

22 April 1971

Mr. Edward Williams
c/o Allied Stores Marketing Corp.
401 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10016

Dear Ed,

... Many thanks for sending me the Jeesten "Truth Letter" with the text of Garrison's mysteriously delayed airmail. I have made a xerox copy and return the original herewith. Jeesten has every reason to call attention to the strange delay in the delivery of Garrison's letter and to suggest that illegal mail interception and surveillance may have been exercised. But it is typical of both Jeesten's and Garrison's mentalities that he goes far beyond a legitimate question and a reasonable speculation into a reconstruction of who did what in which city in which country which he presents as veritable fact.

Garrison's own liberties with fact are extravagant and rather comical. His "inclination to lean ever backward to assure Clay Shaw a fair trial" can best be judged by his attempt to use Aloysius Habingerst as a witness and by his use of the quaint Mr. Spiessel, to say nothing of the assertion of junkies, thieves, witches, and wretches with scrambled brains. I have personal and close knowledge of what he terms the "effective penetration" of his office. It consisted of one timid English schoolmaster with a strong interest in jazz music, who was doing some librarian's work for Garrison so as to support himself, and whose conscience and sense of justice were disturbed by the preparations being made under his nose to frame Shaw without giving his attorneys the proper opportunity to prepare a defense.

With my active encouragement, this young man turned over to Shaw's lawyers a simple list of prospective witnesses, with a brief indication in each case of the nature of the expected testimony, and did so as a pure act of conscience. It was only the access to that list that enabled the defense to look into Speisel's background in advance and to expose him in cross-examination for the delightful paranoic he is.

But enough of Messrs. Garrison and Jeesten, who are rather tedious in their posturings and cloying in their mutual admiration.

I think that I have told you during one of our telephone conversations about the article I wrote up-dating the matter of Charles Givens as treated in Accessories (e.g., WC documents and papers obtained from the Archives provided further corroboration for inferring perjury and collusion, including Givens' statement to two FBI agents on 11/22/63 that he had seen Oswald in the domine room on the first floor at 11:50 a.m.). The article was accepted by the Texas Observer and evoked a 16-page "reply" from WC lawyer Belin to my 7-page ms., sent him for comment in advance of publication. His attempt at self-justification is so feeble that I almost pity the man, despite his abusive characterization of my work ("garbage") and my methods ("Joseph McCarthy-like insinuations"... "deceiving the American people"... "an assassination sensationalist"...etc.). Basically, he admits that Givens' various

statements on his observations on 11/22/63 are inconsistent (in fact, they are irreconcilable) but claims that the direct testimony he received from Givens on 4/8/64 is more reliable than anything he said earlier. Hardly a tenable argument, since all the earlier statements are consistent with each other and with independent evidence from other witnesses, while the story Givens produced for the first time on 4/8/64 tries to incriminate Oswald on the basis of an alleged incident which, if it had really taken place, would have been the central feature of the Givens' affidavit and FBI interview on the day of the assassination and his interviews shortly thereafter, and not the subject of selective and discrete amnesia for more than four months.

As for the supposed higher reliability of direct testimony, it can be viewed in the light of perjury statutes and even occasional perjury convictions, which a high-type legal-eagle like Belin should already know.

His reply wanders all over the map of irrelevancies and achieves its high point by decrying the Gulf of Tonkin resolution and the Vietnam war --the current method of wrapping one 's villainy in the American Flag. What has the Gulf of Tonkin got to do with Charles Givens? Or with Belin's failure to challenge his sworn testimony when Belin admittedly knew it to be in gross conflict with Givens' own affidavit and statements he reportedly made to FBI and SS agents? In the case of at least 62 witnesses, inconsistencies between their testimony and earlier statements to the FBI were questioned and placed on the record, as can be seen throughout the transcripts in Volumes I through XV (indexed in my Subject Index as "Misreporting by the FBI, Alleged").

As things now stand, both my article and Belin's reply (and hopefully my rejoinder to his reply) are to be published in the Texas Observer sometime in or after June. I will be sure to send you the issue, if and when it materializes.

Best regards,

Sincerely,