

2/27/67

Shirley,

Yes, "Fairy" is Ferris. This was (I thought) my "contribution" to Garrison's investigation, when I had a visit from T.B. about six weeks ago; I was wild with excitement at being able to place Ferris in Dallas, which he had denied. But T.B. has since told me that McCullough now denies that he spoke to Fairy or Ferris in Dallas—he claims that the FBI garbled the story given by Barnes and that he (McCullough) was only referring to something repeated to him on a long-distance call about a man "Fairy" who offered a theory about hypnosis, etc. I think this is a bald lie.

So far as Garrison is concerned, everything I hear about him is reassuring and inspiring. I am told by those who have spent time with him recently, and one person who comes from New Orleans and knows him, that he is incorruptible; honest; independent; very intelligent, intellectual, and liberal in his thinking; and fearless. I am told also that he definitely has something, and a lot more than has been leaked to the press.

Of course the lousy press is trying to discredit and ridicule him. We have not been able to get the New Orleans papers here—they sell out instantaneously at the out of town papar stand at Times Square. But they sure are doing a job on him.

Thanks for your letter to Father Huber. Is he going to be capable of shame? I have little (none) experience with the priesthood but I am afraid I will not be astonished if his sense of honor and his fidelity to the truth resemble those maggots Schiller and Lewis more than Pope's John. (I hope this does not offend you—it is not intended that way.)

Shirley, I do have to say that I am very much disturbed by your letter to Arnoni of TMO. I find it most unjust that you should attack him. From the very first day, he has taken an impeccable position on the assassination and on Vietnam and on every single count we researchers and critics owe him the most profound respect and thanks for his fearlessness and for his constant publication of criticism of the MR—by Lane, by Feldman, by Salandria, and many others (letters to the editor as well as articles) including a number of my articles. Even if he was wrong in an editorial on any subject and one wanted to express disagreement, it would be completely unjustified to take a disrespectful and abusive tone. We all owe this man too much. But on the editorial "A Dead Brother Is No Brother" he is absolutely right, without a shadow of a doubt, however painful it may be to read that most deplorable truth. I fully agree with the editorial—so do a number of our colleagues. The Kennedys are using their power to hamper, obstruct, and oppose everything you and I have been doing—how can you doubt it, after that "authorized statement" from RFK and EMK read to the whole nation by that cheap shyster Louis Mizer? Your ability to maintain faith in the Ks is your own affair and I have realized long ago that it is something on which we do not and cannot agree and that we should stay off the subject, since it is non-productive and potentially estranging. I don't want to inject myself into your disagreement with Arnoni but on the other hand I too have a conscience and I can't burden it with the self-suspicion that I failed to express myself out of cowardice. We are so much in agreement on so many fundamental elements that I am deeply sad that we should be so far apart on the issue of the Kennedys—I am bitterly disappointed with them and disgusted, that is one thing that I would not belabor with you since you know my feelings already. But I cannot stay silent when you have attacked a man to whom we all have reason to display the greatest respect and gratitude. Try, please do try, Shirley, to understand that for those who are not burdened, or blessed, by unshakeable faith in the Kennedys, their position can in no way be justified. And that to attack someone for expressing an honest and widely-held view about them must not be grounds for estrangement

among us—who have endured so much together. I know that you will do your best to understand my feelings and my deep friendship for you—which is the very reason for my writing to you now, which I would not do with someone who meant less to me. As always, Sylvia