

*Shirley Martin to Waitsberg*

6/6/67

Harold: I feel better about Garrison after reading your letter and after reading Bill's article in the recent RAMPARTS.

Will send Garrison Jean Hill's statement to me (January, 1964) about Honest Joe being parked behind the stockade fence at Dealey Plaza on November 22, 1963. Mrs. Hill was furious about it because she had asked a policeman if she could park there, to which he replied no, saying that Honest Joe had a "right" to be there.

This bothered Molina too. I talked to Molina in February, 1964, and again in August of that year. He was a frightened little man and yet he loved JFK so much (his house was full of JFK items) that he wanted to tell me his suspicions. He hated the TSHDS people (only natural after what he went through), detested their right-wing orientation. Molina was also concerned about the epileptic. (I told you, I think, that I contacted Altgens on this in August, '64. Altgens had also been suspicious of this "attack" on Houston—and it was Altgens who gave me the best estimate of the time the man had the "fit;" he said that the lights of the motorcade were turning off Harwood onto Main as the epileptic was going off under the underpass in an ambulance to Parkland. Altgens then fatuously remarked: "I checked with the FBI on this and they cleared it." I tried to trace the man in Parkland but got nowhere.)

Talked to a lady who works near the Washateria on Zangs (where Oswald sat up until midnight the night of November 20th); she said Lee used the phone a good deal while in there. She also informed me that the FBI really worked the cleaners over (next door), trying to trace that jacket and number. (I, too, tried to trace that "damned elusive" jacket on Zangs and Jefferson. The "B" as you know should correspond with the last name initial of the ~~smoking~~ soiled bastard who brought it in. On top of this, the Dallas cleaning establishment insists to me that in their fair city first and last initials are used, hence had Oswald brought in a jacket to be cleaned in Dallas (or OakCliff) the legend should have read "D. R." (for Dirty Red).

At any rate, none of this is new to you. Manchester's remark, of course, that Serrrels did not know that Honest Joe was a friend of Jack Ruby on November 24th is nonsense. Serrrels knew it damned well and so testified; in fact, he used the knowledge to get Ruby to open up. Manchester also claims that FBI agent Joe Hesty was a JFK man. He may have been, but he was also a friend and "bridge-playing buddy" of Robert Surrey, aide to ~~XXXXX~~ Edwin Walker and printer of the son-of-a-bitching WANTED FOR TREASON pamphlet distributed against JFK in the streets of Dallas before and on the day of the assassination.

You are quite right when you say that Mrs. Kennedy is not a law unto herself. She has never felt that she was. Nor did she make any demands along this line that terrible day in Parkland. And as I told you I most sincerely treasure your defense of her. My point is only that laws such as Rose was caterwauling about are generally suspended in regard to emergencies involving national or international figures, whether the individual is Kennedy, LBJ, De Gaulle or Kossygin. No one is trying to say that the law should NOT be explicitly followed for everyone regardless, but such is the fact of human nature and life itself that these things happen. (Don't we all know Leftists for example who have certain Judges for friends and who find themselves conveniently exempt from certain situations which otherwise might be considered not lawful?)

The fact that these laws were not courteously suspended for the body of the President of the United States (and for the convenience of his shocked widow) is NOT an indication of Rose's great dedication to the defense of the innocent. As I told you before, Rose is such a man who would not care whether a man is innocent or guilty, alive or dead, tortured or at ease, as long as Rose is satisfactorily occupied and well. In short, Rose is a pig? Had LBJ been killed in Dallas, however, Rose's political antennae would have gotten the message promptly and LBJ's body would have been immediately released without the whisper of "autopsy here---autopsy now." Nor can we say that had an autopsy been performed in Dallas that the country's integrity would have been protected (as the Left has it). As a matter of fact, who among us feels safe to state BEYOND A DOUBT that the autopsy-here-autopsy-now chant put up by Rose was NOT part and parcel of the conspiracy, part and parcel of the epileptic fit, the magic bullet planted on "a" stretcher? Let us imagine for a minute that Rose had kept the body. What then? Would we be happier with the final autopsy result than we are now? Or less happy? Or would the case be quite, quite dead, dead from the very start because even the shreds of evidence that have kept us going, the bullet probed for and not found, the minute particles in the head, the larger segment over the eye, the other instances so confusing that they have been reassuring, where would these have been? How strange it is to imagine for one minute that the integrity not found in Bethesda would have been the Left's for the asking in the hands of that fervent right-winger, Rose. I have seen strange lines drawn, fair and unfair comment parceled out to many, but I have never seen anything so tragic-comic as the Left flying to the defense of Rose.

Nor can we forget the first reaction of the Kennedy aides. Isn't it quite logical to declare that these men, dear men to me, hated men to the Left, were nevertheless human men. Certainly I have not tried to deify them or to pronounce them infallible. Why, then, does the Left insist that Kennedy's friends and Mrs. Kennedy thought clearly and without emotion after having lived through only a few minutes earlier the trauma on Elm Street? (I have had conversation with a Leftist who assured me that he would not take his wife into Dallas in '64 because it was not safe for her. One wonders with what kind of coolness and swift logic this couple would have reacted had they been in the Presidential motorcade on that day?) Since the first HUMAN reaction of the Kennedy aides was that a hideous conspiracy existed against all of them in Dallas, can any one of us seriously blame them for feeling that Rose's action may have been a part of the total conspiratorial picture? After all, WHY WAS ROSE IN SUCH A HEAT? O'Donnell and Buckley had both asked that he (or an aide of his) accompany the body to Parkland to witness the autopsy. Yet Rose refused this. He refused accommodation of any kind. Why? Frankly, knowing what I know about Rose, knowing what I know about Dallas, knowing what I know about the southwest in general, I do not feel Rose was part of any grand design. I think Rose was just a bastard, arrogant, afflicted with that most crushing of all diseases: envy.

But for the Left to keep insisting that had a Dallas autopsy been performed, if only the Kennedy people had been humble and listened to the wisdom and the wit of Gentleman Rose, all would now be well, the world would be healed and no napalm would have fallen in Vietnam. When I hear shit like this I want to cry. I am bored by fools, and this is the talk of fools.

Certainly we would all enjoy more order in human affairs. But since very few of us can get through a day without argument and fear, without fighting even with those nearest and dearest to us, without being gauche or stupid in some manner or another, it beats the hell out of me that the Left continues to beat the Kennedys with a stick over an issue which resulted from purely

human emotion. Nor as I pointed out before can we escape the fact that had LBJ waited at the hospital as he should have done for Mrs. Kennedy this would NOT have occurred. Rose would have deferred to LBJ like a cur with its tail wag. Even Manchester refrained from pointing out what to me was the most obvious blemish of this whole affair: that LBJ left Mrs. Kennedy alone in a strange hospital without the solace and the ~~strength~~ strength of a LIVING PRESIDENT to guide her. You did not answer me, but can you seriously imagine JFK, had the positions been reversed, going off to the airport (crouched down in a car below window level!) and leaving Ladybird alone in a strange Massachusetts hospital? I cannot. Both LBJ and JFK have and had habits of telling the Secret Service where to shove it. It was not that LBJ just HAD to obey Youngblood. LBJ was obeying that elder, more primitive call: scared blood.

For the Left to try to make an issue of the Rose incident, by implying that even then the Kennedy aides were attempting a cover-up is ridiculous in light of Burkley's and O'Donnell's insistence that Rose travel with them to Washington, thereby never having the body out of his sight. If the Left wants to make a dung heap out of this incident, let them inquire more closely into WHY Rose would not accompany the body to Bethesda but insisted that an autopsy be performed in Dallas. Of course, this will not be nearly so much fun for the Left, because picking on Rose is boring for them, whereas jumping on the Kennedys exalts them by making it appear that they are BOLD, Courageous, beautiful people who dare to stand apart from the herd and criticize the Kennedys. Tinkling brass.

The fact remains that much ground will be lost in these useless side issues ~~which~~ are based for the most part on envy. In addition, friends are lost who might easily be valuable in the trying times ahead. Certainly there is much room for reasonable criticism of JFK: he was conservatively orientated as a Representative (he admitted this himself); except for his Algerian speech he had not too much of a record in the Senate (he admitted this himself, leaving it to his friends to explain that for a great deal of the time he was in the Senate, he was seriously ill); he blundered badly at the Bay of Pigs, vacillating even to perform it, and then giving in as the wheels had been so set in motion by the previous administration that he lacked the confidence to halt it, but sticking firm to his word even under the most disgusting pressure that he would not involve American aircraft. Nor can it be explained to the Left why Kennedy (with RFK) appointed certain ~~xi~~ segregationist judges, or why he moved slowly in this area or that. But to those of us who see this country functioning, who see the necessity of leaders, who feel that better things can come but not in one fell swoop, who have a knowledge of the world's revolutions, having seen in history the absolute insanity of France in the Terror, who know very well that there is no absolutely GOOD Left and completely bad Right, who fear the excesses that those on the Left unused to power, uneducated in human culture, lacking humor and forgiveness, who see in these Carnichaels, in these Malcolm Xs, young Robespierres, who do not care to exchange Eisenhower, for example, for Huey Long, those of us cannot go along with you when you attack John F. Kennedy for all the wrong reasons. When you forget the personal pain he suffered, when you forget the real effort he made to reach detente, when you forget how he read his eyes out trying to learn everything there was to know, when you forget that he worked like a horse all his adult life when he could have stood in bed with a martini in one hand and a blonde in the other, when you forget that it was his head blown apart in Dallas--not a Leftist head, but his, a head so held in contempt by those on the Left that all they can do is reduce themselves by attacking him, who is dead and so safe from their poisonous darts.

Love, S.