

25 February 1969

Dear Jenifer:

Thank you so much for the copy of the first AIC newsletter. And more thanks for your letter.

Apologies for my having called the five pages of single-spaced type a "short" letter. It was intended to be short. When I sat down to type it, I wanted to have it ready for the postman who would be along, I thought, about half an hour later. He snuck up on me half way through the first page and I found I had plenty of time, like 24 hours. Sorry about that.

Jenifer, we have survived the Robertson thing; we shall survive the Condon fraud; we have not been defeated by any of NICAP's attempts to obscure the UFO picture. If the Condon report does nothing else, it should show the world the lengths to which the Establishment is willing to go to discredit serious UFO research. It should backfire and help us.

Garrison's curious actions - or lack of them - as well as his conflicting statements should have the same or a similar effect. Some inconsistencies had been pointed out to me some time back but, like you, I just could not bring myself to take away his pedestal. I kept telling myself he was smart and surely had very good reasons for whatever he was doing and saying. The trouble was, I just could not convince even myself.

FILED  
BAR  
11 FEB 26  
Enclosed is a copy of the press release on Kerry Thornley. Please check the statements Garrison makes in that against the references in the WC volumes. As an instance: Nelson Delgado is presented as saying that Oswald would not say anything against the government. But when you read further on that same page, you find that Oswald would not make such comments in Spanish because he was not fluent enough in that language - he did, however, go into discussion of that nature in English. Then read all of the statements by his associates in the Marine Corps, those affidavits in Vol. VIII.

According to this release, had it not been for Kerry Thornley, the WC would have been hard put to depict Oswald as a "Marxist" or Communist oriented. But. In the evidence there is page upon page of statements by Oswald, some in his own handwriting. Thornley is called a "star witness". He gave his deposition to Jenner only, not to other members of the WC. This is hardly the treatment accorded a "star witness".

For a long time Garrison had implied, at least, that he did not believe that Oswald ever fired a gun that day, claiming that Oswald was an FBI informant who warned the FBI of what was to take place. Harold Weisberg had gone to great length to show that Oswald never took that rifle to the TSBD that day. Then, during the first day or two of jury selection, Kerry Thornley phoned to tell me that Garrison was going to claim that Oswald had taken the rifle in and that he had even fired the first shot. I thought Kerry was making his little joke with me. He wasn't.

I had also been told that while Garrison was publicly calling for the release of the autopsy photos and X-rays, he was not permitting his representatives in the Washington, D.C. court to present the evidence or witnesses needed to get the material released.

This particular material is involved in a sequence of events with a strange finale. The D.C. judge first stated that if Garrison would present certain evidence indicating that (as I recall without hunting the clipping) a shot was fired from other than the rear, he would order the material released. After the showing of the Zapruder films in New Orleans at the trial, the judge said he would order the material made available for a doctor (whose name has fled my mind) to examine. The next I heard was that the judge had ordered the material released to Garrison by the Archives. And, now that he finally had what he had been demanding for so long, Garrison rested his case without the photos and X-rays.

Do you recall that at the Clay Shaw hearing before the three "hostile" judges, Garrison was over-joyed to have Perry Russo surface just in time so he could be presented and Garrison would not have to reveal what he termed better evidence and much stronger?

1LED  
1A2  
1 FEB 68

The prime witness against Kerry Thornley is Barbara Reid. A New Orleans newspaper (enclosed is a copy of the item) reported on April 11, 1966, that she had been arrested on a narcotics violation. You will note that the case was to be presented to the district attorney's office, Kerry says that he has been unable to find anything to indicate what disposition was made of the case. If the facts are as stated in the clipping and if there was no prosecution, it would seem she would have compelling reason to cooperate with Garrison, nasty as the implications may be. In circumstances such as these, it would be quite unnatural if no questions were asked. And according to the precise charge against Kerry, the whole case for the charge of perjury rests on her word against Kerry's.

A female named Joan Whritenour has collaborated with Brad Steiger (Eugene Olson) in writing books and magazine articles on UFOs - two individuals who have truly earned the right to be called "hacks". Coral can attest to this. I know Joan very well - too well. When I first met her she was boasting that she was a witch and that all her neighbors called her the "Witch of 34th Ave. No." Two years later she was still making the same claims and enumerating various incidents for which she had been responsible along this line. Occasionally, she would use her alleged capabilities as a more or less veiled threat when it suited her purposes. Furthermore, I have seen demonstrations of things that could only be explained by something more sinister.

Then she began to be interested in all that nice money that was to be made if one could have something published. She began to try to dispel or modify her reputation as a witch. She began to claim that she had merely studied witchcraft, not practiced it, that it had only been of passing interest and that anyone stating otherwise was trying to be malicious. Now she has usurped yet another crown for herself: "the world's leading female authority on flying saucers." And we both know who has earned that title.

I might add that Barbara Reid also had a similar reputation in the French Quarter, that of a self-professed witch, and that she is also trying to play it down and now claims only a passing interest. Harold Weisberg believes her and I am sorry; there are many who believe Joan Whritenour's disclaimers, too.

Interruptions have carried this over to Wednesday, the 26th. One of these days I may finish something the same day it is started.

For myself, there has always been wonderment at the failure of the WC to charge

even one witness with perjury. So many contradictory statements were given under oath; Marina is a good example. I just could not understand it at all.

Now we are told that Dean Andrews, who is serving time for perjury, has said under oath that he lied under oath when he brought up the name of Bertrand in the first place. If this is true, this should free him with no worry for fear he will be jailed again for perjuring himself before the WC - why should that distinguished bunch of men set a precedent at this late date? I don't think they would dare for a very good reason.

With so many theories flying about following the assassination, it would have been obvious that it would be impossible to present incontrovertible evidence and testimony necessary to successfully sustain the conclusions desired by the Powers-That-Be. So it was handled the only way possible. Somewhere among the agencies and individuals responsible for making up the fairy-tale we were given there had to be a number who knew whenever untruths were being stated under oath. They would have known that critics would arise to use the alleged "supportive evidence and testimony" as proof that there had been deliberate distortions and rejection when it suited the fancies of the writers of the so-called conclusions.

So they would decide to let the lies stay in the record but they would make no charges of perjury, they would point to no contradictions unless they were useful to the lone-man theory. I think there may have been some indication of their intention when Jack Ruby was not taken up on his promise to tell what he knew if he could be removed to Washington, D. C. If this had been done, even though the testimony could be declared secret, buried for all time hopefully, there would still be the chance that some enterprising character would find a loophole and surface whatever Ruby told so the world would know. The only way to insure against this would be never to have taken his statements in the first place and then to allow for his early departure for the Positive Absolute, perhaps expediting his removal if he didn't die or commit suicide soon enough.

I think we know pretty much why Kennedy was assassinated and, while we do not know the identities of those involved beyond any doubt, we may be fairly sure of the political philosophies held by those in the conspiracy. I do not now believe it will ever be possible to prove any part of it in or out of a court of law.

Moreover, I believe the 26 volumes should stand for all time as the blue-bound, U.S. Government stamped, sealed and approved monument to the all-time boondoggle. All that is lacking is the official stamp of the Ministry of Internal Propaganda. I think all of us have been led (read "had"); I think there was subtle direction of the critics' attention; I think it was vital to the whole plan that these critics' be of above average intelligence, otherwise they would have missed the veiled indicators.

Now, don't misunderstand me, Jenifer, please. The 26 volumes are very useful. They are wonderful for keeping two bookends from clanging together, they are great to cover book shelves and protect them from dust. They might also be wrapped with suitable dust-jackets from other books and enhance one's image - science-fiction covers might be desirable. Who-done-it jackets would be great. The most appropriate of all would be the American flag. Upside down.

Now; what about the Boxley affair? This should have alienated Penn Jones from Garrison. What about Garrison's admission that Oswald took the rifle and fired the first shot? This should have alienated all the rest. Except Flammonde. But did it?

Do you recall Garrison's contention that two men (Shaw and Oswald, Shaw and Ruby, or maybe Ruby and Oswald) were definitely and positively linked in the conspiracy because the effects - notebooks or address books - of both contained the same telephone number?

Following his reasoning, I would be linked with the Communist conspiracy in the U.S. Gus Hall and I would both have in common a particular telephone number in our address books. Jerry Rubin and I would be part of the Yippie or SDS or some other nefarious plot.

In each of these cases, the damning link would be the telephone number of either a TV or a radio station. This is ludicrous.

I think Garrison was honest when he began all this. Then I think he was somehow maneuvered hither and yon. And I think he must have realized eventually what was being done, that he was being used. This may have effected his powers of reason. It would be humiliating and enraging. He surely came to know the 26 volumes for what they seem to me to be: 26 containers of false trails. He would then begin to try to avoid going to court and he would find he was forced to do so, regardless of the consequences to him or innocent people he had involved.

The chances are that I am totally wrong about all this - I am wrong more often than I am right, it seems. If I happen to be right this time, I will be hard put to support the government as it now operates.

Night before last Dick Gregory was here. He was full of surprises. One thing he said was amazing to me in view of what I had been conditioned to expect of him. He was talking to the young people present and he kept repeating to them that they should get behind the Constitution and make it work, that the country is controlled by those who stand in front of the Constitution and these are the perpetuators of the system that must be done away with. He told them that the Constitution must be made to work again. No; the news coverage did not report this. He also urged them to complete their education.

wouldn't it be interesting to know which time Dean Andrews lied: before the Warren Commission or the other day in New Orleans?

I don't know if you know much about the case of Richardson, the black man who was convicted of murdering his children in Arcadia by feeding them food laced with parathion. Recently Mark Lane has taken an interest in the case and has stated Richardson did not kill them, someone else did, and that he, Lane, is considering working on the case. Oh, I hope not. I can't forget that Lane has been helping Garrison. I happen to believe Richardson was innocent and I would like to see this proved, but not the way Shaw is being proved guilty.

One more thing about the Shaw trial is this: In order to find Shaw guilty of conspiracy, the jury would have to render two verdicts. The first would be that there had been a conspiracy. The second would be regarding Shaw's guilt or innocence. An acquaintance of mine has suggested that Garrison never did intend to convict any of the individuals he has charged, that his only concern in so much publicity about these persons was to bring the public attention to his main purpose: proving that there had been a conspiracy or, at the least, causing the public to question the Warren Report and demand an investigation. Could be.

Enough for this time. Thank you again for the AIC. Wish I could help you to dispel your confusion but I share it with you. And thanks to Jim for easing somewhat my feelings that I was being harrassed. I think you are both great.

All my best,

*Helene*

*P.S. I wish you would  
thoroughly demolish my*