

Dear Sylvia,

Under separate cover is coming my "dialogue".

I bound it up in looseleaf form, and included all illustrations, ~~XXXXX~~ also.

I invite any and all criticism, and am looking forward to hearing anything you have to say. Please don't let the "finished looking" format deceive you. This is certainly no final draft. Circumstances and timetables forced me to spend much more time on some parts than on others. There is practically no page of the dialogue on which there are not items which can be said in slightly better ways. Up until the last minute I kept revising this thing, and I'm sure it shows. There is still rewriting to do etc. Therefore, if you only have a limited time to spend on it, please hit the Warren Report arguments, and the accuracy of what I am saying, hardest. The troubles with English (ranging from style to spelling and grammar) can be fixed up at this end. Besides, Ramparts told me they would carefully go over everything with rewrite men.

concerning which  
Nevertheless, there is one aspect/I do seek your advice. Please tell me where you think I am not being faithful to my "dialogue" format. Shepbaum told me some parts went very smoothly, but at some points the critic's answer to the citizen's question was much too long. In other words, I broke into an essay form. Please indicate where you think such ~~XXXXXX~~ a thing occurs.

Whenever the point being made is not clear, please let me know. The reason it takes one hundred pages to say what I said is that I tried to attain clarity at the price of a little wordiness. ~~IX~~ Intellectually, there's no reason why the statement "51 witnesses heard the sounds come from the grassy knoll" shouldn't suffice. But you and I both know that if you don't quote the testimony, ~~IX~~ the credibility of what you are saying simply won't come across to the reader. But if, after I've added all the necessary words, it is still not clear---then I've committed the "ultimate sin", so to speak, and I do want to know if you think this happens.

The best test for clarity, I find, is to submit the material to one who has never read anything about the case. I intend to do this in the coming weeks.

I do not claim that all this is original work. It is not. Vince Salandria's medical arguments come through quite clearly in Argument #1 and Argument #4. I would never have noticed the "fishing expedition" going on for the "small hole" had I not read his article in Liberation. Furthermore, I used his method of "sopping up" all the quotes in one paragraph which also contains the ludicrous conclusion. This is most effective "salesmanship", I think.

Argument #1 and #4 are really the meat of the case. #2 is my sign hypothesis, and ~~IX~~ I am anxious to do an experiment shooting a bullet thru a sign, filming it, and turning the film frames into stills before #2 is published (if it ever is). Sheinbaum seems to like the idea of doing that. Argument #3 was separated from #4 for three reasons. First of all, it covers the time factor only---and has nothing to do with the actual nature of the wounds. Secondly, its credibility depends on whether or not Ramparts can get life to permit them to publish color panel #2. Thirdly, it's a good point, I think, at which to sum up Frazier's testimony on the subject.

I treated the neck wound a little differently than did Vince. I try to stress the fact that the Government concedes the darn thing LOOKS like an entry wound, but that it isn't----since its a very special case of an exit wound made by a very special type of passage through the President's body.

Vince, being an attorney, ~~XXXXXXXX~~ took quite seriously whether or not the Government was able to ~~XXXXX~~ get the witness "to say" it was an exit wound. As you see, I do not. When they get the witness to say so by employing some ridiculous line of questioning, I consider it perfectly fair game and quite enlightening to try to introduce the reader to just what this line of questioning is accomplishing, and why. I am not only concerned by what they managed to plant in the record, but also by just what sort of questioning was needed to accomplish it.

\*\*\*\*\*

If ~~XX~~ you wonder why I went to all the trouble to bind it up, add pictures, etc. the reason goes like this. It took me weeks to write this thing, and it makes me feel good to see it bound up like that. But there is also a more practical reason. I really do appreciate any comments you have to make. If I hand you a bunch of paper, you could only do it at home when you have time. By making ~~XX~~ the finished product "portable"---I can sneak into your spare time on subway rides, etc.

Incidentally, I have no objection to your showing this to anyone you please. Nor do I have any objection to your making copies of anything that is there, if you are one of these people that have unlimited access to Xerox facilities. (When I eventually return to industry, I will have such).

Also, I did promise to send you pictures of the splice, and so they are included. (215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220) were not included because I have no more prints left, but I'll have more printed up soon).

Please note the running man at the extreme right hand edge of Willis #7. I've made enlargements of him in color. They came out great. I'm having several prints made, and will send you one when I finally get them back. If and when W-7 is ever used in conjunction with anything of mine, I'm going to try to see if enlargements of the "boy who is pointing", "the running cop", and the "running man" can't be extracted and printed, enlarged, at the bottom of the picture.

"  
2 Please note: the running cop is probably Haygood. He says a railroad detective" came into the yards immediately after him and assured him everything was OK. I think the "running man" is this "detective", racing to head off an encounter between an "Honest Cop" (ie: Haygood) who is about to enter among those who just may be assassins (dressed as police) in the rr yard. This is purely a theory, and cannot be proved. But you should see the enlargement of that running man! He's really sprinting as if his life depended on it!

\*\*\*\*\*

I still owe you ZR-4 and some answers to the questions contained in your Dec. 10 letter.

I recently found the ZR-4 neg, which I had misplaced. It will be printed soon.

I intend to answer everything in your Dec 10 letter when my exams are over . I would like to do it correctly.

For your information, the going is quite rough between myself and Ray. I don't want to go into any of the details at present. Suffice it to say that he wants nothing to do with me. If he keeps his opinions to himself, that is fine. I think he thinks I'm a monster of sorts.

I speak to Maggie quite regularly, and I think things are quite cordial. ~~XX~~ As I may have said to you, what makes me feel so uneasy is that Ray and Maggie are much closer than Maggie and me. I didn't even know Maggie until last February. So I never know just what to think when Ray refuses to speak to me. Am I supposed to assume that Maggie hears nothing of it?

Anyway, there is something ironic about a person who wants to unite the world in the name of this or that, claims to "think ~~XXX~~ big" on the worlds major problems, and can't get along with a fellow work/with whom he disagrees on several specifics.

I disagree with all sorts of people on all sorts of things and have never had the problems I have had with Ray.

I think I have inherited from my Dad the ability to disagree with someone, yet respect his opinion. I want to add one more item: ~~XXXX~~ none of this centers around "trees", or any specific theories I have. Its much more general.

I read all three Saugage articles very quickly. They are in the Periodicals room of the UCLA library. I thought they were very good, but will have to read them more slowly in order to ~~XXXXXX~~ understand ~~XXXX~~ details. I did not get a chance to see the "letter" you referred ~~XX~~ to. I'm sure I'll find it.

I look forward to hearing from you. Be as general or as specific as you wish. I don't think there is a great rush. The first issue <sup>in which</sup> they will do anything ~~is~~ is April.

Ramparts wrote to Vince and to Jones Harris.

I assume they have written you a letter, too. If not, I would feel free to communicate with them. Ramparts will be devoting a considerable portion of each issue, starting in April, to the Report. I didn't realize how big this was getting until last week. They really do intend to go into it, and provide a forum for discussion.

Sincerely yours,

David  
David S. Lifton

P.S. Here is Sheinbaum's address: (He is an editor).  
Stanley Sheinbaum  
Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions  
Box 4068, Santa Barbara, Calif.

Ramparts: 1182 Chestnut St. , Menlo Park, Calif.