

1/7/69

Dear Penn,

On reading your editorial when your issue of the first arrived Saturday, I decided to say nothing further, feeling it would do no good. I have a few minutes before something I must do on the hour, about 10 minutes, and I write feeling I owe this to you.

First, I tell you frankly I am dismayed that you would write of me in such a manner without at least asking me, checking with me.

Second, there are errors of fact, some major, some minor, like "Broader" when I think you'll find it is "Browder", if that is the same as the report I have.

With the question, as you cut it, the integrity of Boxley's work, do you feel justified in taking his word alone? On the fact of his work there were sources available to you. I have no reason to believe you checked with any, and I doubt Vince had much knowledge of it, though you talked to him. You did not phone me. Did you speak to Jim?

You quote me without having spoken to me before you wrote and published your editorial. You also quote Fensterwald, who wasn't even there at the time in question, having left two days earlier. Did you speak to him before attributing to him?

That Perrin "wrote" under the name Starr is fascinating, for if the work with which I am familiar shows anything, it shows he could barely write his name and no evidence whatsoever of any "writing", indeed, no evidence of any being sought. Here, suddenly, Nancy's word becomes the given one.

Your paragraph beginning in "the answers may never be ~~known~~ found" is in several basic ways erroneous. Perhaps, as it refers to Vince alone, it might ^{be} be, and he is not plural, therefore, clearly, you intend including me. It is not true of any member of Garrison's staff to whom I have spoken of this, and I think I have to all concerned. It also is not true of me. Here you have taken Boxley's word or imagined it. Whatever, it is wrong.

I tell you again that Palmer told me they really had nothing. He seems suddenly to have left New Orleans, to which he had moved on a permanent basis, not just for the month he had said he would be there working on a book - and the character and content of the book changed with each reference to it. Have you forgotten that he is the source of the mercenary Youngblood? Or that his own dedication to Garrison is reflected in his copying the Alyce film I had borrowed and persistently failing to return it - and above all in describing that man who in the press at least is Garrison's star witness as one of the assassins? There is also reason to believe that he was not in on all the interviews in N.O.

Penn, need I tell you there can be suspicious things in the lives of people of the demi-world without them fairly being interpreted as other than what they are and mean? And that rhetorical non sequiturs may be effective literary devices but are without meaning?... That "respected mechanic" bit is pretty good, considering that he couldn't even get the job on his own, Nancy getting it for him.

I will not carry this further with you. I feel that I owe you the attempt to get you to do the kind of checking you expect of the government before you go off half-cocked. One of their co-conspirators wasn't even in the country! You will do what you will do, and you will be convinced you are right, for otherwise you would not do it. You will also, I am satisfied, ^{eventually} know you did otherwise. Regretfully,