

The# Briggs 1/3/00 letter

Briggs likes the book, thinks it is an important<sup>+</sup> addition to the assassination record for history, but aside from his belief than 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 <sup>Kurtz's</sup>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 agenda 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' <sup>my</sup>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. *If 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<sup>#</sup> or from prejudice of ulterior motive, what I say would be immediately apparent to one who has the factual subject-matter knowledge Kurtz ~~XXXX~~ does not have.

Kurtz's willingness to consult with Wrono means nothing and assumes that his invalid<sup>uncited</sup> 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. <sup>He</sup>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, <sup>that</sup>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 <sup>made-</sup>~~made-~~ up criticisms of his, but they seem designed to come as close as he <sup>original</sup>dares to discouraging the publication of an important 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~~ <sup>not</sup> 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 meant to me & 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, <sup>but impossible</sup> than the Lifton fabrication of the alleged kidnapping and altering of the President's body. It made Lifton a fortune and it deceived 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 <sup>in</sup> ~~dis~~decency 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 <sup>to light</sup> brought nothing new and factual and correct and really relating to the assassination rather than ~~the~~ <sup>his</sup> great number of conjectures and fabrications about it. As Kurtz does not let bother ~~him~~ <sup>him</sup> - if he knew enough to know it - is that few books are as overloaded with repetitive libels as <sup>are</sup> 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

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 of three weeks later Livingstone phoned me to thank me because those frames show exactly what I had said that was important knowledge for him. 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 <sup>assassination</sup> 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, not <sup>Fetzler</sup> ~~Fetzer~~, and the mistakes in his mistitled Assassination Science are beyond <sup>a calculation</sup> belief. But Kurtz does not <sup>mention</sup> 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. <sup>that they use.</sup>

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, that he is a man dominated by his <sup>sick</sup> ego and unable to hide that completely, whose book is intellectual and factual rubbish <sup>and is</sup> ~~other than~~ his self-indictment for the <sup>errors</sup> ~~facts~~ he (inaccurately) attributes to others, <sup>is</sup> without any false modesty, as though it were without question <sup>that it</sup> is not the assassination junk it is but, like the others <sup>above</sup>, 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," <sup>by</sup> 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 Wrone to have used <sup>it</sup> irrelevant as most are and seriously inaccurate as the <sup>makes them</sup> others are, <sup>as</sup> necessary for Wrone to use "to executives a much more balanced judgement in this manuscript." Using the <sup>fiction</sup> of the impossible body snatch, which is Lifton's major contribution, of <sup>Kurtz's</sup> ~~of the~~ ~~Bad~~ President having been shot from below the surface of the sidewalks and roads, which is perhaps the only major "new" contribution by Kurtz. Or <sup>is Kurtz's</sup> ~~Kurtz's~~ also impossible account of how the <sup>allegedly</sup> ~~Cuban~~ boasted of killing Kennedy? <sup>Kurtz</sup>

Continuing his ignorant and/or dishonest attack on Wrone, which ~~he~~ says in obvious untruth "is not intended ~~as~~ as an attack on Weisberg.," Kurtz misrepresents what Wrone 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," <sup>whenever made</sup> what I did publish and Wrone 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 <sup>to</sup> in him in any way or had been inaccurate in what I wrote about him.

This is the fact. I have kept all <sup>many thousands of</sup> 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 <sup>give</sup> I ~~have~~ with no cost or charge, <sup>he had no</sup> ~~as~~ any way of knowing, leave alone of proving, that his misrepresentation of what I did say "is an outrageously false claim." <sup>But he did say this. They are his words.</sup>

Kurtz, who earned much adverse criticism from his ego-indulging and unscholarly book, apparently judges works of a different <sup>character</sup> ~~books~~ <sup>books</sup> that are factually correct and come entirely from the official evidence of which he is so blissfully ignorant, <sup>he compares with his after he</sup> ~~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 Wrone's "d sole reliance" [which it is not] on Weisberg... <sup>ignore</sup> leads him to <sup>the</sup> equally significant contributions of others." Like the <sup>Kurtzian</sup> shot that allegedly transitted the President's chest after <sup>bursting</sup> 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 Wrone 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 Wrone 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 <sup>people</sup> in the entire world, and most publishers would have no way of knowing who they <sup>are</sup>. 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 <sup>not</sup> intended to discourage help the University Of Kansas Press from publishing the book-unless it was converted into the historical and literary disaster <sup>such as</sup> Kurtz himself produced.

Unless Wrono <sup>put</sup> ~~put~~ into his manuscript what is not there now and would be there if he converted <sup>it</sup> into a Kurtzian, 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, <sup>(who is really Fetzer)</sup> and Summers wrote, and no self-respecting writer who has any foundation in the basic, official fact would not do, his book <sup>would</sup> thereby be inevitably <sup>fact based</sup> ~~fact based~~ and where <sup>as</sup> it <sup>as Wrono does in his</sup> ~~as~~ <sup>in</sup> 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 <sup>over</sup> 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 <sup>those</sup> ~~that~~ the singles out, 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 <sup>not</sup> ~~that~~ irrational and impossible Kurtz fabrication, what he attributes to others and <sup>what he made up and</sup> ~~says he avoids himself~~, what he wants Wrono to add to Wrono's book, which is on the ~~Zapruder film~~, <sup>not on the photo reel or film agreed?</sup>

At this point you phoned to tell me the few and <sup>(in)</sup> insignificant criticisms Kurtz said he based his criticisms of me and my work on.

With regard to that road-~~strip~~<sup>stripes</sup> correct representation of the official evidence cited at the time I wrote it, 25 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~~<sup>it</sup> I printed in facsimile the ~~map~~<sup>survey</sup> 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 <sup>of</sup> his efforts to shake confidence <sup>in</sup> what he wrote he writes about our relationship what is not true. <sup>and he has no way of knowing</sup> nor is it true of my relationship with any other, some of whom have spent more <sup>time</sup> researching in my files, to which all have unsupervised access and access to <sup>our</sup> copier.

Most of those who have used my files are those with whom I know I will not agree. Like the John H. Davis <sup>Or Palmer</sup> of the fictional Mafia Kingfish. <sup>Or</sup> 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 <sup>accurately</sup> in the official records I have what I saw in them.

On that, what Kurtz does <sup>Not</sup> tell <sup>Kansas</sup> 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 litigation, 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.