

6 August 1967

Dear Shirley,

I am certainly glad that we are in general agreement on the subject of Garrison; I will keep your analysis of your views on G. carefully, so that it will be on record in the event of future need. Frankly, I don't think that you have to worry about G. emerging as a big hero. He may assume this posture, convincingly on some occasions, but in the end he will be seen for what he is--a man whose original intentions may have been bona fide, but whose ego, recklessness, and desperation gained control of him and turned him into an unscrupulous mountebank.

As you know, Vince has been down there for the last week. I have had some indirect word, not from Vince himself (I am eager to hear from him when he returns), to the effect that he has now seen the whole file in the case of Shaw, and that he feels there is no real case against him. As you say, Vince's adulation of G. has been extravagant and impassioned, to the point where it cast a real shadow over my relationship with Vince (which has been exceptionally close, devoted, and loyal, on both sides). Fortunately, we reconciled even before Vince went down to New Orleans. Even if he comes back as committed as ever to G., I refuse to allow this to spoil our friendship; but I now have some encouragement that he may return sobered and less "romantic" in his view of things.

Like you, Turner's enthusiasm also impressed me, since Bill Turner seems to have his feet squarely on the ground, seems to be mature, responsible, and realistic. I met him only once, quite a long time ago, and before my own opinion of Garrison had jelled (i.e., before the "code" and I think even before the Russo/Bundy testimony). On top of that, Ray Marcus and Harold, and of course Mark Lane, and still others, all raved and swore by the Garrison investigation (and I might add that they gushed praises of Mr. Gurvich, too, in his pre-defection days). The fact that we are in an isolated or minority position in distrusting Garrison should in no way weaken our judgment--after all, we have always been in the minority on the case, whether on the WR or before, or later... This is not to say that I am not disappointed and regretful to be at odds with the others. I am. But the evidence of my own eyes and ears is conclusive. I am certain that Garrison is a charlatan and a menace. If the others can't see that, it is too bad for them, but it doesn't weaken my certainty one iota. Incidentally, you and I are not completely alone in our scepticism and rejection--Sauvage was the first one to see through Garrison, I was next, and now Armond agrees, so does Bill O'Connell (Los Angeles, a close friend of Maggie's and Ray Marcus), and so does Labro, a French reporter who at first was violently pro-Garrison and wrote many articles praising and endorsing him, and who influenced me considerably in favor of Garrison in the early days. Later on, about the time of the so-called "code," he wrote apologizing to me for having misguided me, unintentionally, and even asking me to tell Sauvage that he (Sauvage) was right, and he (Labro) was wrong. I must say that I felt increased admiration and warmth for Labro for his honesty in acknowledging that he had been wrong and his willingness to see things as they were, once there was evidence against his earlier opinion.

I completely agree with your analysis of the MacNeill/Manchester affair; and as I wrote you a few days ago, it seems definitely established that the person who was really involved was Pierce Allan. You are also absolutely right in recognizing in Garrison's pronouncements a paraphrase of Harold Weisberg, or Penn, or Ray, or Lane, etc. This struck me with special force during his half-hour "rebuttal" of NBC. In fact, one of the most devious characteristics of Garrison is his pattern of adopting a critic's findings as his own, indiscriminately and without regard to the reliability of the critic in question or the findings in question. Those who already despise Garrison, or who will later become disgusted and disillusioned, will automatically reject the critics who are publicly supporting him and whose views he is parroting. The double standard of the critics in question has sometimes infuriated me. For example, two of our dear friends

were very critical of Tink Thompson for not having thought that Oswald might be innocent until the end of 1966. How they scorned and disparaged him for being so late to see the light. But they had no word of criticism (or apology) for Garrison's extremely late entry into the ranks of the sceptics and/or critics of the WR. Where was he between September 1964 and October 1966? He was, by his very silence, condoning and supporting the WR. And since then, he has done nothing to uncover the truth except to paraphrase (and often inaccurately) the arguments of the legitimate critics, and to distract attention from Dallas and the WR evidence to a collection of seedy and sordid "witnesses" and a flock of diversionary litigations against Novel, Sheridan, etc., none of which have the smallest relevance to the case, so far as I can see. NO ONE has done us as much damage as Garrison has already done. I wonder when our esteemed colleagues will wake up and realize this.

Don't worry, Shirley--it is not you and I who will have to leave the country. Regardless of what Thayer Waldo or anyone else has, or thinks he has, in vindication of Garrison. Truth cannot come out of lies and fabricated evidence, no matter how the critics may rationalize. I am always tempted to be a female chauvinist and if it were not for Savage's immediate and unqualified statement that Garrison is a fraud, I would certainly be tempted to think that our male colleagues are biologically vulnerable. (Another catch is Maggie's tenacious faith in Garrison.)

So far as Gurvich is concerned, I don't know what is really behind this. My only information is from the news media. But I have an impression (for what it is worth) that he defected from Garrison for two reasons--first, because he really had grave misgivings about the investigation and the "case" against Clay Shaw; and second, because he was afraid the ship was sinking and he wanted out. So I can give him credit for acting initially, at least in part, on conscience. But from there on in, his performance became increasingly shameful. That he hastened to RFK indicates to me that he wanted an "in" with a man certain to be in the White House sooner or later (while Garrison's chances for a position of real power were very "iffy"); and his subsequent statements and revelations, casting Garrison in an increasingly terrible light, then raised the question of why Gurvich, if he was indeed a man of conscience, had waited so long to get out, and why he had not called a press conference (instead of having a secret meeting with RFK) and told the whole public what Garrison was up to. Because his actions seem more opportunistic than principled, I have no more regard for Gurvich than for Garrison. After all, when there is a controversy and one side is shabby and wrong, it does not mean automatically that the other side is heroic and right. Wars between rival gangsters, in the thirties, are a case in point. As for RFK, I understand almost nothing he does. Maybe he really has high admiration for Sheridan and has come to his defence out of pure friendship. Maybe on the other hand Sheridan has inside information on the RFK pursuit of Hoffa, in which Sheridan was a key man in the Justice Department, which makes it necessary and desirable to stick up for him, lest he get sore and spill some beans which can embarrass others.

I thought your letter to RFK was just great. I know how much he has meant to you, and how great a blow it must have been to hear him beating the drums for LBJ. We will have to see what he has to say, and what he does in the future. I am not very optimistic that he will give us grounds for understanding or support.

All my love,