

1622 Cadiz Street,  
New Orleans, La.  
70115  
August 11, 1969

Dear Sylvia,

I enclose a copy of my article on the Partin situation, which I hope you find interesting. Little or no evidence here that anyone has read it, apart from a phone call from a researcher for the La. Republican party.

I have now finished the Garrison book, except for about half a chapter on the trial. However, I have now decided to add a separate chapter on the CIA, as I find that some people down here still believe that G had something on the CIA. Of use to me when writing this chapter will be a list of 33 items which I wrote down onto two sheets of paper last July when in the DA's office. These items constitute the contents of Garrison's CIA file, which was kept in my office along with the other files. I note that some of the items are rather ludicrous, eg., "Playboy article: 'Curbing America's Invisible Government: The CIA'." There are many other such items from newspapers and Magazines.

I note that on 16 May, 1967 the CIA wrote to Judge Bagert in response to the subpoena of Richard Helms—"in the interest of comity and cooperation which is customary between the Federal Government and state authorities". In this letter the CIA "state categorically that the files of this agency do not contain, and never have contained, any such picture of Lee Harvey Oswald taken in Mexico and that we have no information whatsoever that any such photograph ever existed." They add that "Exhibit No. 237 in Volume XBI never contained more than one figure, and the figure in the photograph depicts an individual who, to our knowledge, has not been identified." (my underlining.) I am not sure if the CIA has ever admitted this last before. Is this new?

Could you help me on one point? What was the final status of the autopsy x-rays and photos in the DC hearing? As I understand it, these were actually offered to Garrison by Judge Halleck. Almost nobody seems to be aware of this fact. This decision was then appealed (?), and I presume nothing more was heard of it. Is this your understanding of the situation?

I am not sure if, by the time you get this, the new LOOK article is already out, or if it is due next Monday. In any event I have an advance copy, and they did not make use of any material from my diary in direct quote form, although they did extract some information from it, in garbled form in some cases. Eg, they say that G accepted a \$2,000 campaign contribution from "young rightists," <sup>ie</sup> the Hinckle emissaries, who were hardly rightists, nor was their gift to G really a campaign contribution. I am briefly referred to, and rather severely whitewashed; Warren Rogers says that I "quit in disgust", which is not exactly accurate of course. I hope this doesn't provoke G's retaliation. I note that on the cover they say 'why New Orleans' DA went after a man he knew was innocent' and then produce no evidence in support of this in the article, which I consider very poor. In fact they quote Shaw in a statement saying that <sup>he</sup> Garrison believed he was guilty. The Shaw quotes are very good, I think. The Mafia material on G, and the stuff about the Rowntowner very weak—guilt by association in fact. I'M still waiting for the Life material, which I imagine will be very much stronger. I shall be interested to hear what you think of the article. There are several dishonesties, however. It is definitely not true to say that the case "wrecked Clay Shaw's life," although the same events may well have wrecked the life of one less resilient—and wealthy—than Shaw. I went to get something today from Ed Wegmann's office, and while there chatted with his secretary for a while. She told me that Shaw himself strongly denies that the case "wrecked" his life, and, I believe, tried to get Look to change it.

I shall send you the parts of the G book which you have not yet received as soon as I can get it xeroxed. Meanwhile I continue hearing reports of Fensterwald's big spending. Do you have any evidence of a Hoffa connection here?

Best, Tom.