

Dear Joan,

4/15/00

With the passing of time and all that in that time has happened to me I am reluctant to be or claim to be able to be as precise as you ask. That was clearly the intent but that I named Boxley I cannot now say. In part this is because I do not remember if I named him. In part that is because it would not then have been necessary. With Boxley having been CIA Salandria could not have avoided suspecting him. It may also have been that I did not name Boxley in order for Salandria to feel that he had made a remarkable discovery. However, there is no doubt that I was pointing to him, whether or not I named him, because of his background and the office suspicions about him.

You are correct in believing that I wanted Salandria there because he had, your words, Garrison's ear. The rest was to be able to have him there because Garrison trusted <sup>him</sup> and listened to him.

I made up both stories because of the need and because I could see no other way of convincing Garrison who, remember, had decided to name as one of the actual assassins a man who killed himself in Garrison's jurisdiction about 24-25 months earlier. <sup>To</sup> Garrison's knowledge. As I visualized my problem, when Jim could convince himself of that fabrication of his, <sup>it</sup> would be difficult if not impossible to overcome that and I could not believe that I could do that. It was to convince Salandria and to keep him informed while he was talking daily with Garrison that <sup>at</sup> I needed him there and most of all I needed him because when he saw the actual evidence he could realize the truth and be persuasive with Jim.

As I may not even have had the <sup>chance</sup> ~~chance~~ to do and be.

Maybe some of this will become clearer when we talk in June. I hope that when you are there you can get to talk to Sciambra, who when I <sup>last</sup> ~~last~~ heard from him was a magistrate, and to Von, from whom I've not heard since before he made the legislature. How much they'll remember I can't guess but they are the two who enlisted me. They <sup>were</sup> ~~were~~ genuinely worried.

There is more in the Garrison book in which you can have fun so have it with you.

You can get from Bordelon in particular a personal view of what kind of man Jim really was. Steve, and I think with Lynn Loisel, got an exceptionally fancy and costly pistol to give Jim I think for Xmas, and then Jim turns around and tries to get Bordelon, who had done much for him, very much, in trouble over Jim's allegedly missing records.

As you reread the Garrison book, make a list of questions to ask me. As I remember after all these years, much in it is ludicrous, not only deliberately false. Things of which you have <sup>no</sup> ~~no~~ knowledge. What you do not use will be of use as part of history's record. Best,

Herb

In thinking this over, I hang up on your use of the word "plant." I am confident that I neither used nor suggested that word, for a variety of different reasons. I am also confident that what I did was give him to understand that the Garrison case, the prosecution, was about to be wrecked by the CIA. He might have assumed that it was Boxley on his own but I do not <sup>now</sup> believe that I said or implied that now. As a side issue, I know of no way of connecting Bradley with the CIA, and in this <sup>includes</sup> the assorted nuttiness that was always made up out of nothing and added, and he would have been the second assassin named if Jim had been able to go ahead with what he had planned and told his staff,

In trying to think back on this, I recall no Turner connection of any kind with any part of it. If you have any evidence of any such connection please let me see it. I had no use for Turner, did not take his word on anything, and I do know he was part of the misleading of Garrison. Who in that department needed no help. But after all these years I recall no connection of Turner with that..

Thanks for the SASE. Feeble as I've become all help, no matter how <sup>w</sup> minor, is not a meaningful help, as that is. Thanks for thinking of it.

Turner is another Garrison story, another Garrison misleading on behalf of the French CIA, the SDECE in those years. And its fake book titled L'Amerique Brule. Retitled by Garrison Carewell America.

I have a file on that and on the SDECE connection. I am the one who broke that up when they were about to get Garrison's endorsement for a film version of it, including the best of Zapruder transparencies <sup>the</sup> that macher on that, who used the name James Hepburn, told me he got from a Kennedy family member of friend.

I am and was certain that was false.

Thanks also for the ID Levine book, which I should have read years ago. Not that it had any relevance but because he was to ghost for Marina, about which McClintock and perhaps Dulles had things to say at an executive session or more than one. But I no longer have my set of them and I'll have to ask someone who might remember that or them for a copy.