

About Garrison

Dear Editor:

Marvin Jones, in his letter in last week's Freep, characterizes Jim Garrison's prosecution of Clay Shaw as a "massive power play for personal notoriety". Mr. Jones is not the first nor will he be the last to assert this. He goes on to detail how Garrison "craftily" milked the case for "personal credit". Credit like the demands for his resignation by editorials all over the country including those in New Orleans? Like scorn from every news

medium and threats of disbarment by the American Bar Association? I mean if he's so clever setting up this whole thing for personal gain why does he suddenly get stupid and blow it? Because he wants to commit political (and maybe personal) suicide? There are other ways to gain prestige and political power than attacking the very soul of that prestige and power.

Mr. Jones exhorts us to look at the "actual facts and not what Garrison tells (us) are the facts". We'd love to. If only the governmental agencies denying us access to those facts (sealed in the National Archives, FBI files and elsewhere) would let us! In the meantime each individual's judicious sifting of all points of view of what is or is not fact is all we have. It is my judgment, based on the evidence available to us and the government's extreme sensitivity a-

about the whole issue, that more than one gun was fired in Dealy Plaza. I don't reach that conclusion because of what anybody says except those witnesses whose testimony bears on the case.

If I am being "led by the nose" it is because I smell something foul.

Very truly yours,
Ivan Dryer