

# Tracing Kennedy Conspirators Is Given Only a Remote Chance

JDW  
Former WPI  
reporter now  
with trade  
publication

January 2, 1979

The Editor  
The New York Times  
229 West 43rd Street  
New York, NY 10036

To the Editor:

I read with mingled dismay and glee the "jump head" on today's story by Nicholas M. Horrock (Tracing Kennedy Conspirators Is Given Only a Remote Chance).

After the many years of service The Times has given to that revered institution, the lone assassin, must we now have conspirators in the plural? Certainly the not inconsiderable talents of The Times' editorial staff can be mustered to carry on with the lone accomplice.

Or, considering the long procession of lone assassins and distaff would-be assassins we have seen these past 15 years -- Oswald, Ruby, Ray, Sirhan, Bremer, Frome and Moore -- perhaps we had only a coincidental crossing of paths that day in Dallas.

The House Committee on Assassinations appears bent on leaving the lone assassin and magic bullet buffs with as much ground to stand on as possible. Why undo this good work by raising spectres of conspirators? Your forte lies in the singular and the lone accomplice is right up your alley.

*Robert J. Regan*

Robert J. Regan  
183 Crest Drive  
Paramus, NJ 07652

*Arnold (killed)*  
*Thought you might get a  
laugh out of this. Don't  
think THE NY TIMES will run it  
BUT IT'S FUN TO READ IT  
THINKING OF SENDING THEM ONE COPY  
a week for 15 weeks.*  
*RJ Regan*

*NY Times Stokes & Siskey but might as well make hay while the sun shines*