

DECEMBER 20, 1967

DEAR SYLVIA,

I KNOW YOU WILL READ THE ENCLOSED WITH MOST CAREFULLY, DESPITE THE FACT THAT MUCH OF IT INVOLVES MATERIAL THAT YOU HAVE SAID YOU ARE LESS FAMILIAR WITH THAN OTHER AREAS OF THE CASE (I DO NOT DEAL WITH MY VERY RECENT CONCLUSION OF TINK'S ACTUAL ROLE. THIS WOULD NOT CHANGE THE FACTS THAT I HAVE PRESENTED, BUT ONLY HIS MOTIVATION). THE ZAPRUDER ~~KREKK~~ REFERENCE MATERIALS (MY HYPOTHESES, PHOTO PANELS, AND VARIOUS NOTES) YOU HAVE.

I AM AWARE OF THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE CHARGES OF PLAGIARISM AND INTELLECTUAL DISHONESTY WHICH I HAVE LEVELED AGAINST THOMPSON IN MY LETTER. I BELIEVE I HAVE DOCUMENTED THESE CHARGES; AND THEY WILL STAND UNLESS AND UNTIL HE FACTUALLY REFUTES THEM.

I AM FURTHER AWARE THAT MY CURRENT EVALUATION OF HIS ROLE CONSTITUTES A FAR BRAVER CHARGE; BUT FEW OF US WHO HAVE WORKED ON THE CASE HAVE SHRUNK FROM LEVELLING GRAVE CHARGES WHEN WE WERE PERSONALLY CONVINCED BY THE EVIDENCE, AS WE INDIVIDUALLY ASSESSED IT, SUPPORTED THEM. UNFORTUNATELY, THIS TYPE OF CHARGE CAN RARELY, IF EVER, BE "PROVEN" IN THE COURTROOM SENSE OF THE WORD; SINCE NEITHER THE INDIVIDUAL NOR THE ORGANIZATION WHICH HE REPRESENTS IS LIKELY TO ADMIT THE FACTS. THEREFORE, CONCLUSIONS, IF AT ALL TENABLE, MUST BE DRAWN FROM CIRCUMSTANTIAL AND INFERENTIAL DATA, BY GAUGING ACTIONS AND RESPONSES IN GIVEN SITUATIONS. THIS IS WHAT I HAVE DONE; AND THE METHOD IS RELATED TO THAT EMPLOYED BY YOU, VINCE, AND MENAHEM IN MAKING A DETERMINATION ABOUT A WOMAN EARLY THIS YEAR.

I HOPE "ACCESSORIES" IS HAVING THE SALES SUCCESS IT CERTAINLY DESERVES, BUT I'M GLAD YOU REALIZE THAT SUCH A WORK OF SCHOLARSHIP IS OFTEN MORE APPRECIATED BY HISTORIANS THAN BY LARGE NUMBERS OF CONTEMPORARIES -- UNLESS THE PUBLISHER CHOOSES TO MAKE SPECIAL PROMOTIONAL EFFORTS. SUCH CERTAINLY DOES NOT SEEM TO BE THE CASE WITH BOBBS-MERRILL.

AND OF COURSE, WE BOTH HOPE YOUR FATHER IS ON THE MEND.

LOVE,

