

10/6/67

But I have gone over this so often that it must have become as tiresome to you as to me. I will only ask you, please, if you want to purchase this for me. I have made it a point to respond to the points of proper response to my warm congratulations and very best wishes to you and your wife on the move into your new house, may you both enjoy the best of health and all good fortune and happiness there.

After I received your letter of 10/2/67, more briefly than I would like, I did not make a copy for you of the Libeler memo to Rankin - I retyped it for myself so that I could consult a legible version, and thought you might like a legible copy for yourself too.

After all the links I cannot have any light on the Joesten ad - I was so disgusted with him that I gave it to an acquaintance who had expressed some interest in his works. My rather dim recollection is that it advertised his past and forthcoming works including a book on Garrison's some of these works, both past and forthcoming are being published by Peter Dawday of London. But I don't remember whether the Garrison book is to be put out by Dawday. I think Shirely Martin is on Joesten's mailing list - maybe she can let you have a copy of his ad "receptive" no

About the contents of my book: you will have a copy in a matter of weeks. Meanwhile, don't take any trouble with Archives stuff when you are uncertain of its relevance.

I can't know any better about the "Robert Oswald Times clipping" you may be referring to his piece in the current LOOK, in which he says that if he had been allowed to spend half an hour (instead of ten minutes) with Lee that Saturday and then continue our talk over the next day or two - he believes he would have been able to arrive at final answers to two questions - was he guilty, and if he was, what were his motives? (LOOK 10/17/67 page 65 column 2)

But even under the adversarial system never doubt that you are right to be skeptical about the views of Oswald's innocence of guilt. Harold is aware, fully aware, that neither I nor anyone else had a license to be only right - but this is a truism or a philosophical remark, and not a reply to any of the specific questions in my letter of 9/30/67, page 5. It is not enough to say that I have no license to be only right. I am wrong in my reasoning on my facts as set forth in that paragraph, please address your criticism explicitly to those errors.

Thank God for each skeptic and such sceptics as Birkharts or Dallas cons. or Rankin's claims, or even your own statements that you have given him enough to justify Garrison's claims of "corroborating evidence in his files." I do not take Garrison or Barron's argument that the evidence in his files was merely your own personal opinion in your own mind - that is a personal matter and a personal matter. If you were to publish your own opinion, it would be your own opinion and you would be responsible for it. If you were to publish your own opinion, it would be your own opinion and you would be responsible for it. If you were to publish your own opinion, it would be your own opinion and you would be responsible for it.

*(Handwritten signature)*

10/10/01

But I have gone over this so often that it must have become as tiresome to you as to me. I will only ask you, please, if you want to pursue this further, then please respond to the points I have made, instead of giving me a summary of your own reasoning and writing, which culminates with the statement (and you may agree that it is a non sequitur) that Garrison is convinced that Oswald was framed. If you maintain that Oswald was not necessarily aware of the existence of the plot to murder the President, you cannot believe (as I do not) Russo's testimony that Oswald was discussing the details of the murder with Shaw and Ferrie. If you want to consider that Oswald as an imposter-Oswald, well and good, but then you would have to join me in rejecting the so-called "code" which links him to Shaw and to Ruby in something so clandestine and sinister as to require cryptography to conceal the links. After all, Garrison (and you) cannot have it both ways: if the incriminated Oswald is always a false Oswald, then the real Oswald should not have in his address book the allegedly incriminating codes and phone numbers, etc. But if such incriminating entries do exist in his papers, then he is implicated and logically he himself was the Oswald with Shaw at Lake Ponchartrain, with Ferrie and Shaw in New Orleans, and with Shaw and Ruby in Baton Rouge, which brings the full circle to what I said to start with: that Garrison is incriminating Oswald on "evidence" no less fallacious than the Commission's.

You say, apropos of Spatein's book, that I need not explain anything, and that when you say things like this I need not feel called upon to defend myself. Well, Harold, suppose you discontinue saying "things like this" and I will discontinue explaining (not "defending") myself, okay? (But if you continue, I am afraid my reflexive reaction will be to resume also.)

Harold, you really do upset me. I won't say "offend," because I am sure it was not intended that way--when you question my views on the adversary procedure, it is the one thing above all others on which I would absolutely insist in any new investigation, as you will see in my book. I am irreversibly and totally wedded to the adversary system, never doubt that. But even under the adversary method, there have been appalling and irreparable miscarriages of justice, as a result of which men have actually spent years in the death house. That they were finally proven to be completely innocent (and in several cases, framed by the police or by a district attorney) as in one recent case involving a paint stain on underwear that was said to be blood, when he knew it was paint, you must have read about it) and set free, with the regrets of the State, was due to the efforts and dedication of those who refused to abdicate personal judgment and responsibility even in the face of due process. Thank God for such sceptics and such independent spirits--but for them, wholly innocent men (usually of inviolably with the wrong skin, the wrong religion, or the sin of poverty and obscurity) would have been executed.

I reserve my right to think that even a judge, even a juror, has been wrong--to reserve my right to make an independent judgment of evidence and to give the accused the benefit of doubt and his due presumption of innocence. I don't especially demand that after hearing Masse, Russo and Ruby, and after hearing the numerous errors of the prosecuting in his references to the contents of the 26 volumes, and after repeated and undeniable misstatements and self-contradictions on his part, but that the only part of Garrison's "evidence" that will not go into court is the charge against Shaw. In a other accusations against White Russians, Dallas cops, etc., etc., etc., NOT be tested in a court of law, nor has been presented in court of evidence to substantiate his charges. In the space that remains, I am very sorry to say that I did not grasp the final paragraph of your 10/3/67 letter. I'd be happy to think about the problem if I understood what you had in mind, when you refer to the feasible "practical mechanism." If it is only a question of funds for copies of the documents, that could certainly be discussed, but I am not clear when you say "feasible, safe mechanism."

All the best,  
