

11 July 1970

Mrs Bonnie J Moody  
271 So Janesville Street  
Whitewater, Wisconsin 53190

Dear Mrs. Moody,

Thank you for your letter of the 8th and the clipping of the Evans-Novak column. I hope that you will excuse the sketchiness of this reply, but I am rushed for time. I did want to save you fruitless thought about "Caster" by at least telling you that I discovered, some time after my book was out, that the FBI reports which refer to "Colonel Caster" do so phonetically. The colonel's name is actually "Castorr" and he is not related to the Book Depository Caster--Warren Caster (not William). Haste does make waste --I must correct myself as to the timing of my discovery of "Castorr." It was before my book came out, and I was able to give the correct spelling in the index of Accessories, although it was not possible to correct the name as given in the text.

About Fensterwald: I have some acquaintance with him, although I do not know him really well. My impression is that he has only the best motives and that he has done some useful work on the case. However, I believe that he takes an equal interest in various other assassinations or mysterious deaths, going back over ten years or so, and that this tends to dilute his efforts and fragment them. The Dallas assassination is so complex in itself that it seems to me to require complete concentration, if any significant new breakthrough is to be made. Incidentally, my information is that Fensterwald is--rather, was--hostile toward Robert Kennedy, with whom he had clashed bitterly during the Jimmy Hoffa hearings. The suggestion in the press that they were friends is, to the best of my knowledge, contrary to the actual facts.

I know little about Sherman Skolnick of Chicago but I can tell you that as of the time he filed his suit he had never seen the 26 volumes of the Hearings and Exhibits, much less read them--as he himself told me--and seemed completely uninformed about the case and unfamiliar with the critical works challenging the Warren Report. Consequently, I take a dim view of his allegations, which in any event are rather incoherent.

Finally, and forgive me for being blunt, I disagree with your assessment of Garrison. He entered the scene making charges and claims which were extravagant, irresponsible, and unfounded, and later in an attempt to retain some credibility he resorted to the outright fabrication of evidence (for example, the so-called code of Ruby's phone number in Oswald's and in Shaw's address-books) and to the use of witness in the Shaw trial whom he knew to be mentally deranged (the New York accountant, Charles Speisel) but hoped to "get away with", to mention only two of many despicable, corrupt, and idiotic actions on Garrison's part. I therefore consider him a completely contemptible and dishonest man, a self-serving ignoramus who has no ounce of genuine concern for truth or for justice. The "average person" who thinks or feels that Garrison "has something" only demonstrates that he is uninformed and uncritical, and believes in Garrison because he wishes to believe in him--exactly the way some other "average persons" believe in the Warren Report.

Yours sincerely,