

New Telephone: 891-2153

1622 Cadiz St.,  
New Orleans,  
La. 70115  
April 8, 1969

Dear Sylvia,

As you will see, I have now moved to a different part of the city. It is near Tulane University, and a much nicer neighborhood. I hope to be able to get more work done in this residential neighborhood, as opposed to the French Quarter where I was living before. I am sharing the apartment with a Scottish guy who is doing a math Ph. D. at Tulane.

Many thanks for the KPFP transcript, which I read with great interest. I was quite gratified to see that Kevin has apparently swung through 180°, to a quite surprising extent—referring to Garrison's "immorality as a human being"—but Kunin seems to be the same as ever. \* I need hardly say that he annoys me quite a bit. Here are one or two inaccuracies in his version of my situation: 1. "He'd been on the payroll for four months at that time..." Actually more like 20 months. 2. "He said, well, I felt sorry for Shaw." I said that I believed that Shaw as innocent, not that I felt sorry for Shaw. 3. The bit about the part time job: this was not brought up by the DA's office at all—ie my moral status, but it was mentioned by Salandria when he attacked me on the last day of the trial. He asked me how long I had gone on working at the office after I had given the information, and I said about four months, (that's where the 4 months comes from.) He then said didn't I feel bad about it and I said that I did, admitted that I ought to have resigned, but, to set the record straight, pointed out that I had only been working 2 days a week at that time. Therefore Kunin probably got that information from Salandria.

I'M afraid I don't have the Mark Lane letter, but it appeared in the S-I around the middle of March. I will try to get a copy for you. The gist of it was: it is surprising that the paper called for Garrison's resignation because Shaw had been indicted by the Grand Jury, three judges had cleared it at the Preliminary Hearing, and therefore Garrison would have been neglecting his duty had he failed to prosecute Shaw. This is the most frequent of the sophisticated defenses of Garrison. What it neglects is that the Grand Jury and the Judges do what Garrison tells them to do, to a large extent. \* \*

Kunin's attitude is typified by his remark: "and that case might go under if the affidavit doesn't come through..." As if Garrison's conviction of me represents some sort of vindication of Garrison. Incidentally, at a hearing yesterday, the judge ruled for a recusation of Garrison in my case, which means the court has to appoint a lawyer to try the case. (The State's answer to the pleadings had acceded to this point, so don't think it represents any great display of independence by the judge.)

I enclose a carbon of a piece I wrote for my lawyer about my case, which you may keep. Also 5 pages on a return visit to the DA's office to get some books back—including yours. I have not done anything more on the diary yet, owing to pressures of moving etc.

That's about the news—I plan to be here at least for six months, finishing the Lewis book. I note in my reply to Kunin, that the most accurate and complete account of my situation was published in the New York Times—that pillar of the establishment. (Did you see the piece by Waldron which summarised all the arrests Garrison has made in the probe? A good article, except that it omitted Gurvich for some reason.)

All best wishes,

Tom

I read 'Counterplot': chapter on Sean Andrews is very good, and the whole book is of a high standard, I think.