

27 November 1966

Dear Ray,

You were very thoughtful to send me a copy of Frontiers, which I had not been able to find here. Fink Cohen's article is infuriating. I am glad you blasted him, as he deserves; and I am writing on one or two points that were not covered in your letter. Enclosed is a copy of the letter I drafted but which I may change for stylistic reasons before sending it out, but the substance will be the same as in the draft.

*Sent  
as-is  
12/3/66*

I think your letter rebutting Cohen is devastating and should be submitted to Frontiers as well as to TMO and Liberation. But it should be retyped as an article, double-space. I wish I had time to do it for you. If you wish me to, I will send it to Arnoni in its present form; but I do urge you to take into account that the chance of publication is enhanced by proper manuscript form.

Ed Kern did call me, Tuesday afternoon, I believe, and I spoke to him again a few days later. I was surprised to find that he did not seem to appreciate the full significance of his own article; he still believes in the possibility of the single-missile-theory! And he finds quite "plausible" the Boswell alibi that he made a mistake in placing the dot in the autopsy diagram! Apparently he is so oriented toward the Establishment that he would sooner doubt the evidence of his own eyes than confront the implications. I am going to see him on December 8th, accompanied by Dr. Wecht. He will be able to give an authoritative opinion on whether Connally could appear, move, and function as he does in frames 225 through 234 or 238 if he had already sustained the bullet wounds. Not, of course, for my benefit--for Kern's, who needs some further help and encouragement in his tentative and distressed progress toward the truth of the evidence.

Kern is leaving for Dallas for a few days, to follow up on some potentially significant information which, if it pans out, would provide further corroboration for the planted stretcher bullet (this is confidential).

About Frazier's meaning with respect to frames 235-240, I can agree with your interpretation; because Frazier did say that there was one point beyond 225 when Connally was in position, and of course the brilliant Specter did not bother to pursue it or pin it down.

I was asked to go to Boston on the 30th but I had to decline because it would have been impossible to be at work the next morning and I cannot be absent now--we are approaching the end of the General Assembly and as always there is a frantic surge about this time, and often we have night meetings. I recommended Vince, and he has accepted, so Penn will not lack for support. No, Studies on the Left has not yet appeared, although it was due out on or around the 22nd; and there was nothing in the Wall St. Journal nor in Time, which means that they wasted 5 hours of my time between them (on the whole, I prefer "nothing" in Time and I only hope they are not going to use the interview next week or later on).

The Life article, when all is said and done, followed by the tepid and timid NY Times editorial, are still plus for our side--as witness the scramble of Explanatory nonsense from Connally, Kilduff, Boswell, and now J. Edgar all-kneel-Hoover. In another context, their posturings would be comical. Never mind. We will still catch up with them and nail their unctuous nonsense--just a matter of time, patience, and strong stomach. Yes, the dam has broken, and we can feel very satisfied, on balance, with the direction of the tide. Much love to you and please let me know about the rebuttal--I will still send it to Arnoni as-is, if you wish, okay?