

11 July 1968

Dear Ed,

I had to wait and get my copy of the New Yorker at the newsstand yesterday, as Mr. McL. apparently did not share your feeling that my time and assistance merited an advance copy. Never mind...

I congratulated you, when I read an earlier draft of the article, on the very effective attack on Garrison, and I can only repeat those congratulations now that I have read the final article.

The fly in the ointment, for me, is that I was unable to convince you on the issue of the palmprint on the rifle, or of the time available to Oswald to reach the second floor, and the like (if you give him five minutes rather than less than 2 minutes, as was allowed by the Commission, you may deprive him of an alibi for the shooting of JFK--but you also strengthen his alibi for the Tippit shooting, by allowing a time-span three minutes or more less than the already inadequate time which the Commission allowed him for walking from his rooming-house to the Tippit scene).

It is already apparent from the Peter Kihss story in the Times this morning that your Garrison article can and will be utilized as a plea on behalf of the Warren Report; and the critics in Garrison's claque will leap upon this as evidence that your expose of him is only part and parcel of the Establishment's counter-attack, which (according to their "reasoning") in itself constitutes proof that he really "has" an ace case up his sleeve.

Well, we will see what happens next...In any case, you can always clarify your position further in the book. By the way, Jones Harris phoned in great excitement on Tuesday, asking the whereabouts of Tink Thompson. It seems that Dwight Macdonald is willing to appear on the platform with Garrison, to oppose him, when he is at Madison Square Garden on August 7th, provided that Thompson also appears. I pointed out to Jones that Thompson knows little about the Garrison business and Macdonald probably knows nil, to which Jones seemed to agree. He then asked me if I would be willing to take part, and I said that I would not. I see no need to "debate" so clumsy and transparent a charlatan, nor to help him raise money from the admissions. Sometimes I wonder if all the world is not slightly mad...with the usual exceptions.

Do let me know any interesting repercussions, especially from Tom, Billings, etc.

As ever,