

2/28/69

Dear Sylvia,

Thanks for your note of the 26th. Enclosed are a few things that might interest you.

You read more into my letter than I intended. We disagree on the meaning of the word "disaster". I mean not that they "systematically misused, wasted and nullified" the "long hard work of the critics" But that they didn't make the use that was possible, did not accomplish what might easily have been. I mean also they didn't begin to use what could have been, with proper preparation, that was unpublished.

There are many proper complaints that can be made against the New Orleans prosecution. You may recall I so stated last summer in response to Epstein. However, the dishonesty of the press is not one.

In the Frazier case, it is not at all as you say. The record will show (and the New Orleans papers also) that major admissions were elicited from him. Here again, much less than was possible, but not at all as you say. Nonetheless, in New Orleans Frazier did admit that he did not do what was required and he didn't do it on instructions. He admitted not making the required tests and analysis, did not seek to do anything but show that the shooting was feasible (not even in the time span!) from the sixth-floor window. He readily acknowledged making no effort to determine whether the shooting was possible from any other point. He admitted many other things we will find important.

I would not consider doing a book for the reason you suggest, nor do I regard it as necessary for that purpose, "if only to preserve your credibility as a critic". I now have a record I believe requires no explanations and, with the time wasted in needless explanations, I might accomplish some constructive good. I would do a book if I decide it is historically needed or if it is necessary to the present. In it I would tell what I know of the New Orleans story and evidence. It would not, in any way, be in accord with what Epstein has done.

Sylvia, by now you know me and my writing, know that I feel, yield to and am not in any way ashamed of passion. But we must also have more than passion, more than blind hatred. As I have told you, I never doubted Shaw is Bertrand and much more that has not come out. I do not at this moment doubt there are several viable cases in New Orleans. These things are independent of any evaluation of Garrison, what you describe as "his inherent lack of intellectual and moral quality". He is write or wrong, as a person. The case(s) are right or wrong, on fact, not any appraisal of his personality.

Considering that they are not and could not be experts, I tell you they made excellent use of my two limited-edition autopsy books. I ask you to wait until you have read carefully what appears in both New Orleans papers of the cross examination of Finck. I will try and get the transcript (and I do not believe Garrison has the money to get it). They got Finck to admit much more than I have about the military control over the autopsy. Oser and Alford kept their words to me. They did not use the other major sensation in this writing with which they could get headlines. They did restrict themselves to what they understood to be the courtroom needs. When you read this book you will better understand. You will also then believe, I think, as I now do, that they read intelligently between the lines on this. They made excellent use of what I have on the failure to trace the non-fatal wound, and in doing this they preserved for me what they could. When Cyril finishes with the book, perhaps you could read it rapidly? I need it to send abroad, where I have had a request.... He may now be in N.O. Gary indicates Vince told him they planned to use Cyril, so I presume, unless they regard it as unnecessary after Finck, in rebuttal, where it would be more effective, as I now consider it, than on direct.

Hurriedly, Harold