I was going to write you a rather uptight note asking you just how my political views could be irrelevant when my motive is supposed to have been that I took part in an authoritarian rightist plot—then I read the Epstein piece. I had no idea. I knew Garrison was stupid and a little bit dishonest with himself, but I had no notion that he was so utterly ruthless and insame for power, in such an openly crude manner. Hell, I was taking all this shit seriously!

I do want you to know that I never thought your interest was primarily or even partially political — in fact I am shocked when anyone's turns out to be, after hearing all the lip-service condemning the political motives of the WC (as I prefer to call the Warren

Commission).

I caught the last bit of your radio interview down here — just in time to hear you get asked all sorts of goodies like had you read NONE DARE CALL IT TREASON. Well. I came down here to get away from civilization — and I succeeded. Did you get asked any intelligent questions?

In MATTER OF ZEN Paul Wienpahl paraphrases a story he heard from Ruth Fuller Sasaki: "The American was being shown about by the abbot of the temple. The visitor noticed that the abbot was bowing to the various statues of the Bodhisattvas in the different buildings as they entered. Finally, in some annoyance he said to the abbot: 'I thought that you were a Zen Buddhist and free of all this bowing and scraping. Hell, I'M freer than you. I can spit on these statues.'

"Okay, replied the abbot in his limited English, You spits, I

bows. *"

This is my philosophy and I therefore do not object at all to your position re political camps, etc., in the Garrison matter — in fact I think it is probably a superior stand for anyone whose primary interest is scholarly work to take.

I do not of feel that I cam take a similar position, naturally, because I feel I must wage something in the style of a political campaign in order to:1) raise funds for my legal and investigative defense; 2) prevent a witch-hunt into my own anarchistic faction(s); and (3) prevent an extention of this madness into the lives of my friends in New Orleans — as Garrison has told reporters he thinks my conviction can "lead to all kinds of things," meaning other convictions. And going to jail bothers me much less than the idea of seeing my entire social world recked, with friends and associates getting arrested in some nightmare drama under the direction of the Jolly Green Frankenstein Monster. Obviously Garrison is going to run for congress, and Louisiana is a state very suseptible to what Huey Long called "perfect democracy," which he said was pretty hard to distinguish from a dictatorship.

The Epstein piece was in error about Oswald's acceas to U-2 data. This is something covered in one of my signed statements that got me into this. U-2s took off and landed at Atsugi, so all the thousands of military and civilian personnel there saw them on almost a daily basis. I'm sure that's what the classified document is about. I also know about that Russian test Garrison alludes to (if you don't) as "evidence" of Lee's CIA status, projected. And I think I've figured

out how he learned Russian — from the Polish(?) guy in MACS-9 that Lewis remembers. If you ever want to go into this or similar material concerning riddles of Oswald's military years, I'm happy to do what II can. I also have names and vague notions of the whereabouts of some of the others who were in the outfit.

By the way, LEE by Robert Oswald is one of the few things I have read on him that seems to concern the same person I knew, even though it accepts the Commission's conclusions. The only major difference I find there is that I do not remember him as being at all neat, but quite the opposite — but then I am not a sharp observer of external personal details and I think I might have projected my habits in this regard during my military Marxist—Leninist rebellious phase that I was later, upon going overseas, to get very much onto the same trip he was on when I knew him. This was fairly common in MACS-1, especially — due to the morale situation. Before I learned much more about him as a result of the major out. Now I see where I was wrong on a number of points.

Seeing a photo of him passing out Fair-Play-for-Cuba leaflets on Canal Street (in Garrison's office) was somewhat of a shock, too —

he looked so bold and self-confident!

No one other than Arnoni responded, but Billings just cannot, in the position he is in. He has conducted a much more exhaustive investigation of my case than Garrison did, talking to witnesses on both sides, and if he were to now give me financial aid it would wreck his value as a reporter on the subject.

I feel the main funds in my support will come from people who are now vaguely pro-Garrison (like the FREE PRESS readership), once

they see how they are being taken in.

I remain shocked at Kunkin's continuing silence and refusal to respond to me opportunities to learn of my side of the case. I cannot imagine this going on forever. My friends in Southern Calif. are contemplating a possible protest love-in at the FREEP office. If it happens, I regret that I will miss it.

