

Not furnished
(not sent)

28 March 1969

Dr. A. George Abbott
Assassination Inquiry Committee
4718 Saratoga Avenue
San Diego 92107

Dear Dr. Abbott,

I have read your mid-Shaw trial Newsletters with special interest and I look forward with considerable curiosity to your post-trial issue indicating your editorial position in the aftermath of the verdict and the reindictment of Shaw a few days after the unanimous finding of the jury, presumably on the basis of exactly the same "evidence" which the jury had decisively rejected.

In your Newsletter of 25 February 1969 Prescott Nichols, who recently called upon the critics to unite and "Support Jim Garrison!", admits to the bleakness of Garrison's "case" against Shaw and to his incomprehensible equivocation about the Archives evidence (including the autopsy photographs and X-rays) which he had called for as indispensable to the prosecution. Nichols openly relied "purely on faith" that Garrison would yet vindicate the confidence placed in him and the impassioned advocacy and promotion of his efforts, by your AIC and similar groups, individuals, and publications. But now the trial is over, and I shall be most interested to know AIC's position in its wake, and in view of the acknowledgment in your last issue, in the interview with Art Kevin, of the unconvincing evidence against Shaw and the inadequate prosecution attack on the Dealey Plaza evidence and witnesses per se.

For two years I have been urged and implored to suspend judgment on Garrison until he had his chance in court, with the explicit or implicit condition that if Garrison failed to fulfill his claims and boasts his supporters would acknowledge his failure and their own mistaken judgment. But now that the predicted fiasco has taken place before the eyes of the whole world, many of these adherents blandly disregard that same jury verdict for which they demanded I should wait and continue to praise and exonerate Garrison, finding every conceivable scapegoat to blame for his derelictions. Others admit disappointment and disillusion but make no public acknowledgment on the ground that they do not wish to kick Garrison when he is down. Since they would not kick him when he was "up," despite every cause to do so, it is evident that according to their criteria Garrison is to be immune from criticism regardless of circumstances. One dedicated Garrisonite, after devoting reams of typescript to propaganda on behalf of the New Orleans prosecutor, gave exactly one line to the outcome of the trial, and that was to say that the verdict was a "victory for the newsmakers."

I would like to hope that the AIC will squarely confront the facts, bitter though they may be, and not stoop to Warren Report-like sophistries attempting to vindicate a position which has completely collapsed. Those who contributed, even in good faith, to the sordid Garrison campaign which culminated in editorials coast to coast dismissing any further attempts to reopen the Warren Report and ridiculing the WR critics and their "conspiracy theories," must at least take responsibility for their role. It was, after all, crystal clear that Garrison's caprices and lunacies would discredit not him alone but the whole critics' and citizens' effort; and I do not envy those who now have this on their conscience, whether or not they are honorable enough to accept it.