

by what I have dubbed "political paranoia".

This, I happen to think, is what most of the critics do. They start with the assumption that Kennedy was assassinated by a right wing governmental conspiracy whose main objective was a shift in US foreign policy by letting the vice-President, Johnson, ~~XXXXXX~~ accede to the Presidency. And who engineered the whole crime? The average critic suspects some CIA-FBI military intelligence community type plot. Did Johnson know about it? Once again, the average critic says "Probably not". (I now think definitely not).

~~XXXXXX~~ I must assure you at this point that I have not changed my idea that reactionary forces are indeed behind the assassination. I still do think so. But just "which" reactionary forces plotted to kill Kennedy, and just "what" their true objective was---- these I have changed my ideas about.

I do not intend to reveal, in half baked form, my new "theory". But let me toss out some questions that I have pondered and now answered differently.

Accepting that Oswald was framed, AND that Oswald was an agent---- does this mean that his agency was party to a plot to either frame him or kill the President? Is there another equally logical explanation that we simply have not thought of before that both leads to a frameup of Oswald, and includes the fact that he is "an agent"?

It is said that Oswald shot Tippitt. We critics think not. Yet we are aware that the Tippitt killing took place near Ruby's home. Does this mean Oswald knew Ruby? Is there another explanation?

The shooting of President Kennedy was carried out with fantastic precision. In 5.6 seconds, the guns fired, the hits were scored, and the man was dead. The Commission holds hearings and writes ~~an~~ a Report that is manifestly false. Did the plotters think they could get away it? Did they simply count on the naivete of the reading public? Or is the public acceptance ~~XXXXXX~~ purely a monument to the ability of LBJ to get the two wire services, the New York Times, and half a dozen other important individuals to go along and "not question" after he convinces them that political stability is more important than a complete revelation. *Is there another explanation?*

Finally, one "double standard" I have always been amused by is this. The average critic sneers at the concept of Oswald the "do-it-yourself assassin". I like Stamm's expression because it captures the image of this total amateur committing the crime of the century.

But Ruby is just as pathetic as Oswald. Yet the average critic, accepting Oswald as a patsy, then looks at Ruby as this devilish fiend who "silenced the patsy". That makes Ruby party to a plot. But why?

And then there is Mark Lanes revelation about that meeting. What is the significance of that meeting? Why do we believe Mark Lanes story but not the one in the National Enquirer linking Ruby and Oswald. Are they both true? Are they both false? If so, why?

I am going to close with this. If I can write up my new ideas correctly, pages 310 -350 in the Bantam edition of the WR (Possible Conspiracy Involving Jack Ruby) will read like a mystery thriller. But this will only be true if the appropriate material in the 26 volumes can be cogently incorporated into a readable writeup.

There's probably not one question I have posed that couldn't be answered by you in a rather plausible fashion. But I do have some new answers to all of them, and they will make interesting reading when I get it all done.

Thanks again for the criticism.

Sincerely *Dave*
Dave