

phone: 504-525-0363

638 Royal Street,
New Orleans,
La. 70130
October 9 1967

Dear Sylvia,

There is really not much to report, except to say that G's recent rather wild pronouncements in New York caused some despondency not only with you but also in his office. His He has now journeyed to California, where he might say goodness knows what.

It now looks as though the trial will not be until January, and in this regard it seems as though some kind of a compromise, if not actual agreement, was arrived at between the opposing lawyers.

What did you think of the Robert Oswald piece? Did you find anything new in it? His disclosures about the FBI and Secret Service were of interest. Primarily he seemed to be trying to pin the blame on his mother - rather an uncharitable attitude. I also fail to see how he can be convinced that Oswald was the sole assassin. Surely no-one can be convinced of that. I gather from David Chandler, LIFE stringer in New Orleans, that his magazine's disclosures about Garrison are not yet complete. I spoke at length to Chandler the other day and he seems to be motivated by personal animosity to Garrison, which I don't understand. He says he would like to put Garrison in jail. I responded with an attack on LIFE, which, I said never is able to seem sincere in its indignation. One can't help feeling that the primary business of ~~business~~ LIFE is business, and what they really object to about the mob is the existence of a sort of corporation which doesn't pay up its taxes. I also disagreed strongly with their editorial conclusion - that the wire tapping laws should be changed. It seems to me that they should have considered the option of calling for a change in the gambling laws. After all, J. Edgar plays the nags, and if you legislate against a relatively harmless activity, you automatically bring into existence an outlaw sector of the community who cater to the demand. Wasn't it prohibition which brought the Mafia into existence in the first place? I can't understand why nobody seems to have made these points.

Mark Lane has been absent for the last week or so, for which I am thankful. I must now admit to some distrust towards him. He is always a shade too cautious in his replies. His interest in the assassination seems to be twofold: widening the credibility gap, and himself. He would really like to see Garrison succeed, but is now beginning to appreciate the dilemma he is in, I think for the first time. He has another book coming out, "Mark Lane Replies" (to CBS etc.) and also apparently has a contract to do a book about US WWII prisoner of war camps. Under those terms, if I were him, I think I would attempt to disengage from the assassination controversy. Phelan, I gather, continues to make the round of the Commission critics. What for? Do you know?

I do hope your book has an impact, and is a success; I am really looking forward to it. Lane and Turner opined that the reason you were anti-Garrison was because his investigation put your book out of date. However I am sure you realise I don't believe this to be the case. I won't forget your telling me that you and Maggie Fields "danced for joy" when G. announced he had "solved the case."

I am increasingly disturbed by the war in Vietnam, and things threaten to get out of hand in the next few months. When I came to America 5 years ago I thought, mistakenly I now realise, that Americans were beginning to mature in their relation to the word "Communism". Little more than the word itself is enough to mobilise fleets and armies and send them hastening across the globe. The reality, of course, does not differ too much from life over here. I was amused by Irwin Shaw's description of how Johnson could get the country solidly behind him in the war: lend North Vietnam a few aircraft carriers and let them launch napalming attacks on the eastern seaboard without any retaliation for a few months.

Best wishes,

