

9/16/66

Got TIME Magazine right after receiving your letter at the post office. In the first place, Sylvia, you and I are not ~~going~~ going to be discouraged by anything that son-of-a-bitching magazine presents. The whole article is absurd. Notice their asinine remark: "Four people saw from the street below what appeared to be a rifle barrel protruding from the sixth-floor window an instant after the shots!"

These ~~These~~ witnesses then are Mrs. Cabell, Amos Euins, Brennan (HA!) and I am assuming the unidentified WE Barnett acquisition (who may well be Brennan again.)

But how ridiculous! Amos Euins in talking of the man in the window identified him as a Negro (at first, later changed his story to white man and received after this terrible telephone threats NOT to change his story back to "Negro." ~~That~~ The family had to move.)

Thus we have from ~~That~~ Euins a Negro Oswald. Brennan is too disgusting to talk about. Mrs. Cabell refused to be concise (under oath) as to whether what she saw from the window was a man's arm or a mechanical contrivance. Honestly, sometimes I think TIME must be written and run by mewling puking infants.

Besides what we are trying to do is for history and the record. TIME will have as little influence on this as it did in '48 when it crowed happily that Harry Truman hadn't a chance to be re-elected. Forget TIME. I am going to send a little caustic (I hope) note to them and I imagine you will do the same. But aside from this, to hell with them.

Isn't it interesting that NEWSWEEK (which has friendly ties with the Kennedy family) has been more gentle with us? Remember what a lousy review TIME gave Epstein. Did TIME even review Lane? I can't remember.

Like yourself, I am prepared for the counterattack. I am sure it is coming. But ~~When~~ "when the going gets tough, the tough, etc." There is a rotten sickness in this society that is smelling up everything in sight. I thank God that you and I (for example) are perceptive enough to see it. I wonder sometimes why we are? In my case, I suppose it has been a ~~type~~ ^{kind} of self-enforced loneliness which has made me spend the last 25 years reading everything I could lay my hands on. Some of what was going on under the surface of things was bound to stick. Certainly I didn't begin my self-education wanting to find corruption and rot. I would have been as happy without it. But it was there, and even the most mediocre mind (such as mine) ~~is~~ ^{was} going to spot it after awhile. So in my case, this has given me the advantage. I have had years to sit back and cram myself while the rest of the world was being activist. (Too bad I didn't spend some of that time learning to type.)

The contempt I have for TIME Magazine ~~series~~ defies description. In fact, the whole tone of their article encouraged me. Because they are ALWAYS wrong. Without exception, they are wrong. Deliciously wrong.

How I adore their wide-eyed approach that "fibers snagged on the rifle matched the shirt Oswald was wearing that day" as though this was indeed

the best of all possible worlds and that never in the history of the world has there been an example of corrupt policemen fabricating a piece of evidence. Fabricating is right!

And then in their smug summation they make the remark that to be a conspiracy this case would have required the complicity of hundreds ("a web so vast and complex as to be unbelievable") and thus it was just not so---a just not so story. But TIME in saying this negates the historical example of the Dreyfus case, the Breiliss case (sp?) and, if I may be so bold, the Hiss case.

No, Sylvia, I am delighted with the TIME article --and delighted by another nuance that my TIME-prejudiced ear seems to hear. The cover article on RFK was a snow job. In so far as TIME is concerned it is a snow job. TIME hates the Kennedys--they hate them with a passion unequalled in American journalism. But the cover article was almost gentle, was full of mild praise, avoided the usual cutting edges that TIME usually affords to RFK. This is interesting. Perhaps it is because they feel his power growing so enormously. But I have never known this to turn TIME spongy before. At any rate, we must wait to see. It seems to me there are undercurrents here so subtle that I haven't the chance of mastering them.

I am thinking hard about the Kennedys. If what you say is true, it will be devastating. I can think of three reasons why RFK could convince himself that the WR must be vindicated. On the other hand, RFK would have to read the entire business first, wouldn't he? Because he has made such a public cry of "not reading it". I had assumed this approach to mean that he accepted the Report because as an American he accepted the good judgment of the seven commissioners, but that when and if there was evidence enough to indicate that the judgment of these seven fine men was full of shit, he could say: Ah, well, I never read the report for myself, so I was mistaken in trusting those seven old men.

To me this would NOT be two-faced, because in my opinion RFK is living for ONE THING ONLY. To win this country back from LBJ without violence, but in the most devastating way of all (as far as LBJ is concerned)--in popularity with the people. RFK wants a Kennedy back in the White House in order to do what JFK was cut off from doing: tax the big boys, cut off oil depletion, have a good relationship with the revolutionary people of the world (Kennedy was moving to this even with Castro), get out of Vietnam, get out of a growing involvement in Thailand, participate cooperatively in space, control the CIA, get rid of J. Edgar Hoover (as JFK intended)---and so on. Notice that all the programs that JFK was moving on are being gradually negated by LBJ. If RFK has no actual proof of what LBJ may have put into effect in Dallas, then the best revenge he can take is to get himself (or his brother, neither brother cares which) into the White House.

And what about Lee Oswald? In my opinion if Lee Oswald were alive ~~xxxx~~ Kennedy would go to any length to expose his thinking (even at risk to his "career") in order to save the man's life. However, Lee Oswald is dead. The system that killed him (and killed RFK's brother) rolls on. Bobby Kennedy is determined in my opinion to halt this momentum. But

without evidence, can halt it only in his way. What about Manchester's book? The only thing I can see here is that Manchester has made a mighty effort to exclude Mrs. Kennedy (or any member of the Kennedy family) from any recognition of it. We KNOW Mrs. Kennedy suggested he write it. But we don't KNOW that she agrees with all that he ~~ix~~ has written. Naturally there is a tacit sort of spirit behind it; still, this can always be obviated if and when it becomes necessary. Let the news be confirmed that Lee was innocent and all Mr s. Kennedy has to do as far as Manchester's book is concerned is to say: Oh, my.

I am, I admit, apologizing for the Kennedys again. And when I am proved wrong Sylvia I am going to be the first to write you an apology for having wasted your time reading all this. Yet, there is something----a deep feeling that these people (particularly RFK) are up to something more than we realize. Something that is for the good (not particularly the Kennedy good) of everyone in the world. We are all of us deluded. The Kennedys no less than I. Let the moment be right, the atmosphere light, and we, everyone, can imagine God is guiding ~~xx~~ us--God, or whatever you want to call a universal kind of energy, an importance of particular activity over and above the necessity to live, a feeling that what one does must be done for the sake of some intangible something, without question and without reward, but done, because if not done, the emptiness is terrible--painful. I am sure JFK felt this--as U Thant does--as Bobby does--as Krushchev did--and even as Napoleon and Hitler did. This god-intoxication can be very dangerous. If it is orientated, disciplined (without being physically vindicative or restrictive) it can be beneficial. I think this way of RFK. There is a discipline working here that I can not find in many other leaders (although I also see it in U Thant--what do you think of U Thant by the way). I am sorry he is leaving. Do you think his son died by accident? US News and World Report says the son died two years ago, but I am sure it is longer.). Thus, I cannot throw away completely ~~my~~ confidence that the Kennedys are not ignoring this thing blatantly. No matter what might be said about RFK by the Left (in regard to "ambition pushing out his interest in the assassination solution") the fact remains that not my brother or your brother, Sylvia, was killed in Dallas in Nov. 22, 1963. It was RFK's brother who was killed. I cannot believe that if the killers still exist that he does NOT care. This would be asking too much of human nature and would make of RFK either a cold devil or a cold saint. I don't believe he is either. I think he is a lot like me--no great intellectual, but willing to study and to learn, to correct mistakes when they are made through ignorance and to be willing to try and try again.

The Left accusation against RFK that he worked for McCarthy has always made me smile. I hope to ~~hell~~ hell no one holds against me my political opinions and actions of my early 20s. RFK was brought up in an extremely conservative home (politically and religiously); to have had a conservative instinct strong enough to work briefly for McCarthy as a very young man is perfectly natural. I would have been surprised if he had emerged from Joe Kennedy's household making noises like Staughton Lynd or AJ Muste. On top of this, Joe McCarthy and Joe Kennedy were friends. The job was a natural. But remember Bobby left McCarthy when he saw what McCarthy was ~~up~~ up to--IN SPITE OF ANGRY WORDS ABOUT IT WITH HIS BELOVED FATHER. And contrary to what the Left tries to teach me to say, I have always been proud of RFK for going to Bethesda to visit Joe McCarthy when McCarthy was dying. I have read that almost no one went to the hospital to see him during his last hours; his disgrace was so complete, he had been so properly destroyed that all the former "friends" and supporters avoided him. But RFK visited him, although RFK knew damn well he would be

lambasted for it. When a man dies, it is no time to deal in vengeance.

Yet, I will confess to you again that I am upset about the Manchester book and certainly upset if RFK vindicates the WC in any way. How could he do this? If he presented now and smashing evidence to damn Lee Oswald, then the WC must still be faulted for not having come up with this themselves.

Sylvia, one ugly thought has occurred to me. You don't suppose this was one of those distorted, perverse sex crimes, do you? Like the William Heirens case? Really I do want a comment from you on this. Because this has bothered me and because I have never mentioned it to anyone else. When Lee was first captured and the first films were shown of him on television (about 4pm, Nov. 22, 1963) I was standing in the doorway of my living room about to go to the back of the house. The announcer said something to the effect: Here is the man Dallas police say shot JFK.

The film was of Lee being dragged, pulled, pushed into (I think?) the jail office. His hair was a mess, his eye blackened, his shirt pulled open, his gaze wild. My first instinct (it came without a second's hesitation) was: He is a homosexual. I have never mentioned this before except to Penn who just grinned and indicated he thought I was right. But I did not say even to Penn that I thought there might have been the possibility of a psychological sex crime (the open window, the rifle sticking through it, the fight with Marina the night before, obviously a sex-fight having to do with the fact that the baby was old enough so that she and Lee could resume relations). The sex symbols that I hope I mistakingly associate with the crime are close to those used in the Heirens horror. At any rate, we must be logical and look at the evidence. The fact remains:

- 1: Lee was a lousy shot
- 2: The rifle could NOT be fired that fast
- 3: The time element on Tippit is wrong
- 4: There has not been evidence to prove Lee was in the window

But at any rate I wanted to mention this to someone. I will put it out of my mind once you answer. But the possibility that Kennedy could have been killed (with the motive such as Heirens, sexual satisfaction) is so sickening (at least to most people) that I could understand RFK covering it--and I could understand (perhaps not approve, but at least understand) the order going out to Ruby to kill Oswald.

To keep a trial from taking place with all the attendant questions
I must close. Colonel Caster is I believe Colonel Robert L. Castorr, listed in the '63 Dallas directory as at 12016 Fieldwood. Tele: AC 214-AD-92502. However, Colonel Castorr no longer has a telephone listing in Dallas, not even an unlisted number. He has either moved away or been removed to federal prison because it is my opinion he is identical with the Colonel in the Rich testimony who swiped military stuff off the bases to send to anti-Castro people. Also I believe he is the dame Castorr who was spoken of by the priest as being mixed in with the Dallas anti-Castro Cubans, who knew Mrs. Odio and who toured Dallas in company with Gen. Walker speaking against JFK. I believe also that he was therefore acquainted with Dave Cherry and Jack Ruby. Duff said as you recall that Jack Ruby went to Walker's in '62 and '63. These people are all tied in together and Lee Oswald was mixing in with them on occasion for some reason or the other.

Got a letter from Joesten yesterday. Are you going to send for his books? Please write. Much love, S.

(over)

To keep a trial from taking place with all the attendant questions

...with a view to the...

...I was not... at the time...

...of the... the... the...

...the... the... the... the...

...I will put it out of...

...I believe...

...a letter from...

Also City Reports & William
Keston (I have talked to)

Handwritten notes: "The... (P...)", "I should...", "I should...", "I should..."

Vertical handwritten notes on the left margin.