

Dec 4, 1967

Dear Sylvia,

I just received your letter of Dec 1, which opens with "After mailing you a two-page letter, etc.". The last letter received from you was the handwritten one to Letha of Nov 17. The O'Brien, Lerner, and Epstein pieces you sent were not accompanied by letters. Tricky mail, perhaps? (I doubt any connection, but the envelope flap of your Dec 1 letter was very inadequately secured, requiring only a minimum of pressure to open).

I will inform Kunkin of the Free Press of Menahem's suggestion re the O'Brien ~~xxx~~ review.

My remarks in my letter to Thompson were addressed to his article, and not to his book (~~the~~ the latter, I have not yet completed, but have seen enough, in context, to be satisfied that the pattern of cowardice, plagiarism, and inadequate crediting is continued there). ~~xxxx~~ *opportunity*

I emphasize that his SatEvePost piece must be considered not only a separate entity from his book; but, in terms of public impact, by far the more important of the two -- by a factor perhaps of 500 to 1 (SatEvePost readership at least 25 million vs perhaps 50 thousand for the book?)

In his article, he says on page 55:

"What does this collection of new evidence prove? It does not prove that the assassination was a conspiracy, and that two men were together on the sixth floor of the depository at the time the shots were fired. Nor does it prove Oswald's innocence. What it does suggest is that there are threads in this case that should have been unraveled long ago instead of being swept under the archives rug. It also shows that the question of Oswald's guilt must remain-four years after the event--still unanswered."

I repeat, if proving three assassins, which he claims to have done, does not "prove" conspiracy, he should have the guts to state the obvious resulting implication, ie., that he considers it a reasonable possibility that three "lone" assassins" happened to open fire in Dealey Plaza simultaneously.

Nor is this the only example of outrageous copping-out. But one who can ~~x~~ "explain", apparently with a straight face, the discovery of the bullet as he did, needn't shrink from any buba-meisa in order to avoid making the accusation of conspiracy. I quote from page 50 of his article: "In such a chaotic atmosphere, is it beyond the realm of possibility that some hospital employee found bullet 399 on the floor, in the President's clothes, or on his stretcher, and momentarily snatched it as a souvenir, only to recognize its importance and quickly secrete it on a stretcher where it might be found by ~~someone~~ else--no questions asked?"

I do urge you to read the article soon. I received a reply of injured innocence from Thompson. I am preparing a detailed response, of which I will send you a copy, along with his letter.

Love, Ray

(I'm sending a copy of this to Menahem)