

7 November 1971

Dear George,

Thank you for your last two letters and for the summary of your Boxley interviews. I will keep it absolutely confidential. Easy enough, since I have few and infrequent contacts with critics these days and those I do still hear from have no interest in Garrison or Garrison-connected personae dramatis --except, I suppose, Weisberg, but as he already knows everything there is to know about everything remotely connected with the assassination(s) I do not offer him information. In fact, my contacts with HW are minimal, on my side.

I have never met Boxley nor, frankly, found him of any interest. He did telephone me while I was in Dallas in August 1970 but I do not recall now what it was that he talked about at rather great length. While I was at Fire Island this year Mary wrote to say that she had given him my number there and to expect a call from him, but I did not receive any phonecall and did not regret it a bit. I realize that you have to explore the Boxleys, Bradleys, et al, for your expose of the Garrison comedy, but since the whole "investigation" was basically irrelevant to the JFK assassination as such I have little interest in the colorful characters who came on the scene via Big Jim.

One reason (among many others) that I have great respect for Mary Ferrell is that she saw through Garrison upon meeting him. I also share your high regard for Arch Kimbrough. Individually and together, Mary and Arch have done a staggering amount of research and investigation, to say nothing of their help and hospitality to other researchers. I was interested to read your comments on Lifton, whose duplicity as I learned of it from Mary and from Fred Newcomb caused me to break off any further contacts with him, in sheer disgust. With Paul Hoch, it was purely and simply his melon paper. Before he produced that piece of obscenity, I had very cordial feelings about Paul. It was a shock to discover his moral ambivalence and intellectual confusion about the WR and about Oswald and I completely lost confidence in Hoch. Perhaps I am "intolerant", as a WC lawyer once told me when I had the effrontery to doubt the WR findings just because there were some misstatements, omissions, and other "errors" in it, but I am not willing to maintain an association with a Hoch or a Lifton once it has become clear that he lacks integrity and commitment.

Unhappily, a great many unstable or deranged people have been irresistably attracted to the case, in the same way as such kooks have littered the scene of UFO's and handicapped sober efforts to investigate their nature and origin.

I hope the material I have sent you from my correspondence in re: Garrison has been useful. Is it sufficient in quantity? If not, try to specify what additional material you need. If I have it, I will dig it out, although it may take time since this is our peak period at the office and work spills over into most weekends.

Best regards,

As ever,