

that Duvon Corbitt was especially concerned with conflict between U. S. and Cuban historians. The commentator, William H. Beezley of North Carolina State University, generally praised the research in the papers and focused his discussion on the relationship between the subjects of the papers and broader intellectual and social currents in the United States. He did suggest that the session had been misnamed. Robert Freeman Smith of the University of Toledo presided.

An audience of more than 175 attended the Friday-morning session *The Tools of the Historian and the Assassination of John F. Kennedy*, with David Brion Davis of Yale University presiding. Professor David R. Wrone of the University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point, argued that American institutions had thus far failed to provide the public with a convincing and truthful account of the assassination. Professor Wrone surveyed and evaluated the literature defending and attacking the conclusions of the Warren Commission. Warning against theories and accusations not grounded in "the evidentiary base," Professor Wrone presented the problems surrounding the Kennedy assassination as a test case for the historical method. Professor Michael L. Kurtz of Southeastern Louisiana University examined in considerable detail the medical and ballistics evidence and then showed the famous Zapruder film as well as some slides. Though Professor Kurtz found new arguments in favor of the "lone assassin thesis," he was more impressed by the new evidence, including neutron activation analysis of bullet 399 and other bullet fragments, strongly indicating a "rifle and ammunition other than that used by Oswald." Mark Lane, one of the most prolific writers on the Kennedy assassination, refused to appear at the last moment without an honorarium or expenses although the chairman of the Program Committee and one of the Program Committee members had made it clear on two occasions that the Association could not compensate panelists or paper-givers. Howard Roffman, a law clerk for the Fifth Federal Circuit Court and the author of *Presumed Guilty: How and Why the Warren Commission Framed Lee Harvey Oswald*, pointed to what he argued were errors and doubtful assumptions in the two papers. He agreed with Professor Wrone, however, on the damage done by an "impulse to resolution" that carried critics far beyond the base of evidence. Roffman particularly hoped to address Mark Lane, whom he considered the worst "offender" in this respect. Following Roffman's comments there was a response from Professor Kurtz and spirited questioning from the audience.

More than sixty people attended the Friday-morning session on