

Mr. Alan E. Helseth, ex dir, La ACLU, 1911 Terpsichore 70013

Although your actions has ^{be} been what I consider to be less than honorable and not characterized by integrity of purpose or expression, ~~and~~ although you have not withdrawn your false charges against me after ^{my} presented to you proof of their falsity, indeed, even though you have not answered my ^{two on this,} last letter, I address this letter to you instead of the national office of the ACLU. I believe it is you rather than I who should forward our correspondence to them. If you do not, I will.

^{On Aug 3}
~~Wednesday night~~ the Huntley-Brinkley Report carried what from here seems to be an exclusive news item, that the ACLU has demanded a Department of Justice investigation of ^{alleged} intimidation of witnesses by Jim Garrison. In context, as used by NBC, this said the national ACLU. By inference, who was being intimidated? NBC people.

The timing of your statement is remarkable and a remarkable intrusion into a legal proceeding: ~~in~~ six day before the first of the trials ^{Mr.} Garrison will be taking to court. Need I tell you the ^{impact} influence of your statement on potential jurors alone? ^{should have known that}

On that very same day, your ^{New Orleans} courts tossed out the frivolous suit filed against me by Carlos Bringuier. This suit had as one of its obvious purposes suppression of my writing and publishing. As I wrote you, it succeeded in New Orleans, ^{To} this you are silent -to ~~with~~ the blatant intimidation by means of a fraudulent suit, to the defamation of a writer, to the prostitution ^{of} the judicial process, ^{as} you are to the gross misconduct of NBC, which ^{tried} to plant bad information in the Garrison investigation through me. With permission, I made a tape recording of some of this, It has the NBC man's voice on it. You can get a copy from me or more immediately from Mr, Garrison's office. I gave them a copy.

Certainly the rights of the accused must be protected. But so must the sanctity of the judicial process and the rights of all citizens and the country. Your consistent course of conduct in this entire affair has been to deny a fair trial to both sides, to deny a fair and uncorrupted jury, and to frustrate the judicial process.

~~And~~ need I again refer to the rights of writers? Need I again refer to your wild and inaccurate charges against me, made without consultation with me, made on the basis of no fact, and not retracted when they were

proven wrong? *Or the harm this does me? The opposite of your charge is the truth. Only your ignorance of the subject denies you this knowledge.*
In this last caper, you have made it appear as though you speak for

the National organization. Not only did NBC play it this way, but so did yesterday's AP ticker. That, too, is dishonest, yet consistent.

What you as an individual chose to do is your own business. One should be entitled to expect a different course of conduct from one in your position, But that you should by public-relations devices escalate this into something it is not is shameful.

How much different the course of history would have been if your ~~no~~ strident voice had been heard November 22, 1963, when Lee Harvey Oswald was systematically, deliberately and quite publicly denied all of his legal rights, and each of us with him. How different history might have been if your Dallas delegation had not been fobbed off by the deliberate lies of the three officials who falsely told them Oswald wanted no lawyer when, ^{that} at ~~the~~ very moment the night of November 23, he was ^{publicly} clamoring for the ACLU!

And how silent you have been at all of this.

Now, when there is an opportunity for a judicial determination of fact, now when any aspect of the case can go before a judge and jury, no matter how handicapped by a concerted and not at all disguised campaign

against any judicial determination of fact, we hear the voice that says it is the voice of the ACLU.

It is the voice of Ananias.

If you are not going to send this/ correspondence to the national ACLU, in whose name you are trading, please let me know and I will. I ask also that you send copies of all your press statements. These you have and I do not.

I regret the necessity for addressing anyone connected with an organization with the glorious history of the ACLU and its exalted and essential principles in a manner your deplorable conduct justifies.