

11 June 1967

Dear Shirley,

Don't fret about not having written, I understand, and as you know, I do not stand on ceremony (actually, I often do, I am really "stuffy" and "square" at times, but not with you). But if you think of it when you write next, do send me the reference I asked for, on that book about Manchester and the Kennedys that you urged me to read. I still have not located it, and will have to write to the publishers.

Of course I will relay to Maggie the impression she made on Thayer Waldo. You will probably hear this soon enough, if you have not yet heard it, but unhappily the publication of her panoplies by Random House is off. Apparently they are still unwilling to issue any book attacking the WR, although they claim that the obstacle was purely technical (design and cost). Shirley, please treat this information with utmost discretion—Maggie was deeply shocked and demoralized by the cancellation, and references to it, however well they are meant, may be pouring salt into an open wound. It is better, I think, if she is permitted to mention it on her own initiative. Frankly, I am outraged and pained at what they have done to her—grabbing the work in the first place, with such wild enthusiasm, letting her undertake enormous additional labor and costs to bring it up to the minute, asking her to come to New York for an expensive two weeks, and then suddenly breaking off the deal without even having the decency to explain to Maggie personally, but just telling her agent. Maggie, who is a woman of extraordinary quality in every way, did not deserve such rotten treatment. On the contrary, her personal courage and dignity are such that those dirty devils at Random House should die of shame for what they did to a wonderful person.

The New Yorker article in the issue dated June 10 is on the stands now. It is "friendly" on the whole, but utterly irrelevant—who cares about the personalities of the critics or their private lives? The only important thing is the evidence, and that is almost entirely ignored. Still, we must be grateful for small favors and at least the article is not a malicious attack on us.

Of course I love you, Shirley, in spite of our various differences of view—on the Kennedys, an old story, but also it seems on Garrison and on the Arab/Israeli war. Also I am unhappy about your somewhat capricious labeling of various people as "the Left" in a blanket way. For example, Deirdre Griswold seems to echo your views on LBJ/CIA/Nasser; I feel, on the contrary, that LBJ was ready to stand by wringing his bloody hands in distress while Israel was annihilated, rather than jeopardize the continued slaughter in Vietnam. As for the Russians, they sank \$3 billion in arms into the Arabs ("mice with the souls of rats"), arms that should better have gone to North Vietnam, whose people have fought with ferocious courage and unflinching determination for their homeland, while the Arabs with no motivation or no guts or both, and despite their carefully-nurtured hatred for Israel, put up no fight at all. Do you think that the Russians have been pumping arms into the Arab countries to "liberate" them? or to grab the oil from the Americans, which the Americans had grabbed from the British and French?

The Russians sponsored and approved of the creation of the State of Israel. Yet they aided and abetted the Arabs in their avowed purpose of annihilating the State of Israel. And they did it for oil, as LBJ would have sacrificed Israel for oil, had the need arisen. The Russians were cynical and also stupid, for they could have used the situation before actual hostilities broke out to force the USA into a deal—to exchange for a cessation of bombing of North Vietnam the restraint of the Arabs and cooperation on a peaceful settlement of both wars.

The Communist Governments are using their most vicious rhetoric against Israel, but many Communist parties and many parties of the Left are openly in support of Israel, and opposed to the policy of the Soviet Union. So it is not possible to describe any one position of "the Left" or of "Jewish intellectuals." As you said in your letter to Harold, there is no absolutely GOOD of one persuasion, and no completely BAD of another—each situation must be evaluated on its own merits.

-2-

Turning to Garrison: I had high hopes and confidence in him until he put Russo and Bundy on the witness stand. They seemed to me not to be any more credible than Brennan and Markham, etc., and their testimony seemed without a shred of inherent plausibility. At that point, I began to develop misgivings about G's methods and motives. The passage of time has only increased them greatly. For example, he announced triumphantly that he had "decoded" notations in both Oswald's and Shaw's address books--PO 19106, which when deciphered turned out to be Ruby's 1963 unlisted Dallas phone number. But the "PO" in LHO's book was really the Cyrillic "DD."

When I pointed this out to him, G. seemed absolutely indifferent; and when he later conceded (to someone else) that, yes, the "PO" might be or was "DD" he said that he did not intend to retract or correct his original announcement.

Meanwhile, another piece of information which had originated with G's chief investigator, Gurvich, which appeared to establish a definite link between Ruby and Clay Shaw, evaporated just like the "code" evaporated. Gurvich now denied that there was such information, and denied that he had told the person who told me about it that he had such information ("You must have misunderstood me").

In feeling completely negative about G, I am in unpleasant conflict with Maggie, Ray Marcus, Vince, and others of my dearest and most treasured friends and co-workers. And it is a basic and deep disagreement. It is a most painful thing, I am heartsick about it, but I cannot feel otherwise. I can only hope that in due course, we will all feel as one (whether "pro" or "con") about G., as we have for so long felt as one in our opposition to the WR.

But however much we may disagree on G. and on other questions, we are bound together by very strong common aims and I hope by mutual respect. The very fact that we are individualists explains largely why each of us became immersed in the WR; and that individualism is a guarantee of many differences among us, on various questions.

How is your life developing, with the divorce now decided? Have you definitely planned to leave Oklahoma? Are the children adjusting to things? You know that I love you and treasure you, Shirley, come what may. And you know also, I hope, how much I want for you to have peace of mind, and happiness.

As ever,