

13 July 1968

Mr. Ted Gandolfo
221 Sip Avenue
Jersey City, N.J. 07306

Dear Mr. Gandolfo,

In reply to your letter of 12 July 1968, I should like to remind you that when you telephoned me on Monday, 1 July 1968 hinting that you had made some major and conclusive discovery of an evidenciary nature which you were unwilling to specify by phone or by mail, I took particular care to inform you of my complete repudiation of Garrison and his "investigation" as well as my cutting off of any contact with these critics of the Warren Report who continued to condone and support Garrison. I told you explicitly and emphatically that I wanted to be sure that you were fully aware of my position on Garrison so that you would not labor under the impression that I, like most of the other critics, advocated or co-operated with the New Orleans District Attorney. I have made it a practice for some time now to make this clear to any individual who calls or writes to me, so as to forestall any possibility of misunderstanding on this score.

After I made it clear on the telephone that I was just as opposed to Garrison as to the Warren Report, and in spite of the fact that men were in process of installing an air conditioner in my apartment, you still urged me to receive a visit from you, then and there, on the grounds of the urgency and overriding importance of your "discovery." If I am to believe the explanation in your letter of 12 July, then I have to say that you should have stated during our telephone conversation, after I took the initiative and the care to be sure that you were aware of my attitude on Garrison in advance of any further discussion, that you wanted to discuss the question further before deciding whether or not to share your "discovery." But you did not do so. Instead, you said that my position in Garrison in no way decreased your impatience to make a personal visit so that you could safely tell me of your discovery. When you arrived and the air-conditioning men were still at work, you then said that you did not wish to speak while they were present.

At no time did you suggest that you were placing me on trial, so to speak, with respect to my views on Garrison and the critics who support him. Let me therefore repeat that whether or not you came here, as you now claim, "to find out more about my beliefs or disbeliefs concerning Garrison's investigation," that you came under false pretences. Your telephone call left no possibility except that you had vital information which it was my duty to accept, since you had not succeeded in obtaining a reply to your letters to Garrison and Lane nor succeeded in reaching them by telephone. Now, rather belatedly, you tell me that you really came to find out more about my beliefs and disbeliefs, apparently having forgotten that during the telephone call I myself informed you very firmly and very clearly what those beliefs and disbeliefs were.

During your visit, I elaborated in explicit and precise terms the reasons for my opposition to and distrust of Garrison. Let me remind you that you did not refute or even dispute the facts I set forth or the interpretation I drew from those facts. I am totally unimpressed by your declaration that you "know that Garrison's investigation is a truthful one in every sense," since you yourself did not shrink from misrepresenting the reason for your telephone call, or for your visit. Even if I had confidence in your ability to discriminate between truth and non-truth, I would remain completely unimpressed by your mere

announcement that you "knew" something to be true but would dismiss such statement as grandiose and presumptuous, unless and until you provided detailed facts and evidence in support of your contention. I would not and do not believe Chief Justice Warren on the strength of his pronouncements, alone, nor on the strength of the Warren Report which supposedly justifies and substantiates his pronouncements but is in fact clogged with fallacies and abuse of logic and truth.

Let me remind you that I never solicited any information from you, and I do not solicit it now, but that you seemed determined to thrust your "hitherto undisclosed proof" on me, whether I wanted it or not, perhaps because I had the courtesy to reply to your letter some months ago, and to speak to you courteously on the telephone, whereas your attempts to reach Garrison, Lane, and Sahl were ignored and rebuffed. I trust that if you manage to accumulate the train fare for New Orleans, you will at least be granted an audience. Noting your comment that you are a "poor man" unable to afford the trip at this time, I can only remark that financial poverty can be overcome but poverty of intellect and integrity are unfortunately irremediable.

Since you rather insistently wrote, telephoned, and visited me, while I merely tried to extend the same courtesy to you as I extend to anyone who contacts me regarding my work on the Warren Report, I find it rather comical that you pretend in your letter that you regretfully decline to share your information with me because I have failed to meet your high standards of uncritical adulation of a crude and clumsy charlatan like Garrison. Comical, and also gratifying to be spared the ordeal of receiving your "hitherto undisclosed proof" from a man who finds Garrison's vaudeville "truthful in every sense" is, I fear, unlikely to recognize proof or non-proof if it hits him in the face like a baseball bat. You may rest assured that I am delighted to learn that you intend to approach "the proper people" in future rather than myself.

Yours very truly,

362 East 12 Street
New York, N.Y. 10014

P.S. It occurs to me that I should make it clear that this letter requires no reply and that if I do receive a reply, I will neither read nor answer it, because time is too scarce and too precious to be expended on such insignificant irritations.