

DISTRICT ATTORNEY

PARISH OF ORLEANS
STATE OF LOUISIANA
2700 TULANE AVENUE
NEW ORLEANS 70119



Wm GARRISON
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

October 4, 1967

Mr. M. S. Arnoni, Editor
The Minority of One
155 West 15th Street
New York, New York 10011

Dear Mr. Arnoni:

I have read the article entitled "Garrison and Warren: Anything in Common?" in the October issue of The Minority of One. It is, of course, a disappointment to find that so much misunderstanding can appear in a magazine which heretofore has shown so much understanding.

I regret that it is not possible for me publicly to present evidence prior to trial even while the Establishment press pounds away at its theme that the Warren Commission was right and that matter is closed. I regret even more that the writer of this article should so uncritically digest the official line and so eagerly assume the role of a disappointed former supporter.

I really do not care greatly whether anybody thinks I am wrong or right about the assassination. Since I happen to be right, the problem is theirs and not mine.

Undoubtedly there are many individuals who expected me to conform to some sort of pre-determined image which suited their needs but their disappointment has nothing to do with the objective validity of the case against the men who killed the President. It merely affects their ability to observe with objectivity.

Mr. M. S. Aronhi
October 4, 1967
Page Two

At the outset of this case I publicly said that anyone who bet against us on this investigation would lose. I now repeat that statement. It won't even be close.

Sincerely,


JIM GARRISON
District Attorney

P.S. Ordinarily I avoid getting involved with details resulting from misunderstandings because this would engage me full time in writing letters of explanation. However, there are some errors of detail in the article and I feel I must call your attention to several of them.

The code of Ruby's telephone number is really quite valid and has been confirmed to the satisfaction of qualified individuals unconnected with this office. Furthermore, our reference to the code was necessitated by legal pleadings designed to prevent the address book from disappearing forever into the control of the defendant. Even if it were to turn out that in the long run the alleged code had no objective validity, the very fact that there appeared to be such an alteration of numbers made it necessary for us to oppose returning the address book -- and by such opposition it was necessary for us to describe the nature of the particular code. Nevertheless, I have made very little reference to it elsewhere nor have I had occasion to point out that it occurs again and again and again. I suspect that my real problem here is simply that an elected official happened to stumble across it instead of the unhappy critic who complains so bitterly that such a thing could be possible.

As for William Gurvich, it is simply not true that he was my Chief Investigator and there really is no conflict about that point at all. Bill came along and volunteered his services for nothing and he was never a paid member of the staff.

Mr. M. S. Aronhi
October 4, 1967
Page Three

(his?)
If my response with regard to him was not satisfying to the writer of the article, I doubt if my response to anything would be satisfying. I simply do not bother to explain things and I could not care less whether the writer of the article understands or does not understand.

In concluding this rather long postscript, I cannot help but wonder what the author of the article expected to occur to the only public official taking a stand against the Warren Commission. Did the writer really expect our flag to survive unstained and untorn? This is only the beginning.

The point is that we are fighting and we are not going to quit and that we have found out what happened. This is all that is important. I really do not believe that a careful inventory of my imperfections -- and I do admit to having a great many -- has any relevance to the matter at all.



JG:lcs