Fund, Low Stuc B, going Lucas

October 8, 1968

Mr. George W. Healy, Jr. Executive Editor The Times-Picayune 3800 Howard Avenue New Orleans, Louisiana 70140

Dear Mr. Healy:

1

調査の

のないないのないので、

Your letter of October 4 is welcome and I look forward to accepting your kind invitation. I expect to arrive in New Orleans the afternoon of a busy day for a newspaper executive, election day. Suppose I phone the next day to see what your situation is? My time will be somewhat flexible, for my purpose is to continue my investigations.

May I, with no selfish motive, suggest that you may want to have a list of things you'd like to ask me about? This can relate to the New Orleans aspects, where I have done my own work and will speak of my own knowledge (Jim Garrison has yet to tell me a single thing that is at all improper, nothing a reasonable man would consider a secret despite the contrary press), and/or almost any other part of the entire case, for I have worked on most. I have an enormous amount of unpublished material and am prepared to trust your newspaperman's confidence, if this is your desire.

After I wrote you, I heard from the Dellllawyer and told him of my planned visit. He has asked that I not be ostentatious, because that case, in which no effort was made to serve me either, could be complicated were I to be involved at this point, and the added expense could amount to several thousand dollars. It was scheduled to have been completed by now, but it has been delayed. If you are interested in this litigation, I am confident he will supply you with copies of any of the papers you might want. He is Mr. William Lucas, of Dufours, Levy, Marx and Lucas, National Bank of Commerce Building, 529-5551.

In telling you this and of my plans, I am really expressing my confidence in your personal integrity, as I think you will understand.

I am willing to go further. I will tell you of certain local angles that were never really followed and could be productive. In advance, I also tell you that I will not regard your disinterest as cowardice or bias, because I recognize they can be time-consuming, hence costly. However, if there is to be any kind of a dialogue, even only a social one, it cannot succeed without good faith. I begin with the offer of mine and a basis for your assuming it. What, if anything, we do or do not discuss, I will leave entirely up to you.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg