

Dear "reg,

8/30/84

Your note of the 24th is "Wecht has promised to try to get my case summary published, as I am doing a redraft with a few substantive changes. If you have any further thoughts, they'd be of interest."

While I am not certain, I think that my earlier comments include the character of the writing, not the content, and as you'll see from the notes I've made, as far as I've gone, this is still a great need.

If I had the remotest idea where Wecht hopes to place it I'd perhaps be able to be more specific. But in general there is a vast and unbridgeable difference between a case summary and an article, I take it for a magazine.

This is much too technical, and do not confuse technical and factual. It is not too factual and its factual content is its strength.

Your language is stilted and artificial, stuffy for popular consumption.

It starts out like a very proper collegiate paper or submission for a scholarly journal, not as popular writing. You start an article for popular consumption with something that takes the readers' (after the editor's) attention.

What do you think an editor's reaction will be when he gets to the second sentence and its "debatable presumption."

You do not have a single first name as far as I've gone and in a magazine or any other article you give it at least the first time. Using names within paragraphs is stilted and wrong.

Who in the world is going to know what you mean by "innocent firing?" I can guess but few readers will and editors will chuck it by here if not sooner, and that is only in the 4th graf.

Where you need detail for comprehension, you do not have it (still page 1), where you talk about "the interspace between the tile and the ceiling." Most readers will assume that the tile is attached directly to a ceiling. Changing this kind of thing is simple, as is most of what this needs. Instead of the incomprehensible, "caused a hole in the ceiling tile and was lost in the 'interspace' between the tile and the ceiling," begin with the assumption that your reader has enough sense to know that a bullet makes a hole ("caused" here stinks for popular consumption, and is too sterile), something like "made a hole in the ceiling tile and then allegedly got lost in the three feet between it and the concrete ceiling."

Instead of formulations like "it was caused by an additional shot" (page 2) something like, and this too, means there was another shot more than the eight bullets that Sirhan's pistol held." Or, "And this requires a ninth shot - but Sirhan's pistol held only eight bullets." I've indicated several such formulations in my annotations.

You mess yourself up with unnecessary caution, like, "Following the shooting, an apparent bullet was discovered..." What in the hell is "an apparent bullet?" Isn't "what appear to be a bullet was discovered lodged/..."

This sentence is anything but suitable for popular consumption. Or, really, for any other. (For gods sake, loosen up!): "However, eight bullets are already stipulated by the police as not having been recovered at the crime scene - even in the victims and one 'lost'..." First of all, forget there are words like "stipulated" in popular writing unless you refer to a formal stipulation. The police admitted, alleged, claimed, acknowledge, etc. How how could they stipulate none of the bullets of the eight Sirhan fired had not been recovered at all? Because there was some recovery, I do not even guess what you are driving at. This is a fault of not your knowledge but

You can make this flow better with other simple changes, like top of 4. "According to a hotel waiter, Petrusky, who was present during the shooting, "Alexander Petrusky, a witness...." Or Hotel Walter Abrusky, an eyewitness, said or was told by. Cut out the extra and unnecessary words that break the flow and weaken. And why do you have to say that Bailor "personally" examined...You say he was assigned to investigate, so why "personally?" It is much crisper to say something like, "Professor of police science Walter Alley, then an FBI special agent, examined the pantry area and the door's center divider. He corroborated the policeman's hole he saw were bullet holes."

Now, don't you dare send anything like this to Cyril for him to try to place in any publication. It imposes on him, wastes his time, and no editor is going to fritter away time on anything other than what he is going to consider for publication. Do your rewriting, at least double-space (triple is better if you can), and have it the way you'd like it to appear before you let go of it.

This writing is much too awkward, artificial, sometimes verbose, indirect and sometimes incomprehensible for publication. Loosen up, simplify your formulations, and it'll be a good piece that can be published without any problem if there is no editorial policy against the subject matter. But the most dedicated person is going to get both lost and turned off by this writing.

Excuse the haste because I'm not taking time to read and correct. I think you'll make the typos out. I read this during my morning's walking therapy and I'm too far behind on what has accumulated on my desk.

It won't be hard. Just loosen up and forget you are in college and it will flow.

Best wishes,

August 27

Dear Harold,

Nescht has promised to
try to get my ^{Case Summary?} core summary,
published, so I am doing a
re-draft with a few cos-
metic and substantive changes.
If you have any further thoughts,
they'd be of interest.

Regards,

Greg S.