

enclosures are examples of inaccuracies on your part. The Rosetta Stone of your inaccuracies is your failure to come to terms with the truth that Oswald killed Tippit.

I would respectfully suggest that apart from the fact that I do not have the time to respond to all of the inaccurate statements that you and people like you make about the Kennedy assassination, I also do not choose to engage in any debate with someone who has such bad judgement to use the kind of language that you use. Whereas I wrote to Sam Silver that "He (Harold Weisberg), regretfully, is inaccurate," sending him copies of *New York Times* and *Wall Street Journal* op-ed pieces I have written (copies of which are enclosed and incorporated by reference herein), you imply that I am a "shyster" (page four); suggest that my use of the words "Final Disclosure" and "Full Truth" are "like love from the mouth of a whore" (page eight); call me a "liar" (pages eight and eleven); falsely accuse me of "the use of 'unprofessional or questionable methods'" (pages four and fourteen); and state that I "have the impartiality and dependability of a judenrat and in our society that is close to the role in which you cast yourself" (page eighteen). I am sorry that you are so blind to the truth that Oswald killed both Kennedy and Tippit and wounded Governor Connally. If you choose, you can send a copy of your letter and this reply to your "dear friend," Rabbi Sam Silver, so he can have a better understanding of the facts of the assassination and also the kind of language you use, and the kind of outrageous accusations, such as: "You have the impartiality and dependability of a judenrat and in our society that is close to the role in which you cast yourself."

Three final comments:

1. Those of us serving with the Warren Commission have one tremendous advantage over people such as you who write from transcripts: We actually interviewed the key witnesses and had an opportunity to observe their demeanor and form conclusions about the voracity of their testimony at a time that was within a relatively few months after the assassination.
2. We had the advantage of working within close proximity of each other and questioning each other about all aspects of evidence as well as exchanging information about findings, so it was not just a case of one lawyer in an ivory tower examining documents and coming to conclusions, but rather a group of lawyers who interfaced with one another in an objective quest to find the truth about who killed President Kennedy.
3. Even though I have no respect for your reckless personal attacks on me, I nevertheless am sorry that you have had to battle the physical ailments you describe in your January 8 letter.

In closing, since you "intend to use what I quote above of your letter and what you say in those articles and this writing ... and will be using this letter and any response you may make", I will feel free to make available to third parties your entire letter as well as my entire reply so that they can have a better understanding of the nature of Harold Weisberg and the inaccuracies of his writings. And although for the reasons previously stated in this letter I do not plan to further correspond with you, I nevertheless feel that a constructive purpose will have been served if in some future years objective readers will have an opportunity to review your entire January 8 letter and my entire response, including the