

12/5/66

Dear Vince,

Before I forget--Weisberg phoned this morning and mentioned that he will be on WCAU Wednesday night. Whitewash is out as a Dell paperback, I hear; and he is griping bitterly about the contractual skullduggery. He is putting out his new book as a private edition, like the first, to be available in a few weeks.

Thanks for sending me your notes on Boston. Like you, I don't quite know what to make of the dialogue, or parts of it. Had Cohen said, "You would have to be..." instead of "You will have to be..." I would be inclined to regard it as indicating merely that a rebel and critic in a police state would have to be liquidated if he would not or could not fall in line. The "will" can of course have an ominous connotation. But since the notorious "they" must spend their hours praying that none of the critics happens to cast off his mortal coil for purely natural reasons, I am tempted to think that we known advocates of the conspiracy explanation of 11/22/63 have the least to fear from those who want to keep things quiet.

The later remarks ("...that is why they are struggling so hard..." etc.) seems to be a clear admission that he knows--or is convinced--that it was a group of plotters and no lone assassin. But I do not trust his public statements to be accurate or honest; and therefore I do not trust his private words to be a genuine expression of what he knows or what he thinks. He is clever, true; and tricky, mischievous, and malicious--and at times plain sinister. That is a far cry from, say, Curtis Crawford, whose intellectual forte is nit-picking with gloves on and using ice-tongs, but who is, lamentably, able to convince himself that the mountain of evidence which has crushed the WR to death is merely illusory and that despite all appearances, the conclusions are really sound. How can such a prissy spinster of a quasi-philosopher serve where a blend of Maigret and Humphry Bogart is needed?

The notion of "liking" Cohen flabbergasts me. Where I grew up, no one turned the other cheek--it was an eye (and an arm plus a leg) for an eye; and I have a keen and lively anticipation of the day of the WC's retribution--the WC and all its apologists and lackeys. If we don't have those little ceremonies the line of demarcation between good and evil is likely to get blurred. Let it be known that there is still a penalty for murder, malfeasance, falsehood, and venality. I vote not to let anyone off who is guilty--and we can go into it more when we know the names on the manning-table.

This is not to say that I do not love you for your magnanimity--or in spite of it. Studies on the Left finally emerged from the womb--it is the October-November issue. If you don't get it in Philadelphia let me know and I'll try to send you a copy. Also, the Reporter (on the newsstands around 12/8/66) has Goodall's review of Epstein and Lane. Much love to you and Livie,