

Noon 7.17.67

Dearest Maggie,

On the reverse side of this page you will find a copy of the letter I sent to Gene Persson on 4.13.67. I don't have a copy of the reply I received, dated 7.13.67 and signed by Melinda Hamilton, Assistant to Mr. Persson. The relevant paragraph is:

We are most interested in having someone such as yourself with your background and knowledge look over our script with an eye to an accurate interpretation of the evidence that is at the public's disposal. Needless to say, because it is a play, we have taken certain liberties i.e. incorporating more than one witness' testimony under one fictitious name. We would be most grateful if you could suggest such a person as you state that you are too tied up at this time to do such a chore. When you have a moment, I would appreciate a call as I would like to discuss this with you further...

When I spoke to Miss Hamilton a few minutes ago, I suggested you and gave your address and phone numbers. She did not ask whether or not I had already mentioned this to you, so I did not volunteer any information. She was worried about one thing: would there be any financial charge? I said that I could not of course speak for you or for any other critic but that it was my impression and my experience that each of us has one paramount concern: that the facts of the case should be presented accurately and honestly. That was the main objective, not financial or other factors, and many of the critics had freely given their time and labor in many different contexts in order to ensure the most accurate possible presentation of the facts in this case. However, I did not commit you, one way or another, on reviewing the script of the play, with or without fee (and of course I did not breathe a hint that you already have the script, which would have surprised Miss Hamilton no end).

After many calls from Bill and his questionnaire, I placed a call this morning, as Bill had asked me to do, to the man at WBAI Pacifica. To my embarrassment, he was not expecting my call and seemed to know nothing about my taping remarks on the CBS "documentary". He said that he would call Bill today and clarify the matter. I guess there was a slip-up somewhere along the line. Please don't mention this to Bill; I am sure it is not his fault personally, and I don't want him to feel bad.

I don't know how you felt about Garrison's rebuttal on NBC the other night but I have to say that he said nothing to change my impression. I did agree with his remark that "anything that is untrue is dangerous" and I did chuckle with real pleasure and amusement at his metaphor of the elephant and the daisy --how true it is! For the rest, I am sorry that Garrison has decided to speak in the capacity of a WR critic full-fledged; I don't think his knowledge of the 26 volumes is complete or secure; and it seemed to me that his remarks on the philosophical, political, and evidential aspects of the case were a melange of what he has heard from the various visiting critics, most of whom can speak with greater authority. Is it true that Mark Lane is moving to New Orleans to work actively and full-time with Garrison? And please clarify your reference to an article by Dr. Schwartz, in your letter to Midgley. Must close now and turn to waiting chores. All my love, dear, and please let me know what happens on the script of the play, when you have heard from Miss Hamilton.

As always,