

*not
announced*

Robert Katz
630 West Cliveden Street
Philadelphia, PA 19119

January 13, 1995

Mr. Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I see that by this time you have indeed decided no longer to respond to my letters. I hope you will pardon me for the following critique of your writings and correspondence:

1. You have asserted, among other things, that Oswald committed no murders, that a conspiracy existed, that the single-bullet theory is wrong, and that someone shot accurately at President Kennedy from his right front. Accordingly, I conclude that you believe that two or more assassins fired at the motorcade, and that at least one of them stood in the general area of the "grassy knoll." You also believe that someone other than Oswald was the murderer of J. D. Tippitt. It therefore appears to me that despite what you say, you have indeed reconstructed many of the events surrounding the assassination.

I am left with some questions: Who were the assassins who fired at the motorcade, and what motivated them? Given that you believe that at least one assassin fired from the knoll, where did the other(s) fire from? What kind of weapons and ammunition did they use? How did they get away? Who killed J. D. Tippitt? Why? What was the weapon used? How did Tippitt's killer escape? How was Oswald framed for both murders? How could the individuals who framed Oswald for the assassination have foreseen that it would be necessary to frame him for Tippitt's murder as well? If your answer to these questions is "I don't know," what does that say about the investigations that you and other conspiracy theorists have conducted over the past thirty years?

On a related matter, in arguing that the President must have been struck by a bullet fired from his right front, you assert in Photographic Whitewash that the President's slumping backwards is an impossible reaction to his being struck by a bullet fired from his back. You also assert that the President's falling to his left is an indication that the shot that struck him in the head came from his right. You neglect, however, to back up either of your assertions with opinions from an expert in wound ballistics. Have you had sufficient training in wound ballistics to make such assertions responsibly?

As far as I can see, you have failed to support with evidence the reconstruction which you posit by implication.

2. You devote a small paragraph in Case Open to refuting Gerald Posner's assertion that President Kennedy went into Thorburn's position after he was shot in the neck. You do not, however, provide any medical opinion to back up what you write. Do you have a medical degree or sufficient experience dealing with spinal wounds which would enable you responsibly to make such a refutation?

3. You write in Photographic Whitewash that the C2766 Mannlicher-Carcano was "an ancient worn-out Italian war-surplus rifle that was a piece of junk when it was new," and that "there could not have been a lone assassin with that (rifle)." You neglect, however, to support what you write with opinion from a firearms expert. Do you have sufficient training and expertise in handling firearms to make such assertions responsibly?

4. Also in Photographic Whitewash, you write that CE 399 is "virtually pristine" and "almost intact, unutilated, and undeformed." Are the words "virtually" and "almost" meaningful in this context? I have been taught that the word "virtually," in particular, is often used as a weasel word to mean "not." Would it not have been more exact to write something like "CE 399 had been fired from a rifle but was only slightly deformed when it was found at Parkland Hospital."?

This is only a partial list. I invite you to consult my previous correspondence for more questions about evidence. In particular, I would still be interested in what you might have to say about the handwriting on the back of the picture of Oswald carrying the Mannlicher-Carcano, CE 567 and CE 569 (the bullet fragments found in the Presidential limousine), the fired cases dropped by Tippitt's murderer, and Oswald's carrying a concealed pistol into the Texas Theater and his attempt there on the life of policeman Nick McDonald.

I am not expecting an answer from you, so I suppose all of my questions and inquiries are necessarily rhetorical. If I am left with so many rhetorical questions, what does that say about your willingness to discuss the assassination with someone who disagrees with you?

Very truly yours,


Robert Katz