

May 15, 1968

Dear Sylvia,

I have so little time to write at present, yet so much to say. Therefore, I will either have to follow this up with another letter or call you on the phone.

Enclosed is Garrison's February 21 news release on Thornley. I do not remember you making any reference to this document, so I assume you have not seen it. To get the full flavor of it, first sit down and read it once through without pausing to think and analyze what has been said at the end of each sentence. Then, using volume 8 (to check addendum to footnote 1), go through the entire document paragraph by paragraph and sentence and by sentence.

It is worse than some of the worst sections of the Warren Report. I have dictated a complete reply to this thing which I suppose can be still another article. It is clear that this document is as major a mistake, on Garrison's part, as any he has made yet with respect to codes, Russo, etc. But this is worse. Here we have Garrison's thinking, with regard to Thornley, illustrated in a 7 page essay which is supposed to reflect the standards of his intellect when applied to a record that is fully available for cross checking---the 26 volumes. The result is disastrous for Garrison. (I think that much of this news release bears the imprint of Harold Weisberg, too.)

I thought speaking to you last Thursday night was swell. You sound so calm and rational that I am beginning to realize the injustice you have been done by those who would make it appear that your differences with Garrison are based on personality matters.

The last five days have been one mind blowing experience after another for me. When I sat down, over the weekend, to try to organize my thoughts in order to write, I found myself coming to more and more conclusions about Garrison that were implicit in all the information of which I was aware, but simply had to be developed at a more conscious level. So I must tell you that my position has become even more extreme than it was Thursday night. I am now convinced that Garrison's total investigation is a hoax and a fraud, based on nothing more than meaningless threads he is attempting to weave together which in fact have no meaning whatsoever when viewed in their proper context. A better way to put it is this: when you apply the exact same standards to Garrison that one applies to the WR, there is absolutely nothing left of the man, his investigation, and practically every public pronouncement he has made to date and which his office claims to have originated. Like the Warren Report, his whole case consists of several areas, each a little microsim, which needs to be carefully analyzed and debunked. I am convinced you are correct that the man is a charlatan who is capitalizing on a credibility gap produced by the valid and published research that exists, and the fact that LHO's brief stay in New Orleans was part of establishing some type of intelligence cover, before being placed on the route.

Garrison's contribution is complete bunk and invalid.

Having said this, I want to tell you that I have been going through dry run after dry run with a friend of mine on how I am going to be able to patiently explain the above to an audience,

tonight, without enraging them. Lane has been in town for a week, and through the underground "establishment", has been appearing here, there, and everywhere, making all kinds of laudatory remarks re Garrison. (I note that they bear little relation to those in his book on the subject. Book references to Garrison, you may note, read like wire service reports about various events that have occurred in his investigation.)

I wrote Lan a letter re Thornley which I will mail you. I have some incidents to describe to you that took place this week. Lane discussed you and the Garrison investigation in answer to one phone call on KPFK. I will try to locate that portion of the show on my tape, and duplicate it. (I think he said you had been given every chance to avail yourself of an opportunity to examine the evidence in the case, that you had not availed yourself of it, and therefore he was perplexed at opinions you might have since you had not seen "the evidence"!!)

About the letter regarding the fabricated picture of Thornley. My entire weekend was shot in ups and downs I have been having in attempts to get that letter to Thornley's lawyer. Fred Newcomb, the commercial artist, stalled when Levine called him on Saturday. He said he wanted a written request from Levine for the letter first. That was NOT what Newcomb told me. So I shot over to his house, and I'm afraid I got very emotional. (I think I've gotten over that now, as I now realize that keeping my cool is as important to ~~XXXXX~~ winning this entire battle as is speaking the English language to people that understand no other if you desire to communicate). Anyway, the stresses were there. It's very hard to be looking at a piece of evidence that could possibly be used to debunk a fraudulent case against your friend, and have to put up with the rationalizations of a moral chump, who shrinks at the thought of alienating the other critics out here, by doing something for me. He is supposed to send the letter this week, when ~~his~~ Thornley's attorney's letter arrives. (I called Tampa on Saturday, and made sure Levine didn't wait until Monday, when his secretary came in, but typed it up himself right away. He promised me he would, and confirmed (on Sunday) that he did do so.)

On Sunday, Newcomb cracked and spilled the beans to Stephen Jaffe, a UCLA film student who fancies himself one of Garrison's investigators. Jaffe called Garrison's office. Then Jaffe called me. I was wondering why he called, because he is such a cold person, he has never contacted me for anything. He moved the subject to the letter, and I informed him that I could furnish him no information. He expressed concern that I would give the letter to a newspaper. I pointed out that I thought he should know my activities were confined to getting a copy of it to Thornley's attorney.

When I called Newcomb yesterday, he hung up on me. He has apparently now managed to rationalize away the action he has performed by buying the line of others that there was nothing wrong in what he did; rather, that my motives were dishonest. This is a theory. I do not know this for a fact.

If I were on "the other side", this past weekend, and I wanted to prevent Newcomb from sending that letter out, I would have simply gotten Garrison or Lane to call Fred Newcomb, or have Lane drop by at his house. He is such a chump, I think, that he would have been blinded by the light of his favorite hero, not been able to see right from wrong, and meekly consented to whatever they wished.

This is my personal analysis of the situation. Against this ~~XXX~~ possible outcome, I might cite the fact that I apparently reached his conscience on the matter. Before I left his house on Saturday, he turned to me and said: "Dave, I feel absolutely horrible about what I've done"; he also ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ wanted me to know that he had every intention of being responsive to Thornley's attorney's letter. But he was so childlike. He was constantly trying to squeeze out the awkward moral position in which he found himself, ~~XXX~~ by getting truculent and questioning my motives ~~at~~ at pushing for that letter, or even implying that there had <sup>not</sup> been anything wrong ~~XXXX~~ in what he had done. And so he see-sawed.

May I make a request? At your convenience, could you get together what you consider the main four or five "anti-Garrison" letters you have written, so I might read them in their unedited form? (Please let me extend this offer, Sylvia. I have, at present, the free use of a fine Xerox machine. If you have clear carbons, I will do the Xeroxing at this end, and return them to you within 1 week. That is what I am doing with your USNWR letter; there is no necessity for me to keep a carbon like that when I have access to the machine I do.)

Finally, here is a question I would like to pose to you. How do you answer this vague and general question: "But what about the Andrews conviction?". (My opinion is that Andrews got trapped, because he has psychological problems telling the same story the same way twice, and because of Garrison's methods. I'm interested in your opinion.)

Another question: you mention Russo, Bundy, the code. I know all about Russo, and also about the code. What about Bundy? Is there something particular, or just the general type of witness he was? (You see, as Garrison evolved, I really didn't pay that much attention, granting him what I ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~really~~ <sup>was</sup> a very dangerous benefit of the doubt).

I will be sending you material as I create it, Sylvia, and will probably be phoning you on this matter, as long as that phone is available. This has been one of the most anguish filled yet educational weeks that I have ever had in my entire life.

With great admiration for your very early stance taken for all the right reasons, and which are there for everybody to see,

Most sincerely yours,  
*David*  
David

P.S. (This is one hell of a P.S.) Kerry met with F. Lee Bailey on Tuesday morning, who may be interested in this case. I don't know ~~XXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXX~~ Bailey's position on the WR, but Kerry does not want to work with any attorney who professes belief in that document. Also, Kerry is interested in writing you and eliciting information, advice, and support in the area of setting up a Kerry Thornley Defense Fund, which he jokingly calls a "Fair Play for Thornley Committee". He'll be in touch.