


May 17, 1967.

Dear Sylvia,

I hope you will forgive me for answering so late, but I have been rather busy with various things - mostly, a monthly TV show which I co-produce now and which occupies a lot of my time. I have, however, kept up with whatever was published about JFK, Garrison and the lot - and I have many little things to tell you. But first, thanks for your long letter - I hope the book comes out fine, I am sure it will be a success. I have read Manchester's book and, indeed, it is not worth a cent. I don't think the French are going very wild over it - it's been on sale for the past two weeks...

I read the SEP piece on Garrison and also, of course, the "Newsweek" piece on him. I talked at length with a girl who just got back from New Orleans and I have had numerous phone calls from Garrison himself! (Yes, believe it or not, the man calls me up and I suppose he wants me to play up most of his "discoveries" in my paper, since the US press do not follow him any more). From all these things, and some serious thinking on my part, I am ~~tempted~~ tempted to conclude that, indeed, Leo Sauvage was ~~right~~ right - or, at least, partly right. And that I was wrong, or at least, partly wrong. I wish we could talk over this for hours because it is rather complicated and I am afraid a long letter would not be sufficient enough to explain to you all the doubts that have been assailing me ever since I got back - and ever since those new developments occurred. But, to make it short, I now have reasons to believe that, indeed, Garrison talked too much and too loud - that he was on a trail, some sort of trail, and that he discovered new paths and pointed out things that you, and other serious "researchers" had already noticed, way before, in the Warren Report. But you were all "non official" and he is a D.A. Therefore, we were ready to believe him much more than any other journalist - or writer. And ~~there is also~~ also, when one met the man, one was seduced and charmed and came out of the interviews - as I did - very impressed and rather convinced. But all the things that have happened since the day he announced "I solved the case" point out that he hasn't, that he's been trying to force people into declaring things they had not seen or heard and that some of his staff have been going desperately around N.O. in search of "witnesses" - producing whatever they could come up with. That does not mean his staff, and himself, are not basically convinced, as we all are, that there is something really wrong with the whole business. It just means that Garrison has done what in French we call "mettre la charrue avant les boeufs" - Leo Sauvage will translate that for you, and, by the way, you can relay to him whatever portion of that letter you wish to relay.

In other words, the D.A. has, to my mind, been too hasty, too braggard, and a little too crude - in some of his methods. Those so called "important" witnesses he was supposed to produce have never



appeared. Neither Russo, nor Beauboauuf are reliable. Most of the people Garrison has been trying to involve are queers or ex-queers. He has, therefore, some sort of hold on them - and, therefore again, they cannot come out too strongly against him, because he would reduce them to ashes with pictures or what - proving they're queers- which has nothing to do with the JFK assassination but would, in the New Orleans community, ruin those people. As far as I know, and as far as we can judge, Clay Shaw has had nothing to do with Oswald. He may very well have met him a couple of times. That doesn't make him a conspirator - and Jim has not proven anything beyond that point. A very good friend of Garrison's (a rather dangerous character, but a very intelligent and shrewd man, an ex-cop) told another friend of mine in N.O.: " I could come up with 15 witnesses saying they know something about a plot, but what would that prove?" This same man has been, very discreetly looking around for ways of helping Garrison get out of "this mess" (quote). This is between you and me, of course, and completely off the record. But it just goes to prove that Garrison's best friends are deeply worried by the way his investigation has developed and are either pulling away from him, either trying to help him get out - either trying to find other "proofs or " witnesses" to back up his case.

He, himself, has called me last night and has talked to me during one full hour about Oswald's notebook and his secret code numbers - which were, according to Jim, phone numbers of people like Ruby, Shaw, the FBI and the CIA offices in N.O. The whole thing is very attractive and almost convincing - the only thing that worries me is this:

- i: why would Jim take the trouble of calling me up for an hour and trying to convince me? Not because I'm his buddy- but because he is looking for support and therefore, feeding me with informations, some of them are just plain wild and are not backed up by anything.
- ii : I asked him a couple of times if he could explain and justify some of his statements (about Oswald's involvement with the CIA) and every time he has shrewdly avoided to answer;
- iii : the man sounded worried, deeply disturbed, and rather erratic; I didn't like the sound of his voice and the tone of his arguments.
- iiii: it all looks like a feud: "Newsweek" and all against Garrison - and this feud seems to bother him more than the real problem: the heart of the matter, the investigation, and the charges he's made. He is now playing the martyr - the man everybody is trying to hush up, so that he can, in a matter of time, say: " well, I've been hushed up, all right, and it's too bad - but I couldn't fight the Washington power structure" - leaving himself, therefore, a way out - and forgetting the whole matter. I don't think, as of now, that there will be any trial - and I am afraid that if there was one, Shaw and his attorneys would ridicule Garrison.

BUT, again, we do not know everything that goes on over there. But, as we all guessed long before Jim, it may be very possible that Oswald was deeply involved with the CIA and that, therefore, the whole thing is a big CIA cover up. Then, Garrison is right - whatever his means and his ways of behaving and releasing wild statements - and then, he should be helped and trusted. If it is a CIA cover up, which I still think it may very well be, Garrison is not strong enough to reveal

3-

it and to make it stick. And the US press is not willing to go along those lines - although, I guess, the latest CIA "exposés" have been helpful in that matter.

So, after all, Jim may have something - but, Sylvia, I don't know any more. I'm confused. I'm doubtful. I'm gloomy. In other words, I don't trust the man any more. Don't ask me why: the real reason, I don't know - it may be that, when seen from here, with the distance of time and space, Jim's whole behavior looks stranger and phonier than when seen from near. And also, and again, I don't like the way he let Mark Lane rush into his arms (I, too, had warned Garrison not to go near Lane - I thought it would serve him wrong, and I think I was right), I don't like the way he is behaving. Period.

As of today, I don't know what to do - newspaper wise ← with the interview he gave me the other day on the phone. I don't know if I should publish it - and what good it would do. Hell, he may be using me. And also, he may be on the right track. In a way, I wish he hadn't called me. That phone call increased all the doubts I was entertaining for the past months.

Well, Sylvia - tell me what you think of all this and what else is new. If there is anything I should know, let me hear from you, soon. If not, I still hope you'll find time to write. And forgive this long and rather clumsy explanation. But I feel I owe it to you. And if we are all entitled to make mistakes, I still think we should recognize those mistakes. Maybe, that's what my next article will be about. But I still give Jim a small chance. God knows why.

Best, as ever,

Mieffe .
