

638 Royal Street,  
New Orleans,  
La. 70130  
July 5th 1967

Dear Sylvia,

Enclosed is an article from the States-Item, into which I have incorporated the appropriate corrections. They were pointed<sup>out</sup> to Ross Yockey before publication but he took no notice. The release of this information to the paper was initiated by Garrison as a part of what one might term the propaganda struggle.

I have now been in the office for two weeks and have found the experience interesting, as you could imagine. There have been numerous visiting journalists and buffs etc. Epstein, Bill Turner, Jones Harris, Richard Popkin, Eric Norden, (Playboy interview: he also did the Mark Lane one) have all been in and out recently.

What with NBC, CBS, AP, Gurvich defecting one hardly has time to keep abreast of the latest developments, but I'll try to give you a few impressions from New Orleans: Epstein, doing a piece for the New Yorker, came down with his 3 by 5 cards and attempted a few "structured interviews", in which he asks different people the same questions, (eg. what date did you first get interested in Clay Shaw? (evaded) what date did you first start working on the probe? What first got you interested etc.) Although Epstein told Garrison he was doing a piece on the "counterattack" by NBC etc. it soon became obvious to me that he was in reality doing exactly the same kind of job he did on the Warren Commission and promptly warned Garrison before he said something rash. I have to admire Epstein in a way because he undoubtedly has a very clear and logical mind, he appears to have no preconceptions or theories, and I think he is really only interested in getting at the truth; snag is, with the truth as his end, I think he regards any means as justified.

Jones Harris came down from New York with Popkin a few days later. I had not met either of them before. Popkin struck me as a very kind man who is obviously disturbed by a possibly disastrous outcome of G's investigation, but was too polite to say so openly. Harris remains an enigma to me. He obviously knows a lot about the case but also seems to have amazing lacunae in his judgement. He was also atrociously rude to Norden in front of Garrison (quite uncalled for; Norden may not be the world's expert on the case but he is at least sincerely trying to help) and he launched into an unnecessarily vicious attack on Mark Lane and his coterie. He is too bumptious, always stridently arguing everyone down, although I must say he was nice enough to me. Bill Turner, on his way to Mex. City where he is doing a piece for Bangarts on the Kaplan Foundation is a really delightful man; he is obviously won by Garrison and I think has probably allowed his critical faculties to be suspended in Garrison's favour for that reason. (Definitely not the case with Epstein, who made some of the most cynical remarks I have ever heard. eg. he allowed Garrison was intelligent, "but then everyone's intelligent really.")

Garrison's best quality is also possibly his worst enemy - I refer to his undeniable personal charm and magnetism, his erudite and relaxed manner, his politeness and wit. All these combine to produce an almost hypnotic effect on his audience, so that before you know where you are you find yourself agreeing to something you don't really agree to at all. What he really needs is strong and fearless opposition from within his office, which I gather Pershing Gervais provided. The only real candidate for this would seem to be Jim Alcock, who is both intelligent and a strong personality. I am trying to be fearless, but I doubt I carry sufficient weight in Garrison's mind to make such impression.

I can't really say anything substantive about the case at present. Andrews' trial is Aug. 9th. NBC seems to <sup>have</sup> slipped up badly with Gene Davis as the real Bertrand. I will try to find your ms. sections sent down and send them back before they are xeroxed and handed around too freely. Let me know if there is anything else I can do.

Best wishes,

it didn't deal with <sup>Tom</sup> the issues. (I liked the New Yorker article, even though it was thoughtful and well written.)