

Telephone call from Vince Salandria Thursday 9:30 p.m. 3/28/68

Vince and Chris were coming to New York on Saturday "to see a man" and he thought I might have dinner with them. I was sorry, but I was busy Saturday night.

I took the occasion to ask Vince if he was telling people that I was a CIA agent, which charge I had heard from two different sources, or if he knew who had launched this rumor. He said, no, he did not know anything about this, did not think so, had not said so, and had never heard it. He saw no basis for this, my work spoke for itself. However, he still thought it possible that Thompson was a CIA agent, and had written him to this effect about a week ago. He did not agree with Arnoni about Thompson; for, if he was not a CIA agent, then he was a very dishonest person, yet he did not seem dishonest.

I replied that Vince was worried only about certain kinds of dishonesty and not about others, for example, the dishonesty of the New Orleans investigation. Vince said that Garrison had made many mistakes but he knew, as I could not, from talking to the man face to face, that he was honest and sincere and wasn't he courageous, even I would have to admit that, as evidenced by his subpoena of Dulles and his general fearlessness.

I said that I admitted no such thing and regarded these subpoenas as indicating nothing more than Garrison's cunning about how to make the headlines. I insisted on discussing explicit facts rather than abstract claims by Vince--for example, the so-called "code, Russo's testimony, the grounds on which Bradley had been publicly accused of complicity in the assassination (anonymous letter and photograph mistakenly identified as Bradley). To this, Vince said that Garrison had not repeated the code recently; but admitted that he had not withdrawn it either. Yes, Garrison had made many mistakes, Vince conceded; but that was because the CIA was planting false leads. I asked if Garrison had such poor judgment that he could not differentiate between genuine leads and those planted by the CIA; to this, Vince answered that the CIA was diabolically clever.

After further discussion along these lines, I said that I could not consider myself in the same camp with people who condoned Garrison's methods. Vince said that I was trying to intimidate him, to make him choose between Garrison and me. I said that there was no intimidation involved, merely a statement of the existing situation. Vince said that he was glad I had finally stated my position explicitly. I said that I could hardly imagine that he had not already understood the position, over the past months, when he could scarcely have thought that everything was "normal." We then said goodbye.

P.S. Earlier in the conversation, I had asked him what he thought of the political situation. He replied that he was all in favor of RFK. Yes, he was aware of the Monday statement by RFK in support of the Warren Report but was convinced that he had different views privately. I asked if he had any solid information on that score or was merely inferring that. Vince said that he was using inferential logic, as he had always done, and that was a reliable process. He also talked about a military takeover by the CIA and other catastrophes as seen through the eyes of a comic-strip mentality.