

638 Royal Street,
New Orleans,
La. 70130
(no phone as yet)

Aug 1 '67

Dear Sylvia,

Thank you for your letter of July 7th, and your recent communication to CBS. Altho as you know I tend to take a moderate position in my criticisms of the WR and its defenders I found it hard to regard the CBS Special as a sincere attempt to arrive at the truth. I cannot be accurate as I do not have a transcript, but I remember there was a serious logical gap in their conclusion in the first program that Oswald was the assassin. As I recall a vital link in the chain they forged was to the effect that he could have been, therefore he was!

As you probably know, Salandria is down here now, and has been through all the files on the case. I think his evaluation is the same as mine, namely that there is precious little in the way of a case against Shaw; Salandria's presence down here I think will prove valuable as he does not mince words, and I believe intends to tell G. his opinion of the evidence. In his evaluation of the evidence, Salandria seems to have very good judgement; however I am not so happy about his interminable "model" of the assassination, which in some ways is a curious variant of the theories of certain right wing savants who see in Playboy magazine, the networks, Life, etc., evidence of a world wide Communist conspiracy. Although the targets are different, the same type of thinking is involved. Heads I'm right, tails you're wrong. He eagerly showed me Tom Katen's long and rambling ms. purporting to answer the whys of the assassination (without at any stage showing any familiarity with the hows) as though it was the most advanced thinking conceivable on the subject. I don't know whether you have seen it, but it struck me as third rate. However let me say that Vince's judgement on the realities of the situation in New Orleans seems to be sound (unlike Jones Harris', which seems to be atrocious), and Vince also has a good habit of telling people what he thinks. I only wish he wouldn't bend my ear off with his tenuous theories presented as foregone conclusions.

I really am in no position to say anything about Gurvich's defection, as I never met the man once. He had left by the time I came down here, and I don't know what it would be essential to know, namely his relationship with Garrison. Garrison is a very curious man, with I think, a strong streak of the irrational in him. In his relations with his staff, I have noticed he tends to form favorable and unfavorable opinions based rather obscure data. It is quite possible that Gurvich found himself relegated to an outer circle of favour, and felt affronted. I also have to concede the possibility that he wasn't too happy with the evidence against Shaw.

Let me give you an example of the oddity, in my mind, off Garrison; last Sunday we were having a staff meeting, and Sciambra and Byrnes were having a serious and important discussion about the forthcoming Dean Andrews trial - what Judge, his reactions to this and that, how to approach the trial etc. - but Garrison hardly paid any attention, as though the subject was too boring to talk about, which I think is what he really thought, and he kept interrupting, bringing the subject round to his own theories about the possible involvement of various peripheral individuals, such as Bruce Carlin. I felt strongly enough about ~~him~~^{him} to make the announcement that although I wasn't a lawyer etc. I felt that if we lost the Dean Andrews trial the rest of the investigation is finished. (Which, in view of Dean Andrews' statement, "Clay Shaw ain't Clay Bertrand, amen." I am think is correct.) Fortunately, Alcock, Byrnes, and in fact everyone with the possible exception of Garrison, seem to be aware of this.

I think the Thomas Alyea footage (WFAA, Dallas) might turn out to be devastating if it shows the window without the paper bag. I am confident, however, that it will reveal a Carcano and not a Mauser. A friend of mine in Minneapolis has now obtained movies of Oswald's arrest on Canal St., which also may prove important.

Garrison occasionally mentions you, and he is clearly anxious to have you on his side.

Best wishes,

Com. I trust you will not show this letter to anyone, or transmit any of the opinions etc. contained in it, as I do not want to appear, nor do I intend to be, disloyal to G.