

Sept. 13, '76

Dear Harold,

Of course, I keep all my political letters confidential, in order to protect myself and those who write to me. I am not in the possession of any vital legal or political evidence. I am in possession of historical documents that may someday be valuable, if and only if, I accomplish something.

One word of correction, my investigator's vita and brief is by no means theoretical. It suggests what ought to be done to obtain existing sources of evidence for the purpose of investigating two new lines of evidence associated with the assassination and to re-investigate the old line of evidence because it is hoped that Belin's work was premature. If he based his conclusions on insufficient evidence then a review of all the evidence he had with those missing portions added to it, might be worthwhile. He has suggested as much, himself, on public T.V. One of my so-called theories is entirely consistent with the facts you have presented in your first three books. Clearly, it is less a thesis than a brief in light of the careful work you have already done in researching, interviewing, tracing, etc., ad infinitum your sources. This anti-Castro group conspiracy idea is partly your own and partly J. Garrison's. In any case, it is a useful line of investigation in light of Downing's discoveries. Surely, it is also useful to consider the evidence that point toward pro-Castro assassination, domestic and/or foreign?

As you know how I have revised your thesis, based on my letter of Nov. 18, '75, it seems I ought not to review that here. But, my 42 pages go into detail and provide a useful hypothetical framework for further investigation without assuming at the outset that the hypothesis is true. In any case, I am confident you appreciate the possibility that someone other than Oswald killed Kennedy and that Oswald may have been the back-up man for whomever did this deed. Perhaps, the man who did kill Kennedy was Oswald's back-up man? But, this fact is either consistent with the grassy knoll theory or the Commission theory. I assume that the back-up man would also be in the book building, but it would be wiser to locate him elsewhere. I feel the death of officer Tippitt needs to be investigated too, by the way. Just why did Oswald shoot him?

Secondly, I am of the opinion that the planning for this event was enormous. And included a group of relatively large proportions, for sake of melodrama I like to call it "group 666." And, capable of killing Robert Kennedy, too. In any case, this group would have to be composed of some mix of people who either work for our government or did work for same. I feel those who covered up did so out of fear, incompetence and plain belief in the guilt of Oswald. I feel those who covered up the real murder did so through J. E. Hoover and L. B. Johnson, and I feel this was done for a host of political reasons.


Certainly, people outside of the C.I.A., such as informants, the F.B.I., and members of the clique of ex-O.S.S. buddies who still feel they are invincible, with strong right-wing or even left-wing sentiments, would be more likely to carry out an assassination, though less competent to do so. Surely, the C.I.A. was not very competent in its assassination activity and attempts of foreign leaders. But, it is a toss up between these two kinds of people. I just happen to agree with you and Jim Garrison that people like Cabell, Donovan, and Nixon are prime suspects. De-thereo, of course. But, evidence might point in someone's direction and surely, that would be useful. Evidence could point in many people's directions and that would be even more useful. Evidence could point to no one. That would not prove anything, either.

The complexity of this case, the size of the financial and political magnitude of the conspiracy to commit the crime, and to repeat it, the size of the cover-up instituted by the F.B.I., et al., and the size of the cover-up of the cover-up by the journals, publishers, papers, and government are three separate matters, which I do not connect. In that event, one might feel my theory is parsimonious?

Aside from empirical facts presented by you, it is possible that Clay Shaw blew it, and was replaced by Oswald by the Miami office of the C.I.A. After all, he intimated the plan in a public place before the event, not only after it. Consequently, the big men in the sedan chairs simply decided to get someone else to do it. In the event that Shaw would be investigated the evidence could not completely hang him. And this is just as likely, to my mind, as your conception is to you and Jim Garrison. Just who took whose place? Did Lovelady take Oswald's place, or did Oswald take Lovelady's place?

And now, let me give you back to your family and bed-rest. I am hopeful that all is well and that you will take an interest in the events now transpiring in the Congress. This is one of those situations "when lightning strikes twice."

Sincerely,


P. K. Mackal, M.A.
Social, clinical &
medical psychology

7014 W. Mequon Rd.
112 N.
Mequon, Wi. 53092