

The Horse Latitudes

In its July 13, 1968 issue, The New Yorker published a 35-page article, facile and obfusatory, demeaning yet lacking in the most basic documentation. The article was entitled "Garrison" authored by first generation Warren Commission critic, Edward Jay Epstein.

Jim Garrison will stand or fall on the evidence which he has compiled, a fact that apparently escaped Mr. Epstein in his lengthy article. In the interest of an informed public, we now present another side to some of the 'points' raised by Mr. Epstein. The author of the following is Mrs. Marjorie Field, early and continuing Warren Commission critic and an expert on the material contained within the 26 volumes. ajs.

(Conclusion of the Maggie Field article. Sorry about the conclusion remark of last week.)

Mr. Garrison has developed certain witnesses whose credibility, on the surface at least, leaves much to be desired. He has made some sensational charges from time to time, a few of which appear to be aimed solely at focusing attention to his investigation and which may be of dubious value; some of his charges have been incorrect. A single individual, however, with a relatively small number of assistants who has undertaken so overwhelming a task and who is constantly obstructed by a hostile press and news-media, and by nearly every governmental agency is bound to err, to falter along the way. But not even Mr. Edward Epstein, however much he may boast of having seen all of Garrison's evidence, knows whether or not Mr. Garrison has a solid case against Mr. Shaw. Reliable sources have informed me that NO ONE has seen Garrison's basic evidence, sources at least as reliable as Mr. Epstein. In the last analysis, however, only a court trial will resolve this question and only a court trial will clear Mr. Shaw's name for all time, if he is an innocent man. But steps were taken only recently to prevent the trial from ever coming to pass. Shaw's attorneys moved to restrain the trial by an injunction from the Federal Court, a move without precedent in the history of American jurisprudence, although not one calculated to disturb Edward Epstein. When that move failed the judges disallowed it, Garrison promptly set yet another trial date (one of some six or seven since last September), September 10, 1968. Immediately Shaw's attorneys moved again, this time to take the case to the Supreme Court. (To be reviewed by Earl Warren? Or by Abe Fortas and Homer Thornberry?)

Although Mr. Epstein implies that he spent a year in and out of Garrison's office, the fact is that he spent only a few days talking with Mr. Garrison, that he didn't interview a single witness and that he did have access to the master files. Although Mr. Epstein mocks the amateur students of the Kennedy assassination when he says that they are known as the 'Dealey Plaza irregulars' neither I nor any of my colleagues have ever heard that appellation, which must be a creation of Mr. Epstein's. In the final analysis, then, the man who accuses Garrison of manufacturing evidence has managed to create some of his own!

3 August 1968

Maggie Field