

Dear Dave,

Please note the notes I made on pages 136-7, the last two of Chapter 23, as an example of atrociously irresponsible writing. There is no substance to any of this, no sources are given (and it appears to be impossible to have any real sources for any of it), it isn't even reasonable. It is irrational conjecture, fabrication, falsehood, misrepresentation and pure invention. Can you imagine any FBI agents conniving with the mafia? The odd thing is that one truthful statement he makes intending that it be taken as impossible or untrue is, according to Garrison and those of his people who discussed it with me and the reporters I knew, and I think some lawyers in private practise, the actuality. Marcello was not engaged in any discernible criminal activity. Everybody assumed he was throwing his weight around in his legitimate business activities and getting some benefit from that but that he did have extensive legitimate business interests and was not caught outside the law in them. If you think about it, he would have been foolish to jeopardize the profits he was making inside the law. This relates only to Orleans Parish. I have no knowledge of any other area from these people who were in a position to know....Do you think critical analysis of these two pages would be a good exercise for students?

.....Lesar says that Davis had a hundred or two hundred pages of footnotes that the publisher insisted be omitted and that the book was delayed by hassles with the publisher's lawyer over libel possibilities. (They are very real if the people are alive or in a position to sue, as for example I think Marcello isn't.)

.....As I've been reading a conclusion has been forming and when I read the first page, which is only a half-page, of chapter 32, page 189, I'm convinced that Davis has not only not done his homework on the basis of the established facts - he has poor retention of what he might have picked up from watching some crap like the British version of The Trial of Lee Harvey Oswald when he was doing something else at the same time. He has, for example, Oswald getting the bus at the TSB, Roger Craig seeing a false Oswald running on the expressway, his word.

Davis is a novelist and this book is a crummy novel.

If he really had the notes Lesar says he had, they were not old-fashioned footnotes because eliminating them would have required resetting the type throughout the entire book. They were notes supposedly referring to pages. In any event, I find myself wondering if the real reason they were omitted is because they would have assured libel actions. This mishmash of fancy, stupidity, wishful thinking and fabrication cannot possibly be supported by any kinds of notes but would have to be attributed to people. This is where there certainly would have been libel possibilities. His carelessness and his novelist's fabrications based dimly on reality, like what he says about Wasserman spending a long time "foraging" through my files (see my letter to publisher on this), which is quite false when he knew the truth, his stating that I granted a formal interview when we never met and had none by phone, illustrates what I mean about him, his writing and his approach to and regard for fact and reality.

As I say in a note I hope you can read this egomaniac is to writers like sisters and ambulance-chasers are to lawyers.

.... I'm to Chapter 45 and it gets steadily worse as he builds new fictions on the flimsy dreams on the earlier pages. I was quite surprised to see that in his handling of the CIA's mafia plot with Roselli et al Davis omits the story of the Dan Martin/Phyllis McGuire wiretapping that Jim has and I do also. I am sure that he was told of its content and that he could have it by me or by the student working here for him. No mention at all. I wonder why without wasting time trying to figure it out.

Best,