

August 5, 1966

Sylvia:

I was all set to start a long letter when I discovered my big machine not working properly. This Olympia will handle a bit of work, but it, too, needs help, particularly a new ribbon. Moving is such a headache; nothing is in the right place, but I'll get back to normal after a time.

First, let me ask about the Richard Goodwin comment you made. I take only the weekly NY Times, and so missed the story you mentioned. If you have time, please let me know about this angle; from what you said, I consider it important. Goodwin was an adviser to JFK, wasn't he? And doesn't he have a new book out about Vietnam?

I have no argument with Ed. (Let me call him this, although I don't know him. It is easier to write than "Epstein.") To get the amount of favorable publicity he did is a feat in ~~it~~ itself. I was very pleased with the book and could find nothing wrong with it aside from the two small weaknesses I mentioned to you. Ed's appearance on the TODAY show was poor (but still better than anything I could do!) and this disappointed me. (He needs a hair-styling. NEWSWEEK called him, correctly, "lank-haired.") But, my God! to argue against him because of "timidity" etc. is to demand more courage from myself! I don't fault him in this regard. Finishing the book increased my admiration for him. I was annoyed with Kneble (wrote a letter to him and tore it up); pleased with Warren's rabbity reaction from Israel

("didn't have ~~new~~ enough time, didn't have enough time")
and generally feel encouraged about the case.

I don't know for a fact where anyone stands in this case, except myself. It is my opinion that Ed's private opinions are more definitive than his public ones; but I don't have the right to interpret anybody. All I know is what I feel ("feeling" is my basic approach to the case), and I feel that Lee was innocent of killing Kennedy. I feel that the Paines know who and what Lee was; I feel Marina did not know, but that she is beginning to suspect. I think Marina is still in great danger; in my opinion, she will someday be a suicide. I have no immediate reaction to the Ruby turmoil, except to recognize the feeling of hairs prickling on the back of my neck when I spent over an hour in the company of his sick, vicious sister.

My interviews with the Paines have been very valuable. Everyone neglected the Paines. I don't know why. But an hour or two with Ruth sets the tone for this whole cover-up, in my opinion. The Paines are like a mirror through which I have caught more glimpses of Lee than through any other source. It has always amused me that Lee tried to defend Ruth in a way. "Leave her out of this. She has nothing to do with it." But at the same time, a few miles away, Ruth was doing her best to do nothing for Lee Oswald; yet, Ruth at that particular time was just as convinced as I was (in Hominy) that Kennedy had been killed by a right-wing fanatic.

No, I haven't gotten WHITEWASH yet. I have been meaning to. But the move has kept some of this reading

in abeyance. I have felt out of things, too. Never mind about Weisberg. (This is easy for me to say from 1000 miles away!) We are all a bunch of mixed-up kookie nuts. Would we be bothering with this case if we weren't? Still, in spite of occasional differences, I agree with Vince: we MUST try to stick together. It isn't easy, particularly when egos start grinding one against the other. But if we didn't have great big, healthy egos, we'd be sitting around being ~~=i~~ ticky-tacky. For my part, this is an exciting age. I'm afraid of it; this ~~eeate~~ country scares the devil out of me, yet all the time (when I stop to think) I am reminded of how lucky I am to be a part of you people, and to be semi-accepted by you. I wouldn't want it any other way. The battle has really been joined now (thanks to that son of a bitch LBJ) and we ~~ean~~ are all in it together. What will the next ten years mean? ~~Let-him-be-the~~ Weisberg can have his ~~letter~~ little fandangos, but behind it there is a reason. ~~Let~~ let him be the "one and only" investigator in his own mind. But his work, if this has value, let it stand on its own. Which is exactly the way you feel, I know.

You and I disagree a bit on Lane. I happen to be going through an I-like-Lane phase. On the other hand, if your argument against him is valid, perhaps there is a reason somewhere in the middle of it all for him to react this way. Let me see a final~~x~~ copy of RTJ before I say any more.

Penn? In Illinois? I'm not sure where he is. I wrote not long ago, but no answer received. Still this doesn't mean anything. Penn is a terrible letter writer. Here is another character with the ego of a lion. But it is this drive that gets things done. Penn put me in touch with the wildest ~~letter~~

Methodist minister in this world and I have been enjoying exchanging letters with him. Penn gets enormous respect and loyalty from his associates. I love him; he is a dynamo. IA is very ~~we~~ sweet. Her adoration for this man (her husband) is almost too much. (I think she'd take out her .45 and drill any woman who looked side ways at Penn.) She worries about him a lot. He picks up hitch-hikers and this drives her mad. Actually I think they are taking a month or two off the case in order to get their son married and away to a new life in the Peace Corps. But Penn will be back on the scene.

Glad about the Bertrand Russell War Crimes Committee. The use of German pilots is disgusting. Did you see Allen and Scott today? This is by way of a rebuttal for the Russell Committee, but it won't work (in my opinion) unless they (the US) want to expose the use of the German pilots.

Lee's relationship to and with the State Department is very interesting. I'm glad you are tackling it. Make sure you use everything. Some of the double-talk handed out in the Report in this regard is too incredible to bear. Mrs. Knight (Passport) needs to have her ass paddled in my opinion. That bitch! The new lousy "spy" cases trumped up to fire off the Cold War made me sick and surprise! Mrs. Knight was involved. She and Senator Dodd seem to be ~~back~~ of nearly everything reactionary in Washington. I am still inclined to feel Lee may have been attracting evidence for the Dodd bill in ~~He~~ January and March, 1963. I would love to see some of Dodd's most secret files in this regard. They have probably been destroyed. Not that Lee would have been listed by name; Dodd may never have heard of him. But

some agency filled in for Dodd in this evidence-gathering. Dodd has his hand right on Hoover's ~~XXXX~~ tail most of the time, and can get the whole department to jump when he says "frog." Was sorry for RFK in the bugging bit. All the columnists were up to their usual trick of reading ticker-tapes only and misinterpreted that story damned well! Still, Bobby can handle himself. I remember in '62 when he was yelling for legalized bugging in SOME cases in order to forstall illegal bugging in ALL cases. He knew even then what Hoover was doing.

What is the next step? Where do we go now? Will anything come of Goodwin's request? How strong was it? I am as you have probably guessed leery of Hoover and LBJ in regard to the FBI release to the Archives. I think we are in for a double play here-- or a finesse at least. Certainly the "radicals" (this would be LBJ's definition) have danced enough in the streets on this; it is time for all of us to wonder a little WHY Hoover and LBJ would have us dancing? Dancing I like. But not when the wrong fiddler calls the tune. Wouldn't it be an historical riot if LBJ and Hoover were able to use the New Left to destroy Earl Warren and Bobby Kennedy for them?

Sylvia, let me hear from you. I know you are busy, but I am most anxious to hear about Goodwin's remark. Also, if there is anything I can do to help research the Report, etc., let me know. I am already planning another trip to Dallas, but can't begin to make a date. I think I have spent a fortune getting moved. Mark has been offered a \$25,000 a year job in Dallas. Wouldn't this be a laugh if I had to move down there after just beginning to get settled here.

Write soon. Love, S.

The Texas sniper incident was revealing in regard to the puffs of smoke visible from the rifle as Whitman shot from the tower. The rifle was a .30-.06, I believe, the bullet to which goes in small and comes out big; a hunting rifle used for the most part to stop an animal in its tracks.

In a Warren Report deposition, Hoover admits that the 6.5 releases smoke; this fits well with witness stories concerning the grassy knoll, but I'm not aware of a single witness who can swear under oath to seeing smoke from the sixth floor east window.

Dr. Jenkins has gotten a chair (in anesthesiology) at Southwestern. This is only #5 in the world for such. The endowers were the McDermotts(?), but who gave them the impetus? At any rate, I intend to re-read Jenkins' testimony today. One of the other Dallas doctors recently got some lavish publicity. I can't remember his name until I check back. Most of these men are now sewed up for life.

Read Jenkins' testimony again. He gives the same initial impression that Father Huber gave us when we interviewed him on 11/22/64, that JFK had a wound in the left temple area. Jenkins does NOT support the neck-entry wound impression given by the other doctors; he does, however, incline towards feeling that the occipital wound was an exit area. (Jenkins does stress, in regard to the neck wound, that his attention to it was slight.) The remark he makes concerning the indications of a bullet retained in the lung area are interesting and certainly fit in with the FBI releases to the Archives, eh? I must stop; will mail this to you in the morning. I am going on with doctors testimony until I fall asleep. This Report is like a drug; get started and you can't stop!

the left in this country (one of the major objectives of the assassination) was badly thwarted by the information that the "Communist agent" of an "international conspiracy" was, in reality, a hardworking, America-firster. Well, this is speculation. But surely we are getting closer to a solution!

Midnight, still thinking: I am so sure that Warren (and the others at the top, but not all the Commissioners) thinks he knows who and what Lee was. If Lee was what Warren thinks he was, then the embarrassment of what he did could be very great to the government. I don't think Warren ever entertained a serious thought that Lee might be innocent; his (Warren's) faith in the Establishment was too great for this; in other words, he let George do it, in so far as the actual thinking went. Warren would HAVE to assume that Lee was guilty for him to proceed as he did; forget all ideas about loyalty to the Establishment, the country, etc. Warren's FIRST loyalty would be to himself, to his career, to his place in history. ~~As~~^{To be} Chief Justice of this period's most critical Supreme Court and to deliberately pin a man he knew to be innocent, well, I can't imagine Warren this much of a self-sacrificing man! I have never felt Warren to be bright, not even as basically bright as I am; also, we KNOW Warren has been in the past consumed with himself, even to the point of breaking ethical laws which he sets up for other people. Therefore, it is my opinion that he did what he did to Lee Oswald because he sincerely believed Lee to be guilty and for this state of affairs he took the word of the Agencies and the President. Warren doesn't know one tenth as much about the case as you and I do. But he thinks he knows MORE than we do by knowing (or having been told) exactly WHAT Lee was. He has refused to see that Lee could easily have been what he was and pinned for it, or accidentally involved because of it. Certainly the major facts remain (as stressed by Vince and Ed), that the wounds, the ballistics in general do NOT fit the story handed out to us. I think Kennedy was killed with Lee in mind to be pinned for the crime. But I am not so sure that the people involved knew all they now know about Lee. Surely the great coup against