

Dear Jim,

4/8/73

I've been trying to figure out what to do about the Garrison civil suit, if anything. Frankly, I can't come to a conclusion. The one thing of which I am certain is that Garrison will be at cross purposes with me. Guess there is a second: I'm sick of the whole stinking mess he made.

Why not discuss this with Bud and leave it up to him whether he gets in touch with Garrison? You don't know who my witnesses are, so I'm protected on that. I'd rather, if he decides to get in touch with Garrison, that he not be specific about what I have in mind for discovery. You can tell Bud, though. If Bud is too busy or doesn't want to bother, that is o.k.

I had considered writing Garrison. However, based on his self-concept, the record of the past and his attitude toward me, I decided against it. Besides, I have no reason to believe a letter would reach him.

There was one amusing part of sitting down and trying to think this through. I believe trial is set for this month. The funny thing is what he calls my "communications problem". His first mention of this fiction of which I know was before the hearing by Halleck, in early December 1968. He was then very much embarrassed by having to take help from me in the Boxley/Turner business, generally and if my suspicion is correct, because he is smart enough to know that I suspected that entire fiasco was feedback to him of the insanity he dreamed up about the Perrins and Bradley. He then said, to my face, that "we" had a communications problem. I was content to sit in silence, having already arranged for the necessary. (In fact, I even ducked meetings he asked for.)

Analyzing the workings of the sick mind and pinpointing its sick reactions is not easy. As a generality, I'd say that Jim was and is suspicious of all who do not fawn and tell him how great and perfect he is. He is also a very envious man and is embarrassed when he can't avoid within himself recognizing that he is wrong.

One time in particular I raised hell with him about a stupid double-cross. He had given me his word and broke it, making it appear as though others had that he was innocent. If I tell you I haven't ~~not~~ often used such word, you know the severity with which I spoke to him. He then called Sciambra in, and I really unloaded on him. He is the one who was immediately responsible for what happened. It would require no great imagination to assume that all Sciambra did is what he had been told by Jim to do. So, because I really couldn't tell Jim about himself what I wanted to, I dumped it all on Sciambra, elaborating on the stupidity and futility of the entire business. The more I laid it on about the stupidity, the more purple Garrison's face got. That was in the summer of 1968, or late spring.

His feelings about me may go back to our first meeting, in April 1967, when I cast doubt about Russo and inferred that if he did not know Oswald, they had met. I did not then dream of his having mortgaged himself to the Russo fairy-tale. And, of course, in all the time I spent there I never had any interest in Shaw and never did any investigating relating to him. This, I suppose, was a separate, heinous crime.

There is a "communications problem". It is of different character. It is because I did communicate, did get through, and there was no way of avoiding it.

This is a strange man to whom there are three cardinal sins; someone else being right; his being wrong; and his not being able to avoid recognizing that he is wrong.

It would be too bad if this "communications problem" of his fabrication were to be as costly as I can visualize to him and to those who tried to help him.

In the criminal case, I agree that on the basis of what is public there is little chance of a conviction. However, unlike him and Bud, I do not assume that the government has publicized all. I have, in fact, reason to believe they have not.

Sincerely,