

1115<sup>ND</sup> BEVERLY DRIVE  
BEVERLY HILLS CALIFORNIA

Thursday A. M.  
8:30 - 5<sup>th</sup> Aug.

Dear Sylvia -

When I awakened this morning, — minutes ago — I began to think about the lengthy epistle I had transmitted to you last evening and there is still one area that I feel the need to belabor a bit further — the one dealing with Mark here.

As I indicated to you, I don't know any of the circumstances which have precipitated the heated furor from so many different sides surrounding the mere mention of his name; — if someone, such as Savage, for example, were to specifically pinpoint the reasons for his unmitigated contempt — or one reason, in fact — I would perhaps be able to better appreciate why he has occasioned such strong feelings of distrust on so many sides. But I do feel it is important, nevertheless, to focus some attention, amid all the anti-homosexual upsurge, upon the fact that for a very long time, in the early days of investigating the case, he was quite alone in his fight — he stood up to the

Commission on several occasions — and to the best —  
and was the recipient of the most vicious kind of  
abuse and attack — and really took them all on,  
single-handed, totally without support. He gave all  
of his time, lost out on his law practice and persisted  
under the most adverse and difficult circumstances  
with what appeared to me, at least, to be singular  
courage. He was for a long time the only ~~distinct~~  
distinct voice in the country — and his charges ~~in~~  
the beginning, were not ill-considered or irresponsible.  
I know that he had been rudely accosted by FBI agents  
and that he ~~had~~ <sup>experienced</sup> <sup>harassment</sup> in conveniences and harassment in  
connection with one of his re-entries to the U.S. from  
abroad — and all of this compounded by sniping  
from the people who should have lent him some  
measure of support or encouragement — for I can't  
help but believe, too, that he served as a spring board  
for some of those who criticize him the most vociferously.

As I've indicated before, I never heard of or knew  
Horkline or anything about the man before his brief  
in the Guardian appeared, and I am, therefore, not  
defending him out of some blind or calculated loyalty  
but until I am given some specific reason to ~~about~~ <sup>question</sup> his  
motives or to place him in obloquy, I must, in good  
conscience re-state what I do know about him — and

the little I do know makes me  $\phi$  wonder and feel almost  
dimly about why he is <sup>held</sup> in such well-earned disrepute.  
Can you enlighten me -- and I being a naive fool,  
placing my trust where it doesn't belong! Why is Lunge  
so bitter -- and all the others, too? There must be  
some valid grounds, if so many utter the same cries.  
And, yet, I truly am in the dark. Or could it be  
that he simply doesn't happen to have a "sympathique"  
kind of personality -- or that he was the first?  
There is one area, in all honesty, which was continued  
to disturb me and that  $\phi$  is the matter of the meeting  
(or about Nov. 14<sup>th</sup> '65) in the (Crown) Club with  
Tippit, Wiseman & Ruby. I know that here insists on  
the validity of its having taken place and has never  
backed down in spite of fierce opposition and ridicule.  
But his final performance on that score, before the  
Commission, left the matter dangling and totally un-  
resolved and while I rationalised about believing  
that he really couldn't divulge his source unless, as  
he proposed to the Commission, they were to subpoena  
him under oath and force him to reveal the secret --  
(you know from his last appearance before them that he  
suggested the idea and they ignored the suggestion --  
I, nevertheless, can't refrain from feeling, too, that in a  
matter of such world-shaking importance -- informa-  
tion that would certainly have blown the case sky-high  
-- I should have been able to find some way, within the

bounds of the law, in which to justify his claims or in which to force the truth. — Having left his explosive charge dangling in mid-air, as he did, without a semblance of validity as far as the public-at-large is concerned, about all he managed to accomplish was added mistrust of himself and of his cause and the permanent stigma of "rank sensationalism" — "Self-seeking, self-aggrandizing — lies" !!!

It is all most perplexing and disheartening — and at this point I no longer know what to believe — but I felt I had to stand up for the more creditable aspects of June's contributions to the cause, in spite of and even because of all the vituperous criticism of him — and that is all that I know about him. If you can enlighten me, in any way, I would be grateful as, if there is something derogatory about him or his background, I would be all-urged to inform myself of whatever it may be.

Forgive my taking up still more of your valuable time but, as I say, I awakened with this on the brain and wanted to convey the sum & substance of it to you.

With kindest regards,

Faggie.