

11 May 1969

Dear Tom,

No, I don't have any LA Free Press issues subsequent to the clips you returned. I don't quite understand your allusion to Kevin changing his mind. Does this imply that after his forthright dismay and disgust with Garrison, in the transcript I circulated and elsewhere, he has now reverted to pro-Garrison views? That seems just about inconceivable to me...but one should not, I suppose, be surprised by anything said or done by members of that coterie.

Unfortunately, I cannot be very specific about Jones Harris. I do recall that when Garrison charged you with giving the names of witnesses to the defense attorneys, Jones expressed greater "disapproval" and hostility toward you than I had expected. I feel sure that he does not think you did it for money--I know no one who thinks that--but Jones apparently thinks it was very "disloyal." That is ironic, isn't it, considering how Garrison turned against Jones and blamed him for Epstein's New Yorker article, for giving Epstein inside information, rather.

Does Jones think Shaw is innocent? Hard to say what Jones believes from one day to the next. He is very hot after the Mafia these days, but as I remember it, he has constantly insisted that Shaw is "Clay Bertrand" (though he admits he is guided purely by his intuition and has no firm evidence). He therefore seems to be one of the pusillanimous category of people, as well as a man unfortunately lacking in method and logic, generally speaking, in his work on this case.

You may be sure that I do appreciate and enjoy your diary, perhaps because of my own involvement in this whole affair. The average reader may not find it as fascinating and may get confused by the variety of names and incidents. But there is no question that the diary is a very valuable record of the New Orleans "investigation" and throws further illumination on the behavior of a potential demagogue, and his effect on his inner circle. Incidentally, your point about Garrison's suppression of his documentation (p. 23 diary) is an excellent one indeed and, as you say, has not been raised before. The point should be made publicly when an opportunity comes along.

The Turner/Bradley story is just embarrassing. I met Bill Turner only once and had a quite good impression of him. I must admit that I am disappointed in him, in terms of his performance as a professional investigator (although of course I consider the Salandria/Weisberg charges that he is a "plant" utterly silly). By the way, let me recommend the June issue of Playboy. It has an article on the Minutemen and other paramilitary vigilante groups, by Eric Norden, that positively freezes the marrow. Although I do not consider Norden's writings as gospel, in the light of his enchantment with Garrison for the best part of a year.

As ever,