

[Editor's Note: Following a conference in Encinitas, CA, on 1 April 2001, Clint Bradford posted and circulated a "review" in which he trashed the presentations by Noel Twyman, David Mantik, and myself as he praised that of Gregory "Monk" Burnham. Although I replied to his post right away and responded to two additional rebuttals, he has disseminated it without any acknowledgement that I have objected to his very biased representation. Thinking about it has led me to compose these reflections.]

SIGNS OF DISINFORMATION

James H. Fetzer

One of the telling signs of many disinformation artists (who may or may not be gainfully employed by some "shadowy government agency") is that a lot of their claims are simply too strong to be true. Here we have an example of Walt Brown's journal publishing an unrelentingly negative review of *THE INNOCENT MAN SCRIPT* (2000) and David Wood III's brilliant chronology of 22 November 1963 from *MURDER IN DEALEY PLAZA* (2000).

Both are fascinating works, in my view, that contribute considerably to illuminating, on the one hand, how Oswald may have been set-up and, on the other, events in Dallas on that fateful day. I am reminded of Josiah Thompson's trashing of *MURDER*, about which he proclaimed that there was exactly one good chapter, namely: that by Gary Aguilar.

But if Aguilar is right, then there was a massive blow-out to the back of the head, the brain shown in diagrams and photographs cannot be the brain of JFK, and the X-rays from the autopsy must have been fabricated, conclusions that were drawn already in *ASSASSINATION SCIENCE* (1998), which he also condemned. Yet the former has nine contributors, the latter eleven.

How likely is it that none of the work of these contributors is meritorious, save for that of someone with whom he associates? Not very. Nor is it likely that a review of the mini-conference in Encinitas featuring Noel Twyman, David Mantik, Gregory Burnham, and myself should have no redeeming merits save for Monk's presentation, which I also liked very much.

Consider the source. The objective of disinformation is less to convince anyone of the false than it is to create a set of conditions under which everything can be believed but nothing can be known. This point was made by Martin Schotz, who observed: ". . . one of the primary means of immobilizing the American people politically today is to hold them in a state of confusion in which anything can be believed but nothing can be known, nothing of significance, that is."

The methodology of Gerald Posner bears examination. Posner is supposed to be a lawyer, not a scholar, not a physician, not a scientist. So what can he truly contribute? Really --apart from his actual modus

operandi, which, according to Roger McCarthy, the CEO of Failure Analysis Associates, was to appropriate half of a two-part study his company prepared for the ABA for a 20th Century Courtroom series--would have to be nothing more than scissors and paste.

Consider, there are so many books out there that, by simply selecting those that present the point of view you want to defend, you can arrange for "support" for any conclusion you prefer. That is why, in order to get to the bottom of this case, it has been necessary to go back to the most basic evidence, the autopsy X-rays, the autopsy report, the autopsy photographs, and the Zapruder film in order to reconstruct the case from the bottom up.

That has been the methodology that David W. Mantik, Robert Livingston, Jack White, and others have been pursuing with some degree of success. Books like ASSASSINATION SCIENCE and MURDER IN DEALEY PLAZA are threatening to those who oppose the discovery of truth because they take us back to the basics in order to sort out what evidence is authentic and what is not. They thereby enable us to know what is credible and worthy of belief and what is not.

In my opinion, this journal, JFK/DEEP POLITICS QUARTERLY, ought to be retitled so as not to tarnish the name of Peter Dale Scott, whose work has made the notion of "deep politics" important in assassination studies. Consider the sources of what, in my view, represents the abuse of language and logic in order to mislead, confound, and confuse its intended audience about a matter of the greatest importance to the public, the cause of death of the 35th President of the United States.

Notice when someone like Tink Thompson praises someone like Gary Mack or cites approvingly someone like Todd Vaughan or calls for someone like Walt Brown to ride to the rescue. Notice when someone like Clint Bradford or Martin Shackelford or Barbara Junkkari or Pamela Brown has an axe to grind. Notice when claims are too strong to be true, sources are not cited, quotations are taken out of context, edited selectively, or words removed. These are signs.

I am not suggesting that any of them works for the NSA, the CIA, or the FBI. That creates an exaggerated version of the situation as I see it that makes it easy to satirize. I have no idea why they are doing what they are doing. But there are ample grounds based upon past experience to believe they are abusing logic and language to mislead and deceive others about the state of research on the death of JFK. On the basis of my experience with them, I believe this is deliberate. Their function appears to me to be obfuscation.

It makes a difference. It matters. They seem to have a lot of interaction. Just a few days ago, Bradford's site featured a "Fetzer's Follies" that was little more than fragments of quotations taken out of context. Yesterday it read like selections from the work of Josiah Thompson. It repeats the absurd suggestion that those who are most qualified have no more to contribute to the case than those who are least qualified.

Think about it. Notice how perfectly it promotes the objective of creating a situation in which everything can be believed and nothing

can be known. If the least simpleton should be taken as seriously as the most distinguished scholar, then there is nothing for them to fear. Even the most important discoveries can be readily discounted merely by denial. But perhaps that's what we ought to expect from someone who graduated from Yale!

There is a serious disinformation movement afoot, one that finds the work of those they attack to be too good to ignore. I am therefore refurbishing my web site to accent disinformation, which is the major obstacle to the search for truth about the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I am reposting my exchange with Josiah Thompson. I am elaborating upon his activities. Among those we are considering, he is perhaps the best. His case merits study.

We cannot stop it, but we must understand it. Let us all do our best to expose and combat it. The cause of justice demands no less.