

14Oct68

Dear Sylvia:

I spoke to my attorney here in Tampa, Arnold Levine, the other day, in reference to Garrison's delay on setting a trial date, and he told me that Ed Baldwin, my New Orleans attorney, communicated (indirectly, I think, and informally) with Garrison shortly after I went up in April to enter a not-guilty plea, and that his message to Dim [Jim] was, in essence: "Well, you can go ahead on this case if you want, but I don't understand your reasoning -- you haven't even established in court the existence of a conspiracy and yet you want to prosecute somebody for perjury relating to an inquiry into it."

Apparently this was an angle Garrison had overlooked. So, all else being equal and stable (which it never is), I'll probably not be scheduled for trial, if at all, until after the Shaw trial -- if there ever is one.

This is not as dramatic a reason for the delay as I was hoping for.

I started you book the other day and am already up to page 65. I feel that you misrepresented it when you said it was difficult reading. It is the first presentation of materials on the JFK assassination I've found interesting for reasons other than the indirect impact of that event on my own life. Most of this stuff I have to wade through. And OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS was like an endless anal-sadistic, paranoid-schizophrenic masturbation phantasy.

Some data I would appreciate from you when you get the time, and if you've no objection:

- 1) Helen Hartman's address and/or phone number;
- 2) information, if it is not confidential, on whether or not Clay Shaw ever answered your letter; (I assume, by the way, I have your permission to show this and your letter to Epstein to others.)
- 3) [redacted] details on Mark Lane's use of your articles in his book, as I would like to be able to document this when and wherever I bring it up in the future.

I have discarded my plans to wage political war on Garrison. I do, however, plan to devote an [redacted] occasional ZENARCHY to setting the record straight on this or that aspect of my own case -- in a calm reasoning tone, if that is possible, and once in a while I'll do something general on the "investigation." But I think it is only a matter of months before Big Jim calls a press conference to "reveal" that he is really Napoleon Bonapart.

I was really horrified when Dave told me that Jones Harris has been pestering him to ask me why I said Oswald was 5'5" instead of 5'9" -- regarding this, apparently, as four inches of evidence that I was leading Jenner astray. I should have carried a tape measure around with me in the Corps, I guess. Jesus.

I enjoyed talking to you very much.

kerry

