

Dear Sylvia,

Feb 20 1964

I want to thank you very much for your note of Feb. 7 and the detailed remarks and criticism ~~XXXXXX~~ written by your friend Isabel.

I am incorporating every single item that I can into the final draft of the dialogue, before it goes to a typist.

Because I am a student, however, I can not do it all at once. Therefore, I am going to try to phone Welsh (correct spelling?) at Ramparts and see just what his deadlines are and if this dialogue is receiving serious consideration. If it is, I may Xerox Isabel's remarks, and send them along. I'm sure that IF Ramparts does go ahead with this, they are going to feel a lot better if their own rewrite men have the final say. On the other hand, if they have no firm deadlines, and if there is lots of time, I would like to be the first to get a crack at incorporating this material. If I have any questions, I will address them to Isabel and/or you care of your New York address.

I have something brand new and original on which I am working which I eventually intend to send you, and others. I really don't know when I will get it done. In any event, it is not as precise as the Dialogue, and does not attempt to be a "proof of conspiracy".

It is a rather original piece of speculation which, I think, is ~~XX~~ both plausible and enjoyable enough to be worthwhile reading by anyone who is interested in the case.

~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ It is an attempt to explain the entire plot structure of the assassination. That statement, of course, seems like a mouthful and indeed it is if I was trying to do this several days or weeks after the event took place. But the 26 volumes are out and much more material is available. Besides, no one has ever come up with this before and it explains too many things to go unsaid.

I got onto this whole project by asking myself: Why did ~~OSWALD~~ ~~XXXXXX~~ Ruby shoot Oswald? As you may know, the testimony of a mentally disturbed person is not totally meaningless. It can be very meaningful, in fact, if you can understand the psychological frame of reference of that person. In this case, that would mean understanding Ruby's frame of reference which in turn ~~XXXXXX~~ leads to an understanding of just why he shot Oswald which in turn leads to an understanding of the plot structure. Now IF indeed Ruby's shooting of Oswald was just a case of a volatile man being in the right place at the right time, then practically nothing is to be gained by gazing at his testimony. But if this is not the case, then there is much to be gained.

More important, I find that my tentative explanations are so psychologically plausible that ---in ordinary dinner conversation tests---I have been able to make much more plausible the idea that Oswald was a patsy.

You have probably often been confronted by citizens who immediately say, upon hearing a hypothesis that Oswald was a patsy: "Then why did Ruby shoot him?" Or, alternatively, "Why did Oswald shoot Tippit?" The citizen can accept the physically doctored photographs as evidence indicating a frameup, but the actions of the weekend ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ don't make sense. Is Ruby in on the plot? Is Ruth Paine in on the plot? Who planted all that evidence against Oswald? Does Dallas take Quaker ACLU'ers and turn them into FBI loving frameup artists?

Of course its always very simple to answer all these questions