

8/21/67

Dear Shirley,

On issues other than this one I know nothing of Garrison's beliefs. As to his political associates, judge him as you did JFK. On this issue, I have found his doctrine essential my own. We have some differences, relating to fact. These the future will determine, as it will the differences we have between ourselves. Those general principles I have heard him enunciate, I share. When I was there there was a single thing on both our minds. The only informant chat we had was when Mark Lane was at dinner with us, and I was silent, for me.

I know nothing about the relations between him and Aynesworth. I know what he has said on TV about that writing and Newsweek. I agree with both. I continue to be interested in the Robertson stuff, which I either do not recall or do not know.

I agree that Andrews is in danger, as the silent witness always is. His protection can come only from revelation of what he can say. Then he need fear only vengeance. If you heard the tape of his Scott interview you'd know that before the Garrison case was well known he said he knew the Mexicano and Clay Bertrand - and more.

There is no doubt in my mind that Garrison is the opposite of a racist and the opposite of a reactionary. What he has said of government, of the CIA and FBI, of the right-wing Cubans is indication of this.

I spent too long on Capitol Hill doing things I considered important to ever judge a politician by the company he keeps. Or his beliefs. I'd rather judge him by his active enemies. Garrison's are mine.

On this issue you may disagree with some of the things he does, as Sylvia does. Here you and she may be right or you may be underinformed. Only time will tell. My own interest is in getting this case to court as uncontaminated as possible, as soon as possible, and with Garrison as well prepared as possible. I agree that by my taste he has over-reacted to his opposition. I also do not face his necessities and those of his litigation and I do know something about what is being done to him that is not general knowledge. So I make a different judgement. What the FBI alone is doing I think justifies what he has said and, were I in his position, I believe I may have over-reacted, too.

But I am not and I haven't been - and I will not be - angry with you.

Sincerely,

I cannot accent strongly enough how extremely rightwing and deep south the McKeithen Administration is and has been. So that I am deeply puzzled and disturbed that any man of integrity can work within its framework. I realize that this IS possible. It is being done in Washington. (Shriver works under LBJ, for example, and Shriver is a man of integrity if not many brains.) Still, I am puzzled and bothered. I recall how bitterly JFK was hated by the McKeithen crowd and how Morrison was made to suffer because he was a friend of JFK's. Perhaps Garrison has been so sickened by all this that he wants to expose the whole business.

8/15/67

Sylvia, Harold: A joint brief letter to mention the 8/19/67 NEW REPUBLIC which I am sure you've seen. The exchange of letters between Walter Lister (SBS) and Alex Bickel was the usual stuff, but I was interested in Lister's last line:

"If Mr. Bickel is looking for a weak point in the case against Lee Harvey Oswald, let him concentrate on the lack of proof that Oswald himself actually pulled the trigger of his rifle."

This is a slightly different point of view than that definitively produced by Walter Cronkite!

The paper today from New Orleans tells of Andrews' conviction. I was also interested to read that Aynesworth and Garrison talk and chat and apparently act like friends. There is nothing wrong in this, and maybe Garrison is just using Aynesworth, but Garrison never answered my letter when I wrote to him asking if he (Garrison) would like some of the statements Aynesworth made to me about the Tippit shooting. As I have mentioned before, I think this is relatively important in light of Robertson's obvious perjury in Aynesworth's behalf and in light of the failure of the Warren Commission to call Aynesworth at all. Yet Aynesworth was much more a critical witness than, say, Thayer Waldo for example. (Reiland who could have backed Robertson's story was also not called. I think the decision NOT to call Aynesworth was made at the Dallas level, by a joint agreement between the Dallas FBI and the Dallas Morning News. Consequently the Commission had no more idea of Aynesworth than they had of Martians.)

Still discouraged over the political set-up in New Orleans. Harold, you have always been angry at me because of my willingness to paint Garrison with a guilt-by-association brush. And I have told you that I am admittedly unfair in this regard. My unease, however, in regard to Garrison's friendships goes back a long ways. I have for years been skeptical of McKeithen, particularly after the DeBessups Morrison fiasco (and if I may pull a Penn, the death of this man was strange); now I see in the New Orleans paper that Kerick is NOT being backed by Leander Perez; instead Perez is backing McKeithen. As you recall, McKeithen was a vicious segregationist when running against Morrison (a friend of JFK). That his (McKeithen's) anti-integration sentiments have cooled in office can be laid to the frills of victory, plus no immediate campaign. Yet, now, with that arch-conservative Rep. Kerick in the picture, we are told by Perez, the insane feudalist and Negro hater, that he (Perez) is backing McKeithen. Now, Harold, if Garrison is REALLY a man of high ideals and integrity, can he be a close friend to and an ardent supporter of McKeithen? I know I am being unfair again, but my intuition has always bothered me in this regard. I keep thinking that somewhere along the line the Garrison-McKeithen-Thomas Dodd-Russell Long chain of friendship is going to run into its supporting link: LBJ. Probably not so. At any rate, I am up and down about Garrison. One day I feel he may have merit, the next, I am sure he is full of crap.

Andrews? Andrews still has some integrity I think. Penn told me that Andrews had been bought off long ago, and this may be true. On the other hand, Andrews had the shreds of truth in his hands and then grandstanded them. He swung too much. In my opinion he will wind up dead if he isn't careful. And who can be careful enough? (A member of the NSU said that when he split from the CIA he fully expected to be killed. Isn't this charming?)

Dallas Morning News says that a "privately financed" Dallas group is doing a film with the help of Wade and Curry to show how guilty Lee Oswald was. Wonder which Kunt put up the dough? There is a strong push, not only in Dallas, but in New Orleans as well, to whitewash Dallas. Write soon. Love, S.