

12 October 1968

Dear Tom,

Many thanks for your note of the 8th and the copy of Ruth Paine's letter. It is most interesting! I am very inclined to agree with you that the letter indicates her desire to ingratiate herself with Garrison by the use of flattery, which she has cleverly sensed to be one of his vulnerable points. It was a good piece of "insurance" on her part, especially as she presumably is not aware that Salandria has always been extremely suspicious of the Paines and that Salandria has been influencing and educating Garrison. (Incidentally, I have heard from two different sources that Salandria is becoming disenchanted with Big Jim--not for any of the numerous material reasons for disenchantment, but because he is supposedly not socking it hard enough to the CIA!)

Mrs. Paine earlier (even before the assassination) showed her propensity for self-ingratiation, with Hosty and later with the other FBI/Secret Service agents and of course with the Warren Commission, whose compassion she surely aroused by her stark account of her failure to interest her husband, as a woman and as a wife. But she was more sanctimonious than pure, and certainly revealed her malice toward Oswald on a number of occasions.

Certainly I do not take at face value her account of why she harbored Marina with such angelic generosity. I can believe that there was a strong element of lesbianism, for example, and I do not foreclose the possibility of a more sinister assassination-connected motive. It is curious that from the day of Oswald's death, Marina coldly and cruelly refused to see Ruth Paine, while Mrs. Paine accepted rebuff and humiliation while persisting in her attempts to see Marina. Reading J.H. Martin's testimony about Ruth's visit, when Marina secluded herself knowing that her friend and protectress was right there in the house, one senses a bitter and implacable hostility which is not explained by the official version of their relationship.

You will be interested in the enclosed copy of an editorial in the current issue of The Progressive, calling Mark Lane's bluff. If all of us who have had similar personal experience of Lane's chicanery and untruthfulness could publish similar corrections of the record, we would have quite an imposing body of literature.

As every