

1622 Cadiz Street,
New Orleans,
La. 70115
June 30, 1969

Dear Sylvia,

I hope that this finds you still in New York, or is forwarded to Boston, so that you will not have to wait until your return to get it. At any rate, I enclose 35 more pages of the diary, plus one insert page. This includes chapter 1, (1-11); chapter 2, (11-13); chapter 4, ((1)-(18)), and pps 52-55 of the main body. This leaves me with the chapter on the Archives period to do, basically. For some reason I seem to be having a block about this time, perhaps because it is a crucial 5 month period when I was not really in a very good position for "observing" as I was later. However, I shall do something on that time—and again I think I shall try to make it chronological.

I shall be interested to hear your thoughts on the new sections, especially June, 1967. You will no doubt be able to tell that this is not a genuine diary at this point. I used old newspapers in conjunction with memories. However, it is an interesting period of the investigation, and I think it is an improvement on just leaving it blank. (I shall fill in a few dates for July and August—Dean Andrews trial—in the same way.) At any rate, I shall be interested to know if this retrospective "diary" method works, in your opinion. I did the same thing with the beginning period, when I was hired by Garrison, and I think it is a big improvement over my earlier chapter one.

Today was the day when I was due to go to trial. The date was set and it looked as though we were going to go, when on Friday, Shaw's lawyers, who had been subpoenaed to testify against me, came into court with a motion to quash the subpoenas on the grounds of the privileged attorney-client relationship. To most peoples surprise, Judge Braniff upheld this motion, which was then appealed by the district attorney ad hoc, Bob Zibilich. He said he would take writs to the La. Supreme Court appealing the decision, thus resulting in a delay in the trial. At the same time, my lawyer filed a motion to quash the indictment, which was over-ruled by the judge. However, the thing is, it looks as though Garrison is bent on taking my case to court, unlike the others. No doubt he sees political advantage in it.

As far as I can see, things are likely to get politically difficult for Garrison in the immediate future. The biggest news around here, on that front, is that Charlie Ward, piqued at not being nominated for Judge by Garrison, announced that he was going to run against Garrison. Garrison then produced the bribery allegation about Ward, which is still being investigated by the Grand Jury. (I enclose some newspaper clippings on this.) I note that the man who is testifying against Ward—William Hardy Davis—is ~~scandal~~ calmly incriminating himself by saying that he sent money to N.O., believing it would be used to bribe Ward, which strongly suggests collusion with Garrison in the form of an agreement not to prosecute him. It also suggests that Davis owes Garrison something, for him to do this. A confidential informant here, two nights ago, described Davis as having been "the bag-man for Pershing Gervais," whatever that means, and also said that he had been charged, several years ago, with a crime against nature, on which he "got a good deal from Garrison." I note that William Hardy Davis is one of the 60 odd names I located in CD 75, as occurring on the same pages (classified) as David Ferrie.

Within about a month, Life will be coming out with another, possibly two part, article on corruption in La, which supposedly is quite strong. There has been a great deal of hullabaloo in the local papers about organised crime, etc., so it looks as though Garrison could be running into political trouble. Let's hope so.

Garrison has been writing a book on and off for over a year, and I saw parts of it. It was not at all about his investigation, but was similar to, and on the same level as, the Katen-Salandria piece. The Schoenman visit was

Al Ozer →
was nominated
by McKeithen,
on JG's recom-
mendation.

interesting to hear about. It is odd, Garrison's persistent friendliness towards you. However, I would analyse it as follows: He sees you, in the first place, as an ally in the sense that you agree with him that the Warren Report was a fraud. Secondly, although you have criticised him, at the very end of your book, that criticism was mild indeed compared with many others he has received. As for your vituperation of Garrison to callers, etc., Garrison probably is not aware of the extent of it. Also, I suspect that Salandria says good things about you, funnily enough, to Garrison, and Garrison is notoriously influenced by Salandria. Salandria, I think, does not accuse you of being a CIA agent, and in that respect you are probably the only remaining WC critic not to be so identified. There may well be an element of a ploy, also in Garrison's disposition towards you. He may feel that by being nice enough to you for long enough, you are eventually going to say, "Well, Big Jim isn't so bad after all..." I suspect that this is a method Garrison has used, politically, to convert certain foes into friends. (It is a method which would, I think, work on a certain kind of susceptible person.)

I heard that Flammonde's book sold very well. Have you heard anything about this. Epstein's book, I suspect, did not do so well, although it is a beautifully succinct piece of work, which only occasionally makes the error of making too concrete what was in fact more vague and abstract than Epstein saw it. (This is both his strength and weakness as a writer.)

Do you see the New Orleans papers these days? Let me know, and if not I will send you some more whippings. E.G., did you know that Dean Andrews has gharged Garrison with perjury?

Do you ever hear from Turner, Hoch or Lifton? I called MF in Dallas the other day, after her visit from Fensterwald. She says that he royally entertains anyone who might know anything about the assassination, has lots of money, and is therefore apparently being sponsored by someone, and she can't figure out whom. I suggested Garrison, but she said definitely not; Fensterwald, I gathered, still kind of likes Garrison but considers sick it a waste of time talking to him about the assassination. I wonder if Fensterwald isn't being paid by Hoffa or some intermediary. Life, (May 26, 1967) made it clear that Fensterwald, in his capacity as chief counsel for Sen Edward Long's subcommittee on administrative procedure and practice, was prepared to go to considerable lengths to aid Hoffa, and all my contacts with Fensterwald have led me to believe that his interest in the case has been more that of trying to use it to discredit certain people than to find out the truth. (Specifically, he seemed to want to discredit Bobby Kennedy and his associates, eg. Walter Sheridan.) I wonder if there may not be some truth to this Hoffa hypothesis. It would also explain his alliance with Garrison, who seems to have definite ties with the Hoffa crowd. (Morris Brownlee told me that the DA's office was being paid money by Hoffa interests, with Perishing Gervais acting as the intermediary; I don't know how much truth there is to this. He said that one reason why Garrison was so anxious to get Novel back was that Novel bugged the DA's office for a while, and left for Ohio with some kind of tape recorded proof of this allegation.)

In the course of meeting you over the past two years, I have had occasion to tell you various anecdotes, etc. which may have shed some light on the investigation. It may be that some of these have not found their way into the diary, and I have now temporarily forgotten about them. If there is anything that you can think of that might be worth including, do remind me of it, and I will work it into a diary "entry"--"the other day..." etc., as I probably won't know the exact date, but will be able to get close.

All best wishes
com