

for Hal Weinberg — AMERICAN OPINION — MAY, 1969

want to read him or not. I'm sure you will not regret it if you do. But before I get into the cloak-and-dagger stuff of the reviews which follow, I want to pass along a couple of quotations Kirk gives from T.S. Eliot (timely quotation is the fairest fruit of scholarship). "Tradition," said Eliot, "cannot be inherited, and if you want it you must obtain it by great labour." Never thought about it that way, did you? Me neither. We should.

Now let me sign off (to return immediately after the station break) with a quotation than which you will not this year read anything of its kind more profound. This too is Eliot:

*The World is trying the experiment of attempting to form a civilized but non-Christian mentality. The experiment will fail; but we must be very patient in awaiting its collapse; meanwhile redeeming the time so that the Faith may be preserved alive through the dark ages before us; to renew and rebuild civilization, and save the World from suicide.*

You should certainly read Russell Kirk's *Enemies Of The Permanent Things*.

— MEDFORD EVANS

#### Topaz

by Leon Uris. Bantam Books, Toronto, New York, London; 405 pages (paperback), \$1.25.

NO NEED for me to plug this one for sales. It's been a "Number 1 National Bestseller" (it says on the paperback cover) and the author, who wrote *Exodus* (no, not the book in the Bible, that was Moses who wrote that, but the fantastically popular novel about the founding of modern Israel), has a large, established following of his own. But not, you may be somewhat surprised to learn, an Establishment following. As indicated hereinafter, the Establishment does not

care for Leon Uris. That is really my point in this notice, which is not so much a review as a current-events bulletin.

Thing about Uris is that he, tantalizingly, mixes fact and fiction in his *romans à clef*, this book *Topaz* being the most important on the fact side — a "fictionalized but transparent account," said *Time* (April 26, 1968), of Soviet espionage in France, penetrating not only the French Secret Service, but circles with the shortest possible radius in the entourage of Charles de Gaulle. The real-life code name for the Russian apparatus in question was "Sapphire."

Counterpart of Uris' hero, André Devereaux, is the real *Life* contributor Philippe de Vosjoli, who in the issue of *Life* for April 26, 1968, drew on his knowledge as former chief of French Intelligence in the United States to give the nonfiction version of what his friend Leon Uris had already told in *Topaz*. In *Life* again, December 13, 1968, de Vosjoli reported on spies and "suicides" among N.A.T.O. personnel in West Germany. (See AMERICAN OPINION for March, 1969, Page 74.) De Vosjoli began that piece quietly: "Almost all intelligence agents, like policemen and generals, die in bed. The profession is not nearly so frightening as many people suspect."

It is, however, frightening enough. As background for the bulletin promised above: (which revolves around the "missile crisis" of 1962) Juanita is a captive of Castro's chief working Sadist, and is threatened with indescribable tortures. She is "rescued" when someone mercifully slips her a cyanide capsule. Leon Uris' attitude toward such matters is shown when his Gallic protagonist avers: "If that beautiful woman's life meant anything to this world I have to fight on to the end." Should there be people in France or in N.A.T.O., in Moscow or in Washington, who don't like Uris's *exposé* of Sapphire in *Topaz*, some of them might have pondered the

author's sensitivity to the suffering and death of beauty. Some might have wondered how Uris himself would take it. Anyhow, the following appeared in the *New York Times* of February 21, 1969:

ASPEN, Colo., Feb. 20 (AP) — The 25-year-old bride of Leon Uris, the author, was found dead today, apparently by her own hand, in a fresh snow close to their home on Red Mountain overlooking this ski resort. . . .

District Attorney Martin G. Dumont said Sheriff Carroll Whitmire told him Mrs. Marjorie Uris had been fatally wounded by a bullet fired into her mouth. . . . Mrs. Uris apparently had fired two shots prior to the fatal shot. One bullet pierced the woman's purse and the other apparently was fired into the ground. . . .

Mr. Uris is in Aspen, but could not be reached. . . . He is the 44-year-old author of "Topaz," "Exodus," "Battle Cry" and other best-selling novels.

Mrs. Uris, the former Marjorie Edwards, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John S. Edwards of Philadelphia. She moved to Aspen in 1965 from New York, where she had been modeling.

It was in Aspen that she met Mr. Uris, whose first marriage ended in divorce in January, 1968. It was her first marriage.

Since their marriage last Sept. 8, Mr. Uris and his wife have spent considerable time in Hollywood, where he has been working on a screenplay of "Topaz," a novel dealing with international spies. . . .

Mr. Uris and his second wife were married in Temple Israel at Hollywood. The bride, a jewelry designer, wore a full-length white

gown of Israeli wool challis with Yemenite embroidery. . . .

Mr. Uris, a high school drop-out, has written six books that have sold more than 20-million copies. . . .

Is it really customary in death notices of young women to describe what they wore at their weddings? And is it necessary to offer gratuitous comments on the early academic deficiencies of the bereaved husband? The way things are written up is sometimes almost as interesting as the things themselves. Of course, it was wholly germane to report that the Urises had been in Hollywood working on a screenplay of *Topaz*. Suppose it will ever get out?

Do you believe that this smart young jewelry-designer and model, newly married to a rich and famous author in the prime of his career, would go out into the snow and shoot holes in the ground, her purse, and the roof of her own mouth? MEDFORD EVANS

---

#### Counterplot

by Edward Jay Epstein. Viking Press. New York: vii + 182 pages, \$4.95.

The Kennedy Conspiracy: An Uncommissioned Report On The Jim Garrison Investigation

by Paris Flammonde. Meredith Press. New York: xxx+348 pages, \$6.95.

---

I WROTE a big part of this review before I had completely read the books. Well, I had read all of Epstein, which doesn't take long, but just looked into Flammonde. That name! Remember Edwin Arlington Robinson's poem?

*The man Flammonde, from God  
knows where,  
With firm address and foreign air.*

As if that weren't enough — Paris Flammonde! He looks it too, judging from the photo on the inside back flap of the jacket, where we are told that the

alertly goateed and improbably if appropriately named author is "no novice in areas of controversy." It says he was "for many years producer of the Long John Nebel radio show where he developed an objective, analytical view and where he also became interested in the Garrison investigation."

Obviously, I cannot pass by any book on the *coup d'etat* of November 22, 1963, least of all one which, as I discovered by a quick check of the index, has me in it, with long quotes from AMERICAN OPINION. Seems we rattled the bric-a-brac in the whatnot with that statement in last year's June issue (out, of course, in early May 1968, a full month before the precautionary execution in Los Angeles). You remember the one: "If Bobby Kennedy is loyal to his brother, the Left will purge Bobby also."

The man Flammonde doesn't quite know what to make of me - which establishes a reciprocal relationship. He seems to be genuinely puzzled that I should believe, and say, "that John Kennedy was killed by a Left-wing conspiracy." Quoting me so, he comments, "This is asserted flatly, with no sentence of corroboration" - which suggests that he did not read me so carefully as he might, for on checking back I find that I had three rather long sentences of "corroboration," counting the sentence in which the "flat" assertion occurs, which includes the (I think) powerful if somewhat subtle corroborative fact that the Warren Report said there was *no conspiracy*. If the Warren Commission said there was no conspiracy when there was one, and they must have known there was one, then they were covering up for somebody, and they would never cover up for Rightwingers, only for Leftwingers. That is, as Alan Stang might say, very simple.

But there I go, getting ahead of myself. Where was I? Oh, yes, admitting that I wrote part of the review (at least part of what is in the review) before I read all of

M. Flammonde's book. He could not blame me too much if I had written the whole thing before completing my perusal. Neither could Mr. Epstein. After all, they each went to press with a book on Garrison's case against Clay Shaw before the case came to trial, and both books were out before the trial was over. Curious? I don't read too much into it. I have, though, by now read the book, all of it. (Flammonde's. I had already read Epstein's.) Quite a book. Best introduction I have seen to the Garrison case.

Speaking of himself in the third person, M. Flammonde writes, "The author of *The Kennedy Conspiracy* . . . has striven to retain as objective an eye and attitude as possible . . . [but] is fully conscious that, since the district attorney from New Orleans has been generally pictured to the world as a buffoon, boor, opportunist, and/or a man on a white horse, many will view an unweighted presentation as being a favorable one." And, as a matter of fact, I do view M. Flammonde's presentation of Jim Garrison's case as a favorable one, not only for the reason which he anticipates, but also because he seems to share some of Garrison's (I think) untutored views about Left-Right political relationships in America. Nevertheless, Flammonde's *The Kennedy Conspiracy* is loaded with facts, clearly written (with occasional patches of slightly purple overwriting), and a total air of honesty if not sophistication, which might be the opposite of what you would expect from that goatee and that *nom de je ne sais quoi*.

That Flammonde's book is not outdated by the acquittal of Clay Shaw in New Orleans March 1, 1969 (two years to the day after he was arrested on charges of having conspired to murder President Kennedy) is evident from the approach indicated in such a passage as this from the Introduction:

*Kennedy, King, Kennedy.  
Unquestionably one was killed*

AMERICAN OPINION

by a conspiracy. Probably two. Perhaps three. The likelihood of an interrelationship between two or more, of the numerous assassinations during the past five years is considerable.

Besides the brothers Kennedy and the charismatic Martin Luther King, Flammonde places in the "pattern of political behavior" established by "the archetypical assassination of John F. Kennedy" the murders of Malcolm X, George Lincoln Rockwell, and Medgar Evers. The fact is, of course, that Evers was killed five months *before* John Kennedy. A further relevant fact is that, two months before Evers' death, somebody (the Warren Commission says Lee Harvey Oswald) shot at General Edwin A. Walker, who was, however, like General Charles de Gaulle in this respect, enough of a man of destiny to escape the assassin's bullet. It was the attempt to kill Walker which set the "pattern" of assassination, though in his case the attempt failed. Had it succeeded, he would have been shot in the back of the head — which is the "signature" of the Soviet secret police. That signature, or a reasonable facsimile thereof, was legible in all these cases, if a bit blurred in the case of King. An apparent inability to read this kind of writing is the weakest link in the reasoning of Paris Flammonde — and of Jim Garrison.

One of the best features of Flammonde's book is his analytical reporting of the partisan attacks on Garrison by such agencies or individuals as N.B.C., C.B.S., *Newsweek* (owned by *Washington Post*), the late *Saturday Evening Post*, WDSU-TV (New Orleans television station owned by Mrs. Edgar Stern), Ramsay Clark, Theodore Sorenson, and a radical sheet called *The Minority of One*. If there were any chance that the New Orleans D.A. could succeed in identifying a Rightwing, anti-Communist conspiracy as the murderers of John Kennedy, Left-

wingers such as the Emergency Committee have encouraged him as they have done. They would have helped him.

But, intelligent as Garrison and Flammonde are, they seem to be unable to imagine that the Right in America has the kind of strength it took to carry out Operation Elm Street, who imagine that the C.I.A. (which is almost certainly involved) harbors powerful Rightwingers — and, above all, who imagine that the members of the Warren Commission themselves would be "accessories after the fact" (or that Lyndon Johnson would be such an accessory) in an assassination carried out by, and directed to, the Right.

Jim Garrison had enough sense and that's poor judgment as there is no doubt on the basis of what appears here. He is, however, a man of the Rightwing, and he is not a man of the Left. But it is not compatible with his hypothesis that the Communists did Kennedy in, accepting too uncritically the aid of political Leftists such as Mark Lane. Without impugning the motives of Mark Lane in this case, it is a safe observation that even an eccentric/Leftist, or a New Leftist (which many of Garrison's fans, readers of *Ramparts* and the *Underground Press*, are) would not finally and deliberately betray the Established Left. Individual Establishmentarians, such as Clark Kerr and Lyndon Johnson, are expendable, but the *New York Times*, the Associated Press, N.B.C. and C.B.S., not to mention the *Daily Worker*-recommended Warren Commission itself, will never be tagged out by any hippie critic.

Flammonde gives evidence that by the summer of 1968 Garrison (and perhaps Flammonde) had begun to sense that the Right itself was not the enemy. A long personal, exclusive interview with Garrison following the murder of Senator Robert Kennedy is one of the most valuable features of Flammonde's book.

In it the New Orleans D.A. answered as follows:

*Question:* You have no doubt that he [Bobby Kennedy] would have reopened the whole case once in the White House?

*Garrison:* I don't think there's any question at all. I think the fact that he was killed so quickly [after his California primary election victory] indicates that . . . they had no other alternative. I'm sure they were reluctant to have to go through another assassination, but they were not taking the chance of his becoming President.

*Question:* Do your investigations still point to right-wing elements?

*Garrison:* *It isn't really right-wing* [italics added] . . . The role of the Central Intelligence Agency has now become so clear that even where you see right-wing organizations used, such as the National States Rights Party, the one they use most, it's an organization which they have penetrated at an earlier date . . . One of the things that really helped me see that was when I began to notice that we were getting help from individuals who were . . . members of the John Birch Society. When I saw that, I realized that the right-wing (aspects of the conspiracy) was right-wing more in appearance than in reality. So, we just kept on digging and we end up with nothing but a compartment of the Central Intelligence Agency. (Pages 279-280.)

So Garrison has been learning. And a man who can learn in the midst of a battle like the one he's been in is not to be counted out while he's still kicking, even though he loses a big one like the Shaw conspiracy trial.

I said Garrison\* had tough luck and poor judgment. To his credit, his

judgment began to improve as a result of his tough luck: which was, quite simply, the killing of Senator Kennedy. Robert Kennedy could have helped Garrison expose the conspiracy. That's what the conspirators thought. How do you think Sirhan Sirhan ever got into that Ambassador Hotel serving pantry?

It looks as though Garrison knew he was licked (in this round) as soon as they got Robert Kennedy. He went on to say to Flammonde:

*Question:* What about the Shaw trial . . . ? *Garrison:* The governmental power involved . . . will do whatever is necessary to block any success on our part. If they can't do it legally, then the killing will begin, again. *I think that they have the power to do it legally . . .* [Italics added.] (Page 280.)

Interesting after that to read in the *New Orleans Times-Picayune* of March 2, 1969:

*Minute clerk George Sullivan was handed a long sheet of paper containing the most important words in the life of Clay L. Shaw. . . . Judge Haggerty asked Sullivan to read it. "We the jury find the defendant Clay L. Shaw not guilty," read Sullivan.*

*Pandemonium broke loose. Loud shrieks were heard from both supporters of Shaw and Garrison. "I can't believe it!" exclaimed one pretty young lady.*

*Some people began weeping. Others jumped from their seats to shout. Yet others, including newsmen, sat stunned in disbelief at the verdict. [Emphasis added.] . . .*

*As they were leaving the courtroom, both Mrs. Dymond and Mrs. Edward F. Wegmann [wives of two of Shaw's attorneys] were stunned at the verdict . . .*

Garrison, who had seen it coming since last summer, could have told them. The *Times-Picayune* reports that he "departed long before the verdict was read. He told a newsman: 'It certainly has been an interesting case, hasn't it?'"

One other person seemed to anticipate the outcome. "Asked if he was surprised at the verdict, Judge [Edward A.] Haggerty said, 'No.' But he refused to comment further on the verdict."

Garrison's expectation of defeat this time (if, as it appears, he had such an expectation) obviously does not mean that he is going to quit. Though he may have an Athenian volubility, he has a Spartan intrepidity. On March third he preferred charges of perjury on two counts against Clay Shaw (for denying that he knew either David Ferrie or Lee Harvey Oswald). On March fourth he charged a member of his own staff, Thomas Bethell, with giving a copy of a prosecution document to Shaw's attorneys, illegally. On March fifth he made a perjury charge against Dean A. Andrews, a New Orleans lawyer who is at least in the colloquial sense incredible, who answered as a witness for Shaw, and whom Garrison has previously convicted of perjury. If these legal actions seem like Parthian darts, it should be recalled that Rome never conquered the Parthians.

Picking up the quotation from Flammonde's July 1968 interview again, Garrison said that the power he attributed to the government to block his investigation legally . . .

*... doesn't mean that there won't be more killing . . . I didn't expect to survive the thing, but I don't worry about it. I'm going to keep on pushing ahead. At least they're going to know they were danced with. We're going to keep on as long as I can walk around. I don't have any plans for the future. That's the way I approach it. (Pages 280-281.)*

MSA 1989

Edward Jay Epstein's approach is rather different. The author of *Inquest*, one of the books which helped start Garrison on his investigation, now makes his peace with the Establishment (he has a teaching fellowship at Harvard) by attacking Garrison in *Counterplot*. Epstein was one of the first, and one of the most effective, in undermining the credibility of the Warren Commission. Employing scholarly indirection and understatement to the hilt, he protested that he was not (vulgarly) accusing the Warren Commission of deliberately suppressing the truth, but simply of being concerned from the start with "political truth" rather than Dagnet-type facts.

Now it is hard to figure what Mr. Epstein is concerned with. He speaks of many of "the growing corps of critics of the Warren Commission" as "peripatetic demonologists" who "found in New Orleans an unexpected rallying point." Yet he himself went to New Orleans and talked to Garrison (briefly) before returning to Harvard, before suddenly last summer writing a supercilious thing for the *New Yorker*, which Flammonde, incidentally, takes apart rather well.

Seems that Epstein's essential objection to Garrison is one of style. The "Jolly Green Giant," who has said that he is tired of being called flamboyant, is nevertheless somewhat flamboyant, and what's wrong with that when there is something to flame about? Better than being a cold gefilte fish. Writes Epstein: "The manner [italics added] in which Garrison used the powers of his office and the mass media to affect public opinion came to be the focus of this study." (Pages vi-vii.) There you have the "Liberal" preoccupation with procedure. The means justifies the end.

But let me hasten to give Mr. Epstein credit where credit is due him. He does write elsewhere: "Still, the fact that Garrison expressed his ideas in a paranoid style does not of itself rule out the possibility that there is substance to his

claims." (Page 115.) Which is a more honest and intelligent admission than one ordinarily expects from a "Liberal," though it falls short of recognizing that there is actually no such thing as "a paranoid style." The trouble with paranoids, the reason why they are dangerous, is that their *style* is no different from that of a sane person. If a Jew in Hitler's Germany said, "I am being persecuted," he was right and perfectly sane; if a Jew in New York since Hitler's time says, "I am being persecuted," he is most likely paranoid. Yet stylistically, the two utterances are identical. The test is one of substance, not style.

Mr. Epstein writes disapprovingly of Mr. Garrison's charges against the federal government. Yet nothing is more damaging to the good faith of the federal government than the thesis of Mr. Epstein's own *Inquest*, which is that the Warren Commission was not even trying to present the facts to the public, but simply acting "to reassure the nation and protect the national interest" with "its version of the truth" — was, in other words, administering a large dose of soothing syrup. Maybe somebody has forced some of that down Mr. Epstein's throat. But we should have known there was something wrong with *Inquest*. It had an introduction by Richard Rovere.

My advice: Forget Epstein; read Flammonde.

But when I wrote the following paragraphs, which are honestly dated, I had read Epstein, and had just purchased, but not yet read, Flammonde. My time and attention for two or three days were diverted by spot news on the subject of both books:

*March 1, 1969.* Clay Shaw has been acquitted. The charge was participation in a conspiracy to kill President John F. Kennedy. Waiving dispute of the jury's verdict, we accept the proposition that Shaw did not participate in such a conspiracy. This does not mean that there was no conspiracy. Vindication of Shaw

is not vindication of the Warren Commission. It has been clear from the start that Jim Garrison's denial of the Warren Commission's report of "no conspiracy" was better based than his positive affirmation that he had the solution of the Kennedy assassination.

Garrison postulated an anti-Castro conspiracy, in which Cuban refugees teamed with C.I.A. agents to punish a President who had refused to liberate Cuba from the Communist dictator. It is interesting to note in passing that this theory involves discounting heavily, if not rejecting, the "Liberal" theory that the Cuban "missile crisis" of 1962 was a confrontation between Kennedy on the one hand and Khrushchev-cum-Castro on the other, in which the young President and his resolute entourage were "eyeball to eyeball" with the integrated Russian and Cuban Communists, and — faced down — Castro, automatically in unison with Khrushchev, "blinked." If that celebrated version of the October days of the year preceding the *coup d'etat* of November 22, 1963 be true, is it not more plausible that the assassins on whom the *coup* depended were on Castro's side rather than against him? Particularly since prospects for the liberation of Cuba from the Communist regime have progressively faded ever since?

Some of us have said all along that while we thought Garrison was on the right track when he declared that there was a conspiracy, he was on the wrong track when he said the conspiracy was a "Rightwing" one; and that we would just have to wait and see whether he had a conclusive case against Clay Shaw — that at least the matter should come to trial. It did, and the case against Shaw was not good enough to convince the jury. Let Mr. Shaw go free. If he had been convicted, we should still have been a long way from the heart of the conspiracy.

Certain phases of Operation Elm Street could have centered in New Orleans, but just as the execution occurred in Dallas.

the strategic planning -- if there was indeed a conspiracy which justifies the public attention this whole thing has had, and I believe there was, and is -- must have been done in Washington. Let Mr. Garrison, if he is indeed determined to devote his life to solving the greatest crime in American history, pick up the pieces of his inadequate case against Clay Shaw and start over again, looking this time perhaps for bigger game, but above all looking without prejudice for where the big evidence leads.

Since there is no statute of limitations against murder, and since the consequences of the *coup d'état* of November 22, 1963 are still with us, it is by no means too late. Shaw's acquittal should encourage even more serious investigation than before, since (1) it is now evident that the game is even bigger than was supposed, (2) concern for possible conviction of a (now) presumably innocent man is removed.

Juror David I. Powe was reported by Associated Press to have said, "Garrison has a right to his opinion about the government and the Warren Commission, but I just don't feel his opinion is enough to convict a man." Both parts of that statement are propositions with which the average American is likely to agree. And now that the worrisome anxiety of further injustice to Clay Shaw is allayed, we can all turn to the more massive problem of whether Jim Garrison was indeed right in his opinion about the government and the Warren Commission.

Not that it is all that important as to whether Jim Garrison is right or wrong about anything. It is humanly important and of local political importance, but nationally and globally it is not Jim Garrison who is the proper focus of attention. It is, rather, the Warren Commission and the Establishment which that extraordinary Commission represents. It is of fundamental importance for the American public to determine whether indeed the Louisiana prosecutor

was correct when he said, as he did in his summation to the jury:

*The government handling of the investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy was a fraud, probably the greatest fraud perpetrated in the history of mankind.*

The above suggests that Garrison's sense of moral outrage exceeds his knowledge of history. The "Donation of Constantine" was a sizeable fraud, and the Soviet Union's own "Extraordinary Commission," or Cheka, in its explanation of and follow-up on the murder in December 1934 of Stalin's friend and victim Sergei Kirov, left -- in the Great Terror and the Moscow Purge Trials -- an even longer and wider trail of blood than has so far followed in the wake of the *coup d'état* of November 22, 1963.

Garrison's exhortation was not enough to convict Clay Shaw, and perhaps conviction of Clay Shaw had ceased to be the prosecutor's own overriding purpose. His peroration was an eloquent appeal to America to call to account its increasingly dubious leadership.

March 2, 1969. The *New Orleans Times-Picayune* reports today in a special story from Detroit that "The American Bar Association will urge the Louisiana Bar Association to consider disciplinary action against District Attorney Jim Garrison because of the Clay L. Shaw trial." So violent is the spirit of reaction against the one official critic of the Warren Commission.

But William T. Gossett, President of the American Bar Association, realized almost immediately that when he blurted out his rancor against the New Orleans prosecutor, he was calling a shot he might not be able to execute. Backtracking fast as he could from an original interview with a Detroit reporter, Gossett quickly equivocated, "The whole story is inaccurate. I was just having an informal discussion and did not expect it to be

quoted." The A.B.A. President is, of course, not the only public figure to say one thing informally and "off the record" while reserving the right to say something else formally and on the record.

The public as a rule feels that the informal utterance is the more reliable indicator of the speaker's sincere feelings. The Establishment, from which the A.B.A. is hardly to be dissociated, is plainly aroused, and — enormously encouraged by the jury's acquittal of its protégé Clay Shaw — prepares now to exhibit Jim Garrison's head on a flagpole as an object lesson to serious dissenters from the report of the Warren Commission. Yet in such a punitive action it is imprudent to get ahead of the mob, and Gossett quickly hedged. Action against Garrison would have to be taken by the A.B.A. Board of Governors, which will not meet until May. "We have to have the facts," said the A.B.A. Prexy. One would hope so.

Today's *Picayune* also relates how "Clay Shaw, relaxed, smiling, expansive, told a packed press conference Saturday afternoon that the acquittal verdict "is by no means the end of the matter." "One would suppose not. *When the enemy retreats we pursue.* And yet who knows? The Establishment might do well to let the whole thing lie — if that can be done. To settle for the tactical victory over Garrison in his charges against Shaw might be the wisest course for the earthly lords: perhaps the public will take Shaw's vindication as also a vindication of the Warren Commission. Which is the *In-group's* desideratum.

The catch is that Shaw's acquittal itself was due in part, or so it would seem, to Garrison's emphasis on the fact of a conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy rather than on Shaw's personal membership in that conspiracy. The jury seems to have cleared the man in part

because the prosecution spent so much time elaborating details of the action that day in Dealey Plaza. The jury couldn't find Clay Shaw in that picture. It did not, however, necessarily doubt that the broad outlines of the picture were true, and that a number of people were there besides Lee Harvey Oswald.

Which would make liars out of the members of the Warren Commission. Which is the point with which we are most concerned.

Clay Shaw himself, and at least one of his attorneys, Edward F. Wegmann, believe that Garrison "simply used [Shaw] in order to get the Warren Commission testimony on trial," that Garrison did not even believe that Shaw was guilty, and while if that is true it raises questions of great moral consequence in a number of private lives, yet from the point of view of the main public interest, it simply means that the real issue of the "Clay Shaw trial" — the issue of the accuracy and, more important, the honesty of the Warren Commission is still not resolved. We certainly cannot say at this time whether "history" has yet finished with Jim Garrison and Clay Shaw; we certainly *can* say that it has *not* finished with Earl Warren and company. That "company," by the way — and this is not to be forgotten — includes former President Lyndon B. Johnson, who appointed the Warren Commission; Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas, who apparently suggested it; and former Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, who furnished its main administrative guidance.

March 4, 1969. Learned today that Garrison yesterday filed perjury charges against Clay Shaw . . . .

This is where we came in.

Who knows where we shall all come out in the end? — MEDFORD EVANS

## CRACKER BARREL

■ EAGLE ROCK — In spite of everything Earl Warren may do to abolish religion, a guy's credit cards still make him believe in *Judgment Day.* — JACK MORFITT