

8 12 68

Dear Sylvia,

Thanks for your letter.

There's another San Diego newsletter out. This one has an article by Harold attacking Epstein, and an interview with Popkin defending Garrison. Are you now on that mailing list? If not, I'll make you a copy next time I'm near the xerox. Just let me know.

Re Shaw's letter. Thanks for passing along the information. It is my personal opinion that Shaw is totally innocent of conspiracy. What is really unfortunate about Garrison is that, whether in Shaw's case or in Heindel's case (and who knows but how many others) there may be people in New Orleans who have some significant item of information re Oswald who will now never come forward because Mr. Garrison is such a trigger happy prosecutor who, at whim, seems capable of erecting incriminating conspiracy theories around anybody. In this regard, I would like to ask you what are your opinions on the possibility that Shaw had a totally innocent non-conspiratorial relationship with Oswald which he now can not possibly admit to, inasmuch as Garrison would have a field day with it. I know there is no evidence of this, as yet, and I certainly don't know of it. But if Garrison ever does succeed in producing evidence of a documentary unimpeachable nature that Shaw is Bertrand, my inclination would be to assume that that is all there was to it. Of course, there is still no such evidence that Shaw is Bertrand. When I spoke to Garrison, however, he kept mentioning that he had a hotel register which provided such evidence. He also mentioned having another document, signed Bertrand, which he apparently released just recently. My subscription to the States-Item lapsed at just the wrong time, however, so I have still to learn what that was all about.

I agree with you about the trend tending to polarize anti-G people into pro Warren Report people. Last Thursday, I wrote Epstein a letter about his article. I would like to write him another one, much more carefully done. You are correct about the reaction to his article. I suppose you have seen the Paul Eberle article in the Free Press, which is a good example.

Gary Schoener writes that one of the emissaries Garrison had in mind was definitely Jones Harris. I'm sure Jones does not qualify as an emissary from RFK, as I'm sure you will agree. I am amazed that this turns out to be seed of information which they grew into their "emissary" theory. Incidentally, Schoener lost the sight of one eye, a few weeks ago, when he broke up a gang of negroes who were attacking an individual in a park area. He has written articles on the assassination in the Twin Cities papers, and one long article, similar to "The Case for Three Assassins" in his school magazine. Also, about a year ago when Vince Salandria requested that I send him 2 duplicate sets of a slide set I had made up, apparently one of the sets went to him, with another going to Garrison. Schoener has given quite a few talks with the set, and Garrison, I am told by Vince, uses them quite prominently down in his office to impress everybody from fundraisers to press people.

Regarding your letter to Epstein, I have only sent a copy to Bill O'Connell. I have mentioned its existence to one person out here, Al Swartz, whom you probably don't know, who is on the

grapevine of the pro-Garrison people. I mentioned it to squelch any attempt on their part to undercut your position vis a vis Garrison by citing the pro Wh~~ite~~one of the NY*er article. I would like to know what your wishes are with regard~~XN~~ to making a copy of it available or even showing it to very pro-G people. Specifically, I have in mind the fact that if I make a copy of the letter for any~~of~~ of the hard core pro G people, then copies will end up~~XN~~ at least available to all of them. I, persnally, see no harm in this, since these are precisley the peo~~ple~~ple I think you would want to reach in order to help minimize th~~is~~is polarizing of pp~~in~~ion you have pointed out.

The last brief delay in the book project is now halfway past. I am promised del~~iv~~ery next Monday. I am really quite at the mercy of the printer's, and I can do nothing but comp~~ain~~ain, which I did. But everything is in order.

I am still working on various Kerry Thornley materials. When they are through, I will send them.

Have you read Tom Wicker's book on LBJ and JFK? I find it is one of the best and consise documentaries available which supports the thesis that JFK was killed in order to reverse policy in SE Asia. Of course, Wicker doesn't intend it to be that, and he has a "personality" theory to explain the change in the evolution~~n~~ of the policy at that time, rather than a conspiracy theory. But he marshalls his facts in an impressive way, and precisley at those points where he is stretching his personality theory to the limits of credibility, a conspiracy theory would explain his facts, and quite easily. In the same vein, have you read the Esquire article by Milton Viorst on Dean Rusk, a few issues back? (The issue with Cassius Clay on the cover). We~~ll~~l, someday we have to talk at great length on these matters. I am of the opinion and hold the theory that LBJ and Rusk were involved before the fact, heavily involved, in the plot to kill JFK. For these reasons, I am very interested in any reading material which tends to show that LBJ and Rusk were really quite close, ideologically as well as personally, before the assassination of JFK. I set this forth as a ~~partly~~ undocumented opinion, at present, though I do believe that, ~~XXXXX~~ with the passage of time, the evidence which can be used to prove such a theory shall surface, and that this is the way history shall view it 20 years from now.

And by the way, my belief in this theory is still another factor that makes it easy for me to ~~XX~~ dismiss Garrison. I really must laugh when I think of Garrison, with his Cubans on the north shore of Lake Ponchartrain who carried out the greatest near-perfect crime in history but---oops---were in cahoots with fellows who talk~~d~~ed about it at a party at David Ferris's apartment. I'm quite quick to react to plot structures wh~~ich~~ich I disagree. I reacted in this fashion against Garrison well before I became outraged at his methodology when it comes to particulars of evidence. Its the second, of course, which is most useful in an argument or a debate. But its the first which comes most naturally to me, and gives me the conviction that he is on to absolutely nothing and, in engineering parlance, is merely confusing "the signal and the noise"~~X~~ in the system which he is analyzing.

Best wishes,
David
 David