

17 December 1968

Dear David,

Thanks for your meaty letter of the 13th. It deserves a detailed reply but I am staggering under a heavy workload, including housework (my once-a-week cleaning woman is on extended sick leave), night meetings at the UN, and the residual work of TMO, which I have offered to do. As you will see from the enclosed, Arnoni has had to throw in the towel and has left the country. It is quite a blow to me, in many ways. My reserve of friends and colleagues is not one that can survive much more depletion; and of course it means that I can no longer expect to have my articles and reviews published readily, or at all. I was especially sorry that TMO suspended publication before there was a chance to publish my review of your Document Appendix. I sent an abbreviated 3-page version of it to Joesten. The original is about 14 pages and I am now trying The New Republic and will try elsewhere (any suggestions will be welcome) if, as is likely, it comes back.

Now let me try to comment on the specific questions and subjects in your letter. No, so far as I know, the Dallas police never did view the Zapruder film. Certainly they did not screen it during the four dark days (now, it seems to be four out of four days that are dark).

I am glad to have your confirmation that I had not sent you copies of HW's letters. I had told him that it was my firm recollection that I had not. He wrote back, acknowledging that his recollection might have been faulty but that "unless it is, Lifton told me you had sent him copies of my letters...If my recollection is faulty, I owe you both an apology." Very gracious.

I too have received a number of extremely long, dense letters from Gary Schoener, each time urging me not to feel obliged to reply since he hoped that we could meet personally at Xmas time. Some of his reasoning and his arguments are just preposterous. Despite his waiver, I did have to reply immediately to correct certain factual matters he had raised (e.g., that it was well-known that Garrison had come to New York to meet me and that I had refused to see him—one of many banal inventions which are circulating). I cannot resist quoting a paragraph from my reply to his first letter, which strikes my fancy but which did not embarrass him at all: "I am always astonished by the premise underlying (letters like the one he had sent me)—that I have not thought through or understood the implications of my position on Garrison, and that it needs only a dose of homilies, unsupported assurances about his merits or the merits of his 'evidence,' or appeals for unity to make me see the error of my ways. I should have thought that Accessories, whatever else may be said of it, at least shows that I do not reach conclusions capriciously, or weigh evidence lightly, or subordinate my convictions in the cause of self-ingratiation or advantage."

I have not heard from Madeleine Goddard for a long time. She once came to visit me, briefly, and later sent me a very nice note about Accessories. I don't really remember her very clearly. I will be interested to have copies of your letters to G.S. and M.G. as you offered.

Tapes: No, I do not have the tape of the Warren press conference Lima Peru. Certainly I would appreciate a copy, if it is not too much trouble for you. No; I do not have a master list of transcripts nor any inventory of tapes. I tried to be methodical about it for a while but it was just too great a burden and now my system is to tape a broadcast, immediately transcribe particular short passages of significance, and then erase by reusing the tape. Then I usually use the transcribed passages in some form like the commentary on Bishop or the one I did on Jenner, which was published in TMO (I think in March 1967).

Turning now to page 3 of your letter: I wonder if Jaffe's informant in re RFK was not from Kalamazoo, Michigan, rather than from Indiana? I have in mind one Ed Horsey, of whom you may have heard. I cannot go into great detail, but Horsey has been contacting various WR critics as well as the Garrison gang for the last year or so. I have had two phonecalls from him, about six or more months apart. On the second call, he told me a cock and bull story about having a private conference with RFK, along the same lines as Jaffe's story. It is pure fabrication, though very convincing at first hearing. Horsey recently spent some time at St. Petersburg, Fla. I have had correspondence with a woman from that city who is obsessed (as we are) by the WR, a very nice woman. Horsey wormed his way into her trust and friendship. Coincident with this, more or less, this woman began to be victimized by a series of harassments, by phone mainly. Horsey too seemed to be having the same kinds of ugly experiences. He managed to persuade her that Kerry Thornley was the mastermind responsible for all this mischief and malice. I was suspicious, on the contrary, of Horsey himself. I checked out a story Horsey had told Mrs. H. which "incriminated" Thornley, involving his writing to Tink Thompson, and Thompson sending Horsey a copy of Thornley's letter to him (Tink). I felt pretty sure it was a lie, even though Horsey had displayed a copy of the alleged letter (which he did not actually let her read).

As I thought, it was a brazen and total invention. I immediately warned Mrs. H. and also alerted Kerry. Sorry I don't have time to go into more detail; but if you ever hear from Horsey, be forewarned.

As for the Sciambra interview report on Russo, I do not think there is any real cause for alarm. It is true that Garrison probably would be unscrupulous enough to try to doctor the report and produce the "entire" document. The hitch is that when Phelan published his article in SEP, and this I recall with considerable certainty though I do not have the time to search my press clippings and other records, Sciambra and perhaps Garrison as well acknowledged publicly that there was nothing in the interview report about the meeting in Ferrie's apartment, and tried to give a variety of lame explanations for its omission. Popkin in his NYRofBooks apologia for Garrison also acknowledged that vital lacunae in the report and admitted that it required explanation (which he did not attempt to offer). There is probably additional material on record which would discredit any testimony or documentary evidence seeking to fill in the crucial gap in Sciambra's report; in any case, you may be sure that Shaw's attorneys have carefully collected all of the record. Even so, you might go ahead and alert them to your conversation with Jaffe. That cannot do any harm, and it may be a useful tip. I can get your letter to Shaw, if you wish me to (I have his address but don't know if he would want me to give it out, and I do not remember now where I got it).

I hope that I have not overlooked any major points and will have to quit now and get some sleep. All the best, and thanks for the enclosures that came with your letter,