

30 June 1968

Dear David,

Excuse me if I don't read Weisberg's letter, which was enclosed with yours of the 26th. I did scan it, but his prose gives me considerable pain as does his feverish self-righteousness and his "reasoning." I have a certain affection for Harold, or perhaps "had" is more accurate, for the guilelessness and transparency of his egocentricity, and for the suffering he endures as a result of his constant sense of persecution and injustice. At the same time, I must admit that he has abandoned what little intellectual orderliness he commanded in the early days and in his frenetic fantasies of goodguys and badguys he has become increasingly capable of cruelty towards the Shaws and the Thornleys and of unwarranted charges against them which are completely inexcusable. You should not be disturbed by the letter: it was predictable and inevitable. The important thing is to do what is right and just, without worrying about what the Weisbergs will think and without concern for their name-calling.

Lane is a more degraded and evil person than Weisberg, in every way. I don't think it is for us to "disprove" his disgusting self-serving invention--it is for him to prove it, and to explain just how it was possible for him to write the article on RFK in the LA Free Press not long ago, and to accuse RFK of making false statements, etc., on the Les Crane program in May, if (as he now claims) he had known for several months about the 2 "emissaries" from RFK. Even Jones Harris, who remains associated with Garrison, denounces the story as a complete fabrication. (He says, in fact, that he himself used the phrase "guns between him and the White House" in a conversation in New Orleans with some other people on the subject of the elections and primaries.)

I am surprised that you say that Garrison confirmed Lane's story in an interview with Eliot Mintz. I know that when a member of his staff asked him if the story was true, he hemmed and hawed and allowed as how Lane had exaggerated a bit, and avoided taking a committed position one way or another. But why should I be surprised? It is a case of one proven liar backing up the lies of another proven liar. Remember some years ago when Lane said that RFK had sent a wire to Trevor-Roper saying, keep up the good work, or something like that? Trevor-Roper flatly denied it.

Kupferman has always taken the position that the WC blundered but did not conspire to hide the truth, and he seems to believe that sincerely. I have never heard him say, or understood him to believe, that there was no possibility of conspiracy in the assassination. If so, why would he be a "critic" and why ~~offer~~ his Joint Resolution in Congress? As you know, he will not run for re-election and apparently intends to return to private life.

I don't know Gary Schoener but Vince did once show me a letter from him, and I think he is one of the co-authors of Vince's articles in The Midlothian Mirror. As you say, best to be careful...

David, when can I expect the book? Your 6/1/68 bulletin said it would be mailed out the last week in June. As you know, I am very anxious to have the material. Epstein's piece on Garrison will come out in the New Yorker on 7/10/68. No, I have never had any reply from Clay Shaw.

As ever,