

Thurs. July 25

Dear Sylvia,

Please excuse the delay in this reply; we're living in Piedmont and only go in to San Francisco once a week to pick up our mail.

When you mentioned that Epstein's article would be in the July 13th New Yorker I immediately went out and bought it. I read it with gradually rising ~~dis~~ dissatisfaction. For as accurate and telling as his criticisms of Garrison were, I felt the whole thing had been too single-minded & bent. At points, by neglecting known facts he made Garrison look silly. Take Kenic for example. He never mentioned the details of that curious trip taken by Kenic on Nov. 22 & 23 -- the visit of the skating rink, the visit by the phone, etc. I had read in the Archives the reports on this trip and knew that the intriguing details were not products of Garrison's admittedly precocious imagination. This is just one example which points up the bias -- as the single-minded exposition -- which flawed most of it. What puzzles me is why a bright guy like Epstein didn't take a chance which was just waiting to be taken by the character of the article itself. His introduction could have set up an ending somewhat like this. After demolishing Garrison he could

have pointed out that the fraudulent character
of W's investigation points up the need
for a truly responsible re-examination of the
evidence. His concluding paragraph
could have pointed out the silent logical
points which make the Warren Report inconsistent
& unacceptable. Such an ending would have
fitted perfectly with overall architecture of
his article and would have been a most more
effective ending. As it is, the reader
is puzzled by the very ambiguity of
Epstein's position at the end. This is all
from an editorial point of view. When one
looks at the background of the article and
Epstein's persona it becomes all the more
imperative that he take a further stand.
The average reader finishes the article
with the question: "Is this guy Epstein, the
fellow who started all the rocks, was telling
me that the critics are demagogues and
that it was all much ado about nothing?"
Your request from him for clarification is quite
proper, but of course the beam has been done and
any explanation to you won't change the published
record. Still I'm puzzled by the ~~conclusion~~
took he took -- the article seemed to require
a different ending.

As a part of evidence: I've held
Aosold's rifle in the Archives and I find it
down had to believe that anyone firing it
wouldn't leave rather good fingerprints on the
trigger housing, the bolt, a barrel.

The invitation at the beginning of the
article that the only serious question left to consider
is "why Aosold killed the President" is
nothing less than appalling. It is that
statement which frames the whole perspective
of the article in the reader's mind. Ugh!

Out here I feel very removed from
the core and from politics. It's a nice
holiday -- a sparkling, ever-changing city,
windy beaches, and magnificent woods and
mountains.

Let's keep in touch,

Bob,

Tom