

A. George Abbott, M.D.
San Diego AIC

5 May 1969

Dear George Abbott:

I see from your mid-trial and post-acquittal Newsletters that you and your collaborators are keeping a stiff upper chin about the mortifying outcome of the Shaw trial. Well, maybe Garrison will do better his next time in court, prosecuting five dangerous protesters for flag desecration (New Orleans States-Item, 25 April 1969).

The transcript of the Mark Lane interview, comforting though it may be to the gnostics in your midst, unfortunately omits the following important passage:


"...I think the American people are going to have to rest upon the decision that the jury makes...In the trial here the rules of evidence are being applied as they were written a long time ago and as they should be applied...And I for one am willing to allow that decision to speak for the evidence, and I just hope that the rest of America is willing to take the same position."

Well, I, for another, do accept the jury's decision, even if Lane (as it turns out) does not, and even if AIC opines--after the trial for which it clamored--that "just how innocent Clay Shaw is still remains in doubt." A splendid evidence of your respect for due process and for the prohibition against double jeopardy, as anyone can see. It shows your readiness to join the Warren Report apologists in adhering irreversibly to a fixed position ("Oswald...lone assassin" in their fogue), however many waves of evidence show it to be specious and however much proof piles up that the investigative authority (the Warren Commission, for its Faithful) has resorted to falsification and fraud. (Ever consider that "just how innocent Garrison is" is what is really in doubt?)

You now have the answers to the questions you raised in your 3 October 1968 letter, penultimate paragraph. No: "P.O. 19106" was not a central feature of Garrison's "case"--he did not dare even to mention it at the trial. No: Shaw did not give "Bertrand" as an alias--and although Judge Haggerty explicitly denounced Habighorst as a liar, and his fellow-officers contradicted his allegations, Garrison (who indicts for perjury as readily as I send birthday cards) has filed no charges this time. (Too busy with those diabolical flag-desecrators?) No: Garrison did not have evidence undisclosed before the trial--he had less evidence than he bombastically announced to the world, not "more" (no "code," no William S. Walter on the FBI TWX alert, not even Fred Leemans, from whose recanting recantations Garrison got so much front-page mileage only weeks before the trial). But the unsatisfactory answers to your questions have not, I note, moved you or the committee to reconsider your position on Garrison.

When do you get your Junior G-Man badges?

Yours sincerely,


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

(Feel free to publish this letter if you wish)