Dave Wrone
1518 Blackberry Lane
Stevens Point, WI 54481

4 /13/ol , 2:05 a.m.!

Dear Dave,

That intellectual polecat Kurtz has been on my mind since I awakened at 10:15. Either I have been up all night or my subconscious was and it was like I was up all night. I leave for what knocks me out, dialysis, at 5:30, I'll be back about 11 and not long after that a carload of friends, mostly teachers and a lawyer, are coming from Ohio to take Lil and me to lumch, which they do eevery year. So, aside from what followsm I have a full day ahead!

Please remember that all decisions are yours. I have decided to make a few recommendations.

Kurtz has been dishonest and you should nail him on that, in combination with what he does that is unfair, criticism to which you cannot respond.

When Kurtz says that you say "Phil Willis is an authentic source on when he snapped the shutter of his camera, but he fails to mention that Willis stated that the motorcade cameto a halt before it proceded and that Willis claimed that the shot blew the back of JFK's head off." Kurtz raises substantial questions of his subject-matter knowledge and of his honesty (you use a different word) in this criticism.

Number 1, the time that Willis sbapped his shutter is established without question if his words are not used, and if Kurtz does not know this he confesses the most limited assassination knowledge.

The same is true about his criticism about Willis saying that the motorcade stopped. It was going slowly and the sponaneous reaction of the driver when he heard shots was to try to ~~lean~~ learn what happened. He slowed down immediately and then, in seconds, speeded up again. The probability is, I think, that he did not come to a full stop but many if not most of the people there believed that he had come to a stop. So, whatis wrong with Willis thinking that? (He did not say that the wole whole motorcade stopped, whichis what Kurtz says.)

What Kurtxz says about Willis saying the back of the head our and referring to Mantik in the Fetzer book raises the most substantial questions abour Kurtx snd what he is up to in his criticisms some of which are slurs ans some not factual and not, I think justified.

In that same Fetzter book Dr. Gary Aguilar has a lengthy esssay titled "The Comverging Medical Case for Conspiracy in the Death of JFK." It begins on page 175 and ends on 218. A major part of Aguilar's essay is on the back of the head being blown out, with questions about whether it was the center or a little to the right or t e left of center. Just turning the pages disclosed countless sketches of where the back of the head is blown out.

That also is one of the major questions among those less than fully informed but I Kurtz read Fetzer's book then he had to know this when he made his criticism of Willis. And if he turned the pages and saw all ~~sall~~ those sketches, oh my!

Briggs then assumes that what Kurtx said that is not true is true. He he just assumed it inserting "So, some comments on the limits os Willis's reliability would likely be helpful here."

I think you should decline to insert anything like that. The real question here is Kurtz's knowledge and how and why he omitted from Fetzer what proved his comment to be entirely unjustified.

Then Kurtz repeats what he said before, neither time offering anything other than his opinion, that you are ""too dependent on Weisberg." For him to repeat this and make another comment like it, he should offer specifics and I think you should ask for them after this Fetzer fiaasco and then Kurtz should say what is wrong with using my work? Nobody has published as much. nobody has brought as much out of official suppression and nobody has been the credentials that the FBI gave him in federal court, that he knew more about the JFK assassination than anyone working for the FBI. Why he does not like me and can't hide it I do not know. Our pathx have never crossed. But this is not normal constructive criticism and that in his No. 11, that you "make numerous assertions which "you" claim...to be fact but are really opinions." IIt is possible that this criticism is justified but before you accept ~~eaccept~~ it tou want specifics because,again, this raises questions about how much fact Kurtz really knows.

2

On what the ARRB disclosed, and the actuality is that the ARRB forced the disclosure from an agency source, there are millions of pages and millions of little things like this Nathan Pool matter. not a word of those disclosures can be used safely and checked carefully because some of the inaccurate, some of the most deliberately false stuff has been made available along with some ecellent, fine materia;. But both the ARRB and theHHSCA cannot be used safely without careful checking, as anyone really familiar with both agencies knows very well.

I also enclose Aguilar's chart from that article Kurtz could not have missed. Aguilar lists 43 people whp said the back of the head got it.

I think you should use this legitimateoppostunity to let Briggs know that Kurtz is not as much an authority as he makes on and Briggs believes but you have to do it gently because it also involves Brigg's judgement in placing blind faith in a skunk and a subject-matter ignoramus.

Harold

rect."[114] (author's

erviews with per-
g to skeptics who
a different bullet
ild. In *JAMA* Breo
id witnesses were
n than accurately
itnesses, some of
ore JFK's wounds
position than the
at the proof—the
ere in the 12 vol-
public inspection.
interviews would

ne that the HSCA
witnesses on the
the Warren Com-
suming the HSCA
ted, that it had 26
e HSCA had inter-
l with the descrip-
s at Parkland de-
witnesses said the
nts, or in the sup-
opsy witnesses de-
graphs. (See Table
thesda.) Assuming
unds, the mystery
ms wrong, not one
t!
cret Service agent,
n completed and I
."[116] Hill's recollec-
of JFK's rearward
olumes since 1964.

sy, was interviewed
ves, the interviewer,
ight quadrant of the
mmanding officer of
y HSCA counsel, D.
o, released with no
back of the head so
[118] (author's empha-
ents, prepared dia-
rward. These dia-

	RIGHT REAR	RIGHT SIDE	RIGHT ANTERIOR
1. WILLIAM KEMP CLARK, MD	X		
2. ROBERT McCLELLAND, MD	X		
3 MARION T. JENKINS, MD	X		
4. CHARLES J. CARRICO, MD	X		
5. MALCOLM PERRY, MD	X		
6. RONALD COY JONES, MD	X		
7. GENE AKIN, MD	X		
8. PAUL PETERS, MD	X		
9. CHARLES CRENSHAW, MD	X		
10. CHARLES R. BAXTER, MD	X		
11. ROBERT GROSSMAN, MD	X	X	
12. RICHARD B. DULANY, MD	X		
13. ADOLPHE GIESECKE, MD*	X	X	X
14. FOUAD BASHOUR, MD	X		
15. KENNETH E. SALYER, MD	X	X	X
16. PAT HUTTON, RN	Z		
17. DORIS NELSON, RN	X		
18. WILLIAM GREER	X		
19. CLINTON J. HILL	X		
20. DIANA HAMILTON BOWRON	X		
21. WILLIAM MIDGETT	X	X	

Table I: Observations at Parkland (earliest statements)

	RIGHT REAR	RIGHT ONLY	RIGHT ANTERIOR
1. GODFREY McHUGH	X		
2. JOHN STRINGER	X		
3. WILLIAM GREER	X		
4. ROY KELLERMAN	X		
5. CLINTON J. HILL	X		
6. FRANCIS O'NEILL	X		
7. JAMES W. SIBERT	X		
8. TOM ROBINSON	X		
9. ROBERT KARNEI, MD	X		X
10. PAUL O'CONNOR	X		
11. JAMES C. JENKINS	X		
12. EDWARD REED	X		
13. JERROL CUSTER	X		
14. JAN GAIL RUDNICKI	X		
15 JAMES E. METZLER	X		
16. DAVID OSBORNE, MD	X		
17. JOHN EBERSOLE, MD	X		
18. RICHARD LIPSEY	X		
19. CAPT. JOHN STOVER		(? – "TOP OF HEAD")	
20. CHESTER BOYERS	X		X
21. JAMES HUMES, MD	X		X
22. J T BOSWELL, MD	X		X

Table II: Observations at Bethesda (earliest statements)