

10/28/66

Dear Mr. C.,

If I don't answer letters as they come in, they'd accumulate and I'd never get to do it. Haven't time for a long reply.

On the basis of what I know and what I've read in Lane's that I can credit, I see nothing solid to add to what I said: that Ruby could kill Oswald only because the police made it possible. To add to what is sufficient to indict them without a really solid base for adding is not responsible, and on this subject we must mustered the greatest responsibility. This does not address what we think, for our minds must be unrestrained. Only what we say.

Can you visualize any alliance between the Dallas police and the left?

I think you have read Part 2 of my book too hastily, judging on your comment on Buchanan. Remember, he and Joesten worked and wrote when they did not ~~the~~ have the advantages of the Commission's material.

Popkin has done nothing. The terrific job you speak of is a transparency.

The challenge to produce new material is a diversion. What is wrong with the old that was ignored, misused, abused, evaded? And I have what for the Report is an abundance of new material.

You will soon learn there was no second Oswald - just a false one or ones. Popkin didn't dare take my entire title. There was no need for plastic surgery.

Try thinking of Oswald as merely a patsy.

Sincerely,

Mon. Oct. 24, 1966  
1706 16th St. NW  
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Harold Weisberg  
% Hyattstown P.O.  
Hyattstown, Md.

Dear Mr. Weisberg,

I am sorry to bother you again as seen on the heels of my original letter, but I had one idea, probably not original with me that I wanted to convey before I forget it. You may be sick of the whole matter by now, but now is not the time to flag with calls for reopening coming from every responsible quarter. I am reading Lane and am utterly fascinated.

In one chapter, Lane is discussing the role of the police in Ruby's entrance into the basement. He says something about a fact which would "implicate the Dallas police in the assassination." I must admit I have never taken this theory very seriously, possibly because I shy away from pinning such a monstrous thing on any police department in our country. But a realistic estimate of human nature would dictate eschewing any sentimental reservations about holding any remote possibility up to the light, something the Commission did not do of course.

Then the thought struck me. To plan and bring up a watertight assassination, even perhaps a perfect crime as we may have here, private resources alone would be insufficient. The complicity of public authorities would be a *sine qua non*, no? It seems to be that the hypothesis of a plot, whether from right or left, has to take account of this, and the only two public authorities which could possibly qualify are the Dallas police authorities and/or the federal government of the United States. Mrs. Oswald believes the latter, but I think the evidence is stronger for the former, especially on the Ruby thing.

I think this reasoning answers the question, not why would the police be somehow involved, but HOW WOULD THEY DARE? Very simple, being smart and knowing that assassination, the MURDER of a president, IS NOT YET A FEDERAL CRIME (at the time of '63) and knowing that in the case of one, the local and state authorities are in charge of the crime, who would be in a better strategic position to pull off such a crime, let the fall guy get murdered before he can spill the beans, and then use its own ~~power~~ power to cover up the whole thing. If accepted, this helps to explain away all the seemingly inexplicable factors -- how Ruby get in the basement, the announced time of Oswald's transfer -- how the description of Oswald was broadcast when no one had yet described him to the police, etc. The police had two months before JFK's visit to Dallas to plot this out. Perhaps they figured they had excellent chances of getting away with it because the initial investigation would be in their hands with excellent opportunities for severing tracks wherever needed.



I knew it is presumptuous of me to think this whole concept is original with me, but why can I not remember having read it so plainly stated in any of the critics' works, including your own, if I am not unfair and mistaken? A very simple idea. Assassination was still not a federal crime, though it is now, but didn't this present some sort of unique opportunity for the Dallas police possibly in league with <sup>h</sup>monied, hate-ridden others in damnable Dallas?

\*  
 Ewen  
 Buchanan  
 who accuses the  
 closest to  
 implying police  
 involvement.

Sincerely,  
 Bruce Cossaboom -  
 Bruce Cossaboom

P.S. Specter et. al. Challenge the critics to present alternatives and/or new evidence. How might this do as a starting point? Poplin has done a terrific job in his book of presenting one, but this thesis is half-baked & inchoate. IF a second Oswald, then how? By plastic surgery - Poplin <sup>not by the legendary "Laird" everyone is</sup> alleged to have takes this up, mentions it - could not a reopened Bd. of inquiry call up every plastic surgeon in Texas, U.S., etc. to find out if possible and who might have done it??