

Dear Dave,

1/8/89

I've finished On the 'rival of the assassins, I have a few moments so I begin what I may have to return to over a period of days. Or, there is no point in trying to organize what I'll say.

First I want to make something very clear. I want everything that relates to me for to my unique knowledge to be for the historical record only. One of the reasons is that I do not want to get involved in any kind of hassle. I'm just not up to it now and I think it would not serve any useful purpose.

I feel like I've been on the trail of the assassin of truth, or history, or fact. At the same time, because I have personal knowledge of much of what he writes about, I got a big kick out of much of it. It was, in those many places, recognizable but not more, just barely. Some of these would make great oral histories! *These are fictions!*

To anyone <sup>one</sup> who knows nothing at all about what he writes about this is a great book that will be very impressive. But ignorance is the prerequisite.

I did make notes but they'll give you trouble. Somehow and for no apparent reason I got cuts on each thumb, first on the left, then on the right, when I did not cut the thumbs. They just appeared, first on the left. This impaired my holding the stenographer's note book I was using so I stopped that and wrote on the pages. With the open cutlike opening on the right thumb this made my writing even worse than it usually is and may give you problems. I suggest that where you cannot make it out you xerox and I'll then try to type from it, as I could not in reading the book under my now permanent limitations.

The dishonesty of this book did surprise me, well as I've known Garrison. I mean he lies over and over again, about pretty much anything and everything. What I enjoyed most is where his personal accounts are the exact opposite of what I know the actuality to be. He lies even in his sources, not infrequently to avoid crediting my work. An example, one of many, and he likes to credit his pal Lane, he attributes to a FOIA request by Lane, one he did not make, what Lane cribbed from Post Magazine of years earlier, the FBI's "missile" receipt, which at all points Garrison merely lies to say is a receipt for a fourth bullet. He makes no mention at all of the Meagher and MA Roffman books and perhaps a single one to one of mine.

He says the most important single thing done by any critic was Lane's work on the two witnesses the government avoided to the Tippit killing, Clemmons and I think Wright. That was not original with Lane in any event. Or, he did it all, the critics did virtually nothing. *(Garrison)*

On the paranoia he did not suffer but was all around him he was spectacularly dishonest, and I mean in all respects. This should be on tape so I won't go into it now. Remember for the future, this has to do with his trip to Arizona or New Mexico, where he was indignant to find Boxley had followed him. From there Garrison says he proceeded to LA, after sending Boxley back to New Orleans, which he did not do. Another wonderful point is his separation from Boxley, the good work attributed to Vincent Salandria. That also belongs on tape. In gruesome and hilarious detail.

He actually knows so little about what he claims to have known personally <sup>and</sup> and intimately he says Banister's office mislocated. He is wrong even on the so-called training camps and the raids on them that are an integral part of his theory/book. It really is all theory, all crap and nonsense where it is not ridiculous and as usual untenable. He is even ignorant of all the real work that has been done since he fell flat on his face, makes no reference to it and instead quotes Kurtz and Hurt. Great scholarship! .....

I do not know what you intend but if it is a review there is nothing you need from anyone else. You'll be reviewing a novel, this book is that detached from reality. *And you know more than enough.*

*Salandria  
is, in  
his version  
the pre-  
eminent  
critic.*



Even on the decision in the Shaw case, Compare his account with the fact that the jury returned with its verdict in an hour! The whole decision took that little time and consideration.

There is not a single citation to a single FBI record or one of the CIA, when there are more than a quarter of a million pages now available. This is scholarly? No, it is because he has and had no interest in any fact. I have the impression that he wrote this book long ago, intending self-justification then and not then able to get any publisher interest. To what he could have written 20 years ago he has added a few citations to Kurtz and Hurt and a few references to Lane where Lane cribbed and where he is used as the original source and there is nothing else.

I prepared his people, particularly Oser and Warell, if I recall the name of the other 6'6"er there who was, next to Oser, the one who handled most of the case and I think recently if not still was United States Attorney there, for some of their questionings. Even where they got as a result testimony casting serious doubt on the FBI and what it did and did not do, there is no reference. Mike Frazier admitting he removed more metal from 399 than he told the Warren Commission. Yet Garrison treats this bullet as planted. and that without ever reference to Darrell Tomlinson's testimony about it. *(and is not even mentioned)*

He does an Otwell, rewriting history to control it. Particularly about himself. He blew the big one and he pretends he did not and that the federal agencies did him in. They did not have to; he did it to himself.

He makes no reference to Tom Bethell by name and misrepresents how he got to know and hire him, saying Tom came down from Washington whereas as Garrison knew, he come from England and was in New Orleans because of his interest in jazz and to write a book about it. He makes ~~two~~ <sup>two</sup> references to his British research er. He makes no reference by name to Gurvich, his volunteer second chief investigator and maybe one side reference to him, I'm now not sure. At the same time he still treats Farewell America as a serious book rather than what he finally knew it was, a disinformation by the French SDECE. He has no reference to the group that financed him, Truth and Consequences, not even to its existence or help. It does not exist so far as this book is concerned. His, particularly with his gross misrepresentation of the phony indignation he expressed over Bixley at the Arizona or New Mexico college in which he says that Bixley was wasting HIS money, makes it appear that he financed his flights of fancy with his personal funds. He didn't.

There are points where I think he mixes up the various so-called anti-Castro "training camps" that in reality were the sucked-bait for scams. There were three that I know of, besides the cabin raided for the explosives found there. He refers only to one and that was largely a Minuteman-type thing with few Cubans in a total of only about 10 men. Yet he refers over and over again to the heavy alleged passage of Cubans through Banister's office, which in an of itself is not substantiated and I'm sure is not true. He knows so little about these things he seems to confuse the explosives place with camps. It was merely a small house on a building lot and they never did locate it. I did, without no trouble at all. He says the FBI raided it because of Kennedy's policy of ending attacks on Castro. In fact it was raided after the complaint of a neighbor I interviewed, concerned because he'd seen those crazies bring that stuff there in a Uhaul trailer and then almost blew the whole area up with careless trash burning.

He never does say that his investigators, save for volunteers and one incompetent wished off on him by Lane, Steve Jaffee, later a successful Hollywood flack, were regular members of the New Orleans police. They may have been good investigators for normal police work but they were utterly lost in this kind of work. He and they were not even able to follow up on what he knew from Oswald in New Orleans about Moonfield - and they could have won the Shaw case if they had followed it up, as

I did years later when it was first possible for me, when I was in Memphis. Shaw's alibi for the Clinton witnesses who placed Shaw, Oswald and Ferrie together is that it had been impossible for him to leave New Orleans because he was so busy renting space in the new Trade Mart. My other lead on this was a picture he knew all about from the Commission's records, the people in it identified in FBI records. It included the Bloomfield man who was actually in charge of renting that space, which Bloomfield had contracted to do. They did it, not Shaw.

There is one area in which he is fair to Shaw, his peculiarities. Garrison for the first time indicates Shaw's s-m preference. He did <sup>not</sup> leak to the papers the results of the search of Shaw's home. Returns on search warrants are publicly available and a reporter looked at it. It does not mention what <sup>he</sup> knew had been observed ~~but~~ but was not, naturally, taken. There were two large <sup>(12x20)</sup> hooks in the ceiling of Shaw's bedroom,

Where he does refer to a witness he says identified Thornley as the man in the Mexican visa line along with a picture of Oswald, I'm glad he did not recall my work, first at his request, on identifications. I interviewed Douglass Jones of the Jones Printing Co., which printed the Hands Off Cuba leaflet Oswald had. Jones identified Thornley in four different pictures of about a hundred I showed him. I then made the only clandestine tape I made, that their request. They had an amateurish arrangement of a regular tape recorder inside an attach case. It was so primitive a contraption I had to turn it on before I entered Jones' place. I got a clear enough recording but it was a good thing Jones spoke to me as soon as I got there or the tape would have run out before I began the interview. Somehow they managed to lose the tape and Boxley, who went with me, claimed the opposite of the truth on this. I then played the tape and Jvon and others heard it. Later I went back with Sciambra and interviewed both Jones and Myra Silver, each separately but in the presence of the other. I used the same pictures. Neither could see what pictures I showed the other and they both identified the same pictures of Thornley as the one who got the leaflets and both failed to pick any of the Oswald pictures..... He claims that Boxley was planted on him and was working for the CIA still and here he had something tangible and didn't use it. (I have that tape, made in the open.)

If nobody exposes Garrison in any of the promotions already scheduled and in some ways already begun, like his New Orleans press conferences for the second of which he had Gandolfo with him, this book, because it is written so well and has been made into a real-life novel may sell well. Gandolfo says he is to be in New York day after tomorrow, and is having a big press conference the next day, and that he is scheduled for an appearance with Ted Koppel the night after that. He had told me earlier that some of the morning shows, like Today, had expressed an interest. If a George Lardner is there and has read the book, and if he spots the ignorance Garrison displays of such basic things as the confusion I've noted between the Banister and the old Cuban "evolutionary Council offices and the mislocating of Banister's office, it can become the farce it should be.

From what Gandolfo has told me Sheridan Square is spending quite a bit in advance promotions. Garrison is being put up in the Plaza in New York, for example. He had real spreads in New Orleans, from Gandolfo's description....If we have to refer to this, I'm keeping a copy in the special file I've made of the observances of the 25th anniversary., his book being one.

Best,

*Harold*