

December 10, 2007

Dear Dr. Aguilar,

Thank you for sending me your review of Reclaiming History in The Federal Lawyer. I had to read it fast and I cannot respond adequately to it here because, once again, I am working on another book deadline 0 the harshest attack ever on George Bush and *his* war in Iraq. I will be writing this letter almost in a stream of consciousness since I don't have time to do anything else. I'm going to try to be brief, but I'm not too good at that.

Instead of receiving this civil letter from me, Dr. Aguilar, by all rights you should be receiving a summons and complaint in a civil lawsuit for libel by you against me that would unquestionably result in a favorable judgment for me that would force you into bankruptcy and/or have you working for me (by attachment of your salary) the rest of your professional life. My Christmas gift to you is that I don't intend to sue you now, and I doubt very much that I will change my mind.

Why am I giving you this enormous break? Because one normally sues their enemies. And in a strange sort of way I still view you as a friend, one who helped me while I was writing my book and who even gave guidance to my son near the start of his medical career. Also, it's very clear to me that you are so out of it, and so f.....-up on this matter, that I sense at some wholly irrational level, number one, you actually believe your outrageous nonsense, and number two, don't even realize how seriously you defamed me. Witness your sending me a copy of your preposterous, defamatory review with a friendly cover letter and wishing me a merry Christmas. That's not the normal conduct of a serious defamer. I'm also aware that no sensible person could possibly give any credence to your review inasmuch as you make an

p.2

outrageous charge and offer no substantive evidence to prove it. So at least among sensible people you only embarrassed yourself, and I'm not going to reduce myself down to your level by even bothering to write a letter to the editor of The Federal Lawyer responding to your vapidty. Someone who can write a review as crazy as yours doesn't deserve a response from me in the magazine, which could only elevate you by the fact that I thought you were worth responding to.

However, I would hope you would have the character to write a letter to the editor yourself, and without losing too much face, acknowledge that you spoke very loosely when you alleged my book was full of intentional omissions and distortions. It will be worthy of note to me to see if you have sufficient character to do this. As a friend (should I still be a friend of yours?), let me give you some extremely good and valuable advice. You pull off (sic) a stunt like you did with me with the wrong person in the future, and your economic future could be destroyed. Be grateful to me that I am giving you this good advice. It couldn't be more obvious that without this advice you simply don't know any better.

[In a sidebar, along the left-hand edge of the page, he inserted: "By the way, Dr. Aguilar, if you think that because one is a public figure like me that it insulates you from all civil liability for defamation of character (libel), I am here to inform you that you are 100% wrong."]

Before I elaborate just a bit more on this, let me first point out that in addition to your article being libelous, it was also silly. I've never viewed you as a silly person, but your review contained some very silly assertions. For example, for you to say that Reclaiming History "hasn't laid a glove on major elements of the case for conspiracy is terribly silly, and upon reflection, you should be embarrassed for having written such words. Anyone who can read Book Number Two of Reclaiming History, including the 32 reasons I set forth why there was no

p. 3

conspiracy in the assassination, and make this remark is permanently allergic to any evidence pointing away from a conspiracy. But because of your intellect, my sense is that this is not so, that you simply couldn't resist using a colorful metaphor, and you did so without thinking what you were writing.

Getting back to your assault on my integrity, objectivity, and credibility, there can be no question that *Reclaiming History* is the most objective, factual book yet written on the assassination. (In a sidebar, he adds, "As The Oregonian reviewer said, 'Bugliosi lays [the Kennedy assassination] out on a legal pad, pros and cons, discrepancies and all ____.'"") Dr. Aguilar, I repeat what I have said before. In my non-fiction books I never, ever knowingly omit evidence damaging to a position I have taken. On my children's lives that will never happen. My whole orientation as a trial lawyer before a jury (where, if you lose your credibility with them, chances are you've lost your case) and a bestselling (sic) author of true crime books, an orientation that no other writer on the Kennedy assassination that I am aware of has had, is against this. Even disregarding the matter of ethics, from a purely selfish viewpoint one can only hurt himself by not being objective and factual and having the lack of objectivity and truthfulness exposed, as you ridiculously claim you have done with me. You don't reach the level I have as a trial lawyer and writer of true crime books by not being as objective and factual as possible. If anything significant which is contrary to a position I have taken is not set forth in *Reclaiming History* it has to be because I either was unaware of it, or forgot it, or it concerned a highly technical matter I may not have had a 100% grasp of. Nothing else.

Everywhere in the book I show my objectivity, yet you say I deliberately omitted contrary evidence, an extremely serious

p. 4.

allegation that you failed abysmally to prove. Do you think, for instance, that you prove your case by the Stringer-Lifton matter? You haven't. I either forgot or never read what Stringer told Lifton. I never read every single page of every conspiracy book ever written. Have you? And do you think that when I was not writing up the brief Stringer quote, I checked the index of the hundreds upon hundreds of books I have on the Kennedy assassination, and, though I have no computer, checked every article on the Kennedy assassination to see if Stringer may have told someone also something different? If I had done that with everything I wrote I would have **never** completed the book. But Dr. Aguilar, I'll put my credibility for telling the whole truth up against yours (or anyone else in the conspiracy community) any day of the week and twice on Sunday.

Obviously, if *Reclaiming History* comes out in a second edition, what Stringer told Lifton will automatically be in the book, even though Lifton never asked a proper question. It should have been side versus back, not top versus back. As you know, I set forth the statements of many Parkland and Bethesda witnesses who thought there was a large defect to the occipital region of Kennedy's skull, something you neglected to tell your readers. Why would I knowingly omit what Stringer told Lifton?

As to the Jacqueline (sic) Hall-Kallas matter, I've never heard of her and know nothing about this, yet you slander me to thousands of readers by saying "It is not surprising that Bugliosi says nothing about any of this." How in the hell could I have when I never even

p.5

heard about this before I read it in your review? Your slander presupposes I **did** have knowledge. Any intelligent reader who read what you said would say, "What evidence does Aguilar have that Bugliosi was aware of that Hall-Kallas matter?"

Dr. you're out of your depth when you attempt to attack the credibility of someone like me. By the way and before I forged, Tim Miller from Nashville called me on December 6 and told me that you told him that I quoted you out of context in my book. It would have been nice if you had set forth in your review exactly where I allegedly did this (or told Tim, which he said you did not), so I would know what in the heck you are talking about.

Going back to my not knowing about the Lifton and Hall-Kallas matters, since it's safe to assume that you learned one hell of a lot about the Kennedy assassination from my book that you did not know either, do you realize what I could do with anything you wrote on the case if I employed your tactics and reasoning?

(Actually, since I took on an unprecedented task in the book and have no secretary, computer, or researchers, it's remarkable I was able to become aware of the incredible amount of information I did.) My god, you distorted and omitted things in your review of Reclaiming History when you were aware of them because you actually read the book. For instance (and I don't have the time to respond to all of your foundationless allegations), you seem to suggest on page 65 of your review that I omitted something the Church Committee said about the Warren Commission investigation not receiving

p. 6

facts that affected its investigation. See page 370 of Reclaiming History. The thought never entered my mind that you were up to no good when you omitted this.

And how in the heck can you write that in my book I dismissed the finding of Randich, et al? To the exact contrary I specifically gave them credit for their findings and said they helped bring about a dramatic new development in the whole area of NAA. What a gross distortion on your part. Did you really read pages 435-438 of the endnotes? If you had, how could you write what you did?

And where do I say I accepted Sturdivan over Randich-Grant? If you think I say this in the footnote on page 437 you're incorrect. And you suggest I'm not a scholar because I didn't contact Randich, et al? Contact them for what? I had their article. I've got a million things on my desk, many far more important, and I'm on a deadline, and I'm supposed to contact Randich to talk some more about his article, and Sturdivan's response to it, and then get Sturdivan's response again? Apparently you feel, Dr. Aguilar, that Reclaiming History is not long enough. That 2500opages doesn't have all the detail and follow-up necessary to warrant it being a very comprehensive book and a book of scholarship. Dr., Reclaiming History has exposed you to a level of scholarship that you're probably never been exposed to in your whole life, and you're suggesting I'm not a scholar?

Dr., getting back to your very serious libel of me (forgive my rambling letter, but again, I am extremely busy and rushed

p. 7

for time), how do you have the unmitigated gall and guts to say that "hundreds upon hundreds of pages could be written detailing similar examples of Bugliosi's omitting or distorting evidence"? (sic) I expected more of you, Dr. That statement is more than just wrong, It's inexcusable and outrageous and you should be very ashamed of yourself. It is also, to repeat, clearly libelous, particularly since your readers are fellow lawyers of mine, and everyone knows I am held in the highest esteem by most members of the legal profession, one reason being my high credibility. You may be pleased to know that in over 30 years of writing non-fiction books, and receiving literally hundreds upon hundreds of reviews of them, to my knowledge you are the very first reviewer in a paper or magazine to question my integrity and call me a liar who deliberately omits and distorts evidence. The very first one, Dr. Aguilar. And you say you could write hundreds of pages about my lies (by omission) and distortion? You can't write one page, much less hundreds.

Instead of being very grateful for writing a scrupulously honest book that is scrupulously fair to the conspiracy community, something I consciously and consistently did for over 20 years because that's simply the way I am, you viciously accuse me of writing a book that is full of intentional omissions (lies by omission) and deliberate distortions. What a dirty, rotten thing for you to do, Dr. Aguilar. What you said can hurt me among stupid, undiscerning people, of which there are many, and hurt your credibility among sensible people. Any fair and rational and knowledgeable person

p. 8

reading my book and then reading what you said about me (or visa versa) can only say, "What in the world is Dr. Aguilar talking about? Is there something wrong with him, or does he have an ax to grind?" Dr. I'll

give you \$5,000 for every deliberated omission or distortion you can prove I made. Don't even try. It never happened.

You don't prove a deliberate omission or distortion merely by showing an omission or something I wrote that is not accurate. Surely you must know this. In my book, I prove, over and over again, where members of the conspiracy community lied and deliberately distorted the evidence. I did this by showing there was no other explanation for what they did. Where there is another reasonable explanation you haven't proved anything. Aren't you aware of that? If you are not, you should keep your pen or pencil out of your hand when you have the urge to attack someone, or write your assessment in a more mature, intelligent way.

Dr., not only do I always, without exception (as I say, if for no other reason than for my own benefit), state the contrary evidence to a position I am taking (unless, as indicated earlier, I am unaware, forgot, etc.), on many occasions in Reclaiming History I accept the position of the conspiracy community over that of the anti-conspiracy community. (How often, Dr. in your writing, have you done this on an important issue?) If I had only done this once it would demonstrate how very fair and objective I was in Reclaiming History. But I did it over and over again, e.g., the Albert Bogard car salesman issue; Sylvia Odio being correct in seeing Oswald at her door; Dr. Perry having, indeed, originally said that he thought that the

p. 9

wound in the throat was an entrance wound, and so on. In fact, I even set forth all the pieces of evidence which, on their face at least, point to Oswald's innocence. How would you possibly aspire to writing a fair and objective review of Reclaiming History without mentioning these important facts?

Dr., the one word that has been used to describe me more than any other is credibility. And yet you set out in your review to show, for the first time ever about any book I have written, that I am a person with no credibility. I repeat. You should consider yourself God damn lucky that I am not suing you and destroying your financial future. You owe me a bit-time apology, Dr. Aguilar. Not only are you wrong about everything you said about my credibility and integrity, but it is absolutely astonishing that you would put my credibility, objectivity and scholarship on the same level of Gerald Posner's, as you seem to have done. Dr., are you sure that you read Reclaiming History as carefully as you should have?

A few other quick points and then I have to run. (This letter has gone for too long, especially for a person who doesn't deserve one word.) You say my book is "conclusion-driven." Is this a negative? (And isn't this what your writing is, too?) Dr., there either was or was not a conspiracy on the assassination. There's nothing in between. The notions that there has to be is analogous, in an imperfect parallel, to ruminating "Maybe Hitler had a point." Or are you suggesting by those words that I didn't support my conclusions. (sic) If that's your point, it is preposterous on its face. I offer an

p. 10

enormous amount of support for every position I take in the book. Whether or not you agree with my position is a separate issue. Relevant to this issue of support, I had heard that the Warren Report was, at 6500 citations, the most heavily sourced single book there was. If so (and I don't know this to be true), at over 10,000 citations Reclaiming History may be the most heavily sourced non-fiction book of any kind ever written. The citations alone in the book run to 170 pages. In Norman font, they would run to 300 pages, a book in itself.

Dr., I told Dr. Mantic (sic) that in my writing about him in Reclaiming History I perhaps did not (though it was completely innocent on my part) treat him with as much respect as he deserves. If your review of my book is any indication of who you are and your scholarship, I perhaps treated you with too much respect, and will have to examine your writing more closely than perhaps I have.

Dr., again, I have to run. To end on as friendly a note as I can muster under the circumstances, you know I have always respected you and Dr. Mantic (sic) (I also wish I could write as well as you and that I had Dr. Mantic's (sic) rather imposing IQ) and feel that the two of you have definitely elevated the quality of

professional criticism against the official position in the Kennedy assassination. I am very, very surprised and disappointed you didn't feel I did likewise on the opposing side. If you did, I overlooked it in my very quick reading of your review. But I believe that your review, as terribly wrong as it was, was at least most likely sincere on your part, and I thank you for that, along

p. 11

with some of the nice things you said about Reclaiming History.

I hope everything is going well for you and that you have a good holiday season and a great New Year.

Best,

Vince

P.S. Please give my best to Dr. Wecht. Also, I'd like you to give a copy of this letter to Dr. Mantic (sic), unless, for whatever reason, you prefer not to.