

1 June 1967

Dear Harold,

There is no charge for the tapes I sent you of the Long John discussion—accept them with my compliments. If you have facilities to make a copy, fine, I would like the record for my collection. If not, never mind—I can always borrow Bill's, if need be.

No, I did not hear Long John "with other" (whatever or whoever that means) last Wednesday; sorry I missed it, whatever it was.

So Ray "is disturbed by my refusal to give him references for JG?" That is one great pity! Ray perhaps does not remember that a little more than a year ago he refused to make available a chart of Dealey Plaza showing where each witness was positioned, when I asked him for it on behalf of Ed Epstein. I did not argue with him when he refused; and I hope that he will permit me the same freedom of action.

My position with respect to JG is very simple—it is also final and not negotiable. He has "decoded" the notations "PO 19106" into Ruby's unlisted 1963 phone number in Dallas. I am ready to grant that his "decoding" was done in good faith (if without sufficient care and objectivity). But it is in error, for what he read as "PO 19106" in Oswald's book is in fact "DD 19106." The entire decoding is therefore invalidated. If I understood Ray correctly (and I am certain that I did), JG conceded on Sunday night that the "PO" was in fact "DD." But he does not intend to retract or modify or correct his sensational press release in which he announced that cryptographic versions of Ruby's unpublished number had been found both in Oswald's and Shaw's notebooks.

In other words, he is allowing a lie to stand on the record, and he is turning what started as an innocent mistake into fabricated evidence against Clay Shaw (as well as against the dead Oswald)—fabricated evidence which present a prima facie case for their implication with each other and with Ruby and still others in an assassination of a President.

My loathing for lies, injustice, tampering of evidence, and abuse by the State of the helpless or lonely individual is not restricted to particular situations or particular agencies such as the Warren Commission—I am no less outraged when my "friends" or "allies" show their contempt for truth, for the rights of the individual, and for the intelligence of the public. I do not condone in Mr. Garrison what I do not condone in the Warren Commission. And nothing that any of my friends may say about his brilliance, energy, ideals, sincerity, erudition, etc.—nothing can turn his falsehood into anything less than falsehood, for I have only one standard—not one for Warren and a different one for Garrison, one for Oswald and a different one for Shaw.

If my colleagues cannot see through this new charlatan on the scene, after their individual and collective dissection of the fraudulent Warren Report, it surprises and disappoints me. But if they see through his fraudulent claims and accept or justify them, on one or another ground of expediency—if they condone in JG what they would not condone in the WR—I am horrified and heartbroken. It means that the people nearest and dearest to me for almost three years are strangers and adversaries.

I will not lift one finger to help JG or anyone else who perverts the truth and advertises false evidence which is knowingly false. I make no apology whatever for this, and I never will. Yes, "we have both made mistakes about people;" but there can be no mistake about this false evidence, which is admittedly false.

My galleys are here and I must not take more time, important as this issue is. All the best, Harold, as ever,