

22 April 1967

Dear Dr. Wecht,

Thanks for your letter of the 21st, which arrived with remarkable speed. Can it be that the postal service is improving, while everything else seems to be jet-bound downhill? Just a week ago today I was in the peace demonstration, together with what seemed half a million people... Now we have our answer --the bombing of Haiphong.

The anaesthesiologist's comment about a bullet hole in front of the head is most important, or would be, if he or she had the guts to say so publicly. There were four anaesthesiologists in the emergency room at one time or another--Drs. Jenkins, Akin, Gieseckie, and Jackie Hunt. It has always amazed and disgusted me that all those emergency room doctors have kept silent, and Connally's doctors, even when their own testimony was flagrantly misrepresented in the WR, and when they could not have swallowed the absurd distortions. Having spent all my working life in some medical or public health establishment, I have few illusions about doctors, but I would have hoped that a few besides you yourself would have shown some courage and concern for truth when the assassination of a President was at issue.

One of the factors that gave me great confidence in Garrison at first was his insistence that justice must be done, though the heavens fall. I was wildly excited when he followed that with the flat statement that there was no evidence that Oswald had killed anyone in Dallas on 11/22/63. And other remarks of his were also heartening. As you say, we are all awaiting the outcome of his investigation; but I am unhappy to have to say that my initial exhilaration has given way to very mixed feelings.

The main disappointment, for me (and the other critics, with only one exception, violently disagree with me about it), was Garrison's use of two witnesses against Clay Shaw (Russo and Bundy) whom I regard as totally lacking in credibility. No doubt he has better evidence that he is not ready to reveal. But should not an arrest and a criminal charge be well founded, in itself, as well as the later prosecution? The other critics insist on giving Garrison the benefit of doubt; but it seems to me that it is the accused--however little we may like or admire him, and I am scarcely drawn to this deviate/sadist Shaw--has first call on any benefit of doubt. How can we denounce Helen Markham and Brennan, but accept Russo and Bundy?

Feelings are running very strong on this issue and relations are becoming strained with some of the critics, who are governed by their "faith" in Garrison. Faith, faith, faith: Have we learned nothing from the faith we once had in Warren? I continue to have some confidence and hope, and to try to persuade myself that the Shaw hearing was nothing more than a strategic error, that will be vitiated by strong evidence during the trial. I am still co-operating with Garrison, if and when asked, and on good terms --but I cannot be quite so blithe as some of my colleagues about the Shaw affair. (I have been told that my position is "bourgeois.") I wonder how you view it? ### Kupferman reintroduced his Joint Resolution in a speech on the floor of the House on the 13th; it got almost no press coverage. I guess he sent you a copy, this time. ### Nothing much new otherwise; I am expecting my galley proofs in a few weeks; am also having preliminary discussion on a revised edition of my Subject Index, which has gone out of print. ### Will you be in New York again soon? I would love it if we could have a good long talk on your next visit, maybe spend an evening if you can manage. Warm regards to you and Mrs. Wecht,

As ever,