

Phone call from Vince Salandria Saturday night 10/7/67 about 9 to 10:15 pm

Vince called to ask further details about the death of Shirley Martin's daughter Vickie. He felt regretful and self-reproachful because he had not honored a pact he and Shirley had made long ago, to remain close friends and colleagues always, which had become vitiated by their differences on RFK.

After I filled him in on my conversation with Shirley earlier that day, Vince switched to discussion of a new "reconstruction" he and Tom Katen were going to write, similar to my thesis to Tink Thompson of 18 August 1967. Vince said that analyses of and attacks on the WR are now valueless and irrelevant—he has a new methodology, which would prove that the government was guilty of the assassination by showing that on 11/22/63 evidence of conspiracy was being buried and ignored, LHO was being called the lone assassin before and against the evidence, and there was an immediate foreign policy switch on Vietnam, that very day.

In discussing the evidence in those terms, we somehow got on to Garrison, which was the subject of the remainder of the conversation, for about an hour. Vince now took the position that Garrison should not be attacked because he wasn't important enough, and because the Establishment was attacking him, making it unnecessary for any critic to do it. His analogy was that he, as a civil libertarian, never attacked the Soviet Union for totalitarianism, although he was no apologist for the Soviet Union: he did not do so because the whole country was busy doing that all the time.

Whereas before this conversation, our disagreement on Garrison had centered on whether or not he is honest, and whether or not he has a case, Vince now seemed prepared to concede that he was both careless, inaccurate, and even dishonest. He said that he had told Garrison this to his face and had pleaded with him on this score. But, according to Vince, I was using a double standard, because I was not attacking others who were also or equally dishonest: i.e., Leo Sauvage. He had published a theory of a racist plot. Now he knew better, he knew that it was a cold-war plot; it was therefore outright dishonesty that he did not publish a retraction of his racist theory, and come out publicly with the cold-war (or Salandria) theory. Another example was Bob Richter—he had come to Philadelphia and had admitted before 5 witnesses that he came to spy on Vince, to make sure (one week before the CBS broadcast) that they didn't have anything new that would make CBS look silly. He had also said that the WR might be right, or that there might have been a conspiracy. Why didn't I denounce Richter, then? He was dishonest because he had not quit his job with CBS. Still other dishonest people I had failed to denounce: Tink Thompson, who had been just plain dishonest about the anterior neck wound; Shirley Martin, who was dishonest about RFK; the reasoning that Vince espoused was, everyone is imperfect, everyone makes mistakes, so why pick on Garrison?

However, if I was going to pick on Garrison, why had I not denounced him for exonerating the FBI, and for whitewashing the CIA by saying that "ex-CIA agents" were involved? Everyone knew there was no such thing as an ex-CIA agent. Vince offered me a pact: he and I would jointly denounce Garrison for exonerating the FBI the CIA and the Warren Commission.

Earlier, Vince had said pointedly that I was on the side of the Establishment on the Garrison issue. That was all right, he realized that I was acting on different and independent motives. But I was on the side of the Establishment. He later appealed to me to reexamine my position.

He now said that he had seen evidence in Garrison's files, which he was not at liberty to discuss, which proved that Oswald and Ruby were linked, that Shaw was Bertrand, etc. etc. No, he did not say that he had seen evidence incriminating oil millionaires, Dallas cops, White Russians...Garrison had probably got hold of one small corner of the conspiracy, it was entirely possible that all those he had named were in fact involved in it. He is certain Shaw was CIA; why was I so concerned about him? He had good lawyers, they would look after his interests.

Confidentially, he would tell me what he had really thought of Garrison when he went to New Orleans—which he would never publish, or admit to: He had thought him pathetic. But we shouldn't use our time on attacking Garrison. As for the code—there was considerable significance to the presence of "19106" in both notebooks—Vince was

not an expert on frequency probabilities or codes, he thought it might well prove to be vital evidence, regardless of the "P.O." being in reality a "D D" and he did not agree that the "code" was fabricated evidence against LHO (or Shaw).

Finally, Vince said that he recognized my right to criticize or attack Garrison, he would make no objection to that, but he did not see why we could not go on as before, or why I had terminated my relationship with critics who did not agree with me on the issue of Garrison.

I have not indicated my replies to Vince on any of his comments or arguments during the discussion of Garrison, all of which I rejected. To summarize my position, near the end of the conversation, I told Vince again that I regarded the Garrison "investigation" merely as an extension of the Warren Report, in which he similarly was accusing Oswald of incrimination in a conspiracy to assassinate the President on mistaken, dubious, and fabricated evidence; that I regarded apologists for Garrison as exactly the same as apologists for the Warren Report; and that it was a single campaign against a fraudulent and consciously fraudulent indictment, and a fraudulent version of history, against its authors and its supporters. I could not consider myself in the same camp as those who supported Garrison or by their silence condoned his chicanery. As for joint attack on him (as Vince had suggested), I needed no authorization from anyone for attacking Garrison, nor did I need instruction on the grounds on which I would attack him. Nor did Vince need any authorization from me or anyone else if he wished to attack Garrison. I needed no partners, nor did he need any partners, nor did we need to negotiate the grounds on which Garrison should be attacked. I declined his offer of "partnership" and made it clear that I would continue to be guided by my own judgment and my own conscience and to pursue a consistent policy of denouncing lies and fabrications against innocent persons, wherever they originated. I felt that we had taken different paths, that we were now in different camps, and that our differences were so fundamental that they could not be put aside or ignored. The conversation terminated on that note.