

1622 Cadiz Street,
New Orleans,
La. 70115
Feb 28, 1970

Dear Sylvia,

Thank you for your letter of Feb 24th. Enclosed are some clippings about Shaw's recent suit of Garrison for \$5 million. It is particularly appropriate that he is alleging a conspiracy, and I note that the suit was announced on a Friday--another of Garrison's tactics. I take my hat off to Shaw.

I was very interested to get the Jack Anderson clipping. The story has been completely blacked out in New Orleans, and on that day they ran a different Anderson column in the S-I. I had known of the story for some time, as had all the reporters in town, I think. However, the boy's father had made it clear that he would not corroborate--indeed would deny--the story if it appeared in print, which prevented anyone from doing the story. I notice the Anderson column was cleverly written to circumvent libel action. (One inaccuracy, incidentally, was his statement that Garrison had "made much" of Shaw's alleged homosexuality.) If the boy's father had filed a complaint against Garrison, as everyone was hoping he would, the story would have got in the papers in a big way before the election, and quite probably would have cost Garrison a crucial number of votes so that he would have lost.

Thornley has been in touch with me and I have told him just about all I know, which is not much, mainly because the case against him is so incredibly slim.

As for the Mrs Oswald--Mary Ferrell business, this is guesswork, but I speculate: Mrs O may very well have asked Mary at one point, "Do you know Sylvia Meagher?", and Mary may have answered yes, meaning she knew of you and had read your books. (A no answer would suggest she had never heard of you.) That kind of slightly imprecise exchange is quite common between people, I notice. As for the long conversation, I cannot imagine that Mary would have claimed that, and that part sounds like a product of Mrs O's very muddled mind. I do know that Mary Ferrell expended enormous patience with Mrs O, cultivated her at length, in the hope that she might have some information she would only reveal to a trusted friend. The Ferrell's gave her money, a tape recorder, and lots of their time. All to no avail. One day Mary said to me in complete exasperation, "Tom, that woman is impossible!"

I cannot think of any comment on the Murret business. I gather Penn Jones' 3rd installment is now out, and also that almost all of it was published first in the Midlothian Mirror, although I have not seen a copy and do not care if I don't.

Thornley has engaged an expensive lawyer here, Ed Baldwin, who is also defending Partin and the LI&T mob. I wonder how much he is charging Thornley? He got some kind of continuance in his case. I have not heard that G has started to move on any of his other indictments. I wonder what the effect of the Shaw suit will be? He may well decide to bring Shaw to trial, in the hope of getting a conviction and thus discredit Shaw as a "perjurer". In view of this risk, I applaud Shaw's action all the more.

Best wishes,

Tom