

7/23/68

Dear John,

This is my last copy of the Epstein answer. If you think you can do anything with it, copy and return. Paul Hoch has a copy. Hal can get it Xeroxed for 5 ¢ a page for you. It is to appear in the monthly BOOKS this week. They are sending a set of proofs to the San Diego people for use in their newsletter. They have and will use the picture of Oswald in his CAP uniform, the FBI reports I quote (also SS), the picture of 541 Camp-531 Lafayette, etc. There is enough visual for TV use. ~~xx~~

I do not know if there will be any other interest after BOOKS comes out. I know the editor has a column which is published in New York, possibly in the underground press, and has used some of it, for I've gotten some reaction.

There is no active public official about whom legitimate complaint cannot be made. The question is: are Epstein's complaints legitimate? For the most part, they are not. They are out of context and inaccurate—in some cases the opposite of truth, as, for example, with the tape of which we just spoke and NBC. He does not do legal dirty tricks. He does not bug phones, for example. He is not the kind of guy who would try and corrupt a witness. He hasn't the means, for he has no money. In the specific case, he did the opposite. On the fact of Epstein's slime, I'd say he is wrong. On the opinion, Garrison has to use the press when he can to stay alive. He is under the heaviest campaign that can be mounted. He has to try and prevent the advance contamination of the judges and the jury, aside from the urgent need of preventing the intimidation of potential witnesses, one of the obvious focus of the opposition. But he never mentions Shaw and hasn't. Touchstone: when he got all that socialist paraphernalia when he searched Shaw's home (with a warrant), he made no release, issued no pix, etc. The only reason it got out at all is that the law requires the filing of an inventory of what was seized with the court. That this man, naturally, did, and an alert reporter, knowing this, checked it out.

I could make criticisms of Garrison, too. But on the fact of the case, I am satisfied he is right. I am also satisfied he has not endangered Shaw's rights in anything he has ever said to the press. Nothing that I can recall, in any event.

Soon as I hear from Hal I'll be in touch.

Sincerely,