

6/8/76

Dear Bob, *Cutler*

There is no way I can give you the kind of response to your worksheet mailing you want.

Nor can I in good conscience be part of a presumption of truth by consensus. Even less would I want to be when you announce the intent of presenting this to a committee, I take it of the Congress. There such an operation would be ruinous on the concept of truth by consensus alone.

I can't think of 100 of what you call "researchers" whose word on this subject is worth anything.

Our postulate built in conclusions that, surprisingly, coincide with those of the officials with whom I disagree. You provide space for other shots but not for disagreement with these conclusions with which in all respects I disagree entirely.

Not only am I only too aware of the proof to the contrary, I am not aware of any proof in support of these claims, no matter by whom made.

Yet your chart shows two shots only and from that one window only, supported by the language saying this in your two boxes.

These defects are not relieved by the upper box of legend which I had to use a magnifying lens to read.

Were this to relieve these objections you limit to Frame 313 for any shot and ask what cannot be established by a consensus or on the basis of any evidence of which I know, a precise statement of the origin and time of other shots.

Aside from my belief that I hope you will not resent, that this is an exercise in futility and of the dim and outdated past it is a sure loser under any circumstances, more if presented to a Congressional committee which will regard you as irrational. The backlash will befame everyone.

Besides, what will or can this mean when you are finished? It will have no evidentiary value. It will make you look ridiculous. If not irrational, and I'd hate that. It will be laughed at by sophisticates, and you had better assume that this describes Congresspeople.

And of all that might be presented to Congress, were this other than I describe, do you really think it is worth all this time and effort on your part considering how far what is now available has taken us past this kind of concept?

You have even built in "Congress' prime responsibility: WHO (dunnit?) & WHY?"

Whether or not Congress agrees, as I think unlikely, how ell do you think it will sit for them to have their responsibilities assumed for them prior to any action on their part? Is this not what we criticize in the Commission, etc.?

In all interests, especially your own, please back off and out before it is too late.

Sincerely,


worksheet. pls return w/ comment on white

this drawing shows the flightpaths of two familiar WOUNDING HITS, their wound sequence & a schedule of WHEN WHICH shot was fired & HOW rifle location caused bullet to impact wound (WHERE) it did... should you find this solution (expensive detail)?

a. sketch in flightpaths of your WOUNDING HITS - ONLY - Tag's mine
 b. re-list the sequence using wounds' given numbers
 c. complete WHICH, WHEN, WHERE, HOW schedule


this polling of about 100 researchers urban re-drawn as a consensus will be presented to proper committee, freeing if concentrate on Congress' prime responsibility: WHO (dumbit?) & WHY?

appreciate this is low on your totem pole - but it might help free some to investigate who, why and I have to have you on the final list -



WOUND SEQUENCE	years
1	JFK back, entry
2	JFK throat, exit
3	JBC chest, entry
4	JBC chest, exit
5	JBC wrist, entry
6	JBC wrist, exit
7	JBC thigh, entry
8	JFK head, entry
9	JFK head, exit

WHICH shot	WHEN Z hit-frame.	WHERE wounds · entry · exit	HOW rifle location
1	CE 599 ± 210	JFK neck, entry & throat exit / JBC chest & wrist entry & thigh entry	TSBD V#1
2	head	JFK head entry & exit	TSBD V#1
3			
4			
5			



1/3/76

Cutler
Dear Bob,

There is no way I can give you the kind of response to your warmest mailing you want.

Nor can it in good conscience be part of a presumption of truth by consensus.

Even less would I want to be when you announce the intent of presenting this to a committee, I take it of the Congress. There such an operation would be ruinous on the concept of truth by consensus alone.

I can't think of 100 of what you call "researchers" whose word on this subject is worth anything.

Our postulate had 100 conclusions that, surprisingly, coincide with those of the officials with whom I disagree. You provide space for other shots but not for disagreement with these conclusions with which in all respects I disagree entirely.

Not only am I only too aware of the proof to the contrary, I am not aware of any proof in support of these claims, no matter by whom made.

Yet your chart shows two shots only and from that one window only, supported by the language saying this in your two boxes.

These defects are not relieved by the upper box of legend which I had to use a magnifying lens to read.

Were this to relieve these objections you limit to frame 313 for any shot and ask what cannot be established by a consensus or on the basis of any evidence of which I know, a precise statement of the origin and time of other shots.

Aside from my belief that I hope you will not resent, that this is an exercise in futility and of the dim and outdated past it is a sure loser under any circumstances, more if presented to a Congressional committee which will regard you as irrational. The backlash will befall everyone.

Besides, what will or can this mean when you are finished? It will have no evidentiary value. It will make you look ridiculous, if not irrational, and I'd hate that. It will be laughed at by sophisticates, and you had better assume that this describes Congresspeople.

And of all that might be presented to Congress, were this other than I describe, do you really think it is worth all this time and effort on your part considering how far what is now available has taken us past this kind of concept?

You have even built in "Congress' prime responsibility: WHO (Admit?) & WHEN?"

Whether or not Congress agrees, as I think unlikely, how all do you think it will sit for them to have their responsibilities assessed for them prior to any action on their part? Is this not what we criticize in the Commission, etc.?

In all interests, especially your own, please back off and out before it is too late.

Sincerely,