

April 1, 1992

Letter to the Editor
New York Times
229 West 43d
New York City
New York 10036

To the Editor:

Howard Hurtig in a March 28 letter embraces the Warren Report's autopsy as offering incontrovertible proof for the validity of the official conclusions on the death of President Kennedy. He neglected to say the autopsy also relates how slow the limousine was traveling, that the shots were fired from the rear, and other conclusory non-medical "facts" not present to a prosecutor viewing a corpse, but certainly political and prejudicial in nature, suggestive of the low quality of the medical information.

He also is unaware of the much publicized and incontrovertible fact that the autopsy printed in the Report is the fifth autopsy protocol. After Oswald was murdered and there would be no trial Dr. Humes burnt the first autopsy in his recreation room fireplace. His second holograph protocol was severely altered to make fundamental changes to become the third. The fourth and typed copy again was changed in becoming the last version passed in the Report as the only protocol, which receives Dr. Hurtig's praise as a medical gem.

In Oliver Stone he pommels a straw man. The movie JFK is more properly referred to as Warren Report No. 2, being equally as corrupt as the original official non investigation document. I found ninety-five percent of the film to be false to the facts.

Robert Krauss's letter supporting Oswald's marksmanship is based on a mistaken notion of the facts of the assassination. He does not address the disrepair and dangerous quality of the delapidated rifle, which caused the Army to fix it before test firing. He omits the fact the only eyewitness (who committed perjury) to a man in the window said the rifleman stood up to shoot, for a while leaned his shoulder into the window, and did not use the window sill. He did not use the boxes inside. Mr. Krauss further assumes Oswald was in the window, which is a political statement. No credible evidence places Oswald there. At the very least an expert on weapons should address the massive physical and eyewitness facts in the evidentiary base before touting his authority on an irrelevancy.

Brewster Barton says more about the weakness of American education than he supposes when he proclaims his teacher's guide for the JFK movie was well received. That such monumental lies, fraud, and propaganda told as truth is accepted by teachers means propaganda is alive and well and its creators, distillers, and purveyors successful practitioners of this socially corrosive poison. Did his pernicious guide include the point by point criticism of the lies of the JFK film? How is it possible without a thousand page book?

David R. Wrone
Professor of History
UWSP
Stevens Point, WI
54481