

W. more

Dear Dave,

Sunday, 5/20/00

A few comments on your Posner review that ^{is} quite good.

In Paragraph 5 at end of second sentence, suggest you add, "a common and cheap test that the FBI performed on more than a dozen totally irrelevant rifles but ~~it~~ avoided ^{on} ~~the~~ rifle it proclaimed the ^m "murder rifle" although ~~it~~ ^{it} knew ~~it~~ was not and could not have been that rifle."

~~On~~ lines up, add: "The FBI then had 57 independent field offices plus ~~several~~ ^{all} other offices with "murkin" files. Each is identified, what does not exist in

Posner's book, ^{each} ~~is~~ classified ^{with its 'murkin' code} and a serial number. Many of the numbers of what Posner cites without any real identification, if he had ^{knew} ~~given~~ them, could have been duplicated more than five dozen times! *This is not history's method.*

As he had to have known if he had done his own work!

With all of ^{this} ~~it~~ freely available to him for two ~~decades~~ decades before he began his rewriting of our tragic history, and basic as it all is to an honest book, he is so ignorant of it that after he wrote his book he still did not know how to cite the basic official evidence he boasts about mastering and using.

If you cannot or do not want to add this much to what you wrote it is the kind of information you can use after the book is out. You might want to make a separate collection for that. For that the evidentiary hearing transcripts can be dynamite. Did I send you a set? I think Clay has one, I know that Gerry and Neichter do. I had them made commercially and sent them. If Kansas is interested for having them for its library or history dept, they should have them. *ask*

Br 199?

But I'd rather not have that zeroxing to do personally feeble as I now am.

You can take the stink scent out of that skunk! *and put it on him!*

Good luck! And best!

May 15, 2000

David R. Wrone
1518 Blackberry Lane
Stevens Point, WI 54481

Editor
Journal of American History
1215 East Atwater Ave.
Bloomington, IN 47401-3703

Dear Editor:

Ralph E. Luker's laudatory review of Gerald Posner's *Killing the Dream* falls short of history standards.

Posner's record with *Case Closed* on JFK's assassination ought to have alerted Luker to the potential for a similar trampling of historical principles. There in order to convert the subject for purposes not historical he committed literally hundreds of factual errors and used a variety of devices--omissions, fake map, invented "facts", and misrepresentations, which numerous responsible reviewers copiously reported.

Failing to heed that flag Luker could have read Harold Weisberg's *Whoring with History. How the Gerald Posner's Protect the King Assassins*, a 472 page fact by fact refutation of Posner told exclusively in terms of the evidentiary base by a subject matter master who is not a theorist.

official and
reedy about
able

Extensive and profound errors abound. For example, in a 1974 federal court trial for the first time Ray had an opportunity to question the official assertions and alleged evidence against him with officials and witnesses placed under oath. The trial examined and refuted the evidence against Ray without dispute or appeal. Although aware of its existence Posner does not mention this exculpation of Ray, the complete refutation of the state's case.

The bullet in King ~~cannot~~ ^{could} be connected to the rifle. The rifle ~~cannot~~ ^{could} be connected to the crime. It was not even swabbed to see if it had been fired since last cleaning, ^{insert} Witnesses saw the blanket-wrapped rifle dropped on the street before the shot was fired. News photographs taken immediately after the shot show the bathroom window opening too narrow to enable a scoped rifle to fire through it. Additionally, inside the small bathroom, the way Shelby County and FBI said the rifle was fired would have required a shooter to have his back, ~~left arm~~, and rifle butt ~~pushed through the left wall~~ ^{to have been inside the wall when allegedly fired}.

little

There are acute problems with Posner's sources ^{as cited} that should have been noted. As one example: ^{on both} Either through ignorance or deliberate obfuscation, Posner constantly footnotes "MURKIN". But that is a FBI acronym not the file number. MURKIN records contain over a million pages, which ^{as cited} means his sources cannot be checked. When through occasional fortune a few sources were located erroneous and distorted use of their information were sometimes found to be the case. ^{insert}

2

Luker's denigration of Oliver Stone's cinematic corruption of history is well taken, but he fails to see that his Posner is merely a Tweedle Dum to Stone's Tweedle Dee--and that right after breakfast.

His instructional homily to the King family is gratuitous, misconceived, and improper for a review in the JAH. What else could the King family do? With historians

- in public and with the official evidence -

deaf, with the doors of justice closed, and with Ray exculpated, they mistakenly appealed to theorists the only apparent open path in a world where professionals had ceased to be their brother's keeper.

Our history is too precious to be corrupted and manipulated--Posnerized--in the quest for private ends.

Sincerely,

David R. Wrone