

10 January 1968

Dear Tink,

After your call last night, I re-read the article in the L.A. Free Press ("Prof. Thompson defends Garrison"). I decided that there are too many direct quotes (with one of which, concerning the leak of Garrison's psychiatric record, I fully agree) favorable to Garrison to enable me to accuse the paper of slanting. I realize that your qualified reference to the "Henry Wade of New Orleans" was omitted; but on re-reading the article, it seems to me that its inclusion would still leave the general tone one of sympathy and cautious support.

As I indicated, I too deplore the psychiatric smear of Garrison --because it is irrelevant and unfair and merely creates an illusion of persecution, which in turn generates an undeserved sympathy for him. He should be attacked only on relevant grounds, of which there are plenty, as enumerated in my letters to the editors of Playboy, the New York Review of Books, and The Minority of One. I thought that I had sent you copies, in each case, but in case I had not, I am enclosing herewith copies of the last two (I do not have at hand a copy of the letter to Playboy).

In any case, Tink, you do not need my approval of your stand on Garrison, nor should you rely on my judgment of him or anyone's judgment, of Garrison or his evidence or any other evidence in the case. I don't think that I should "brief" you, as you suggested, since I can be responsible only for my own position, based on my own study and evaluation. I can make available to you any of the Garrison material which you may not have--transcripts of his radio interviews, the Playboy interview, public speeches, and the collection of newspapers from New Orleans--should you wish to study these documents.

After your call, I got in touch with Arnoni to tell him that you had already mailed the letter to Ray. I have not yet seen the letter, as I mentioned, but from what you and/or Arnoni told me of its contents, I have the impression that you are soliciting opinion from a number of us--Arnoni, Salandria, and myself (among others?)--as to a proper course of action with respect to Ray's claim of injury. This seems to me to weaken your position that you have complied fully with the canons of attribution and that, where the book rather than the SEP article is concerned, there are no grounds for injury to Ray or anyone else.

Now I come to a more delicate matter, and I hope that you will not misunderstand or take offense: when I checked your ms., it was primarily a check on the accuracy of your citations. In one or two instances, I volunteered also comments on your arguments--for example, on the innocent "souvenir-hunter" explanation for the bullet finding its way on to a stretcher. I also pointed out the factual inaccuracy of your original text on Epstein vis-a-vis Salandria. I did not comment on any other attributions nor do I feel responsible for them. Since the footnote attributions included attributions to me personally, I would scarcely

place myself in the invidious position of complaining of their position or adequacy.

The fact remains that I was not struck by any questions or doubts, when I read the ms., about your attributions to Marcus or any other researcher—I had neither memorized the dates or sequence of their discoveries or publication of their discoveries, nor was I aware of or party to their conversations and/or correspondence with you, nor did I feel it incumbent on me, in reviewing the ms. for a particular and restricted purpose, to bargain with the author for greater or lesser credits for myself or anyone else.

The issue is not what I said or did not say with regard to attributions to Ray Marcus when I reviewed the ms., nor is the issue what Arnoni or I now consider to be the merits of Ray's arguments: the issue is strictly that of the propriety and intent of your attribution of credit to Ray. You have taken the position that your attribution was proper and adequate and that you in no way sought to take credit for the work or discoveries of Ray Marcus or anyone else. I believe this without reservation; and I think it is a mistake to widen the issue by introducing the opinions of others, which may create the impression that you are equivocal about and unsure of your own rejection of the charges.

Since you have mailed the letter to Ray already, this is perhaps academic. Just the same, I thought I should detail my views, which obviously I have not made clear in conversation. It is infuriating to have these distractions, whether by Ray or by Dave Lifton or Garrison or others, when we need all our time for the task we have set ourselves --to destroy the lies about the assassination and to determine what really happened in Dallas. These are irritations which should not be allowed to poison the atmosphere.

One other thing which I may not have articulated in conversation is my hope that, in your litigation with LIFE, it will be possible to give prominence to the position that we all share: that LIFE has no moral right to the possession, much less suppression, of any of the evidence, nor has any other private party, including the bereaved, the right to hold or refuse access to physical or other evidence.

Since all this is written in friendship and affection, I rely on you to receive it as such.

As ever,

