

21 January 1970

Mrs. Mae Brussell  
Box 3050 Rt. 2  
Carmel 93921

Dear Mae,

Thanks for your most interesting letter of the 14th and for the outline of your 72 notebooks. I am staggered by the amount of work you have done, especially on a number of aspects that have been relatively neglected or covered superficially in the critical literature. This is certainly true of the White Russian colony in the Dallas-Fort Worth Area, and of the neo-nazi CUSA (Larrie Schmidt) apparatus. I did make voluminous notes and annotations on these two groups, back in 1964, when I was doing my first reading through the 26 volumes. However, when it came to the writing of my book, I gave priority to the direct material evidence such as the number and direction of the shots, the autopsy and medical findings, the rifle, paper bag, photographs, etc. etc., and gave relatively little space to equally portentous background relationships, character and personality, and the like. There simply was no space and no time to fit in the totality of the evidence and still get the ms. to fit between the covers of a book.

I did try to show the almost universal incredulosity and disbelief of all those who knew Oswald even slightly when he was said to be the assassin, and also to indicate his consistently positive attitude toward JFK. I also covered in considerable detail the State Department/passport and repatriation evidence; the so-called "alias" Hidell; and some of the other questions covered in your notebooks. But I assume that you are familiar with Accessories and also with the Subject Index.

I have never been able to resolve in my own mind the contradictory evidence on whether or not Oswald was an agent for some intelligence agency and I still find myself ambiguous. In the very beginning, I thought there was a strong case for his clandestine role on behalf of the CIA or some military intelligence outfit. Certainly the "defection" and State Department dealings are grounds for a strong presumption of a cloak-and-dagger mission. Yet, on balance, my ever-all picture of Oswald--his attitudes, convictions, and capacities--leave me with an indecisive impression and a certain amount of doubt that he would have played such a role, for more than a very brief time if at all.

When I was making my notes and annotations of the 26 volumes in 1964, I did jot down some of the witnesses who were never called to give testimony ("non-witnesses"). The list is only fragmentary but I am enclosing a copy in case it is of any use. I am sure that the comprehensive list would cover many, many pages. One name that should be on my list but is not is "Col. Wilmeth," that mysterious figure who took so much trouble to get into contact with Marina. You have no doubt given him the full scrutiny he deserves. I would certainly love to have a week-long gab-fest with you and to see your 72 notebooks, if only it was possible. Maybe I could get out to the coast during my vacation next summer. There must be at least ten thousand questions that we could explore together, and maybe come up with something really decisive. Let's be sure to stay in touch. And congratulations on your monumental compilations of evidence and data which must be destined to illuminate areas of the case which up to now have been murky.

Sincerely,