

July 8, 1968

Dear Sylvia,

When I read your letter of June 30, the thought occurred to me that perhaps Jones Harris ~~is~~ was one of the "emmissaries". I know this may at first sound ridiculous, but each time I have spoken to Vince Salandria this year, he has gone to some length to make the point that Jones Harris is "a representative of the Kennedy family" or "their agent" or some such wording. I think Vince is firmly entrenched on the Garrison grapevine, and that if he really thinks such things, then it is highly probable that Garrison does ~~so~~.

Join ~~XXXXX~~ this hypothesis with your information that the "guns" quote is from Jones Harris---and things start to shape up. I enclose a xerox copy of a news letter put out by a San Diego "Citizens Committee". (I spoke to George Abbott last week. He seems quite reasonable; Jon Olson, however, is extremely pro-Garrison, in that blind faith sort of way.) The newsletter contains a transcript of a taped interview with Garrison. I think, but am not absolutely sure, that this is the tape to which I referred last week, and that my informant confused Art Kevin with Elliot Mintz. Two things impress me. First, note how the Jones Harris hypothesis is consistent with Garrison's description, and your information re the source of the quote: "They (the emmissaries) didn't come at the same time. One of them did indeed when I brought up the question of his continued silence, pointed out that with these forces still active in America, that Bobby Kennedy was very much aware that there were many guns between him and the White House. The way he put it, I think it was Bobby Kennedy's quotation from him...The phrase "many guns between Senator Kennedy and the White House" was indeed told to me by one of his friends and appears to have come from him." Second note how Jones Harris is consistent with the geographic location ascribed to the "emmissary": "One of the men that we had loose contact with from time to time was from New York. Another was from New York State, and another was from the West Coast. It was a loose sort of affair, but we had this liason."

in my
letter

I wonder who the West Coast emmissary is?

I neglected to mention in my last letter that I spoke to Fopkin at some length on the phone. I was really quite suprised how seriously he takes the "2 Oswald" hypothesis. Not that I don't think Oswald was impersonated, but that he really does take quite seriously the idea that the entire assassination is explained in terms of two look-alikes, one of whom shoots, the other planting self incriminating evidence etc.

Regarding the book: I am getting a form letter out this week to all who have ordered, as the corporation has told me that because of summer vacations etc., it is going to run about 20 days behind schedule. I understad that this is par for the course in the printing business, but I can also understand how anxious you are for the material. I will send your copy first class mail, as soon as they are ready. Harrison Salisbury of the New York Times ordered ~~XXXX~~ one last week through the LA office. They said they may do a story on it. Also, I want to tell you that I am most grateful for the names that you sent me.

I am enclosing a copy of a second letter that Harold wrote to Open City. This one is 90% about me, and I am answering it. This week's Open City should contain a letter by Kerry, replying to Weisberg. Next week's will contain my reply.

Changing the subject back to Garrison. I think that the most interesting passage in the transcript is this one: "What is this presumption of guilt, the presumption that you are a liar? Mark Lane has never lied~~X~~ to me that I know of and I certainly wouldn't bother to lie about a thing like that."

What I find so interesting is how his defensive tone, in that passage, is so consistent with the former position you said he took with a member of his office.

In the last 30 days, I wrote a very nice letter to Dr. Bahmer requesting that the portion of the Executive Session transcript that is reproduced in Ford's book~~X~~ be declassified. I pointed out the incongruity of ~~such~~ material remaining classified when it is publicly available, and the injustice of having to get permission from Simon and Schuster to quote from material that is uncopyrighted. My request was refused. No reason was given.

A final item. I think the very pro Garrison people also feel that the RFK killing was part of a plot. The reasons I hear cited include the use of soft-nose bullets, the caliber of the gun used, the fact that ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Sirhan was seen talking with others beforehand etc. No one I know of claims to have any evidence, but it seems to be "in" to think that is the case.

Regarding Weisberg's second letter. I find much of what Harold says preposterous, and am not without a sense of humor about it. But what I find most outrageous is that he would make the charge that Kerry and I deliberately sat down and attempted to frame Heindel, and produce a set of false affidavits. I find it difficult to believe that Harold really believes this. If he does, I would not put any theory past him. If he does not, I cannot understand how he justifies such reckless charges, in his own mind.

I'll have more to say as things develop, and I will do everything possible to speed the printing order, and your copy in particular.

Best wishes,

David