

Paris - March 30 ,1967.

Dear Sylvia,

thank you so much for your kind letter - and I do hope you're not sick any more. You've been driving yourself too hard these last months and I urge you to relax a little bit.

I have nothing very new to tell you ,for,as you know,nothing much comes out in Europe on the JFK business. I wholeheartedly agree with you on your feelings about the " weirdos" of N.O. and your fear that Garisson does not have much else to come up with - agree also on Sauvage, Lane, Manchester (!) and what else... What I read in the US press here about Russo, Novel, Martens, Lillie whatever her name is and that other kook, Kroman, the North Dakota sleuth ~~se~~are me - and make me wonder if, after all, I was not fooled by the whole Garisson business. But, you see, I have received a long letter from a girl down there who helped me a lot and who knows Jim and his crew pretty well. She says she still is convinced that the D.A. has got a few important things up his sleeve - and that we're not through with surprises yet. I do trust her judgement. So...

I don't know about a new Buchanan book ,but if it interests you, I can enquire. I suppose, however, that it won't be much; the stories he's been publishing here are, principally, clever reprints of Penn Jones' side of the affair (the " bizarre" deaths, excerpts from the Warren Commission, etc...) I suppose he's trying to outpublish people like me! But, whatever I publish, someday, on that, won't have much ~~resemblance~~ resemblance with Buchanan. After all, I've been there - which is more than he can state...

Very thrilled with the news about your book - hope it does turn out as a good seller - if only to do you justice and repay you for all your trouble, the vicious attacks on you, and the amount of private money and time and energy you've put into the whole affair.

Thanks also for the references about this mysterious photo: I indeed possess a very precious copy of your remarkable Index. I wonder why those people at Scarecrow Press wouldn't reprint it. It's becoming the Number One Tool for anyone who wants to work on the case. By itself, it could be a best-seller! They must be out of their minds. Anyway, I checked about this photo and as you say, it is a funny and odd thing. I believe I've seen that man in Dallas during my first trip (in 63, while everything was hapening.) I'm trying to remember hard - but it's not ~~very~~ very easy, but I suppose it could be one of those few people that both Ruby and Oswald knew - and about whom the FBI or the Secret Service was trying to find wether they were a possible " link" or not. But ,why would the CIA be involved in that? It could, then, be a CIA agent, or sub-agent, or employee - or whatever - and if they showed that photo to Mama O, then, it would be to make sure she had never seen the man and therefore be reassured that she couldn't make any connection between him (and what he represented) and her son... Speculations, of course, but still, it's a ~~fixix~~ fascinating aspect of that story.

Two little things I am sure you noticed and which pleased me: Cardinal Cushing's reference about the Garisson probe and the fact that he never believed someone killed JFK all by himself. Coming from the man who

2-

is one of the closest to the Kennedy tribe, it sounds very interesting to me. Item Two: the short bit in "Newsweek's" Periscope, 15 days ago, about Ruby telling Joe Tonahill that it was Tom Howard who told him to lie about his reasons for shooting Oswald. I am sure this information comes from Hugh Aynesworth, who, as you know, works for "Newsweek" now and is based in Houston - and is prejudiced about the whole story (Warren man all the way) but still knows a hell of a lot about some details of the story.

So much for now. Hope you're feeling better and that you'll have a minute, one of these days, to send a note,

as ever, best,

Philippe

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Philippe', with a long horizontal line extending to the right from the end of the signature.