

1622 Cadiz Street,
New Orleans,
La. 70115
Dec 21, 1969

Dear Sylvia,

Enclosed are clippings from the States-Item re: the sensational arrest of Judge Edward Haggerty last Wednesday night. From the same paper there is a clipping about Garrison's back surgery. There has of course been considerable speculation that Garrison ordered the raid, knowing that Haggerty was there, and I suppose this is a possibility, although of course G. was in the hospital at the time. The acid test will come when we see whether the grand jury (ie Garrison) decides to press charges or not.

I am not entirely out of sympathy for Haggerty--he is by no means the worst Judge on the bench, and at least sometimes acts independently of G's wishes; nor can I entirely sympathise with him, since nobody compelled him to be at the "stag party", and I am sure he has moralised at many a defendant from the bench. Whatever happens, the incident will serve to tighten still further Garrison's grip on the judiciary, and so it is to be regretted. (They showed the raid--surprisingly--on TV, and it really was extraordinary to see Haggerty rolling on the floor, wrestling with policemen. Of course, his treatment of Habighorst comes to mind.)

Yesterday I had a call from Stanley Primmer, who was in New Orleans. He came over to see me, with his Brazilian wife (who apparently speaks almost no English,) and we talked for a couple of hours. He said he had recently spoken to you. He struck me as being very anxious to find some way of concluding that Garrison's case had been valid, and, I am afraid, the kind of person whose mind works in such a way that he is able to sustain his beliefs more or less whatever you tell him. Sentences tend to start, "Alright, let us suppose, just for the sake of argument...." and then great constructions are built on these premises. (Let us suppose that Shaw is in fact a CIA agent...let us suppose that Russo is in fact telling the truth...that kind of nonsense.)

I was surprised that Primmer, who is apparently ~~has not~~ so interested in the case, has read neither Brener's ~~not~~ Epstein's book--but he has read Flammonde's. He also wanted to know how to get in touch with Sciambra, because Weisberg had told him that he was the person to talk to in N.O. I told him Alcock would be preferable, and he did in fact have a phone conversation with Alcock, and, I believe, met Sciambra briefly. I'm afraid that Primmer is so anxious to believe that G's rhetoric is true--CIA plot, etc.--that it is probably impossible to convince him that G had no case. Of course, I told him that nobody was more anxious to believe in G than me, having spent two years working for him, etc., and that I had bent over backwards trying to construe the Shaw case as being valid, but there was no way it could be done, and Primmer indicated he saw my point, but maybe privately thought I was a CIA agent nevertheless. I could not resist telling him of Mary Ferreri's conclusion about Boxley--that he really never worked for the CIA, only pretended to, and that in fact there are no doubt fewer CIA agents around--not more--than one would expect. Primmer I think is like an acquaintance you once described to me in a letter, (a friend of Sprague,) who was, you said, "privately and basically very pro-Garrison," (you thought.)

I wrote a letter to the NY Times, New Yorker, Nixon and States-Item, complaining about the implications of the President's "Southern ~~strategy~~", not that it is Southern, but ~~that~~ a vote getting policy implies expedience ~~and~~ conviction, and that somebody should tell Nixon that he was not elected Pres. so that he could get himself re-elected four years later.

rather than

All best wishes for Christmas & New Year,
Cora.