

29 May 1967

Dear Philippe,

There is now, in my opinion, no further margin for doubt: our G. is a charlatan and a fraud. One of the critics, whom I will call R, arrived in New York on Saturday morning, to see G. who was here for a television interview. The interview was taped on Saturday and broadcast yesterday: again, G. made grandiose claims, inaccurate pronouncements, and irresponsible charges unsupported by evidence.

R., who is unconditionally and servilely dedicated to G., and who frankly admits that he believes that the ends justify the means, urged me to see G. I was reluctant to do so, because I felt that there was really nothing to discuss and because I did not wish to present myself in what might be interpreted as the role of supporter or admirer. In any event, G. became so occupied with various journalists and interviewers that I did not have to make any decision. (G. had told R., apparently of his own volition, that he wanted to be sure to see me while he was here.)

R. decided, however, to tackle G. himself on the subject of the so-called code. I explained to R. very carefully the reasons why I could not accept the "decoding" of the numbers in LHO's address book; he, in turn, accepting my arguments and admitting that G.'s claims about the code were "mistaken," then presented the issue to G.

G. in effect conceded that the objections were valid and thus that the code was not valid—but he refused to withdraw or retract publicly. He said that his error was an honest one (and I am ready to believe that it was indeed an honest misreading and misinterpretation) and therefore feels justified in allowing it to stand—a process of reasoning and morality which truly escapes me in its entirety. Not only is it dishonest to allow it to stand after he is confronted with proof that it is not valid—it is stupid. The defense lawyers will expose the code as a fraud, if no one else has already done it, in a courtroom. It would be infinitely better, on a purely pragmatic level, if G. himself corrected the record before his adversaries do it. But he is too vain and shortsighted to see that.

Since he is now revealed indisputably as a dishonest man who is willing to allow an unfounded allegation against Shaw to stand on the record, his entire "case" is suspect, and his purposes, his methods, and his morals. Not only will I now have nothing to do with G. but I have told R. (who tried to pick my brain on G.'s behalf on certain points of evidence in the 26 volumes) that I will not give him the information and that I intend to add a short paragraph to my book repudiating G. and his whole sordid circus. Another thing I learned last night, not from R. but from someone else: I had heard some weeks or months ago that G.'s office had determined that one of Ruby's associates, Alex Gruber, had telephoned Shaw long distance a few hours after the assassination—at about the same time that Gruber himself received a call from Ruby. This seemed definitely to establish a link (perhaps innocent, perhaps not) between Ruby and Shaw. Now this person who gave me the information in good faith tells me that G.'s investigator denies that he ever said this, insists that he was misunderstood, and states that no such Shaw/Gruber link exists.

I am deeply disgusted, not alone with G. but with those of my colleagues who are no less enchanted with him and no less willing to collaborate with him now that he has shown himself to be a charlatan than when they still thought he was a knight on a white horse. Must rush to work now, Philippe—do let me hear from you again if there is any news on your side. Warm greetings,