

16 August 1967

Mr. William Turner  
Ramparts  
301 Broadway  
San Francisco 94133

Dear Bill,

Just received my copy of the September issue and hastened to read, and applaud, your commentary of the CBS evangelism on behalf of the Warren Report. Like you, I had the impression that Bob Richter was sympathetic to the critics' position, and I know for a fact that he made a determined effort to introduce some semblance of balance and impartiality. Obviously, he did not succeed.

I did a review, too, which was to appear in the September TMO. It has been displaced by the Arab-Israeli war, to which the entire issue is to be devoted, and is now scheduled for October--which may be a case of better never than late. It is just as well, then, that I sent CBS and other interested parties a quite long letter taking issue with some of the more flagrant of their fictions and perversions of fact (I am sorry that I ran out of copies and did not send you one). In any case, my letter made the identical point about the blurred frames--that frames 195 and 203 were just as blurred as the three frames CBS cited. An argument that occurred to me only after the letter was mailed and the review was written is that the interval between the first two frames cited by CBS (190 and 227) is something less than the 42 frames or 2.3 seconds required to operate the bolt of the Carcano.

When it comes to Garrison, you probably know already that I differ from you and from almost all the other critics. But Garrison is lucky to have a writer like you presenting his side of the case. Despite my personal lack of confidence in him, I certainly hold no brief for the dirty work by NBC and its sister-media, which I suspect would have been no less wicked and malicious if the New Orleans investigation was a model of propriety and scruples. Unfortunately, I find myself unable to invest one iota of credibility in Russo or Bundy, or in the so-called code ("P.O. 19106"); and one of Garrison's hottest adherents among the critics has recently returned from a visit there discouraged and even dismayed after examination of the whole "case." (But even more loyal and impassioned, just the same.) I was interested in your explanation of the Sciambra hucunae, which is about the third version I've heard and which, even if it is the authentic one, still leaves the incident a curious one. Who thrusts half-completed memos at a reporter without at least specifying in advance that it is incomplete?

As to Gurvich, you have obviously changed the opinion of him which you expressed to Arnoni and me when you were in New York a few months ago. He has certainly behaved with less and less dignity as his defection grew older. Even so, every traveler who returned from New Orleans told me that he was the chief investigator, and I have to question the disavowals made on every side after the defection.

Your review of Inside The FBI spurs me to read the book, which has been sitting unopened for two months on my table. Congratulations.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher  
302 West 12 St NYC 10014