

10/23/67

Dear Maggie,

Writing Armoni, with his past, is a tough. Your letter is a masterpiece! When I read such cold, unanswerable letters, I cannot wait to see the book!

Of my own I made a circulated no copies. I have gotten some pretty rough lumps from him and taken them in silence, save for straightening a record between us, rather than in any way hurt him.

However, Here is a copy of mine. Because I never expected anything like these slanders I regret Sylvia seems to be manufacturing, I never said anything about it, but I may be responsible for the calling of the others who have been published before the grand jury. I do not know what Jim planned, and I also may have had nothing to do with it. But when I felt the intelligence and the sincerity of that remarkable grand jury, I strongly recommended that all of us be heard. I mentioned your name, Sylvia's, Hal Verb's and, I believe, Paul Hoch's, in addition. It is my recollection I also said that there were some points on which we were not in agreement, but I believed the jury could determine for itself who and what it believed. I believe ~~at~~ I also said this on leaving the room and meeting the press. By now, my recollection may be wrong, but I think not. Also, when Jim phoned me in New York a week or so after I left N.C. and asked me for some citations, I gave him Sylvia's number so she and he could be in direct contact, on the ground I was too preoccupied to recall clearly (I was already having Dell trouble) and because she had the volumes at hand and I didn't. By this time she had already decided against him, but not publicly, and I had the additional purpose of giving her the opportunity of playing devil's advocate. It was before any of the coordinated whitewashes that she took her position. I think what triggered it was the notebook entries. She refuses to face the realities on this now, having reached an inflexible decision that was, I believe, based on other things (like perhaps his reported affinity for Ayn Rand).

Looking forward to seeing you all soon. I've written Bill and Steve and asked each to relay contents to you. Best good wishes,

19th. Octo. 1967

Dear Harold —

A few days ago, I sent
the following letter to
Armani.

Regards,
Maggie.

October 15, 1967

The Editor
The Minority of One
155 Pennington Avenue
Passaic, New Jersey 07055

To The Editor:

"The Minority of One" is, in my opinion, a periodical of the greatest significance. This nation has been increasingly deprived by the news media of any point of view other than the official one. The unanimity, during these cold war years, with which the press has directed what we are allowed to know and what must be concealed from us has been a blatant exercise of power and control. The cruelties and deceptions perpetrated by "the people in high places" have not only rarely been questioned by the news media, but they have been accepted and even heralded. For this reason, "The Minority of One" is a unique and necessary organ which affords the American people the opportunity of examining the other side of the coin. It has fastidiously thrust into debate the great issues of our time and has, with perspicacity and devotion to objectivity, searched for truth.

It was with great dismay, therefore, that I read "Garrison and Warren: Anything in Common?" in the October issue, for this is a subject upon which I feel personally qualified to comment, having devoted the last three years of my life to a study of the Kennedy assassination. In this article, the standards of objectivity and honest challenge which I have come to expect from "The Minority of One" are sadly missing.

To begin with, there can be no responsible analogy drawn between Warren and Garrison. Time will not permit me to elaborate on why this is so but the simple fact is that the verdict on the work of the Warren Commission's case is already in, we have seen the evidence and we have been able to evaluate it for the deception that it is - whereas Mr. Garrison's case has yet to be tried, we have not seen his evidence, and the verdict has not been handed down. I will not here belabor the comparison between a powerful governmental commission with the support of every investigative agency in the country at its disposal (to say nothing of the entire news media, with few exceptions) - and a single individual in a restricted jurisdictional situation who has been the victim of overt governmental and media interference and suppression. That there are troublesome aspects of the Garrison investigation, thus far, is undeniable. Mr. Garrison has developed some seemingly questionable witnesses and evidentiary material. I do not quarrel with T.M.O.'s contention on

that score. What I do question are some of the statements made in the article which I know to be a misrepresentation of the facts.

For example, the statement "Garrison wanted them all (independent researchers) in his corner and carefully cultivated their friendship and support" is a total misrepresentation, at least insofar as I am concerned. Over the past five or six months I have sent numerous communications to Mr. Garrison and had I not taken the precaution of sending them "Return Receipt Requested", I would never have known that they had reached their destination. Mr. Garrison, at no time, responded to my comments. Just two weeks ago, I finally received a letter from him thanking me for my accumulated mailings. I am not the only researcher to have experienced this lack of immediate response. I know of several others who have also offered Mr. Garrison suggestions from time to time to whom he has not responded. (I do not consider this discourtesy on his part; I recognize that he is besieged by such mail, and that he has overwhelming demands on his time.) How, then, can "The Minority of One" categorically state that he has "carefully cultivated" our friendship and support? On the other hand, Mr. Garrison can hardly be criticized for summoning Harold Weisberg, Ray Marcus and Vincent Salandria to appear before the Grand Jury in New Orleans for the purpose of revealing the results of their research on the case. On the contrary, he would have been remiss, in my opinion, had he not availed himself of the opportunity to study and assimilate the excellent and important contributions made by these gentlemen in the interests of extracting certain basic truths about the assassination. Had he not done so, he might conceivably have been charged with bias and arrogance in his approach.

For another example, "The Minority of One" says "there are several criteria of judgment which Mr. Garrison cannot escape... Procrastination may not serve as escape from responsibility, and no district attorney may be allowed infinite time to substantiate or withdraw his charges". These statements would lead the reader to believe that it is Mr. Garrison who is escaping from his responsibility by procrastinating about the trial and by purposely thwarting it toward an indefinite resolution. This is a complete distortion of the facts, for it is the defense which has demanded first that the charges be quashed, next that there be a change of venue, and the fact that the trial, once scheduled for late October, is now postponed until January has been due to the efforts of Mr. Shaw's attorneys and not to any attempts on the part of Mr. Garrison.

There are other statements in the article which are less than truthful. My purpose in writing this letter is not to plead the case for Mr. Garrison. I do not know what evidence

he has or has not. I see no reason why, however, when judges and grand juries find sufficient cause to bind a man over for trial, the District Attorney should not be allowed to proceed with his case and to stand or fall on the evidence presented in a courtroom.

What saddens me is that a periodical which has earned the most profound respect for its singular integrity, courage and honor has allowed its prejudice against the tactics of the District Attorney of New Orleans to besmirch its reputation for uncompromising representation of the facts.

Very sincerely,



Tuesday, October 17, 1967

Shaw Trial Slated for February

NEW ORLEANS, Oct. 17 (AP) — The trial of Clay L. Shaw, wealthy New Orleans businessman charged with conspiring to assassinate President John F. Kennedy, was scheduled yesterday for the middle of February. Criminal Dist. Court Judge Edward A. Haggerty Jr. decided the date as a compromise between the defense, which wanted a six-month delay, and the office of Dist. Atty. Jim Garrison, which asked for a speedy trial.

The trial date will be nearly a year after Shaw was first indicted. Shaw, 53, was arrested by Garrison's office and indicted last March 22. Since that time he has been free on \$10,000 bond.