

1115^{NO} BEVERLY DRIVE
BEVERLY HILLS CALIFORNIA
October 15, 1967

The Editor
The Minority of One
155 Pennington Avenue
Passaic, New Jersey 07055

To The Editor:

"The Minority of One" is, in my opinion, a periodical of the greatest significance. This nation has been increasingly deprived by the news media of any point of view other than the official one. The unanimity, during these cold war years, with which the press has directed what we are allowed to know and what must be concealed from us has been a blatant exercise of power and control. The cruelties and deceptions perpetrated by "the people in high places" have not only rarely been questioned by the news media, but they have been accepted and even heralded. For this reason, "The Minority of One" is a unique and necessary organ which affords the American people the opportunity of examining the other side of the coin. It has fastidiously thrust into debate the great issues of our time and has, with perspicacity and devotion to objectivity, searched for truth.

It was with great dismay, therefore, that I read "Garrison and Warren: Anything in Common?" in the October issue, for this is a subject upon which I feel personally qualified to comment, having devoted the last three years of my life to a study of the Kennedy assassination. In this article, the standards of objectivity and honest challenge which I have come to expect from "The Minority of One" are sadly missing.

To begin with, there can be no responsible analogy drawn between Warren and Garrison. Time will not permit me to elaborate on why this is so but the simple fact is that the verdict on the work of the Warren Commission's case is already in, we have seen the evidence and we have been able to evaluate it for the deception that it is - whereas Mr. Garrison's case has yet to be tried, we have not seen his evidence, and the verdict has not been handed down. I will not here belabor the comparison between a powerful governmental commission with the support of every investigative agency in the country at its disposal (to say nothing of the entire news media, with few exceptions) - and a single individual in a restricted jurisdictional situation who has been the victim of overt governmental and media interference and suppression. That there are troublesome aspects of the Garrison investigation, thus far, is undeniable. Mr. Garrison has developed some seemingly questionable witnesses and evidentiary material. I do not quarrel with T.M.O.'s contention on

that score. I do question are some of the statements made in the article which I know to be a misrepresentation of the facts.

For example, the statement "Garrison wanted them all (independent researchers) in his corner and carefully cultivated their friendship and support" is a total misrepresentation, at least insofar as I am concerned. Over the past five or six months I have sent numerous communications to Mr. Garrison and had I not taken the precaution of sending them "Return Receipt Requested", I would never have known that they had reached their destination. Mr. Garrison, at no time, responded to my comments. Just two weeks ago, I finally received a letter from him thanking me for my accumulated mailings. I am not the only researcher to have experienced this lack of immediate response. I know of several others who have also offered Mr. Garrison suggestions from time to time to whom he has not responded. (I do not consider this discourtesy on his part; I recognize that he is besieged by such mail, and that he has overwhelming demands on his time.) How, then, can "The Minority of One" categorically state that he has "carefully cultivated" our friendship and support? On the other hand, Mr. Garrison can hardly be criticized for summoning Harold Weisberg, Ray Marcus and Vincent Salandria to appear before the Grand Jury in New Orleans for the purpose of revealing the results of their research on the case. On the contrary, he would have been remiss, in my opinion, had he not availed himself of the opportunity to study and assimilate the excellent and important contributions made by these gentlemen in the interest of extracting certain basic truths about the assassination. Had he not done so, he might conceivably have been charged with bias and arrogance in his approach.

For another example, "The Minority of One" says "there are several criteria of judgment which Mr. Garrison cannot escape... Procrastination may not serve as escape from responsibility, and no district attorney may be allowed infinite time to substantiate or withdraw his charges". These statements would lead the reader to believe that it is Mr. Garrison who is escaping from his responsibility by procrastinating about the trial and by purposely thwarting it toward an indefinite resolution. This is a complete distortion of the facts, for it is the defense which has demanded first that the charges be quashed, next that there be a change of venue, and the fact that the trial, once scheduled for late October, is now postponed until January has been due to the efforts of Mr. Shaw's attorneys and not to any attempts on the part of Mr. Garrison.

There are other statements in the article which are less than truthful. My purpose in writing this letter is not to plead the case for Mr. Garrison. I do not know what evidence

he has or has not. For no reason why, however, when judges and grand juries find sufficient cause to bind a man over for trial, the District Attorney should not be allowed to proceed with his case and to stand or fall on the evidence presented in a courtroom.

What saddens me is that a periodical which has earned the most profound respect for its singular integrity, courage and honor has allowed its prejudice against the tactics of the District Attorney of New Orleans to besmirch its reputation for uncompromising representation of the facts.

Very sincerely,

Maggie Field.