

Two weeks ago yesterday I was hospitalized for what was to have been a day and a half that lasted for two weeks. I was allowed home yesterday in time to read the mail of those two weeks. I begin to respond on my 83rd birthday. Responding to all of it will take some time. I'll not be able to respond to much of it as fully as in the past, as I hope some of you will be able to understand. It ^{fills} ~~fills~~ a box that held 100 file folders. Two weeks of book orders have also accumulated and filling and mailing them will also take time. As will additional medical appointments several of which follow today. And, perhaps from two weeks ^{no} ~~no~~ physical activity at all instead of the ~~my~~ limited physical activity that had been possible for me I am also a bit weaker.

The initial diagnosis at the hospital, based on fluid in my chest, was congestive heart failure. Not quite a full quart of fluid was taken from my chest. Analysis of it disclosed nothing. Several cultures ^{also} were made. It will be some time before the results of them ^{will} be available.

I was told I have some anemia and that my kidney function is less than it should be.

The fluid was not in my lungs and there was no blood in it.

If the doctors learned more than this I was not told. Several specialists were involved and at least one of them will continue to be in ^{consultation} ~~exam~~ examinations. I do not suggest that the doctors learned more than they told me.

I was ambulatory all the time that I was hospitalized and to a degree I was able to continue work. I've about completed research for another manuscript that can be of book length. When I can get to it!

I hope this explains my delay in responding and in my responding at less length than in the past.

For which I am sorry but my first ^{priority} ~~priority~~ remains completing the work to the degree now possible for me.

Harold Weisbar 4/8/96

Thanks for the unfortunately justified The Rhythmakers article and the CD 1216, which I did not have in that form. I have the original CIA records on which it is based... Nothing in Hosty's book is credible. I've a book-length ms. on it... Sorry I've no time for more now. Thanks and best, H

3-28-96

Dear Harold

I've enclosed two items of interest.

- Time magazine (not the best source we know) reported however in their November 11, 1966 issue that

- "The (autopsy) photo's were examined last week by two of the autopsy doctors. They agreed that the evidence 'fully corroborates' their testimony before the Warren Commission.

Amazing > As we know both the back/neck wound is much different and as you once wrote the head wound has been moved by four inches or "no silly millimeter".

- Rhetorically, since both wounds are in a distinctly different location, what again does this say about their credibility?

- Hosty and his whole Mexico City claims about LHO ignore many things (the tape recording of a man's voice the FBI claimed wasn't LHO; no photos of Oswald from surveillance cameras. ^{And} CD 1216 ^{enclosed} from the CIA to Rankin mentions their uncertainty that 'Oswald' spoke to Kostikov at all.

By the way, could you believe Hosty. His version of the shooting is that the Tague shot hit the curb then ricocheted ~~across~~ ^{across} the street causing dust on the knoll to fly up in the air and that was the puff of smoke that bystanders saw. [(see page 253): Assignment Oswald by Hosty]

At one point in the book he utilizes Posner's prize: The Willis girl as being indicative of more time ("nine seconds" - pg. 250) to accomplish the shooting.

He however does not mention the Willis girl by name ("a little girl") but then goes on to say that "Dozens of people, including law enforcement officers, swarmed up to the grassy knoll - no doubt confused by the unusual acoustics of Dealey Plaza". (P253).

Interesting, the girl looking towards the TSBD is evidence of an early shot from there but she was not confused by the acoustics as were many other people.

He mentions that JFK's "tie fibers" were turned outward, consistent with an exit wound (P250) but doesn't begin to describe either the character of the wound nor the lack of copper tracings in that very same tie knot. I've always thought that your explanation of scissors relating to a "puncture wound" makes a lot of sense both with the tie knot and the throat.

Well, we could go on and on, but Hasty does seem to say, in so many words, that Revill made up some of what transpired between them that day (pg 145-146).

I'm wishing you the very best and think of you quite often when my thoughts revert to Dallas. I want to sincerely thank you for all the ground that you've broken on this case, and look forward to more of your writings.

Ross F. Rebertus