

Sent to Paris Flamme, "As promised,"

on 1/10/69

Page 7 para. 5

It is difficult to reconcile the statement that Garrison rebutted the NBC attack "point by point" when the transcript includes the explicit remark, "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

The correct spelling is Earling.

Page 115 para. 3

The statement that Morrison introduced Shaw to JFK on an air flight during 1963 is just not true. JFK was not taking commercial flights during his presidency, nor were persons unacquainted with him permitted to fly on Air Force One. I have been told that when these objections were raised, Garrison disclaimed the remarks entirely and blamed Playboy for inserting it. Which seems only to compound his resort to cheap lies and preposterous inventions.

Page 125 para. 1

Walker's name and number were not on a slip of paper but written in Oswald's address-book---though not in "code."

Page 132 para. 1

I never heard of Wade's being appointed to the federal bench. I think this is an error. In fact, on page 231 you indicate that Wade was still the district attorney of Dallas as of May 1967.

Page 277

As I said in TMO in September 1968 ("Three Assassinations") Lane's allegation about emissaries from RFK is one of the cheapest lies I ever heard. In March, RFK publicly insisted that the Warren Report was valid and that if elected he would not reopen the investigation. Shortly afterwards, when RFK was to campaign in New Orleans, he appealed for protection against a Garrison subpoena if he went into his area of jurisdiction. About ten days later, Lane attacked RFK in an article in the L.A. Free Press, suggesting that he had himself set into motion the events that culminated in the assassination of his brother. Furthermore, the remark about guns between RFK and the White House was made by Jones Harris---who is not an "emissary" for anyone. In short, the Lane allegations about emissaries from RFK to Garrison are false and self-serving. If mentioned at all, all the attendant circumstances should also be pointed out so that the reader will not be misled. Incidentally, a couple of years ago Lane alleged that RFK had cabled Trever-Roper to keep up the good work, whereupon Trever-Roper promptly and categorically denied the story absolutely. Garrison had neither the honesty nor guts to do the same, but backed Lane's story in part and in essence. That is another thing that the reader is entitled to know.

Page 289 para. 4

The omission of any mention of the party in Ferris's apartment from Sciambra's

initial Russo interview report 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." A conspiracy can be discussed without explicit reference to a party held at a particular time and place. Even if Russo had given assurance that he told Sciambra about the party in specific detail and along the same lines as his subsequent testimony, it would still not explain why Russo omitted so cardinal an assertion from his report. In any event, Russo is hardly a disinterested witness; on the contrary, Sciambra's "omission" makes Russo vulnerable to a possible charge of perjury and collusion.

With respect to this and other subjects such as the preposterous "code," I cannot see that the requirements of objectivity are fulfilled by leaving the reader on his own, to draw his conclusions by himself on the basis of partial or condensed information. Objectivity surely does not imply that one must relinquish the opportunity to analyze, point to contradictions, reach judgments. Where you refrain from doing so, you inevitably leave room for the impression that you are endorsing or concurring in the so-called "evidence," whether it is the code or the alleged party in Ferrie's apartment or the invented "emissaries."