8/20/68

Dear Sylvia,

Thank you for answering my letter, which was not intended to elicit a response or to provoke you into reaction. I do not know the source of your Thornley information, aside from Dave or him, but on the basis of what you say, I have no reason to credit it. You begin with the basic assumption of his innocence (with is legally proper) and of his having no connections whereas I do not. I did, until I conducted my own investigation. I tried in what ways I could to prevent his making the mess for himself that he did. I cannot now tell you what this inevstigation discloses, but it is not in accord with what you believe and what you have been told. I tell you, for whatever it is worth to you, that he occupies a position in this you appear not to understand. If you are in touch with him, why not ask him what he overheard when he was with federal agents? I, of course, do not know it from him. I do from those he spoke to - and I must have spoken to a dozen people in New Orleans who were his personal friends, including some who still are.

Your concern for his legal needs is fine. I wish some of my colleagues had the samex concern for mine. I have been the victim of endless harrassment by Bringuier. It alleges no er or on my part, is frivolous, is merely aimed at me because financially I am the weakest of all of us, has ulterior purpose that to date I have been able to frustrate (but may not be able to indefinitely -and if they fail, then believe me, we will all be hurt), and have put me more than $4,000 in debt. Unlike the Thornleys, who have an income, we have none. What you do with you money is, indeed, your own affair, and I ask none of it. I do, for you, not for me, ask you to exmine what may be a motive you do not understand. I do not want you to hurt yourself without be aware you might be. You realize, what I am telling you about is past, and there is nothing you can now do about it. It must be obvious I seek nothing except that you understand what you may be doing without realizing, something you may later have trouble with yourself about? But on poor Thornley's financial and legal problems, I was in New Orleans when he was arraigned, though I was not in court. I was working there that period. There seemed to be no financial problem that precluded his lawyer spending a week or so there, with his wife. The proceeding took but a day.

I did not recall, if I knew, of your disagreement with Vince over Lifton, but you are right in telling me that I had forgotten your disagreement with him over his Liebeler associations. They continue. I find them not inconsistent with his Thornley contacts and activities, which include the foulest slanders that I find no one objecting to.

If you trust Thornley's integrity and assume he is using your money only for legal purposes, fine. I tell you from what I know of him I'd assume the opposite. I also tell you I have reason to presume he has no financial problems with a lawyer or legal expenses. I assume he is using such contributions for other purposes. Among these is a fairly large-scale campaign against me. At the same time, I tell you it does not trouble me. In some ways I rather welcome it, as perhaps the future will show.

Think what you will of Garrison personally (and may I suggest you do not know what I do?), I think, when you learn all, when this period is past and written about, you will learn the genuine effort he has made to protect the rights of those he has accused. Just recently he refused to prosecute Layton Martens for attempted murder when he had nothing to do with the arrest and charges. I happened th be in New Orleans early the morning after the arrest of the night before. I started checking on it before Garrison even knew about it, before anyone in the office did. It is I who learned the essentials, who the girl is, even, what the relationships were. I tell you Garrison had available witnesses who would have sworn that for a month Martens

had been going around saying he would have to kill Darryl. Garrison had Louis Ivon make his own investigation. Louis was satisfied that at the moment Martens did try to kill Darryl there was a fight and it could have been self-defense. Therefore, there is no additional prosecution of Layton Martens, though he did almost kill Darryl by going away and coming back with a knife from the kitchen and plunging it deep into Darryl's gut. Further, last November Martens sought me out and twice asked me to arrange for him to cop a plea on the perjury charge. There is no doubt about his guilt and the DA's office leaned over backward to help him avoid it. Martens' lawyer did not give him permission to talk to me, which I demanded Layton get, and he did not ~~ask~~ give permission to talk to Jim, which I also demanded he do. Neither Jim nor I would have anything to do with him. This was in the presence of a witness. Need I tell you that it would have been helpful to Jim had Martens walked in and confessed guilt? He would have nothing to do with it.

You have no idea what there is that could have been "leaked", on all those charged, and none has been. Jim himself has never said a word about the evidence against those he has charged. Stop and think, and I am confident you will find this so. Had he leaked what I gave him about Thornley and what he says about his own ideas of murdering people, he could have damaged Thornley very much. He and I have been silent on this and will be. You will eventually learn of the sizeable effort to protect Thornley from himself. Until then, whether or not you accept my assurance, I do offer it. It is wrong to accept the lies and distortions that he, Dave and their considerable pr associations are spreading. The answer will await court, for reports keep reaching me that both plan suits against me. Thoughxx I cannot afford lawyers, I will welcome it, as you also will see. You really have no concept of what can be fairly said of Thornley and what he is said, by credible witnesses (not the one he deceptively isolates), about what he did.

Again, if you are in touch with him, why not ask him why he had the need for a post-office box, exactly where Oswald and others had theirs, and at the same time? If he tells you it was to receive mail, then I tell you I have some of his letters and this was not his return address. I am talking about original letters, in the original envelopes.

Sylvia, believe me or not, trust the result or not, I have made extensive, personal investigations in New Orleans and elsewhere. I have never asked Garrison what he has on anything. I am my own cat. I give him part of what I develop. I know what I have, what witnesses I have, what they say, whether they seem credible or not, whether they have animus or not (and not one is his enemy-those I have eschewed), and in almost every case I have substantiation of what I am suggesting from dispassionate people. My work is so independent of Jim that the last two weeks I was there I saw him once by accident and once we had a drink together. I have opened whole new areas, established connections between seemingly independent parts of the assassination story. I have made contacts and friends outside his office, including his enemies, who have frankly told me of the legal improprieties of the other side, in detail, things that will really shock you when you learn them. Quite obviously, I cannot talk of them. None of this has been without some hazard. These are things of which you can have no glimmer from the Report of the 26 volumes. I have established, independently, perjury and subornation of perjury.

There is absolutely no doubt about federal intervention in New Orleans, from before the time the Garrison case was publicly know. I have been told by some of the characters that they are under federal protection. There is a prima facie case of others being cared for financially by the government. One, who has no income, is so indiscreet as to regularlity lose in the neighborhood of $35.00 nightly playing cards. Believe me or not, these are things Garrison does not kno , did not tell me, that I developed on my own. I have a surprising amount of this on tape, too, for most of the witnesses are willing. The magnitude of the Liebeler evil neither of us initially suspected.

As a contibutor to Thornley's fund, do you think it would be presumptuous to ask him to lend you a set of his writing? Perhaps you might even want to limit it to Oswald. Read this guck and ask youself whether or not he has not been part of the framing of Oswald. There is other relevant evidence I do not cite, but what is public he should have no reluctance to let you see. I have only a single copy of what I located. I have given other copies to others, but I'll be glad to let you know if he did not send you a complete file, should you have any interest. It seems to me that whether or not he was part of an Oswald frame-up would be of interest to you. While I have not said so, perhaps you might ask him if he has ever been a "False Oswald" or so suspected.

What you think of Garrison is of no concern to ~~what~~ me. What you have done is beyond recall. What you might do will be no problem to me. What you can say can hardly be more than you already have. I seek nothing personal in writing you. I take this time for no selfish motive. I now have three unpublished books on which I am working, one quite topical that is behind schedule because it has grown to twice its projected size. I take this time because despite what you wrote, I believe, as I have for some time, that you are motivated not by logic or fact by by emotional considerations. Certainly this is at least partly true of all of us, and I say it without intended criticism.

I do not want to prelong this correspendence. I just do not want you to hurt yourself, to later look back with regrets and the wisdom of hindsight.

Sincerely,