a single instance did he offer any alleged proof of this alleged error.

While there is no reason not to believe Briggs' statement of the problems he faces, making the changes Kurtz wants makes a different book of this and introduces factual error that is not in the manuscript. Publishers have the right to object to such things as the tone of the writing, and those with less than the necessary knowledge of the actual fact rather than the so-called theories and misinterpretations may be more inclined to do that, in this instance it appears that Briggs is influenced by the Kurtz criticisms, which are almost all baseless and none of which he documented with any proof. *He does not because he cannot*

I believe that if Briggs were to ask for this kind of documentation of what Kurtz made up, whether from subject-matter ignorance or from prejudice of ulterior motive, what I say would be immediately apparent to one who has the factual subject-matter knowledge Kurtz ~~does~~ does not have.

Kurtz's willingness to consult with Wrono means nothing and assumes that his invalid, ^{uncited}and undocumented criticisms are accepted as factual, which they are not for the most part. What should be required is validating Kurtz's criticisms, especially his allegations of factual error and of libel. ^{He}It would also introduce error where there is no error. It would at the least delay the book's appearance and, aside from criticisms of style, ^{that} ~~the~~ with criticisms that are not accurate but reflect the Kurtz preconceptions, including of himself as Sherlock Holmes reborn. Kurtz may even believe some of these ^{made-} ~~made-~~ up criticisms of his, but they seem designed to come as close as he dares to discouraging the publication of an important ^{original} work on an important part of our history. Allegations of libel and error where there is none serve that end, not an honest end of a peer review. Kurtz is only presumed to be the peer that he is not.

Two of the more glaring illustrations of this are what Kurtz alleges are Wrono weaknesses, prejudices or dangers to a publisher.

About what Wrono said on page 162, Kurtz's brief comment is "Posner lied." Libelous? "Only one with an overwhelming ignorance of the supposed assassination literature could raise any question at all about more than Posner's lying. This is illustrated by what Kurtz says about what Wrono said about two books. Kurtz begins that by stating that what Wrono said is, "again, a cheap and totally unjustified shot at numerous serious, responsible assassination researchers and scholars who have uncovered much evidence and written highly incisive analyses. Wrono apparently thinks that even the work of his idol, Harold Weisberg, Case Open, is not worthy of admiration, since it is not cited in the footnote." Before continuing with those whose work is so exceptionally fine and pertinent, what Kurtz does not say is that Case Open not only is not about the Zapruder film, it also refers to Posner as not only a liar, and, unlike Kurtz, who imposes on trust, it proved that he ~~lies~~ lies. More, he also called Posner a plagiarist, and documented that with irrefutable proof, with documentation, as Kurtz ~~can~~ ^{not} do here except by dishonesties and to those who are not ~~so~~ subject-matter experts and take him at his uninformed and prejudiced word. (No Posner meat 'n' sue & no reputation.)

Kurtz cannot have read Case Open and not known that he is quite unfair in his made-up criticism, and he cannot be an authentic subject-matter expert and, especially with regard to the Zapruder film, speak so highly of the most indecent and enormous frauds in so-called assassination literature, ~~than~~ the Lifton fabrication of the alleged kidnapping and altering of the President's body. It made Lifton a fortune and it ^{but impossible} received probably more Americans than any book after the Report. If there is anything factual and new in the Lifton book I do not recall it. I do recall that, aside from this indecent fabrication of which

Kurtz has so high an opinion, just about all else in the Lifton book that he claims he brought to light was published many years earlier. His contribution is that monstrous ⁱⁿ disdecency of the totally impossible body snatch.

Nobody with an open mind can read Livingstone's outrageous books and not wonder if he is really rational, as he is not. He has brought ^{to light} nothing new and factual and correct and really relating to the assassination rather than ~~the~~ ^{his} great number of conjectures and fabrications about it. As Kurtz does not let bother ^{him} ~~if~~ he knew enough to know it - is that few books are as overloaded with repetitive libels as ^{are} Livingstone's, as his personal behavior is even worse.

Livingstone and the Zapruder film? He phoned me after his second book had appeared and told me he was going to the Archives to look at the Zapruder film. When I asked him ^{if} he had written two fat books on the assassination without

3

looking at that film, he confirmed it. Reluctantly, I told him about the two of the none frames the Commission was to have published and didn't and that they disprove what he has been saying, so I did not think he'd want to see that. He insisted, I told him about the two frames immediately after frame 334 which are clear on the back of the President's head as he falls over on his wife and that they show the back of the head intact, without any blood or even a hair out of place. Two or three weeks later Livingstone phoned me to thank me because those frames show exactly what I had said that was important knowledge for him. ^{by} But soon he was inventing the most massive of conspiracies to alter the film. He could not be wrong so the film had to be as his thinking, and this is the "literature" that Kurtz says is by "responsible ^{assassination} researchers" Kurtz is critical of Wrono because he did not use them and their ego-tripping fabrications.

Kurtz does include another of the academic assassination ignoramuses who consider themselves Perry Masons. He has the name wrong, it is Fetzler, ^{a calculation} and the mistakes in his mistitled Assassination Science are beyond belief. But Kurtz does not ^{mention} include Fetzler's associate, Noel Twyman, whose massive Bloody Treason was apparently self-published. It is an exceptionally expensive printing job because of all the color pictures in it in particular and because of the extortionate fees charged by the Zapruder heirs for the use of that film. These two books are so bad and so ignorant I have a book-length manuscript I leave as a record for our history of their atrocities and ignorances and their fabrications and those not original with them. ^{that they use.}

Where the other books Kurtz criticizes Wrono for not using make any reference to the Zapruder film at all it is incidental and not in any sense new. If accurate. Indeed, to Kurtz, who was not known to Briggs to be the non-expert on the assassination that he is, ^{sick} that he is a man dominated by his ego and unable to hide that completely, whose book is intellectual and factual rubbish ^{and is} other than ~~an~~ of his self-indictment for the ^{errors} ~~facts~~ he (inaccurately) attributes to others, ^{is} without any false modesty, as though it ^{is} ~~was~~ without question ^{that it} is not the assassination junk it is but, like the others name ^{above}, of "highly incisive analyses" that, as the review of it in the Journal of American History pointed out, includes the incredible Kurtz "highly incisive analyses" that has the shot allegedly hitting the President in the back coming from below street level. Or bursting through the building's walls and the sidewalk and/or the street near it! "Incisive" is hardly the word for this fantasy, and most people knowing the truth would not be inclined to find this as coming from "serious, responsible assassination researchers," ^{by} which, of course, Kurtz, the subject-matter ignoramus, means himself. He refers to this assassination trash to which he is uncritically addicted as

necessary for Wrono to have used ^{irrelevant} as most are and seriously inaccurate as the ^{others are, as} necessary for Wrono to use "to executives a much more balanced judgement in this manuscript." Using the ^{fiction} of the impossible body snatch, which is Lifton's major contribution, of ~~Kurtz's~~ ^{Kurtz's} of the ~~President~~ President having been shot from below the surface of the sidewalks and roads, which is perhaps the only major "new" contribution by Kurtz. ^{Or Kurtz's} ~~Or Kurtz's~~ also impossible account of how the ^{allegedly} ~~Urban~~ boasted of killing Kennedy? ^{Kurtz}

Continuing his ignorant and/or dishonest attack on Wrono, which he says in obvious untruth "is not intended ~~as~~ as an attack on Weisberg," Kurtz misrepresents what Wrono said about my books in his footnote on page 207 and he lies in saying that ~~that~~ "outrageously false claim was originally made by Weisberg," ^{what I did} ~~what I did~~ publish and Wrono referred to ^{accurately}, is that for the three and a half decades after my first book was published, neither about it nor about the other eight that followed it have I received a phone call or a letter from any one of those on the commissions and committees about whom I wrote so critically and criticized ~~so~~ severely in which he protested that I had been unfair ^{to} in him in any way or had been inaccurate in what I wrote about him.

This is the fact. I have kept ^{many thousands of} all the letters written to me, all the criticism that were sent to me, and ~~that~~ what I state is the literally fact.

But, omniscient as Kurtz would have it, believed that he is, having never been here or used the free access to all ^{the} ~~I have~~ with no cost or charge, ^{he had no} ~~as~~ any way of knowing, leave alone of proving, that his misrepresentation of what I did say "is an outrageously false claim." ^{But he did say this. They are his words.}

Kurtz, who earned much adverse criticism from his ego-indulging and unscholarly book, apparently judges works of a different ^{character} ~~character~~, books that are factually correct and come entirely from the official evidence of which he is so blissfully ignorant, ^{he compares with his after he} ~~as he judges~~ learned his book was faulted.

It is conspicuous and it is hardly scholarship to say of his and the other books that range from the insane to the at best undependable and did not report on any duplication of what I did that Wrono's "sole reliance" [which it is not] on Weisberg... leads him to ^{ignore} the equally significant contributions of others." Like the ^{Kurtzian} ~~shot~~ that allegedly transitted the President's chest after ~~bursting~~ its way up from underground? Or of the alleged snatching of the body? Or the other innumerable errors and impossibilities in the works he says Wrono had "tunnel vision" not to use.

This is fair sample of Kurtz's impartiality, his subject-matter knowledge and of what he, with no false modesty, described as his own "responsible" and significant "contribution" when what he refers to is not on the Zapruder film and the Zapruder film is what Wrono wrote about.

Those who consider publishing on the assassination have every reason to believe that a college professor who also wrote a book on the assassination that was published by a university press would be an informed and dependable source of a peer review, but that is not true in this case, not on this subject, of any more than perhaps ten ^{people} in the entire world, and most publishers would have no way of knowing who they are. Briggs had every reason to believe that Kurtz is informed, impartial and that his would be a scholarly review. It is not ~~a~~ in any way. It is ignorant, ~~It~~ is grossly inaccurate, his inaccuracies transgressing into lies, and it is not easy not to believe that ~~his~~ serious factual errors and the baseless troubles he predicts for this manuscript were ^{not} intended to ^{discourage} help the University Of Kansas Press from publishing the book-unless it was converted into the historical and literary disaster ^{such as} Kurtz himself produced.

Unless Wrono ^{put} ~~puts~~ into his manuscript what is not there now and would be there if he converted ^{it} into a Kurtzian ^{work}, to Kurtz it ought not be published.

It is conspicuous that in his criticisms Kurtz generally includes no direct quotation of no source, not a single one. That is not solid commentary of the kind on which a publisher can contentedly depend. It may in this case prevent the publication of a unique, valuable and accurate book on that great national disaster, the assassination of the President, when such an assassination is a de facto coup d'etat.

If by any chance Wrono includes what Kurtz, Livingstone, Lifton, Hurt, Felzer, ^(who is really Fetzner) and Summers wrote, and no self-respecting writer who has any foundation in the basic, official fact would not do, his book ^{would} thereby be inevitably ^{faulted} ~~faulted~~ and where ~~as~~ ^{as Wrono does in his} it does, in manuscript, used only the official evidence and is not accurate, it would become another of the great mass of assassination trash that has added to popular confusion and bewilderment ^{over} of the assassination.

That the country does not need, and that no honest publisher should want.

I wrote this in haste and with many distractions and interruptions. In reading and correcting it I want to emphasize what I say on page two, that neither ~~Wrono~~ Kurtz nor ^{those} ~~that~~ the singles, with himself, as serious and responsible researcher, brought to light any significant fact about the assassination that had not been published before their books were. Kurtz in particular ^{did not}.

With regard to the imaginary Kurtz shot to the President's back, is ^{not} that irrational and impossible Kurtz fabrication, what he attributes to others and ^{what he made up and} says he avoids himself, what he wants Wrono to add to Wrono's book, which is on the ~~the~~ Zapruder film, ^{not on the photo reel or film agreed?}

at this point you phoned to tell me the few and ⁱⁿsignificant criticisms Kurtz said he based his criticisms of me and my work on.

With regard to that road-~~stripes~~^{stripes} correct representation of the official evidence cited at the time I wrote it, 35 years ago, in the book that followed it I reported that the road stripes had been changed by the repaving of the street and in ~~that~~^{it} I printed in facsimile ^{surveys as} the map of before the repaving and the map of after the repaving. The stripes, obviously, were not where they had been after the repaving.

Inherent in Kurtz's misrepresentation of the relationship between us is his belief that ~~when~~ when two work together on the same subject, one corrupts the other. He knows nothing about our relationship but in another ^{of} his efforts to shake confidence ⁱⁿ what he wrote he writes about our relationship what is not true. ^{and he has no way of knowing} ~~Not~~ is it true of my relationship with any other, some of whom have spent more ^{Monday} ~~time~~ researching in my files, to which all have unsupervised access and access to ^{our} ~~the~~ copier.

Most of those who have used my files are those with whom I know I will not agree. Like the John H. Davis ^{Or Pinner} of the fictional Mafia Kingfish, ~~or~~ Livingstone, who had his research done by a Baltimore policeman. That policeman who robbed me extensively for David Lifton, for whom he also worked. ~~He~~ stole for Lifton only copies of my critical commentary on Lifton's outrageously indecent and impossible work.

Obviously, + could not corrupt those who did not believe as I did and who did not see ^{accurately} in the official records I have what I saw in them.

On that, what Kurtz does ^{Kansas} ~~Not~~ tell is what my work consists of. It is of nine printed books and more than two dozen book manuscripts that are a record for history. With my FOIA litigations, some of which was precedental and one of which, according to the legislative history, persuaded the Congress to amend the Act in 1974, I brought to light about a third of a million once-withheld government assassination records. Of them about a quarter of a million came from the FBI and the Department of Justice. His university got only a small fraction of the ^{first} of them.

And Kurtz never came to see or copy any of them or to ask me any questions, by ~~the~~ mail or in person.

On this subject, Kurtz is not even rational, leave alone informed, as he is not.