

July 17, 1968

Dear Gary,

I want to thank you for both your letters, and the two slides enclosed in the second one. I am very tight for time, at present, as I am trying to bring to a head the "book" project. I will feel much relieved as soon as it is completed, which should be sometime in the next week.

Therefore, please permit me to put off answering in detail the questions you raised in your last letter. I started to compose a reply, and it went on and on and on. Garrison is a very difficult topic to discuss in a letter; in person, I'm sure I could spend three or 4 hours in a very fruitful dialogue.

In any event, I will retype my letter to you that I have drafted, and xerox some enclosures that I think you should read.

If it is possible, I would like to get copies of the major stuff you have written. I once saw an article you wrote that appeared in your college magazine, but I only had the briefest of looks at a copy Hal Verb had.

I will send you copies of what I have written, and especially the material on Garrison. This material will receive much wider publication, if and when he sets a trial date on Thornley. Also, on its appearance in a local underground paper, Weiberg wrote several letters attacking me and Kerry, to which we each replied. That makes a total of four lengthy "letters to the editor" that I think you will also be interested in.

Of course, this week's New Yorker magazine contains a long article on Garrison. I'm most curious to know how the Garrison camp deals with all the points raised therein. (I was, naturally, disappointed in the pro-Warren report tone Epstein gave the article, but that is his hang-up; the anti Garrison material he deals with is really quite devastating).

Finally, I suppose you have heard the story of the "missaries" from ~~XXX~~ RFK? Do you believe the story? Are you aware that there are those on intimate terms with G's office (or at least were on such terms) who claim that the whole tale was made up by Lane, and was then subscribed to by Garrison, and that absolutely no such "missaries" exist! (I don't believe the story at all, though I would go wherever the evidence leads; I long ago, however, stopped believing any unsupported assertion by Garrison or Lane.)

In the last analysis, it's all a matter of credibility and integrity, topics which cannot be done justice in a brief letter. Presuming you are in behavioral psycho, I think you would have a special interest in trying to satisfy yourself as to how a man who appears to be sincere could possibly be so wrong, should it turn out that this is the case. Conversely, I think Garrison's sincerity has served, with many, as a substitute for competence in the manner in which he conducts his investigation, the theories he propounds, ---his general performance.

All this and more must be discussed in greater length in a future letter. Meanwhile, please pardon my delay. There is much to do, and far too little time available.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel