

Copy to his attachments under Henry

12/17/68

Dear Helen,

Your card dated 12/6 with the clippings on the motorcyclists, sketches and several typed sheets did reach me in New Orleans, but I did not have time to respond from there.

On the back of the card is this note: "Jack Senn call to New Orleans 18 Oct 68". Perhaps it means something to you.

There were some strange doings. First a man identifying himself as Horsey called me at home about Thornley and himself, beginning by saying he had just clobbered me on TV and perhaps should not have. He called me several more times in N.O., or someone did, the last time leaving a message. When I called back the woman who answered the phone said he'd moved, leaving no forwarding address, about three days earlier - before this call was placed. Meanwhile, he or someone else had phoned my home, found where I was staying, and phoned there. The one who phoned there was impolite, identified himself as Thornley, and declared the alleged intention of "getting to the bottom of this". Now the man with whom I stayed in N.O. knows something of the story and asked for a number to which I could return the call. The caller refused to give it. From several sources I've heard that Thornley wants to talk to me. He has not tried. Horsey says he has valuable information to give. The two need not be related. Anyway, since then, silence.

If Thornley wants to talk to me, he has no problem. All he need do is phone and, if I am not home, leave his number. It would seem, however, that if he really wants to know anything I might know, the least likely way of learning it is not by threatening frivolous lawsuits and not by not seeking it. Frankly, I hope he does file whatever suit he has in mind. It will provide a mechanism for the discovery of truth not available in a criminal proceeding. He has no such intention, or has no reputable lawyer who would engage in such a frivolity. His purposes are propaganda and can be nothing else.

I got his address when I was in New Orleans. Perhaps I'll get his number and phone him when I get a few minutes, and put an end to that nonsense. So you will know, my purposes in going to his agent, Clint Bolton, were not unfriendly. I told Bolton that based on what I knew alone, Garrison's interest was inevitable and I believed T would be wise to offer cooperation rather than await force. I also told Bolton it seemed possible that T had knowledge the significance of which might not be clear to him. I further offered that if this were the case and by talking with me he could learn the significance of any such fact, it would be his literary property. Could I have been more open, or fair? I had nothing to do with Garrison calling him, arresting him, charging him, or the press release, learning in each case from public sources, not Garrison. He hardly knows Garrison as he even dreams that anyone writes a press release for him.

On the indictment, which I have never seen, I cannot sit in judgment. I know only that in writing about it, T has skirted around it, which tends to encourage suspicion. It is other things in which I have interest, other things about T and what he may or may not have done. I have never mentioned these at all. Nor will I volunteer them to him. They are as a consequence of my own work, having nothing to do with Garrison, and they require explanation. It is a fool if he has anything to say and doesn't say it without first reading about it or hearing from others. I can tell you this: his public statements have not been truthful. His conjectures presented as fact about me are false. His public representation of himself is deceptive, and he is taking advantage of people of good intent.

Late Saturday night I was sitting in a Bourbon St. cafe when I by accident met a friend of his. Naturally, we talked about Kerry. He told me this

story: when the girl who was living with him left him, he got his revenge by phoning her mother and telling the mother she had been living with him. I know of other cases where he has beaten women. I have a low opinion of men who do such things. But those things have nothing to do with my interest in him, which would be unchanged were he innocent of the New Orleans charge. In my opinion, that charge does not rest on Barbara Reid alone, as he says. She is not the only one who told me of seeing K and O together. Nor is this the only way in which K could have perjured himself in saying he did not know LHC in NO. More I will not say, but I do have reason for saying this, not conjecture, and the reason is not from one person, from reputable people, and on tape.

On Barbara and their libel that she is a practitioner of witchcraft: she is a Catholic. She did have a voodoo altar in her home. Kerry helped her erect it - for a TV show. Thus, I think it is clear that while weeping to some women for help he is defaming others coast to coast, without their having recourse. Were they to sue him, what could they get? What he has just done to me with Raum is another example. It is a careful distortion, knowingly false. Do not bother to get the clippings. I now have them. Raum is a journalistic whore. I'll enclose my letter to his editor if I get it done in time. What I did tended to exculpate, not incriminate T, and a careful reading of the memo, separated from his propaganda about it, shows there was no intent to deceive and no possibility of it, for the pictures were printed in pairs, in each case one not retouched in any way. Garrison knew nothing about it and there was no reason to presume he did, certainly none for "confirming", the word Raum used, attribution to Levine.

Did Kerry tell you that he and Dave Lifton got together and, in effect, framed an innocent man, John Rene Meindell, with T giving Garrison a false affidavit? Garrison, whether he is right or wrong, is not a vindictive man. He made no charge against Kerry on this, perhaps presuming the falsehood was in good faith. When another man he has similarly under indictment actually plunged a knife deep into the gut of another and was charged with attempted murder by the police, Garrison refused to prosecute on the ground it could reasonable have been in what this man, Clayton Martens, might have considered self defense because they had been engaged in an argument. There are some things on which I disagree with Jim. Perhaps if I had read K's grand-jury testimony and the indictment I might not agree with him on that. But on the things I have learned on my own, T has much to explain, and it is related to the story of the assassination of JFK.

By themselves, without explanation, the enclosed sketches mean nothing to me. I see the resemblance to LHC in the indistinct Xerox of a picture of a man of whom Horsey said he is a friend of K's, a roommate, a member of the "W" club. I do not know who Swan is. I have other reason to believe Andrews had a different relationship with Oswald than came out before the WC.

Can you explain Horsey to me? This strange behavior? Who is he? What does he do? How did he get in all this, meet you, etc? Ditto Senn? It looks strange.

If you have any interest in it, why not arrange for Kerry to phone me with you on an extension and hear his complaint to me, see if it has any validity? Then you should have your questions answered. I do not think he will have any serious face-to-face complaint. I spoke to his colleague Lifton almost two months ago. Lifton has been silent since. He has not, in fact, sent me what he said he would, and he has sent out a rather extensive critique on his and Kerry's writings about me and Garrison. Please excuse the haste, for I'll not have time to read and correct this. Hope you can understand the types. Thanks for the Xmas card, and have a good holiday and a fine new year.

Sincerely,