

----- Forwarded message from resolution@amazon.com -----
Date: Fri, 5 Jul 2002 14:19:47 -0700
From: resolution@amazon.com
Reply-To: resolution@amazon.com
Subject: Your Amazon.com Inquiry
To: jfetz@d.umn.edu

Dear Mr. Fetzter,

Greetings again from Amazon.com.

I'm sorry if you found my previous response to your letter offensive or insufficient.

I understand that "The Warren Report" is a work of non-fiction, and your refutation of the facts therein does pertain to the book, but your review was heavy on dialogue concerning American History, not necessarily "The Warren Report". What we're looking for in a customer review are things like "I think the cover of this book is attractive" and "I thought this book failed to present the facts in a believable manner" and "I think the editor did a poor job".

As an authority on the subject, the review that you provided us was captivating, for sure. But it was also a 500+ word essay which attempted to educate our customers about the topic of "The Warren Report". I understand your point- that your review WAS a critique of the information provided by The Warren Report- but for several reasons we will not be posting the unedited version of your review.

One of these reasons too, as you know, was the promotion of your own works within the review. Cross-merchandising is prohibited in our Participation Guidelines, which you can find here:

<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/browse/-/508094/>

I do hope this is sufficient explanation for you, Mr. Fetzter, and I encourage you to contact me with any further concerns you may have. Please know, however, that our stance on the issue of your review will not change.

Best regards,

David Bradley Cross
Executive Customer Relations
<http://www.amazon.com>

=====

>Date: Thu Jul 04 09:15:49 PDT 2002
>Subject: Re: Your Amazon.com Inquiry
>To: resolution@amazon.com
>From: jfetz@d.umn.edu

>Brad Cross,

>

>Here is the shortened review that I originally submitted followed by

>the review as it now shows on Amazon.com regarding THE WARREN REPORT:
>
> THE REVIEW SUBMITTED: * (one star) The greatest hoax ever
perpetrated on
> the
> American people
>
> THE WARREN REPORT (1964) has become the most disputed,
debated, and denied
> publication in the history of this nation. It purports to
account for the
> death of our 35th
> President on the basis of three crucial hypotheses:
>
> (H1) that JFK was hit at the base of the back of his neck by a
bullet that
> traversed his neck
> without hitting any bony structure and exited his throat at
the level of
> his tie;
>
> (H2) that JFK was hit in the back of his head by a bullet
fired from the
> sixth floor of the
> Texas School Book Depository, which was the shot that brought
about his
> death;
>
> (H3) that these shots were fired by a lone assassin, Lee
Harvey Oswald,
> using a
> high-powered rifle, which was identified as a 6.5 mm Italian
> Mannlicher-Carcano.
>
> If any of these hypotheses is false, then THE WARREN REPORT
cannot be
> sustained.
>
> The first hypothesis, (H1), cannot be true, because his shirt
and jacket;
> the autopsy
> diagrams by J. Thornton Boswell, USN, MC, and by James Sibert,
FBI; the
> death certificate
> executed by Admiral George Burkley, USN, MC; the summary
report of the
> autopsy by
> Sibert and Francis O'Neill; and even the reenactment
photographs indicate
> that the bullet
> entered about 5 1/2 inches below his collar, not at the base
of the back
>of
> his neck, much
> of the evidence for which may be found in the book,
ASSASSINATION SCIENCE
> (1998).

>
> A recent study by David W. Mantik, M.D., Ph.D., using a CAT
scan of a
> patient with similar
> chest and neck dimensions to those of JFK, was conducted by
drawing a line
> from the
> alleged point of entry to the alleged point of exit, which
turns out to be
> anatomically
> impossible because cervical vertebrae intervene. It turns out
that a
> member
> of the
> commission, Congressman Gerald Ford, had the description of
this wound
> changed from
> "his uppermost back" to "the base of the back of his neck" to
make the
> "magic bullet"
> theory more plausible.
>
> That the "magic bullet" theory is not only false but provably
false and
> anatomically
> impossible devastates the government's official position and
those of
> other
> inquiries and
> studies that take that claim for granted. These include the
REPORT OF THE
> HOUSE SELECT
> COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS (1979) and Gerald Posner's CASE
CLOSED (1993),
> which are predicated upon that premise. Since no bullet
transited the neck
> and exited the
> throat, the throat wound and the wounds in Governor John
Connally have to
> be accounted
> for by other shots and shooters.
>
> The second hypothesis, (H2), turns out to be inconsistent with
the
> Commission's own
> diagrams of the wound the President sustained; since, when you
juxtapose
> frame 312 of
> the Zapruder film with the Commission's own diagrams, as
Stewart Galanor,
> COVER-UP
> (1997), has done, they are not consistent and could only be
reconciled if
> another assassin
> had been firing at an upward angle from a location behind and
below that
> of

> the President,
> such as from the trunk of the limousine.
>
> The third hypothesis, (H3), turns out to be physically
impossible,
>because,
> while the death
> certificates (there are several), THE WARREN REPORT, and even
articles
>that
> have since
> appeared in the JOURNAL OF THE AMA, all report that the
President was
> killed by the impact
> of high-velocity bullets, the Mannlicher-Carcano, which has a
muzzle
> velocity of only 2,000
> fps, does not qualify as a high-velocity weapon. It follows
that the only
> rifle (technically,
> carbine) Oswald was alleged to have used cannot have fired the
bullets
>that
> brought about
> Jack's death.
>
> Moreover, as studies published in MURDER IN DEALEY PLAZA
(2000) establish,
> at
> least one of the bullets that entered the President's skull at
the
>location
> of his right temple
> was a frangible or exploding bullet, which left a trail of
small metallic
> pieces distributed
> through his brain. The only ammunition that Oswald is alleged
to have
>use> however, was
> standard copper-jacketed military ammunition, which does not
explode and
> cannot have
> left any such trail of debris.
>
> We now know vastly more than we knew at the time of THE WARREN
REPORT
>about
> the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, including that he was
hit at least
> four times (once in
> the back from behind, once in the throat from in front, and
twice in the
> head, once from
> behind and once from in front); that at least six shots had to
have been
> fired in Dealey
> Plaza that day (four in Jack, at least one in Big John, and

the shot that
> missed and injured a
> distant bystander, James Tague); and that Oswald cannot
possibly have been
> a "lone
> assassin" (as the previous arguments explain).
>
> The government's own inquiries turn out to have been based
upon evidence
> that
> was fabricated to conceal the true cause of death, including
the lateral
> cranial
> X-ray, which was altered by imposing a patch to conceal a
massive blow-out
> to d,

> the back of the head; the anterior/posterior cranial X-ray,
which was
> altered by
> the imposition of a 6.5 mm metallic object; and the diagrams
and
> photographs
> of
> a brain stored in the National Archives, which cannot possibly
be of the
> brain of
> John Fitzgerald Kennedy.
>
> These conclusions, which were established by studies published
in
> ASSASSINATION
> SCIENCE, have been confirmed by documents released by the
Assassination
> Records
> Review Board, including the discovery that two brain
examinations were
> conducted
> with two different brains. As Cyril Wecht, M.D., J.D., has
observed, these
> investigative
> studies "shift the burden of proof to those who through
ignorance,
> naivete,
> or conscious
> pro-government bias continue to defend THE WARREN REPORT, the
greatest
> hoax
> ever
> perpetrated on the American people".
>
>
>
> THE REVIEW AS POSTED: * (one star) The greatest hoax ever
perpetrated on
> the
> American people

>
> THE WARREN REPORT (1964) has become the most disputed,
debated, and denied
> publication in the history of this nation. It purports to
account for the
> death of our 35th
> President on the basis of three crucial hypotheses:
>
> (H1) that JFK was hit at the base of the back of his neck by a
bullet that
> traversed his neck
> without hitting any bony structure and exited his throat at
the level of
> his tie;
>
> (H2) that JFK was hit in the back of his head by a bullet
fired from the
> sixth floor of the
> Texas School Book Depository, which was the shot that brought
about his
> death;
>
> (H3) that these shots were fired by a lone assassin, Lee
Harvey Oswald,
> using a
> high-powered rifle, which was identified as a 6.5 mm Italian
> Mannlicher-Carcano.
>
> If any of these hypotheses is false, then THE WARREN REPORT
cannot be
> sustained.<
>
> These conclusions, which were established by studies published
in
> ASSASSINATION
> SCIENCE, have been confirmed by documents released by the
Assassination
> Records
> Review Board, including the discovery that two brain
examinations were
> conducted
> with two different brains. As Cyril Wecht, M.D., J.D., has
observed, these
> investigative
> studies "shift the burden of proof to those who through
ignorance,
>naivete,
> or conscious
> pro-government bias continue to defend THE WARREN REPORT, the
greatest
>hoax
> ever
> perpetrated on the American people".
>
>Now I find this extremely offensive, since you have removed the
explanations
>I have provided that establish the falsity of the premises of the

book that I
>have identified. According to your response, the reason for doing
this is:
>
>> As Ms. Naslund stated in her email to you, our concern is not with
>> the quality of validity of the reviews you've written, but whether
or
>> not your review pertains to the book itself, rather than the
broader
>> topic the book is based on. Personally, I find your reviews to be
>> very eloquent and most thought-provoking. However, this sort of
>> dialogue is better suited for our discussion boards.
>
>So, if you would be so kind, please tell me what there is in this
review of
>mine that does NOT "pertain to the book itself"? I have summarized
the key
>premises of the book as (H1) to (H3) and devoted sections of my
review to
>each of them. Please tell me which of my sentences does
NOT "pertain to
>the book itself"? In the last version I posted, I offered other
books as
>the source of the same refutations, but how else are the contents of
this
>book--allegedly a work of non-fiction--supposed to be addressed?
What I
>have done is explain how we know that the premises of the book are
false.
>So please tell me which sentences of my review do NOT pertain to the
book?
>
>Jim
>
>James H. Fetzer
>McKnight Professor
>University of Minnesota
>Duluth, MN 55812
>(218) 726-7269 (office)
>(218) 724-2706 (home)
>(218) 726-7119 (fax)
>jfetzer@d.umn.edu
>Quoting resolution@amazon.com:
>
>> Dear Dr. Fetzer,
>>
>> Greetings again from Amazon.com.
>>
>> My name is Brad Cross, and I am a member of our Executive Customer
>> Relations team. As I work closely with our Customer Service
>> Department, your recent letter to Mr. Bezos has come to my
attention.
>>
>> First, please let me apologize for the frustration you've
experienced
>> as a result of submitting reviews at Amazon.com. Customer reviews
are

>> a fun and important part of our store, and I'm sorry that your
>> experience has been less than satisfactory.
>>
> . . .
>>
>> Now, I see that the issues surrounding our edit of your review
>> of "The Warren Report" have been solved, as you have edited the
>> revised review yourself online. However, this and any review are
>> subject to our review guidelines. If a review is deemed non-
compliant
>> with our guidelines upon submission or thereafter, it can be
removed.
>>
>> As Ms. Naslund stated in her email to you, our concern is not with
>> the quality of validity of the reviews you've written, but whether
or
>> not your review pertains to the book itself, rather than the
broader
>> topic the book is based on. Personally, I find your reviews to be
>> very eloquent and most thought-provoking. However, this sort of
>> dialogue is better suited for our discussion boards.
>>
>> Dr. Fetzer, I hope this letter has clarified this matter somewhat.
>> However, if you continue to have questions or concerns, I hope you
>> will contact me directly at resolution@amazon.com.
>>
>> Best regards,
>>
>> David Bradley Cross
>> Executive Customer Relations
>> <http://www.amazon.com>
>> =====
>>