

FROM "A PROJECTILE PASSING THROUGH CLOTH AT A GREATLY REDUCED VELOCITY". EISENBERG COULD HAVE SCARCELY DONE BETTER. I SUBMIT THAT A MORE REASONABLE INFERENCE THAN THE ONE YOU DRAW IS THAT THE "FINE STRIATIONS" WHICH NICOL DETECTED MIGHT HAVE BEEN CAUSED BY FIRING 399 INTO COTTON WADDING. BUT OF COURSE, THAT POSSIBILITY, WHICH MUST HAVE OCCURRED TO YOU, WOULD HAVE DEPRIVED YOUR SOUVENIR HUNTER OF HIS HISTORIC ROLE.

(I ALSO NOTE THAT IN CONNECTION WITH YOUR COMMENTS ON 399, YOU TREAT THE THEORY THAT IT WAS PLANTED AS IF IT WERE POPKIN'S ALONE, MAKING NUMEROUS REFERENCES TO HIM; BUT NOT A SINGLE REFERENCE TO ME OR "THE BASTARD BULLET" IN THIS CONTEXT. I MAKE THIS OBSERVATION NOT FROM ANY SENSE OF WOUNDED FEELINGS THAT YOU MIGHT CONSIDER MY MONOGRAPH VALUELESS; FOR I HAVE ALREADY SHOWN, I BELIEVE, THAT YOU THOUGHT ENOUGH OF IT TO CO-OPT CERTAIN PORTIONS OF ITS CONTENTS AS YOUR OWN. NOR DO I INTEND, IN ANY WAY, TO DEPRECATE POPKIN'S WORK; IT BEING AN UNDISPUTED FACT THAT HIS ARTICLE IN THE N.Y. REVIEW WAS THE FIRST PUBLICATION OF THE "PLANT" THEORY. I MERELY POINT OUT, (1) THAT THE PRINCIPAL THEME OF POPKIN'S WORK (BOTH ARTICLE AND BOOK) WAS THE "SECOND OSWALD" THEORY; (2) THAT THE "PLANTED 399" WAS A SECONDARY--ALTHOUGH IMPORTANT--THEME IN HIS WORK, WHICH ALSO INCLUDED MANY OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CASE; (3) THAT POPKIN HIMSELF PUTS FORTH THE PLANT THEORY NOT AS SOMETHING HE HAS PROVEN, BUT MERELY AS A "REASONABLE HYPOTHESIS". HE SAYS ON PAGE 55 OF "THE SECOND OSWALD":

"WHAT OTHER POSSIBILITY IS THERE? THE COMMISSION NEVER SEEMS TO HAVE CONSIDERED THE POSSIBILITY THAT THE BULLET WAS PLANTED. YET IN VIEW OF EVIDENCE CONCERNING NO. 399 IT IS AN ENTIRELY REASONABLE HYPOTHESIS THAT THE BULLET HAD NEVER BEEN IN A HUMAN BODY, AND COULD HAVE BEEN PLACED ON ONE OF THE STRETCHERS. IF THIS POSSIBILITY HAD BEEN CONSIDERED, THEN THE COMMISSION MIGHT HAVE REALIZED THAT SOME OF THE EVIDENCE MIGHT BE "FAKE" AND COULD HAVE BEEN DELIBERATELY FAKED." (UNDERLINES ADDED)

MY MONOGRAPH, HOWEVER, WAS THE ONLY WORK ENTIRELY INVOLVED WITH BULLET 399; AND THEREFORE AFFORDED THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLORE IN CONSIDERABLY GREATER DEPTH ITS ROLE ON NOVEMBER 22 '63. I FRANKLY BELIEVE I DO NOT OVERSTATE THE CASE WHEN I SAY IT GOES SIGNIFICANTLY ^{FURTHER} THAN ANY OTHER WORK TOWARDS PROVING THAT 399 WAS IN FACT PLANTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF IMPLICATING OSWALD.

TO CONFRONT THE FACT THAT MY "HYPOTHESES" APPROACH HAD VIRTUALLY ELIMINATED ANY "LEGITIMATE" INVOLVEMENT FOR 399 WAS TO CONFRONT THE FACT OF NEAR CERTAINTY THAT IT WAS PLANTED; NOT INNOCENTLY BY A CONSCIENCE-STRICKEN SOUVENIR HUNTER, BUT BY AN ACCESSORY IN THE CONSPIRACY WHICH MURDERED PRESIDENT KENNEDY; AND TO CONFRONT THE RESULTING FACT THAT THE SECRET SERVICE AND FBI, BOTH OF WHOM HANDLED THIS BULLET, HAD TO (AT LEAST) STRONGLY SUSPECT THAT THIS BULLET WAS EVIDENCE, NOT OF OSWALD'S GUILT, BUT OF THE EXISTENCE OF THAT CONSPIRACY. I BELIEVE IT WAS FOR THIS REASON THAT YOU PREFERRED TO DRAW ATTENTION TO POPKIN'S LESS HAZARDOUS CONCLUSION, THAT IT WAS AN "ENTIRELY REASONABLE HYPOTHESIS" THAT 399 WAS PLANTED.

AVOIDANCE -- WHY?

WHEN WE FIRST MET AT LIFE IN OCTOBER '66 I WAS PUZZLED BY YOUR FAILURE TO CONFRONT THE Z189-198 SEQUENCE, WHICH I SPOKE OF EARLIER AS INDICATING A PROBABLE JFK HIT AT 189-190. I WANTED TO POINT THE OBSERVATIONS OUT TO YOU ON THE SLIDES, WHICH WERE A FEW FEET FROM US ON THE LIGHT BOX. YOU SAID YOU HAD NO TIME TO EXAMINE THEM. IN THE FOLLOWING WEEKS AND MONTHS, BY WHICH TIME I LEARNED THAT YOU WERE WRITING A BOOK, I WAS PUZZLED AT YOUR FAILURE TO CONTACT ME (IN EACH OF FOUR PHONE CONVERSATIONS, I CALLED YOU). EVEN PRIOR TO OUR LIFE MEETING YOU WERE CERTAINLY AWARE, AT LEAST THROUGH VINCE, THAT I HAD DONE CONSIDERABLE PIONEER WORK WITH THE ZAPRUDER FILM; AND, FROM IT, HAD DEVELOPED A NUMBER OF HYPOTHESES AS TO TIMING OF SHOTS. ~~RECORDED BY [unclear] ON [unclear]~~

PARTICULARLY IN REGARDS TO OUR DIFFERENCES OVER 189 WOULD I HAVE THOUGHT SUCH ADDITIONAL MEETINGS DESIRABLE FROM YOUR STANDPOINT; ESPECIALLY IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT BY THEN (SPRING '67) YOU HAD COME TO ACCEPT A PRINCIPAL HYPOTHESES OF MINE, 238. IT SEEMED TO ME THAT, WERE OUR POSITIONS REVERSED AND WERE I THE ONE WHO WAS PLANNING A BOOK, I WOULD BE THE ONE TO INITIATE CONTACT WITH YOU IN ORDER TO MAKE SURE I WAS FULLY EXPOSED TO YOUR ARGUMENTS AND COUNTER-ARGUMENTS, PROVIDED THAT IT WAS MY INTENTION TO MAKE MY BOOK AS ACCURATE AS POSSIBLE. THEREFORE, SINCE IT IS QUITE NATURAL TO ATTEMPT TO GAUGE ANOTHER'S BEHAVIOR IN A GIVEN SITUATION BY IMAGINING ONE'S OWN, I COULD NOT HELP BUT WONDER AT YOUR POSSIBLE MOTIVES:

PERHAPS, CONCERN ON YOUR PART THAT I MIGHT TAKE AS MY OWN KEY FINDINGS OF YOURS? HARDLY; THE FIRST KENNEDY SHOT WE ARE IN TOTAL DISAGREEMENT ON; THE 238 CONNALLY SHOT WAS MY OWN DISCOVERY, AND THE DOUBLE HEAD-HIT I HAD ALREADY CONCLUDED.

ACADEMIC SNOBBERY? PERHAPS YOU WERE AWARE OF MY OWN LACK OF FORMAL ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS, AND CHOSE NOT TO DEAL WITH A SCHOLASTIC INFERIOR? SUCH ATTITUDES WE KNOW ARE COMMON ENOUGH; BUT EVEN IF YOU DID HARBOR SUCH AN ATTITUDE (AND I HAVE NO EVIDENCE THAT YOU DID), IT WOULD NOT HAVE APPEARED TO ME SUFFICIENT TO OVERCOME THE DICTATES OF SELF-INTEREST -- ASSUMING YOU UNDERSTOOD YOUR SELF-INTEREST TO COINCIDE WITH A THOROUGHLY HONEST BOOK.

WHATEVER THE ACTUAL REASON FOR YOUR BEHAVIOR, IT DID NOT SEEM CONSISTENT WITH A WILLINGNESS TO CONFRONT EVIDENCE INIMICAL TO YOUR THEORIES. RATHER, IT IS CONSISTENT WITH A STUDIED REFUSAL TO CONFRONT SUCH EVIDENCE; AND, ALSO, PERHAPS WITH A CONSCIOUS INTENT TO INSULATE YOURSELF FROM ONE WHOSE WORK, IN A NUMBER OF IMPORTANT CASES, YOU INTENDED TO MAKE USE OF WITHOUT PROPERLY CREDITING YOUR SOURCE.

SUMMARY

I SUMMARIZE MY CHARGES AGAINST YOU AS FOLLOWS, RESTRICTING THEM FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS LETTER TO YOUR FAILURE TO PROPERLY CREDIT YOUR SOURCE WHEN USING MY MATERIAL (A DETAILED LISTING AND PROOF OF "PATTERN TWO" CHARGES WILL BE MADE IN A LATER LETTER):

1. YOUR FAILURE, IN YOUR ARTICLE (PG 46) TO CREDIT ME WITH THE 238 SHOULDER-DIP LEADES READERS TO BELIEVE THE DISCOVERY WAS YOUR OWN. THIS IS PLAGIARISM.
2. THE CONVEYANCE, IN YOUR ARTICLE (PG 46), OF THE IMPRESSION THAT THE THREE INDICES YOU CITE AS EVIDENCE OF A 238 HIT ARE CO-EQUAL IN IMPORTANCES CONSTITUTE INTELLECTUAL SLOPPINESS AT BEST; AND PROBABLY INDICATE A DELIBERATE ATTEMPT TO ERRONEOUSLY MAXIMIZE YOUR OWN ROLE IN THIS THEORY.
3. YOUR FAILURE TO NOTE, IN YOUR ARTICLE (PG 50), THAT I HAD MADE AN INDEPENDENT DISCOVERY OF THE JFK DOUBLE HEAD-HIT, AND THAT THIS WAS PRIOR TO YOUR OWN DISCOVERY AND HAD APPEARED IN PRINT AS MUCH AS ONE YEAR EARLIER (FACTS KNOWN TO YOU LONG BEFORE THE WRITING OF YOUR ARTICLE); THESE CONSTITUTE INTELLECTUAL SLOPPINESS AT BEST; AND PROBABLY INDICATE A DELIBERATE ATTEMPT TO HIDE THE FACTS.
4. THE RELEGATION, IN YOUR BOOK, TO THE END OF A CHAPTER A PERFUNCTORY CREDIT LINE FOR THE DISCOVERY OF THE 238 SHOULDER-DIP (PG 81), CONSTITUTES INADEQUATE CREDIT FOR A FIND WHICH YOU KNOW TO BE OF CENTRAL AND UNIQUE IMPORTANCE TO YOUR BOOK (PG 74-76). THIS CONSTITUTES A CARELESS BREACH OF INTELLECTUAL ETHICS AT BEST; AND PROBABLY REPRESENTS A DELIBERATE ATTEMPT TO MASK MY AUTHORSHIP OF THIS DISCOVERY. YOUR FAILURE TO MENTION THE FACT THAT YOU PREVIOUSLY HELD ANOTHER VIEW PRIOR TO ADOPTING THE 238 THEORY IS CONSISTENT WITH THIS INTERPRETATION.

5. YOUR FAILURE, IN YOUR BOOK, TO MENTION AND CREDIT CONNALLY'S TURN-INTERRUPTION FOLLOWING Z237 CONSTITUTES INTELLECTUAL CARELESSNESS, AT BEST; AND IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PREVIOUSLY NOTED ATTEMPT TO FALSELY INFLATE YOUR OWN CONTRIBUTIONS AND TO DIMINISH MINE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 238 THEORY. (PG 70-76).
6. YOUR RELEGATION TO THE END OF THE CHAPTER ("THE HEAD SHOTS") OF A CREDIT TO ME FOR HAVING INDEPENDENTLY DISCOVERED "THIS DOUBLE MOVEMENT", (PG 112), WITHOUT NOTING: (A) THAT I HAD CONCLUDED IT WAS CAUSED BY A DOUBLE HIT (YOUR TREATMENT IN THIS CHAPTER--PGS 86-95--SHOWS UNMISTAKABLY YOU ARE AWARE OF THE DISTINCTION); (B) THAT I HAD CONCLUDED THIS PRIOR TO YOUR OWN INDEPENDENT DISCOVERY; (C) THAT I WAS IN PRINT WITH MY FINDINGS ONE YEAR EARLIER (EPOCA), OR NINE MONTHS EARLIER IN THE U.S. (RAMPARTS); ALL OF WHICH WAS KNOWN TO YOU; THESE FACTS CONSTITUTE GROSS INTELLECTUAL SLOPPINESS, AT BEST; AND PROBABLY INDICATE A DELIBERATE ATTEMPT TO MASK THE FACTS.
7. YOUR WRITING OF THE 314-315 FRAME TRANSPOSITION (PG 89), IN A CONTEXT WHICH WOULD NOT PERMIT THE UNINFORMED READER TO CONCLUDE THE DISCOVERY WAS NOT YOUR OWN, CONSTITUTE PLAGIARISM.
8. YOUR FOOTNOTE ON PAGE 149 OF YOUR BOOK, RAISING THE QUESTION OF A HIGH-SPEED FRAGMENT FROM A LOW-SPEED BULLET WAS PLAGIARIZED FROM PAGE 72 OF MY BOOK.
9. YOUR USE OF A SECTION TITLE "WHICH STRETCHER" (PG 154), KNOWING THAT IT WAS IDENTICAL TO A CHAPTER TITLE IN MY BOOK, IS UNETHICAL AT BEST; AND PROBABLY CONSTITUTES PLAGIARISM.
10. YOUR INCLUSION OF THE TIME-CONSTRAINT ARGUMENT (PG 156) TO PRECLUDE PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S STRETCHER AS A LOCUS OF TOMLINSON'S DISCOVERY OF BULLET 399, PROBABLY CONSTITUTES PLAGIARISM (PG 16 OF "BASTARD BULLET").

THESE ARE MY CHARGES AS TO CREDIT. I DO NOT MAKE THEM LIGHTLY OR MALICIOUSLY. I RECOGNIZE FULLY THAT IT WOULD HAVE BEEN GROSSLY UNJUST AND RECKLESS TO HAVE MADE THEM WITHOUT DOCUMENTING MY CASE AS FULLY AND FACTUALLY AS I WAS ABLE. WHILE I CERTAINLY MAKE NO PRETENSE TO BEING EMOTIONALLY NEUTRAL, I HAVE CONSCIOUSLY STRIVEN, TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY, TO PRESENT THE FACTS WITH INTELLECTUAL OBJECTIVITY. IN SHORT, I HAVE TRIED NOT TO PRESENT AN ADVOCATE'S BRIEF. IF YOU FEEL YOU CAN FACTUALLY REFUTE ANY OR ALL OF THESE CHARGES, PLEASE DO SO. I WOULD WELCOME YOUR EFFORTS, ALTHOUGH I FRANKLY BELIEVE THE FACTS (AS DISTINGUISHED, PERHAPS, FROM MY OPINIONS AS TO YOUR MOTIVES) TO BE IRREFUTABLE.

I AM, THEREFORE, ASKING THAT YOU DO THE FOLLOWING; BOTH IN JUSTICE TO THE ACCURACY OF THE RECORD, AND IN AT LEAST PARTIAL RECOMPENSE FOR THE INJUSTICES DONE ME:

1. URGE WILLIAM EMERSON OF THE SAT EVE POST TO PRINT A LETTER FROM YOU, OR TO OTHERWISE CORRECT THE RECORD IN THEIR MAGAZINE; CREDITING ME WITH DISCOVERY OF THE 238 SHOULDER DIP, AND WITH THE INDEPENDENT AND PRIOR DISCOVERY OF THE DOUBLE-HIT.
2. THAT YOU PROMPTLY TAKE NECESSARY MEASURES TO INSURE THAT IN FUTURE PRINTINGS OF YOUR BOOK, WHETHER IN HARD OR SOFT COVERS, THAT PROPER CREDIT BE GIVEN ME FOR THE FOLLOWING: THE 238 SHOULDER-DIP; THE 314-315 TRANSPOSITION; MY PRIOR AND INDEPENDENT DISCOVERY OF THE JFK DOUBLE-HIT; THE TIME-CONSTRAINT ARGUMENT IN CONNECTION WITH PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S STRETCHER; AND FOR THE SLOW BULLET/FAST FRAGMENT ARGUMENT.

I ALSO ASK THAT YOU INFORM ME WITHIN THIRTY DAYS WHETHER OR NOT YOU INTEND TO TAKE THESE STEPS.

SINCERELY,



RAYMOND MARCUS

P.S.-- TO AVOID THE IMPRESSION (BY THIS POINT, UNDERSTANDABLE) THAT MY VIEW OF YOUR BOOK IS TOTALLY NEGATIVE, I WISH TO STATE MY BELIEF THAT, IN A NUMBER OF WAYS, IT IS ONE OF THE MOST SIGNIFICANT WORKS YET TO APPEAR; AND IN ITS PRESENTATION OF IMPORTANT PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE, SKETCHES, AND CHARTS, OBVIOUSLY THE MOST SIGNIFICANT. BECAUSE OF MY OWN LONG-HELD BELIEF THAT PHOTOGRAPHS CONTAINED THE MOST CRUCIAL EVIDENCE AVAILABLE IN THIS ENTIRE CASE, AND THAT THE ZAPRUDER FILM CONSTITUTED THE MOST DECISIVE, I QUITE NATURALLY LOOKED FORWARD TO YOUR BOOK AS THE DEFINITIVE WORK IN REGARD TO THIS EVIDENCE. THIS WAS SO DESPITE MY PUZZLEMENT AT YOUR APPARENT REFUSAL TO CONFRONT THE FACTS OF THE 189-190 HYPOTHESIS IN OUR CONVERSATIONS, AND AT YOUR FAILURE TO CONTACT ME.

AS TO THE CREDIT QUESTION, I SIMPLY DID NOT SUSPECT THAT YOU WOULD FAIL TO MAKE PROPER ATTRIBUTION, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FACTS, WHICH WERE KNOWN TO YOU. NEITHER DID I ANTICIPATE THAT THE SECOND PATTERN, TO WHICH I HAVE REFERRED, WOULD APPEAR. IN THESE RESPECTS, YOUR ARTICLE AND BOOK ARE GREAT DISAPPOINTMENTS. IT IS PARTICULARLY UNFORTUNATE THAT A WORK SO EFFECTIVE IN CONCEPTION, PRODUCTION, AND PRESENTATION, AND INTO WHICH THE AUTHOR HAS OBVIOUSLY PUT A GREAT DEAL OF CONCENTRATED EFFORT, SHOULD NEVERTHELESS BE SO SERIOUSLY FLAWED; ESPECIALLY SINCE THE MAJOR FLAWS WERE AVOIDABLE.

P.P.S.-- YOU SAID IN YOUR CLOSING PARAGRAPH, "I HAVE ADMIRER FOR A LONG TIME THE ACUITY AND HONESTY OF YOUR WORK...". I ALSO SEE BY THE RETURN ADDRESS ON THE ENVELOPE OF YOUR LETTER TO ME (COPY ENCLOSED) THAT YOU HAVE NO REAL DIFFICULTY IN USING MY NAME -- AT LEAST IN THIS CASE. IF ONLY YOU HAD REMEMBERED TO PUT THE NAME YOU HAVE SHOWN YOU CAN USE TOGETHER WITH THE WORK YOU SAY YOU ADMIRE, THIS LETTER (ALTHOUGH NOT THE NEXT ONE) COULD HAVE BEEN AVOIDED.

A NOTE TO THIRD PARTIES TO WHOM COPIES ARE SENT:

TO THOSE WHO MAY REGARD THE FOREGOING AS A PURELY PERSONAL MATTER BETWEEN THOMPSON AND ME, THIS LENGTHY COMMUNICATION MAY WELL SEEM AN UNNECESSARY IMPOSITION. I AM AWARE THAT SUCH MATTERS, ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THE HISTORIC MAGNITUDE OF THE CASE, MAY SEEM PETTY IN THE EXTREME; AND THERE MAY BE A TENDENCY FOR SOME TO SAY "A PLAGUE ON BOTH YOUR HOUSES".

I SUBMIT, HOWEVER, THAT THE CHARGES I HAVE MADE ARE PARTICULARLY SERIOUS PRECISELY BECAUSE OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CASE. WHATEVER ADDITIONAL PERSONAL MOTIVES ANY OF US MAY HAVE FOR OUR INVOLVEMENT IN THIS CATAclysmic EVENT, IF OUR PRIMARY MOTIVATION IS NOT TO DISCOVER AND EXPOSE THE TRUTH OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S ASSASSINATION, WHATEVER THAT TRUTH MAY BE, THEN WE DESERVE LESS THAN RESPECT FROM OUR COLLEAGUES, OUR FELLOW CITIZENS, AND FROM HISTORY. SINCE I BELIEVE A NOT UNIMPORTANT PART OF THE RESPONSIBILITY WE HAVE UNDERTAKEN IS TO LEAVE AN ACCURATE RECORD OF OUR PARTICIPATION AND CONTRIBUTIONS, I BELIEVE THE DOCUMENTATION I HAVE PRESENTED SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THAT LIGHT.

COPIES: VINCE SALANDRIA, MS. ARNONI, SYLVIA MEAGHER, BILL TURNER, DICK SPRAGUE, RICHARD POPKIN, MAGGIE FIELD, LILLIAN CASTELLANO, DAVE LIFTON, HAL VERB, ED KERN, STEVE BURTON, BILL O'CONNELL

(DOCUMENTATION MATERIAL HEREIN REFERRED TO AVAILABLE ON REQUEST)