

Auckland, 19/03/95

Dear Harold

I have been holding back from writing these last few weeks thinking you may be going to reply to my very long letter of 5th February, that is, to add something to your aerogramme of 17th February. It is obvious this was not your intention, and rightly so. For my own silence, there have been factors holding me back from writing too.

Looking at these dates I see with surprise how long it has been since I last wrote to you. Time is getting away from me. Two weeks ago I worked the whole weekend on a submission I had to write to the government on behalf of my professional association (Transition Education and Training). Then last weekend I spent most of the time in bed with what I thought was just a bad cold, but it did not get any better. I saw a doctor last evening and found out I have a bad attack of bronchitis. I have struggled through the last week with a lot of discomfort. Still, feeling so tired and 'yucky' helped me take a few decisions during the week regarding my work 'overload'. I resigned from my position on the LINK Advisory Committee (I have been there for five years), I resigned from the branch secretary's job for our teachers' union (Western Springs College branch) and I resigned from the Auckland regional committee of the Transition Education and Training Assn. This was in the pipeline months ago, but it is another responsibility I have dropped.

What has happened here? Not a lot, but there are a few things on the go. I have had an invitation to speak on the subject of the proposed JFK Assassination textbook to the May conference of the Auckland History Teachers' Association. I bought a little mini-cassette tape recorder that I can use for making notes to myself while I am reading. I meet Donna Chisholm next week and she seems very interested in giving my course some coverage in the SUNDAY STAR TIMES. That will be good for a number of reasons, not least being it should ensure there will be a good number of people applying for the course. She does however seem interested in writing something into the university's refusal to take the course this year. I would not like to see that issue become the main thrust of the story.

The biggest development over the past few weeks has been all inside my head. As you can well imagine not a day goes by that I do not think about the assassination, and picking and rejecting possible ways of using my knowledge in getting the book together. The answer came to me in bed one night, all in the one word, RECONSTRUCTION! In that one word I saw a way of composing the book! It allows me to be selective in what areas I decide are best analysed, I can move forwards and backwards inside the process of 'reconstructing' what may have happened- looking only at the evidence. I can see it in my mind, like a staircase, with a door to understanding at the top and many windows with partial views on the way up. Every step in the 'reconstruction can be easily set up, from identifying an event, to listing relevant evidence, to the WC conclusion(s). Then we go backwards to 'reconstruct' the connections between evidence and WC conclusions.

Your aerogramme of 17 February had a statement that set me thinking, and I cannot fault it. You'll recall I had assumed a military-based conspiracy or one that involved active participation by some branch of the military. (This scenario further assumed some in positions of high command turning a blind eye.) Referring to the military autopsy, you reminded me that nobody in the military acts unless they have been ordered to do so. I agree, of course, it is the whole credo of the military mind. If you take this rather simple truism to a logical conclusion, the orders to kill Kennedy most likely came right from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Such a situation, with a decision to act possibly originating with the Joint Chiefs, could well have involved McGeorge Bundy as National Security Adviser, and maybe his brother William too? Problem with this sort of thinking is, where do you stop? I remember telling you once L.Fletcher Prouty seemed to obliquely point a finger at McGeorge Bundy. You were noncommittal in your response. There was a reference I did not fully understand to McGeorge Bundy in John Newman's book that seemed pregnant with implications, where he indicated that the revised draft for NSAM 263 considered by LBJ on Sunday 24th November 1963 had apparently been typed on Bundy's typewriter. (There was also I think a question mark over exactly when it may have been typed, and what that may or may not mean.)

Here we are lost in speculation again. How easy it is. I do not seriously think about "who?" as much as I used to, but I still find it interesting to wonder.

I have not received the second bundle of papers from Gerald McKnight yet. I hope they arrive soon.

I feel like going back to bed, and that is where I think I will go with a couple of panadol.

With love and best wishes,

Jan.