

Dear Dave,

later 9/27/94

You may have wondered about my yesterday's letter because you sent me those reviews with your letter of the 14th. That is because your letter just reached me today. I guess the delay was because you used the wrong zip. You used 17012 instead of 21701.

I note that Rose gave DeVries about twice the space he gave you,

I'd ~~not~~ read the notes before. My God, this guy thinks Killing the Truth is an excellent book! And others not fit to be cited other than in ridicule.

I can't imagine that on that talk show he cites in his note 19 I did not say how I know those men were winos. I find it interesting that those characters are keeping book on me! Keeping my appearances? But I am certain I explained if asked to, and if I was not asked to, that justifies this idiot in saying, I find it wildly speculative for Weisberg to make such a statement...." After the police records have been so well publicized!

These nuts never get out of their nuthouses!

If he can quote Marrs as a source his ignorance must be as of Marrs' level!

I've done a little more checking of what he wrote and his sources. This guy is really a subject-matter ignoramus and he lacks any genuine scholarly critical capability. He is a theory-nut and nothing else.

I see more that he misrepresents in Case Open and he reflects his ignorance of my work in it. I did in fact postulate earlier shots than the Commission said based on what was later called the jiggle theory when some of his students raised what I wrote with Luis Alvarez. You'll find that in WWI, under Zapruder.

This is pretty sick stuff, the sickest part of which is that they do not realize they are sick and believe all others are.

The copies you sent include the table of contents. Does Burgess really question the authenticity of the Zapruder film?

And does Rose really believe that Oswald was at Oak Ridge?

Amazing!

Harold