

ent nialqpo yow on al stow ll ,bit z'it neve and "lyrie" out of yitititve staien
officars aculari asop bolw ,stocpa aramab. ent non' yiang v'it to notitad to mofesimo
... auto q'it of p'acqueraler
... ititotibe QNT out of acqueraler may be bejmedaco y'itotia even I PK east

Comments on THE KENNEDY CONSH IRACY by Paris Flammonde--1/4/69

NOT SENT

Page xxv, Delete "Senator Richard B. Russell" and insert "Senator Russell Long"
Page 3 last sentence, Actually quite a few people knew about Garrison's project before February 1967; I myself knew about it in mid-January, and others even earlier.

Page 6 para. 3, Garrison's judgment in recruiting staff is nothing for him to brag about, in view of the affair of Gurvich and the more recent case of Bill Boxley (to say nothing of the non-salaried accredited "investigators" Steve Jaffe, or the accreditation of Mort Sahl, entertainer).

Page 7 para. 2, I have been told that all except one member of Truth & Consequences discontinued their financial support some time ago.

Page 7 para. 5, It is difficult to reconcile the statement that Garrison rebutted the NBC attack "point by point" when the transcript of his remarks include the explicit statement "I am not even going to bother to dignify the foolishness which Newsweek and NBC and some of the other news agencies have tried to make you believe..."

Page 8 line 2, Correct name is Earling.

Page 27 (also later pages dealing with "Farry"): You say that the Secret Service asked about a "Mr. David Farry" but Weisberg quotes "a Mr. Farry." Actually, although the actual question did not include "David" or any first name, I agree that it was directed to David Ferrie. But I do not agree that there is any anachronism, or anything sinister: The Secret Service got a call on November 24, 1963 from an informant who gave Ferrie's name and said he was connected with Oswald. This information is in a Secret Service report dated 12/13/63, quoted by Popkin in the NY Review of Books (9/14/67, page 28, column 1). My private files contain information that the 11/24/63 informant who called the Secret Service was a New Orleans Assistant District Attorney. One must ask why Garrison did not offer that information to Weisberg, or to you.

Page 115 para. 3, The statement that Morrison introduced Shaw to JFK on an airplane flight in 1963 is untrue and absurd on its face. JFK was not taking commercial planes; nor were persons unacquainted with JFK permitted to be passengers on Air Force One. I am told that Garrison, when these objections were posed to him, disclaimed the statement entirely and insisted that Playboy had invented and attributed it to him. I reject the suggestion that Eric Norden or anyone on Playboy would be that unethical.

Page 125 para. 1, Walker's name and number were not on a "slip of paper" but written in Oswald's address-book (not in code).

Page 132, para. 2, I never heard that Wade was appointed to the federal bench. In fact, on page 231 you refer to Wade as still being district attorney of Dallas in May 1967.

Page 173, para. 3, I agree with you about the Commission's use of the word "probably."

While I do not equate any of the critical works with the Warren Report, I note that Bill Turner's Ramparts article of January 1968 consists largely of such phrases as "...one can only surmise...he may have been slated...he evidently acquired...one possible answer...the likelihood is...it may be significant...there may be a pattern here ...a clue may lie...he may have been asked...it is not beyond the realm of possibility..."etc.

And, taking a few pages of your own book at random, I find the phrases "Garrison believes ...it was rumored...office is supposed to have...the assertion has been made...it is more than likely..." (pages 19-21).

Pages 227-231, the so-called "code" -- It taxes my patience to have to repeat all the reasons why this whole series of claims by Garrison is just absolutely absurd and dishonest. I mentioned a number of those reasons in a published letter to the editor of the New York Review of Books, commenting on Popkin's article. Epstein has also gone over the ground thoroughly in his New Yorker critique. It is regrettable that you have mentioned only the objections made by Shaw's lawyers and failed to mention that, as Epstein and I have pointed out, the entry in Oswald's address-book was not "PO 19106" but "DD 19106" (the Cyrillic D), or any of our other arguments. What really does amaze me is that you publish without comment or criticism Garrison's statement of 5/17/67 "We are well aware that there is a Mr. Lee Odom..." etc. Do you really believe that it is possible, as Garrison indisputably implies, that sometime before 11/24/63 Oswald and Shaw wrote down, in code, Ruby's unlisted phone number, as "PO 19106" or a variation thereof, and that more than two years later a real P.O. Box 19106 was created in Dallas, and rented by a man who subsequently visited Clay Shaw and gave him the P.O. Box address? And did Shaw, who had presumably written Ruby's coded number at an earlier time (it was no longer possible to call Ruby at that number from 11/24/63 onward), then insert "Lee Odom" above the coded number and "Dallas, Tex." below it?

Page 277, I have also commented in print (TMO September 1968) on Mark Lane's allegations of emissaries from RFK to Garrison. It is one of the cheapest lies I ever heard. At an earlier stage, Lane alleged that RFK had wired Trevor-Roper to keep up the good work, referring to his introduction to Lane's book. Trevor-Roper denied it absolutely. As to the "emissaries," the story is totally false, if only on the basis of RFK's last public remarks about the Warren Report, and the public statements or articles by Garrison and by Lane (especially Lane's attack on RFK in the L.A. Free Press 4/19/68), which are totally inconsistent with the "emissaries" story. In fact, the story is beneath contempt and I am sorry that you saw fit to repeat it.

Page 281 line 5, the word "publicly" is misspelled.

Page 281, end of para. 2, Too bad about Boxley.

Pages 287-288, According to my log, Lerner in later columns said that Garrison had oversold himself on the case and had become obsessed with it (6/14/67) and that if Garrison persisted he would violate due process and raise suspicion that he is delusional and paranoid. (6/30/67)

Page 289, para. 4, The omission from Sciambra's report on his initial interview with Russo is in no way overcome by Russo's "assurance that he and Sciambra had, in fact, discussed the matter of the conspiracy plot during their initial interview." What was omitted was a reference to the party in Ferrie's apartment at which Shaw was present under an alias and Oswald was present. Russo's "assurance" to Phelan does not

relate explicitly to the "party," but even if it did, it would in no way explain the omission of mention of that party from the Sciambra report, which does include specific references to Clay Shaw.

Page 327 I have already commented on your references to the TMO editorial.

CONFIDENTIAL - SECURITY INFORMATION - THIS DOCUMENT IS UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE TWO