

April 5, 1968.

Dear Sylvia:

Thanks so much for reading my MS. I thought you would return it after reading the first chapter.

I think you have misunderstood the scope of my book. Strictly speaking, I do not consider myself as a critic of the Warren Report but an analyst. My main purpose is to present the main theories of important critics, without passing value judgment on them. If I wanted to do so, I would have written another book on the relative merits of each critic, including yourself. But I am not interested in that. What I have done is to reconstruct the assassination in the light of important revelations made by the critics, including Garrison. You may well ask how factual these revelations are. I cannot vouch for their accuracy; I have taken their word for it--on the face of it only.

As I have made it abundantly clear in my book, there is only one way of ascertaining the truth: an adversary trial in which all the evidence is subjected to cross-examination by both parties. This is by no means a perfect method, but it is the best one available to man. Hence, if I were to pass a value judgment on the works of each critic, I would put them to cross-examination, but that is out of question. That is why I have stayed away from making comments on the works of critics, including Garrison, or on the feuds or bickerings among the critics. I have just reported what the critics have done, and have tried to reconstruct the assassination as I see it.

As for Garrison, I am afraid you have missed the whole point. I do not give a damn whether he is a crook or a saint. The coming Shaw trial will prove what he is really. Until then I suspend my judgment. That's fair, isn't it? If his theories are bogus, he will be exposed at the trial, and that will be the end of him. If he proves his case, he will have vindicated his position. Whatever methods he has employed, fair or foul, the defense lawyers will get ample opportunity to test them. Thus, in this case there is a channel open to challenge his theories in an open court. But the commission did not leave any such channel, and this is why its methods of investigation has come under severe attack. Had it done so and arrived at the same conclusions, nobody would have pointed an ~~accusing finger at it~~ accusing finger at it.

Furthermore, I don't think I have given Garrison a sympathetic treatment, as you suggest. My main concern is with the way the Establishment tried to discredit not only his investigation, but also his character. This is what I object to, and I feel this brings us to the Orwellian society. I am totally opposed to character assassination, and if you would remember I have tried to defend him only on that score. I haven't defended any of his theories. Since he is an elected official, with a brilliant record of achievements, and since he has taken his case to a court of law, I think he ought to be given a chance to prove his case. To condemn him before he had this opportunity would be to return to the barbarism of the Stone Age. But had he tossed around his wild accusations without any legal recourse for the affected party, I would have never bothered to mention him even.

----P.T.O.

I hope I have been able to make myself understood. I have not praised or condemned the works of any critic, except yours--and that was favorable. I have defended them only in cases where I found them being unfairly attacked.

All the same, I am most grateful that you did read my MS, and offered some valuable suggestions. I am hoping you won't let our differences of opinion come in the way of our personal friendship. I am enclosing a point-by-point perusal of your comments.

Sincerely yours,

Shankar

En.

P.S.

You may rest assured that I will no longer associate my MS. with you.

Sh

POINT-BY-POINT PERUSAL OF YOUR COMMENTS

Your comments 1, 2 and 3:

Gladly accepted.

Comment 4:

If the commission had already received a copy of the State Dept. memo, as you say, why would it ask for the original memo? It appears that the commission itself was, perhaps, not sure whether the copy was a genuine one. Moreover, if the memo was destroyed while being thermofaxed, how was it possible for the State Dept. to attach another copy with the "selfsame explanation of the thermofax incident?" The very fact that the ~~original memo~~ Dept. was able to make another copy suggests that the original memo was neither missing, nor destroyed. At any rate, I will clarify the point as per your suggestion.

Comment 5:

You are right. I will incorporate the fact that he was released after he had pleaded guilty and paid the fine. Nonetheless, I cannot gloss over the fact that he requested for an FBI agent to see him, rather than a lawyer--this in itself is highly suspicious and in support I have set forth arguments for the reader to judge.

Comment 6:

Your points accepted and I will make the necessary changes.

Comment 7:

Although the critics have ignored the hole in the ~~whi~~ windshield, without seeing it, the picture the Warren Report published shows a neat hole on the windshield, as reported by Dudman and confirmed by Cormier of the A.P. I cannot accept the commission's denial, without actually looking at the windshield. Even the dent on the chrome topping of the windshield strongly ~~gx~~ suggests that the dent must have been caused by a fragment of the bullet that hit the windshield. The very fact that the dent was on the outside surface of the chrome, according to Secret Service Chief Rowley (Six Seconds in Dallas, p.113-14), proves that it could not have been ~~h~~ caused by a bullet fragment coming from behind the car. The bullet, as such, had to come from the front. Thus, it appears that a bullet from the knoll area pierced the windshield and struck the President's throat--the angle of the hole and the wound matches ~~and the wound matches~~ perfectly (according to Buchanan, I think). And a fragment of this bullet ~~caused the dent~~ must have then caused the dent on the outside surface of the chrome. Since you raised the point, I will elucidate it as above.

Comments 8, 9 and 10:

I stand corrected.

Comment 11:

See Rush to Judgment (a Fawcett edition), p.112.

Comment 12:

See RJ, p.98 (and Vol. IV, p.259-64, the sources quoted by Lane). Lane quotes Day as testifying, "This is the rifle found on the sixth floor of the Texas Book Store at 411 Elm Street, Nov.23, 1963, and I recorded it at the time, C-2566." Was it a verbal or typographical error? A cross-examination would have settled the point. I believe that the original German Mauser ~~was~~ was replaced by an Italian rifle on Nov.22, 1963, and Day's testimony supports it. Day must have been prevailed upon to change his original testimony, and he seems to have done this, but in the process left such discrepancies. Thus, the photo of Day carrying the rifle taken on Nov.22 indicates that the gun he found on that day was a German Mauser, not the Italian Carcano. I have examined ~~this photo~~ the gun in this photo, as well as those that appeared in the Mail Order catalogue (as reproduced in the Times, Nov.25, 1963) and American Rifleman (Feb. 1963). The rifle in the Day picture differs noticeably from the ~~others~~ other two; some of my Marine friends also agree with me. I think this point should be cleared by ~~outside~~ rifle experts. In any case, to ~~cover up~~ cover up one lie, one has to invent several lies, but if one is found out, the rest gives away. I therefore think these discrepancies should be pointed out, since the commission offered no means of ~~verifying them~~ sorting them out.

Comment 13:

Since I last saw you, I have come to possess two bits of new photographic evidence (one of them has an interesting history), which reinforces my belief that the Dallas police tried to frame Oswald. I am making further explorations and I think this would throw new light on this point.

Comment 14:

You are right. I wanted to mention the fact that none other than Applin, Gibson, and Brewer has been produced by the commission as a witness, even though the Dallas police had a list of the names and addresses of all the persons present in the Texas Theater. I will tie this in with the 13 above.

Comment 15:

I disagree with you on this point. I think Mercer's written allegations obtained by Garrison are quite revealing, though belated. The validity of her allegations can be only tested in a court of law, and it will be interesting to see what the court rules on it when the Shaw trial opens. Until that time I would like to wait and see. I think this attitude is clearly reflected in my discussion of this point. I have merely reported what Garrison has said; it is for the court to rule whether Mercer's allegations have any substance. If her allegations are found to be true, it would only confirm the suspicions of many who believe that the commission's 26 volumes contain innumerable forged documents. I don't think any serious critic should pass the contents of these volumes as facts, regardless of the outcome of the Shaw trial.

Comment 16:

I am prepared to go along with your views, but I still wonder why the man's face was cropped before publishing, as Lane says. In any case, I have made it clear in the text that I am simply reporting what Lane <sup>and</sup> Wes Wise had said. I have not seen the enlarged color print of the Willis photo; as such it is difficult for me to pass an opinion. I have made the necessary correction that Wise gave his encounter with Ruby on Nov.23, not "seen after

*an account of*

the shooting," as I have mentioned. Actually, I don't accept any of the theories of critics as statements of fact--I simply take them on their face value. I firmly believe all these theories should be given a rigorous test in a court of law, before coming to the conclusion as to whether ~~one~~ <sup>any</sup> particular theory is right or wrong. I look at the assassination controversy as this: on one side, we have the advocates of the Warren Report; on the other, the critics. Both these opposing groups have advanced their ~~arguments~~ respective positions. While presenting these positions, I have tried to reconstruct the assassination as I see it. The concluding chapter of my book which I intend to write after the Shaw trial is ~~over~~ <sup>will</sup> ~~will~~ <sup>contain</sup> whether there was a plot to kill the President. By no means, my book is ~~not~~ the last word on the subject; it only presents my point of view.

Comment 17:

I think, I will be better off taking the words "little controversy" out.

Comment 18:

You are right. It was a typographical slip, which I had already corrected in my mastercopy.