

10 March 1967

Dear Philippe,

Like you, my feelings about Garrison have fluctuated up and down. In fact, your telephone call from the airport rather discouraged me, since it followed a brief conversation with Sauvage, who flung acid scorn on Garrison, and was followed by a call I made to the Garrison investigator who had once visited me and who did not give me the reassurance that I hoped for. All that weekend I was in a brown mood, apprehensive that Garrison did not have the needed evidence to sustain his charges or his boasts, and that the press would succeed in its campaign of ridicule and burial.

Finally, some days later, I began to get trickles of information that revived my confidence. First, a magazine writer who is a former federal agent called me, having just arrived from New Orleans. He did not see Garrison but spent some hours with Gurvich, the chief investigator, and came away with the impression that Gurvich is a very high-calibre person who is running a highly professional and competent investigation and who has the evidence he needs, or enough of it, to give him a sense of inner confidence and sureness.

Next, I had a phone call from Garrison's investigator who some days earlier had not been able to bolster my confidence and optimism. This time, he left me quite exhilarated, for two reasons: (1) he had discovered a document in the Archives which he thought might be important and on which he asked my opinion, since he was not sufficiently familiar with the evidence to make a secure judgment. Well, it was important--very likely the definite proof of the deliberate fabrication of physical evidence against Oswald by a law-enforcement agency for which many of us have long been searching, to sustain the very strong impression we had that such evidence had indeed been forged. (2) Also, this chap now seemed far more confident and suggested that when the Clay Shaw hearing was held on the 14th, it would be (pardon the vulgarity, but I am quoting him) "like shit hitting an electric fan."

Now, to top it all, I got a phone call today from a very excited friend who works in the UN building and has been very helpful by alerting me to news stories, etc. (he is with a press agency). "What do you think" (he asked me gleefully) "is Clay Shaw's full name? It is Clay Bertrand Shaw!" I nearly shrieked with excitement; but I was already late to a meeting where I had to make a statement (I had been called back from the door of the elevator) and could not linger longer than to ask where this stunning information had been found; and he told me that someone had had the inspiration to look in the Harvard yearbook, and found it there! Now, I cannot vouch for this--maybe it is a mistake or a fantasy. But if it is true, and this chap has always been completely reliable and accurate, then it is a big development which should make Garrison's detractors look pretty sick. I am very sorry that Sauvage--whose logic is usually impeccable, as is his judgment--has such fixed views on Garrison. But, after all, Sauvage too can be wrong. I liked very much your Garrison profile (thanks for sending it), as also your New Orleans dispatches--you may be a minority of one, but I think you have picked the right side. And certainly I agree on the CIA connection as you analyzed it. So let us be of good heart; and let's stay in close touch while this continues to unfold. Affectionately,

Sylvia Meagher