

M^{RS} JOSEPH A. FIELD JR
1115^{NO} BEVERLY DRIVE
BEVERLY HILLS CALIFORNIA

Monday
23rd Aug. 1965

Dear Sylvia-

Again, I begin with an apology! Try as I might, I simply was not able to write a proper kind of letter to you this past week. Our son has two house-guests and while I won't bore you with the various and constant demands on my time, I seemed to be in more or less constant motion. Also, I'm trying desperately to work against time in order to accomplish the task I have set for myself on the WR, in time to complete it before I leave for N.Y. and I end up in a veritable ball of frustration 1). because I'm continuously being interrupted and pulled in every other direction and 2) because, as I've already intimated, I begin to collect my notes and past research on a particular phase, only to become entrapped by all sorts of other tributaries. I am making a very slow progress but my main problem, in addition to those already outlined, is that the task I have set for myself is utterly monumental AND it's difficulties are considerably increased by the fact that I am working entirely alone. The time element, for example, could be enormously cut down if there were someone to help me with the looking up of references, etc. or simply with the typing involved. I sometimes think I'll be working on the damned thing until I breathe my last, which may be sooner than I think! And, Sylvia, I am quite honestly SO tired of the whole ugly mess - really quite sick to death of it - and yet, I have a maddening compulsion which will not allow me to give up until I've done what I want to do about it.

I was, of course, interested in learning of Salandria's visit to the Archives. His transcript should be very informative and important. Ray Marcus, however, is quite surprised at what S. has determined about the time that Cannally and the President were first hit, being of the opinion that each was struck much earlier than S. seems to believe. I, too, share Ray's opinion but, of course, we haven't seen the slides. Ray did an entire hypothetical treatment on that subject, which I sent you, and I thought he had worked it out quite validly. S. is convincing and seems to be logical and careful in his

conclusions, however, and I will certainly read his findings with 2.
both an open ~~and~~ mind and great interest.

I am utterly mystified by the events attendant upon Marina's marital situation. They could be fraught with significance and they could also not have much bearing on other things but I am highly suspicious of the whole business. Also, the story of the gun and revolver, which you were kind enough to send along to me, is completely incomprehensible! Our papers carried nary a word of it. When did Marina sell the so-called Mannlicher and to whom? How do you interpret Katzenbach's stand on having the weapons returned to the Archives "in case there are future doubts among students of the case"!!! especially in view of what he allegedly communicated to Salandria? In my opinion, everything in the way of evidence (alleged, of course) connected with the case should have been put on display for the public's examination, particularly since the Government has nothing to hide!!!! Yet, the car was totally dismantled, the number one piece of evidence, the murder weapon, is being passed around privately, there are no X-rays or photographs or movies for one to see and we are still supposed to believe that everything is open and above-board! Remarkable!

You can't imagine how electrifying^{ing} your single sentence concerning Mr. K.'s message to Salandria to "lay off" was! It was a bombshell of such great magnitude that everything else paled and I kept telling myself "this is it"!! I have been very careful about confiding it to others, having restricted its circulation to Ray and Ronnie. (I didn't even tell Dave because I was afraid of what such an implication might cause him to do in the way of telephoning and generally running off at the mouth about it indiscriminately).

I hope you will forgive me for waiting so long to untangle the mystery concerning why Dave was so upset a few weeks ago and what the cause of it was. As I've already told you, while Dave has found some potentially valuable and explosive developments in the case, (to wit, the figures behind the wall), he does go quite wild every now and then and, once he had made those quite startling discoveries, (and I continue to believe that they are, indeed, behind the wall) he began to think that there would be no limit to the dramatic things he could continue to uncover, if he persisted in studying the pictures. So, persist he did. And one day he called and said he was quite ill over his latest find and proceeded to tell me that there was an Army truck behind the wall with a crane-like, movable ladder, that there were many, many more men there in helmets, etc., that there were distinct faces up in the trees and they were there via this ladder-type

appurtenance, and he was thus convinced that it was an enormous Army-Pentagon type operation, not just a Texas-conceived crime, and that, therefore, there was no point in our working to uncover the truth because it was all too vast, too powerful, too well-engineered, etc.! And he was ill because he genuinely feared for all of us, feeling that we ~~had~~ been delivered over into the control of the military. Now, I must admit that I was not able to see what he saw! I saw the faces in the trees but, by this time, I was afraid I was seeing faces in every conceivable part of the picture so I couldn't trust any such notion. I'm also quite ready to believe that the Pentagon could very well have been involved and that we have reason to fear its power, etc. but I must say that Dave's assumptions bordered a bit on the ridiculous and Ray was absolutely fit to be tied and told him so. I didn't go that far with Dave because I can easily believe almost anything, at this point, no matter how far-fetched it appears- and, also, because I didn't want to shut him out - but Ray feels that it's way out and that Dave has really gone overboard on the whole thing. I finally conceded that Ray was correct when Dave went several steps further - bought a very complicated, high-powered special viewing lens and then proceeded to tell me that he saw parts of a helicopter back there, etc., etc. ad infinitum!! Even I finally told him that no matter how convinced he was of the validity of his findings, he would do well to keep the information to himself because even the most dedicated doubter would not only think him highly irresponsible and wild but would seriously question his sanity! In the meanwhile, however, he has admitted that the whole business about the helicopter was a misapprehension, although he continues to insist that there is some kind of complicated arrangement back there, bearing directly on the assassination, and he's working desperately to develop what he can with it. He was quite elated when I reminded him that Truly had mentioned a WPA project being engineered back there because, obviously, that tended to support his theory. When you think about that bit of intelligence from Truly, you begin to wonder, too, not only what the heck such a thing might have been doing there at that time, but also at the exclusivity of Truly's reference to it, since he is the only person testifying (that I know of) who ever mentions its existence! Now, you have the essence of the tale, for whatever it may be worth, in any case - and, frankly, I'm not inclined to put much store by it.

As for the Eva Grant interview, in which she spoke of Ruby and Rippit being "like brothers", there's absolutely no question in my mind that she said it. Dom Benafede is a responsible reporter and, as I've said, it most definitely appeared in the N.Y. Times with a by-line of an equally respected reporter, because I saw it and still have all of it, EXCEPT for that missing and very important phrase. That she later denied having said it is quite understandable and beside the point. I suppose my one recourse, in trying to track it down with finality, is to write Buchanan in Paris and ask him if he has a copy of the interview in his possession or if, at least, he can give me the proper references, for he used the quoted phrase in his book but failed to document it and he's the only one who has made the reference, among the doubters.

My plans for N.Y. are not entirely formulated but I do expect to reach there about the 2nd or 3rd of Oct. (I leave for Paris on the night of the 8th and plan to be gone till the end of the month). As soon as I have a more definite schedule, I shall let you know as I am most anxious to meet with you and to meet, also, with any or all of the others who may be available and interested. I know that being a career-girl, your time is much more restricted than is mine so that I would wish to accomodate myself to your convenience and, outside of a few shopping chores and a visit or two with friends, I hope to keep myself relatively free so that I can fit into your schedule. More of that, later - but, for now, you can pretty well count on my being there no later than the 4th.

No more comes to mind at present so I shall take leave of you until the very near future. I so look forward to your letters, bulletins and most informative resumés of conversations, etc. For so long I had the feeling that all was dead, inactive, shut off with regards to the case but since I've known you, I've had a wonderful renaissance of interest and activity and I do feel, perhaps idiotically, that we ARE getting somewhere! God only knows where!

Yours, appreciatively,

Maggie

P.S. Read the Aug. 23rd issue of NEWSWEEK - (p. 83) on the Rosenberg case! It will revive your hope as to the power of a well-documented book & what parallels can be drawn! (OVER)

P.P.S. One of the chores I have assigned to myself consists in pointing up the one-sidedness of the Commission members with regard to the conservativeness of their backgrounds politically, (thus emphasizing what Mark Lane has often done this - the almost total lack of any member's representing the views of Pres. Kennedy). Along this line, I am almost certain that Gerald Ford was once a member of the House on Un-American Activities Committee and would like to bring the fact to light but, search as I may at the library and through other sources, I have failed to find the fact in print so that I could use it for documentation. Can you help me in this instance? Do you know about it? Or can you suggest where I might find a record of it? I would be ever so grateful to get that information. Many thanks. M.M.

My plans for N.Y. are not entirely formulated but I do expect to reach there about the 2nd or 3rd of Oct. (I leave for Paris on the night of the 21st and plan to be gone till the end of the month). As soon as I have a more definite schedule, I shall let you know. I am most anxious to meet with you and to meet, also, with any of all of the others who may be available and interested. I know that being a convenient, your time is much more restricted than is mine so that I would wish to accommodate myself to your convenience and outside of a few shopping chores and a visit or two with friends, I hope to keep myself relatively free so that I can fit into your schedule. None of that, later - but, for now, you can pretty well count on being there no later than the 4th. We were going to mind at present so I shall take leave of you until the very near future. I so look forward to your letters, bulletins and most informative resumes of conversations, etc. for so long I had the feeling that all was dead, inactive, and off with regards to the case but since I've known you, I've had a wonderful remembrance of interest and activity and I do feel, perhaps id-ly, that we are getting somewhere! God only knows where!

Yours, appreciatively,

Joseph

(Handwritten notes and signatures at the bottom of the page, including a signature that appears to be "Joseph" and some illegible text.)