

Jan. 1 1965

Dear Sylvia,

I, too, was knocked out by a terrific fever for about 2 days. There is a long half completed letter lying on my desk ~~XXXXXX~~ which I started to write at the beginning of my Christmas vacation. I promise I will finish it.

Meanwhile, enclosed is a letter from Gerald Ford, and to be appreciated, it should be read along with the one that was sent him. That, too, is enclosed. Paraphrasing the great Earl Warren: "We just wanted the record to show that we have asked you this question, and you have answered it."

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Two Wednesday's ago, I received a call from someone at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions who I met at a Viet Nam teach in at UCLA and who is now at the Editorial Board of Ramparts. He wanted to see all my material on the assassination; in particular, he wanted me to write an article ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ explaining why there had to be more than one man involved. He was in receipt of the Cook article, and told me that the way I had explained it to him after the teach-in had seemed much clearer. ~~XXXXXXXX~~ I asked him if one came away from the Cook article thinking that more than one man participated in the shooting, and his answer was "Yes, but...". It seems it isn't that clear-cut, and too technical and complicated. This is just the impression I received in conversation, of course. I have not seen the article. I promised him an article in 4 days. Two days after I started, I got sick. Anyway, its almost through. About 7000 words are in final form, all typed up. Its called: "Assassination---1963 The Citizen and the Critic: A Dialogue in Defense of Conspiracy". The format is very original, I think, and is well suited to ~~AK~~ some of the complicated type explanations that are necessary so that on a first reading, the reader will not feel lost. I'll send you a copy, Kerox'd, as soon as its finished. Theres a chance

I may suddenly panic about my final exams, and leave 2500 words or so undone. I'll see. I could do this, because the article is divided up into 4 separate arguments---each independent of the other---about why there must be a second shooter. The first concerns the Kennedy head reaction, the second concerns the fact that ONE bullet didn't go through Connally and Kennedy, but it must in order for there to be one shooter. The third concerns the "wounded sign". The fourth is an actual critical analysis of the "trajectory through two men", and the nature of the wounds along this trajectory. The fourth ~~argument~~ concerns material that is in the two Salandria articles. The ~~same~~ third is my way of explaining the sign; the same goes for the first (as regards the head reaction). I think my science background really helps here. Also included in the first ~~article~~ ^{argument} is lots of earwitness/^{and eyewitness (ie "smoke")} testimony to corroborate the head reaction. The critic explains the concept of "constraint" to the citizen, lists three or four "constraints on the lone assassin theory", and then the four arguments are really ^{ONLY} ~~simply~~ an orderly way of presenting testimony and evidence that violated one or more constraint. But this way of saying it is very clear, I have found, and the least confusing to the listener. I would say the whole thing is going to run 13,000 words. It can be said in less, but at the price of clarity. The division into four arguments is a great aid, because the reader understands why they are logically independent and, if he wishes, can reject any of them without doing harm to the others. But if he accepts any/^{one} of them, there is a second shooter. This approach tends to "quantify" the benefit of the doubt the reader gives the government if he still chooses to believe the Report.

You'll be hearing from me as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

David