

10/21/67

Dear Sylvia,

Glad your book is attractive. Hope they make a real effort with it. I've just gotten the first copy of Oswald in New Orleans and note the sloppiness with which it was prepared. Like leaving out the table of contents and the other books I've written. I fear the time I have the chance to go through it.

Do not begin by apologizing for the inevitable errors. First, we are all human; Manchester has a monopoly only on intent. Next, the design is of the report and its authors, who made a certain amount of error inescapable. Compare the critical writings with that of the apologists, and I feel there is no need to apologize for our side. To those who know you, no apology is necessary; to the other side, none can accomplish anything.

In yours of 10/19 you say what I meant about emotion. There is no need to apologize for it, every reason to feel it. The problem is does it interfere with judgement, does it alter proper values and relationships. Please believe me when I say that insofar as those we both consider "critics" have revealed their attitudes to me, your representation is not fair.

I believe the first of the copies I am to get of O in NO were shipped. I'll mail you one as soon as they arrive.

My own schedule for the immediate future is jammed. Moving and the proliferation of problems over what I (or the bank and its appraisers) could anticipate are of a sort to educate Mr. Blendings. I've spent so much time on them and keeping up to date on other things, I've done no writing. I'll have to spend the coming week preparing for my trip. Monday in Washington, 10/30 I go to New York for a press conference 10/31, of which I know no details. I expect to spend until then trying to unravel the Dell situation. I hope we can get together, 11/1 I do a show with Jack McKaney, the next day, assuming nothing is arranged in Philadelphia, home, to leave for N.O. 11/5. 11/8, Chicago, 11/10, p.m., Frisco, where a TV taping session is scheduled for 27 minutes after touchdown, a time when I'll hardly be out of the airport. I understand this is how my Frisco schedule is. I have friends working on it there. Early am 11/15, L.A., where I hope Steve has arranged a speaking engagement at UCLA, with an invitation to Liebel to be there (and an empty chair is he isn't). If this does not materialize, I'll likely stay in Frisco for another day to take advantage of the available opportunities, then go to LA 11/16 early a.m. Early plane for Dallas 11/20, where I have a three-hour talk show on the McLendon KLF! Next a.m., home. Imagine an invitation to go to Dallas and be on radio! Arranged by a radical-right, racist "fan" who I hope has not simultaneously arranged another execution.

The kind of thing that doesn't show of which I've tried to tell you in the past is this: I now know that without doubt my west-coast distributor has been refusing to fill orders. I doubt it this will happen with Hobbs, Merrill, but it is a sign of our sick time and what our opposition is capable of.

Best regards,

10/19/67

Dear Harold,

My thanks for your letter of 10/15/67 and please forgive me for not typing this but my fingers are rebelling after years of draft reports on the General Assembly.

I had expected a copy of my book on 10/25 or 10/27. Imagine my amazement when a messenger delivered it on 10/17/67, a week or more ahead of schedule! I am pleased with the jacket and general design of the book. As yet I have but one single copy but I hope to speed one to you next week, when a supply arrives. And I sincerely hope that the book will not disappoint you seriously - although I feel it inevitable that you and my other colleagues will find some flaws and errors - inadvertent, I assure you. At the face we have all been working, it is perhaps unavoidable, but, as I said, inadvertent - as was my use of your name as one of six in Gurwich, already retracted. I thought you had been among those who told me he was Chief Investigator - Frankly, there was no reason (before his defection) to make any record or tally. I had to rely on recollection and I completely accept your statement (and Bethell's) that I was mistaken. I can only reiterate that it was in good faith.

I agree that there is a difference between destroying an original and a copy. But that is not what Garrison said. He said the document was destroyed, with the clear implication that it was destroyed in the same way that Humes' destroyed his "notes."

over

I am at the office so I cannot check the memo CE⁹⁴⁸, but I am not certain that one can conclude from its contents that it was the original that was destroyed by thermo fax. I will try to check that tonight. [later: It says "the copy in Oswald's passport file" which does not rule out the possibility that it was the original but does not provide grounds for saying it was. The point remains that Garrison did not shrink from quoting out of context so as to mislead the public. You are defending an argument he never made.]

Harold, you are quite right: I am "emotional" about Garrison, in the same way that I am about the WR, and as you are yourself unapologetically emotional on the WR. But that has not diminished your scholarship, your sense of responsibility and readiness to document in meticulous detail your assertions, or your ability to employ logic in evaluating facts and adducing cause-and-effect. So, clearly, emotionality in itself (as you argued in a conversation we once had, in which you decried the clinical, unemotional of the "intellectuals") is not sinful. It becomes dangerous only when it affects judgment or produces a manipulation of fact or truth for some ultimate "good" purpose. You may think my bias against Garrison is affecting my judgment, but I think the critics who defend him are affected by their bias for him. And I remind you that from January to April (or was it May?) I was 100% pro-Garrison and did everything in my power to assist him when I could — I didn't even wait to be asked. I found that I had been mistaken and it was a painful discovery. We will see, in the end, who is right. Best always,
Sabina