

27 April 1968

Mr. Mike Farrell
9954 Glencrest Circle
Burbank, Calif. 91504

My dear Mr. Farrell,

The sentence which you quote from the opening paragraph of my letter to The New York Review of Books was not a literal statement but an ironic comment on Popkin's fervor in defending Garrison, before the Shaw trial, while asking his readers to suspend judgment and, indeed, to confer on the prosecutor (Garrison) the benefit of doubt and the presumption of innocence to which the accused (Clay Shaw) is legally and morally entitled. I would have thought that my letter in its entirety made clear the ironic nature of the sentence in question, as well as the fact that I consider Garrison no less abusive of truth, fact, and justice than the Warren Commission and therefore to be repudiated now, on the basis of his record to date. That record is vulnerable not merely on the grounds of error, misstatements, and unsupported allegations but also to fabricated evidence and resort to testimony which compels the strongest suspicion of deliberate perjury.

I have documented my criticism of Garrison, as I have documented my attack on the Warren Report, and have not asked to be taken on faith or trust. Your response to my explicit, documented arguments is, in essence, that you "feel sure that he must...have more evidence...than he has already presented..." It is impossible to confront faith with mere facts or logic, faith in Garrison or faith in the Warren Report such as that of Mr. Louis Nizer, whose faith permitted him to write a rapturous introduction to the Report before the Hearings and Exhibits were available for examination and whose continuing faith presumably inspires him to defend the Report with undiminished passion even now that it has been thoroughly and shamefully discredited. You will undoubtedly continue to have faith in that evidence which you assume Garrison has kept in reserve. For my part, I intend to concern myself solely with that "evidence" that he has already "made public," applying the same rigorous criteria applied to the Warren Report, however much Garrison's admirers may prefer to ignore that so-called evidence and to have others remain silent about its flagrant defects and absurdities.

One last point: my misgivings about Garrison developed and grew into utter repudiation before he was the subject of attack in the mass media, and this is a matter of record. My position is entirely independent and I have no intention whatever of assuming any guilt by association because others later also repudiated Garrison, for reasons which may be different from mine.

As to the list, it is now recognizable as one that I did compile quite a while ago. It would take me about a full day to fish out from bales of periodicals and newspapers stored in my closets the sources you request. Although I am hard pressed to spare the time or effort, I would do so for a purpose which I regarded as worthwhile and necessary. I do not feel willing to make the necessary sacrifice of time or energy on behalf of a committee whose purposes are inimical to me. You have explicitly said that the Committee feels that Garrison deserves its support, while I am convinced that he must be denounced for the same reasons as the Warren Commission. It is an issue on which I find it impossible to compromise. I am sorrowful that our views are so incompatible and can only hope that further developments will provide clarifications which will make our positions reconcilable.

Yours sincerely,