

11 July 1968

Dear Tom,

I have mailed back to you under separate cover (book rate) the manuscript of the first two chapters, which you kindly left with me when you were here last Saturday. The ms. reads extremely well. It flows, easily and coherently, and sets forth relatively complex material with great clarity. So far as the writing is concerned, and the factual account of the New Orleans "investigation" as well as your assessment of events and participants, I can only praise this sample of your book-to-be. But, as you anticipated, I am unhappy and disappointed that an objective and necessary account of the Garrison affair will, implicitly and explicitly, serve at the same time to encourage credence in the Warren Report and in Oswald's guilt.

On that issue, we are apparently in honest and real disagreement. I am not going to repeat all the evidentiary arguments in my book, since you have read it and remained unconvinced; and I am certainly not going to entertain for one moment the kind of facile charges which the pro-Garrison critics of the WR are surely going to make, against Epstein in the case of his New Yorker article and perhaps also when your book comes out—charges that the attack on Garrison is motivated by a desire to rehabilitate the Warren Report, that Ed is a fink or a secret agent for the Establishment, and that sort of nonsense. It is because I believe that there is a genuine, fundamental difference between us that I am saddened. I feel also that no expose of Garrison will be really effective, in terms of those misguided souls who still "believe" in him, unless it also presents an unambiguous case against the Warren Report. Apparent "kindness" toward the Report will be interpreted as proof that the attack on Garrison is an Establishment-inspired act of desperation, because he really has such a devastating case up his sleeve. I would certainly not want you or Ed or anyone to misrepresent his views on the WR but I would hope that you take every care—as Ed unfortunately did not do—to avoid creating the impression that the concomitant of a rejection of Garrison is an acceptance of the WR's validity.

Your comments on the performance of the FBI, at the end of your Chapter 2, are a case in point. It may well be that some of the critics have been too ready to read the most sinister meanings into even the innocent shortcomings of the FBI's investigation on behalf of the Warren Commission and have overstated the case. But in attempting to be fair to the FBI, you seem to me to be somewhat too generous—for example, you take no account of the serious and specific instances of FBI intimidation of witnesses (detailed in both the Subject Index and in Accessories) or the persistent claims by WC witnesses that the FBI misrepresented statements made by them (also detailed in both books); nor of the peculiar manner in which the FBI as well as the Commission treated the report made by Robert Adrian Taylor; nor of the apparent inaction on and concealment of the "Miami tape" affair; nor various other deficiencies and derelictions on the part of the FBI which can scarcely be brushed aside.

I am, of course, very curious to know how Epstein's article was received in New Orleans and how it has affected you personally. I will perhaps phone you tonight or tomorrow night. Meanwhile, can you tell me—in confidence, of course—the real identity of "Mrs. Holland"? and if possible of "Bill Boxley"? Also, I should mention that a man named Sandy Hochberg phoned, saying he is just back from New Orleans and discussions with Garrison and his staff, asking to come and see me to discuss a possible article. I have told him to come by next Monday and if you think there is anything I should know about him (I know nothing except that he is a free-lance reporter or public relations man) please ring me up collect (if we have not already been in touch on the phone).

I was glad that you and your friend Tom dropped by. All the best,