Dear Mrs. Meagher: I am with you in telling the truth and $\frac{7/3}{6\rho}$ heartily glad you are doing so. Our family was through this before with Lilienthal and FDR in the TVA controversy, and met the same kind of personalities and tactics. Many who covered up then were the equivalant liberals. They were defending what would be a Benito Mesolini to America if he could (a leading scholar who made a definitive study of Benito had access to TVA papers and declared this true though he could not publish it). Progressives felt they had to rally to the extablishment, right or wrong. I fought this and keep fighting this. My question is that I have not felt clear that Garrison was essentially cynical and self-seeking, as Liliehthal, or deeply unethical but with redeaming motives like Roosevelt and Warren. Sauvage made this differentiation and I feel it needs to be made in analysis. The two do not belong in the same basket. The unethical "good" guys are more dangerous than the thoroughly cynical because they allow Machievelli to operate, they support the establishment right or wrong. People must come out into the open and face up as you are asking them to: are you for truth or falsehood? The issue then becomes white or black and the greys

