

29 August 1968

Mr. Griscom Morgan
Route 1, Box 275
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

Dear Mr. Morgan,

I appreciate your letter of the 25th and the enclosures, which I shall read with interest as soon as my attention is disengaged from the carnage in Chicago.

I have no information on the Miami tape except the press story that I sent you and no reason to doubt its validity.

Regretfully, I cannot agree with your further elucidation of your position on Garrison. That public men, or just men, are not all black or all white but grey seems to me axiomatic, in philosophical and moral terms. That does not imply that each time we denounce Lyndon Johnson for the criminal war in Vietnam we are obliged to enter a rider to the effect that he is not 100 percent evil but a grey mixture. The fact that Garrison is a tender father to his children (I am not being frivolous--this argument was actually posed to me by one of his muddle-headed admirers) is completely irrelevant to his "investigation."

In the context of that investigation, it is impossible to reduce the indictment against Garrison to mere "character weakness." As I have already stated, he has engaged in deliberate conscious fraud, falsehood, fabrication of evidence, and harassment of vulnerable individuals for the very reason that they were vulnerable or helpless. That he does this in the guise of a libertarian, an anti-establishmentarian, and a spokesman for truth and justice, does not mitigate his acts but makes them all the more obscene.

I reject your premise that Warren was merely weak. He took deliberate decisions, against the strong objection of his own legal staff, to protect Marina Oswald from cross-examination when she was a self-avowed demonstrable liar and the chief witness against Oswald. He overruled the lawyers who protested against reliance on Brennan and Markham. He tried to prevent the publication of the Hearings and Exhibits. He refused to permit Lane to represent Oswald's interests. He saw the Zapruder film with its plain evidence of an assassin in front of the car, and "found" a lone assassin in a building behind it. Excuse me, this is not weakness but something far more ugly and shameful. (Cooper probably signed the Report in good faith but he remains silent, long after it has been stripped of any claim to good faith or credibility. He has not the same degree of responsibility as Warren, but I am not about to strike a medal for the Senator.)

Many of us who received the Warren Report with decisive, clear, and uncompromising judgment see in the Garrison "report" such enormous convolutions and intricacies as to render it as occasion for agonized rationalizations and self-searching, endlessly intricate and incapable of resolution. I suspect that if he had accused Castro agents and the SDS, instead of the CIA and the Batistianos, none of the critics would have the smallest difficulty in seeing him for the cheap clumsy and unscrupulous phoney he is.


One of our colleagues, a critic who was always exceedingly generous about my work on the WR and my personal attributes, attacked me vehemently, in these words: "What right do you have to criticize Garrison? You've never held public office!" I am sorry to say that subsequent and more sophisticated arguments against my position have had little more logic or relevance.

No one has ever tried to silence me on the issue of the Warren Report. On the issue of Garrison, my fellow-critics have urged me to be silent and have even tried to discredit my book because on one of its 500 pages I had the audacity to express misgivings about him. They have not challenged the facts I elucidated against Garrison's "case" but sought to invest them with innocent motives and outright heroism. I am ashamed for them.

Many people have written to me asking, or demanding, that I justify my opposition to Garrison. I have tried to answer each of them conscientiously, honestly, and with painstaking detail, even if it had to be done after midnight and at some inconvenience. Perhaps the time will come when it is realized that it is Garrison, not his critics, who belongs in the witness-box and Garrison who is obliged to justify himself. Leo Sauvage has called him the Henry Wade of New Orleans, but I fear he was too generous. Wade, at least, never pretended to be an apostle of the cause of truth and justice or the New Left.

With these reservations, I am ready to agree that Garrison is as Grey as Dorian.

All good wishes,


Sylvia Meagher
302 West 12 Street
New York, N.Y. 10014