

9/29/67

Dear Tom,

Your boss was quite talkative during his visit to New York last weekend but at least one of his taped interviews, with Howard Cosell of ABC radio, was cancelled for reasons which the station did not wish to explain. I have asked for a transcript of his Page One interview, on ABC television, and have made my own transcript of his Mike Wallace interview (by Joe Wershba), since CBS radio said that they had made no transcript. I enclose a copy of the latter transcript, for your information.

On the second page, about the middle, Garrison talks about Ruby's "orientation" and specifically about a name, "Tom Hill," allegedly in Ruby's address book, and supposedly followed by the address of Robert Welch. I was not able to find either the name "Tom Hill" nor the address of Welch. If you can give me specific references, I would be grateful.

During the Page One interview, Garrison similarly alleged that a Fort Worth phone number with a "Pe" exchange was to be found both in Oswald's address book (he mistakenly called it CE 38 instead of CE 18) and on two phone messages to Ruby, both dated 6/6/63. I was able to find a "Pe" phone number in CE 18, identified there as the number of a radio or TV station; but could not find the corresponding number among Ruby's phone messages. Again, if you can supply specific references, I would be grateful.

According to my tally, Garrison has now accused (1) Shaw, Ferrie and Oswald (or "Oswald"); (2) the CIA (3) anti-Castro Cuban exiles; (4) the Dallas police (certain individuals); (5) members of the White Russian community in Dallas; (6) members of the Minutemen; (7) members of the John Birch Society; and (8) "insanely patriotic" oil millionaires. This suggests a total of at least 20 conspirators, if one calculates only two conspirators in each of the groups of which he claims "members" or "individuals" were implicated. Well, for all I know, there were 200. I am ready to accept 20, 200, or 2000, if and when there is proof. Garrison says that there is "corroborating evidence" in his files. How come Salandria missed seeing it? And how come Lane said recently (if my informant is correct), "Heaven help Garrison if Russo is all he has, and so far as I know, all he has is Russo"?

I cannot, of course, dispute claims about what is or is not in Garrison's files--not, at least, from personal knowledge; but if his accuracy in quoting the published evidence in the Hearings and Exhibits is any index to his accuracy in discussing his own "evidence," the critics in the entourage will be hard put to justify their hero. But I notice that where they encounter this difficulty, they produce quite ingenious rationalizations --or they merely refuse to discuss the specifics. It is amazing to me how they manage to accomodate misstatements from Garrison for which Specter or Liebler would be played alive. (Some of the critics, not quite equal to the massive hypocrisy required for support of your boss, are discreetly inching away. One even had the temerity to allege that he had never held any brief for Garrison's "case," even though it was his passionate commitment to Garrison that caused a total rift between us.)

The Warren Commission and its apologists must be basking in the comfort and reprieve which the Garrison investigation gives them. Nothing that the most satanic mind in the CIA could have designed could possibly benefit the Commission more than Garrison's (presumably) gratuitous campaign against their Report. Whatever his original motives, and whatever his ultimate objectives, he has certainly served as a windfall to the Commission, a windfall of incalculable dimensions. For if and when he falls flat on his face, he will have succeeded in conferring some degree of immunity from suspicion on the various groups he has accused --groups which may indeed include the guilty or their accomplices. The "cry wolf" exercise now in progress must give them enormous satisfaction.

Nothing in the four years during which we have been at work to uncover the truth, and to expose the Warren Report for the ugly fraud it is, has dejected and disgusted me so much as the conversion of the whole affair into a cheap spectacle, in which one irrepressible tongue is spewing forth more confusion and misinformation per week than the whole clientele of an insane asylum.

Nothing much new, otherwise. Do write when you can. All the best, Tom,

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'A. J. F.', written in a cursive style.