

10/12/1967

Dear friend:

The combination of ultimatum and condemnation of Garrison in your October issue is quite unwarranted. In fact, it is typical of the conceited impatient petulance that seizes Warren Report critics from time to time - a conceit and irresponsibility which reached its height when Harold Weisberg vented his spleen on Mark Lane in public.

You speak of "real disasters" which have struck Garrison's case against the Cuban exiles and the CIA. The "disasters" turn out to be (1) Garrison's belittling of the part played in his investigation by Gurvich who defected to Washington's side, and (2) a possible error on Garrison's part in misreading some Russian letters in Oswald's notebook.

Shame on you. The Gurvich side of the case has already been handled well by Ramparts and the Los Angeles Bree Press.

The second deals with a telephone number of Jack Ruby allegedly found in both Oswald's and Clay Shaw's notebooks. I am not a cipher expert so I must reserve judgment on the details of Garrison's decoding. However I have studied Oswald's writings and merely stating that Garrison did not realize that the letter prescripts of the numbers were in Russian surely does not exhaust the matter or justify such a blanket attack.

The Oswald page can be studied in Vol. 16, page 58 of the Hearings and Exhibits. The telephone number in question is given in three forms on the page while the Commission's transcript gives only two. The second form is rendered correctly as DD 19106, on the basis that the first two letters are in Russian in the text. The first form has the number 19206 with a prescript that cannot be DD although the Commission transcribed it as DD. The first letter may be a B but

hardly a

The third of these numbers was not transcribed by the Commission at all. On the side of the page is written "D 1-91-07" in a different handwriting.

There is certainly some mystery here, and some allowance must be made for Garrison, who like most district attorneys, is too cocksure of himself and careless of scientific method.

But is this a reason to declare that Garrison's "trust account" is exhausted? First you say that Garrison gave his word to reveal the whole truth and that he must keep his promise. Then you say he must do it right now, sine die, i.e., before the trial of Clay Shaw, or be exposed as a "punctured windbag".

Since Garrison would be a fool and a rascal to reveal his full case before the trial of Clay Shaw, it follows that your demand is already a full denunciation.

That is the kind of demand made by the NBC frameuppers who, by the way, invited "serious investigators" to view the unedited film of their attack on Garrison and then refused me permission to see it on the grounds that I was not an official investigator.

If Garrison's case deserves any scepticism, it must be a benevolent scepticism. You cite the fake "leads" which were being foisted on the critics a few months ago with the probable intention of misleading and discrediting them.

One obvious difference between such leads and Garrison's work is that he has, undoubted and unerringly, located the plot to kill Kennedy in its actual locales and in its ident milieu - New Orleans, Miami, Dallas - Cuban exiles, CIA agents, alias police Klansmen. Another difference is that Garrison has bet his life on the outcome.

So do you must, but without spite, with more good will and with the best chance of doubters, a little patience.

Sincerely,

Harold Feldman
Harold Feldman

4616 Larchwood Avenue, Phila. Pa.
19122