

L.A. Calif. 90049  
August 23, 1968

Dear Ed,

I received your letter of August 12. My letter to you of August 6 was written in a totally impromptu fashion, and largely based on my recollections of the many readings I had of your article when it first came out. Shortly after I mailed my letter, I decided to reread the article for my own benefit, & draw up a rough outline of it so that I might more easily reference to it when necessary. After several close readings of the article, I thought that it would be desirable if I expanded on my general remarks that I made in my letter of August 8, and got down to specifics. The result was 9 pages of commentary which you will find enclosed. I have referenced the various points I am making to the pages in the New Yorker. The points, themselves, are labeled with roman numerals. There are seven of them.

I think point I is, by far, the most important point that has to be made. And I think you will ultimately have to come down on one side of the question of the WR or the other. Your book Inquest has already put you in print with a specific position on the question of the solo-assassin thesis of the WR, and on the question of whether the Commission, as a political entity, would knowingly endorse conclusions they knew to be false. As I point out, if you have changed either of these positions, I think you ought to indicate it.

I  
In your letter, you state: "I didn't use the article to berate the WC, it is because I find the Garrison phenomenon more interesting---and dangerous. And I want to trace out the rise of a demagogue not beat dead horses (again)."

I think it is impossible to analyze Garrison correctly without taking a position of the WC's Report. And I think that the position you take on the Report in turn determines what type of conclusions that analysis will lead to.

The reason I think it is impossible not to confront the question of the Report's validity is because much of the credibility Garrison does have is founded in the vacuum left by the WR. To analyse Garrison's success is to analyse the nature of the void he is filling, and how it came about. To do this involves passing a judgement on the validity of the void, so to speak, and this in turn involves passing judgements on the WR, the criticisms of it that have been made, and the people making those criticisms.

Garrison's pronouncements fall into roughly two categories:  
1) those pertaining to the New Orleans aspects of his investigation (Shaw, Ferrie, Russo, Bundy, codes, Thornley etc);  
2) those pertaining to the Warren Report, and the evidence in the 26 volumes or in the archives.

Your article can easily poke in Garrison's statement in the first category. It is the second category, however, which has earned for Garrison much of his credibility, stature, and credentials. Yet this work was largely done by the critics. It is in dealing with these statements that you must judge the Commission's work, the validity of the conclusions of the WR, the validity of the criticisms leveled by the critics, and the critics, themselves. It is in this area, where Garrison frequently misuses valid unanswered questions to serve the ends of his own propaganda, that you must