

12/21/70

JW, PH, GRS, RB,HR,

I was rather surprised to get a glowingly-endorsed copy of Garrison's book from him, and just at a time when I'd planned to write you, taking as my texts a quote in the S-I of 12/14. I have written him. Since then I've gotten through the first half of the book.

If there is anything original, new and dependable in it to the point I've reached, I didn't notice it. As some of you have heard me say, I don't know what kind of lawyer he is, but he sure is a great writer.

There is minor error in parts with which you may not be familiar. One that comes immediately to mind (and of no consequence) is his account of Ferrie's return from his Texas trip. Ferrie did not scam because he heard a strange voice answering his own phone. His lawyer told him to. And why.

The omission of names baffles me. Vix, Jack Martin's. And this is but one of a number of contradictory accounts, all from Martin, of the beating by Banister. For this particular one I am responsible, having elicited it from Jack and taken him to Jim with it. I do not endorse it. I have no way of reaching an independent judgement.

One of the more fascinating deviousnesses of the book is the wholesale adoption of the work of others masked, in the Thompson manner, by seemingly generous credit in footnotes. However, in almost all cases, what is credited to most is mere citation of the official evidence. The concept of the first half is not original and is an exaggeration of the original source. It is persuasively done, though.

Some of the avoidances of original sources titillates, as with the citations on LHO's security clearance, two references being different and neither the real one. Another is merely to JD 75, rather encompassing. I'm not checking all citations, but some of those I do are fun. Mark, for example, is extensively credited with what he did not originate. It seems as though there is a conscious effort to seem to be crediting all critics with something.

Sincerely,