

8 November 1967

Dear Ray,

Your comments on Accessories are particularly meaningful and I am very grateful and happy that you find such merit in the book. I suppose that basically I have always had confidence in it---but in common, I suppose, with most "first" authors, I have been periodically inundated with doubt and dismay, for no identifiable reason. To have such generous words from a first-generation critic of the WR, who has originated a series of findings of first importance, is cause for particular pride and gratification. And I thank you most sincerely for the encouragement you have given so freely, knowing as I do that you would say neither more nor less than you really felt.

I can only regret your disagreement with the passage of the book that deals with Garrison. Do you honestly find no grounds for misgivings about his evidence or his witnesses? or his scrupulousness about plain fact? Even those who support him most fervently have acknowledged the troublesome aspects of his investigation and the fact that he has developed "seemingly questionable" evidence and witnesses; one of these supporters has told me, in writing, that he laughs at the idea of Garrison's incorruptibility and takes it for granted that he uses every dirty trick in the book, specifically, frameup, but that all of this is to be cheered because he is attacking the CIA, the Establishment---the Enemy. I wonder how we are to discriminate between enemy and ally if both utilize exactly the same techniques---in the service, of course, of "good ends." Since you know, better than I, that Garrison is now going on a fishing expedition hoping to get something on Hunt and Walker, and is downgrading Clay Shaw, I marvel at your unflinching confidence in his "case."

Re: the curb, we did point out to me during one of your early visits to New York that the mark was actually a chip. I was under the impression that you were working this up, perhaps for publication. In any case, I did not have the precise data set forth in the enclosures you sent with your November 3 letter, and I felt that the case against the WC---even within the context of the assertions in the WR---was devastating, in terms of intent and method. I hope that you do intend to do something with the evidence of a chip, not a "mark"---there is still a formidable collection of issues to be dealt with.

I think you misunderstood my meaning about "viewing" the Zapruder film, or I did not make myself clear: what I meant was merely that in merely viewing a screening or looking as an ordinary observer at the slides one can easily spot the head shot, while to pinpoint the other bullet impacts is impossible from mere viewing but requires painstaking study, measurement, and analysis. Certainly I did not mean to imply that the Zapruder film does not provide evidence on the timing of the other impacts---merely that it is not immediately apparent to the eye, especially when it sees the motion picture. (I don't think this clarification is particularly clear either, but I am writing this late at night and am blurring with fatigue.)

I am really glad that you, too, feel that Harold's identification of Shaw as Bertrand was unfounded and prejudicial. You will be interested to see his reply to my letter of November 1, which requires no characterization from me but speaks for itself. I know that you will express your views on this to Harold, if you have the opportunity---perhaps he will listen more objectively to you than to someone who does not share his views on the district attorney.

Again, Ray, my sincere thanks for your words about the book.