

2 April 1968

Dear David,

Thank you for your letter of the 30th and the accompanying tape. I had received a verbatim transcript of Lane's remarks at the time he made them (or a tape from which I made a verbatim transcript, I no longer remember) and I am enclosing a copy for you. As you will see, this science fiction broadcast took place on March 29, 1967 and, after more than a year, I am still waiting to hear from Garrison even one detail from his "case" which "it is impossible not to accept."

I share your outrage and indignation about Craig's sordid lies about the station wagon and, I feel sure, about various other of his contemporary version of his observations and experiences on 11/22/63. I feel sure that Julia Mercer's similar outpourings are equally sordid inventions, and that their fellow-witnesses in the Garrison "investigation" deserve nothing but contempt. Even more contemptible is Garrison, for encouraging and trumpeting to the world allegations which he either knows to be despicable lies or which he is too moronic to recognize as such and too lazy to check out in the published documents. When I arrived at the conclusion, almost a year ago, that Garrison was a charlatan and a slob as an "investigator," I felt that I could take it for granted that any future claims from him or witnesses utilized by him could be regarded, ipso facto, as bereft of any semblance of credibility. I have not taken the trouble to research any of his lunatic claims since the alleged "code" P.O. 19106, and nothing has transpired which suggests that this is not a perfectly safe position.

You have demonstrated a real sense of responsibility in checking Craig's current allegations against the record, and I am especially pleased by your indignation about his perversion of fact. Since he is capable of this kind of deliberate deception now, I have to regard him as unreliable in all his allegations and especially his account of Oswald's alleged remarks to him and Fritz, which I have never accepted in the first place since they are inconsistent with the known facts and with my personal impression of Oswald. Now, what I want to understand is why you alone among the California critics has taken the trouble to check up on Craig and to resent his misrepresentation. The others no less than you and I were first-generation critics, working continuously over a long time with facts in their most minute and fractional aspects, highly sensitive to the tiniest discrepancy or contradiction, and deeply committed to truth and precision about the evidence in order to arrive at a scrupulous determination of events, so far as they could be determined. How can such researchers now abandon the tools of their trade and accept uncritically such gross indignities to truth as those of Craig and his sponsors? Well, the question is rhetorical, I suppose; but I regard it as a real tragedy that so many have turned their backs on everything which formerly governed them, in order to aid and abet the mischief being done by a gross charlatan.

Please stay in touch.

Best regards,

302 West 12 St NYC 10014