Nov. 18

Dear Harold,

Certainly the J.F.K. assassination has been followed by a host of people and these may be classified as official and unofficial investigators, insiders or outsiders, legal or political writers, etc. I myself have come to my own conclusions about the assassination, the motive, and related evidentiary matters.

What I have to say today to you is wholly off the record, but I do not doubt that it corresponds very well with your own views, since mine have been influenced by yours, more than anyone else. My original view was that the assassin was a person desirous of becoming the President of the U.S.A.--either a prominent Democrat or a prominent Republican. This is one of the popular myths reviving right now. I expressed this view in 1970 to thirty sociology students at U.W.M. The end result of my spilling the beans was some doctered skin pills--none-other than LSD-25.

I later expressed to you a belief in a more massive conspiracy involving the military, ex officio, and the proponents of the War in Veit-nam, who also were firm supporters during the Cuban events, prior to and leading up to the Cuban missil crisis. I still believe there is some truth to this "wider" theory. I did not focus in at that time on the F.B.I., the secret service or the C.I.A.

Finally, I became engrossed in your C.I.A. book, the New Orleans business, and related matters. I have finally developed my views about the "narrow conspiracy" theory. I believe that the crucial point of evidence is the identification of Oswald infront of the Texas schoolbook building and the investigation of the people in the building at the time, including a police officer. I still think that this is the legal (if not factual) point of importance, i.e., J.F.K. was shot from the sixth floor building by SOMEONE. I do not believe that this someone was necessarily "the false Oswald." I believe many organizations planned to kill J.F.K., but most of these were simply fly by night operations--involving lonely homosexuals, and a host of disgruntled ex-C.I.A. people. I do not think the Garrison case was very strong, frankly. I wish I knew more about it? As to the grassy knoll, this may or may not be factually relevant, but it does not alter in any way the conspiracy thesis!

Now, I think the murder of officer Tippet, the death of Oswald in retaliation for killing Tippet, and the circumstances of the death by Ruby under such imperfect security, is the key to the Dallas business. Certainly, Oswald was "shut-up" before the F.B.I. could interview him in depth. Certainly, Oswald was not prepared to admit that he was the assassin, or the only one involved.

And the second thing your books bring out for me is that no single man was entirely able to carry out such a fantastic sequence of events, that no single man could cover up the case, and that no single man could fire so many bullets so accurately in such a brief interval of time. And this seems to be the nub of the latest public review of this evidence. I.e., that it is absurd to regard the J.F.K. assassination as an "accident," involving one unstable person. If we know anything about Oswald then it is that he was stable, determined and patriotic. He did work for our government, he did not work for the K.G.B., and he was somekind of messenger boy for the White House to the U.S.S.R.--a common practise of that administration.

Who was responsible for all of these activities leading up to the assassination--the collection of laundered monies, the professional messengers, and the planning and co-ordination of the killing? The answer is so simple that it needs a lot of serious thought. A man not only frustrated by the fact that he could not be the President himself, but a man who had deep feelings about the so-called betrayal of C.I.A. operatives in the Bay of Pigs. In short, a man of the intelligence establishment on friendly terms with monied interests, military experts, and southern radicals and racists. A man who might be considered to be respectable, a hero of sorts, and uncompromising in his hatred for Kennedy and his actions. A friend of R. M. Nixon.

Who was responsible for saying " I won't investigate this if I am in the White House, or reopen the national archives " and you can count on me to be by your side all of the way? I think this is obvious. Johnson put the stuff into the archives so that it would hang over the Republicans' heads. His successor saw to it that the archives remained closed... His successor could only advance himself politically by allowing this matter to remain dead and buried--and who hated J.F.K. most of all? The one man who felt he was cheated of the office in 1960 by the syndics of the Cook county polls.

And who was responsible for burying the assassination and frightening the newspapers, the publishers and all the rest of the investigators who dared to look into this matter? Why, the very same two-some that I have already directed my attention to. But, who was most upset by the Bay of Pigs? Who was most vociferous and powerful in seeing to it that Kadi-justice should be carried out, and who was the person the Watergate papers refer to as "sedan chair two?" Could it be Bill Donovan? Could it be one of Nixon's top men--which one remains to be seen? Or could it be a military man? Whomever it was, this is the person who planned it, carried it out and paid for it. With the conivance of underworld monies, large corporation monies and European monies--probably to the tune of $500,000.00, our President was killed like a common gangster.

Finally, why was J.F.K. so damn determined to go to Dallas after the Stevenson incident? Why did he persist in his plan to campaign so early in Texas, when his Vice-President was none other than L.B.J.? In looking through Salinger's WITH KENNEDY I believe the reason may be hidden in the first twelve pages of his copy. Did Kennedy have an appointment to talk with a big man in the C.I.A. at Dallas? Who may have this been and why? Did it have anything to do with foreign espionage? What sort of interest did J.F.K. himself take in classified dosiers of intelligence agents of either our own establishment or the European one? He had the clearance to open anything up he wanted to open up and this may have been one of the reasons he persisted in going to Dallas. Speculative as it is, it seems wholly appropriate to make this timely suggestion, now.

I must confess that all of this is very general and that I am only a professional psychologist, not a lawyer and not an investigator with any reputation such as yourself. But, I offer it to you with my most sincere belief in your devotion to the solution of this case, once and for all. I do not have evidence that points to Mr. Nixon or to Mr. Donovan. I have great respect for the latter gentleman, but none for the former one. I may be biased in regards to the former, but not the latter. I believe someone will run a plank to open the archives up in ten years and will solve the matter. I do not see myself in that role. I do not judge the person who was responsible for this action. I do feel the matter is one that revolves about the supremacy of the law in our country or of private morality or the role of military ethics in defining what the president can or cannot do.

I only mention these people then by sheer accident, with neither malice nor envy, out of frustration at being so far from a final answer. I do not know how vast the conspiracy may be, but am confident that it is vaster than even you surmise it to be. I suspect that at least ten more years are required to iron it all out.

I make no charges, no character assasinations. I mention facts that may be construed as motives. I do not subsume a thing about these gentlemen. But, I know deep inside I am right and I can't shake it from my mind. It is largely due to my love for J.F.K. that I bring these ideas to your attention. It is largely due to my affection for R.F.K. that I give you my preliminary reconstruction of the first assassination. I believe the answer will begin to form in everyone's mind when the report Sen. Church is preparing is released. I am afraid that the O.S.S. may be involved in this, Harold. I respectfully remain--

Paul

P. K. MacKal, M.A.
Social psychology &
Social psychiatry.

This and the need to mail books out when I can't do much explain why I have to limit myself in response to your 11/18 and the thoughtful gift of the book to merely "thanks." Best, HW 11/28/75