

Just received the issue of Ramparts containing "Mississipp. autopsy" by David Spain, which I had requested. Haven't read it yet - more on it anon.

1115th BEVERLY DRIVE
BEVERLY HILLS CALIFORNIA

Sunday
after my call to you

Sylvia, dear:

Here is the article you wanted. I decided to send you 2 copies since I had made several at the time, in preparation for the panoply on the "peripheral crimes", threats, etc. It seems strangely prophetic - the caption, at least - and I now regret, all the more, that I never followed up my intention of having a meeting with her. I had, last year, called her - as I believe I told you - she was out of town and I spoke with her secretary who told me that she had a continuing and vital interest in every facet of the case. One thing I especially remember being impressed by, at the time (i.e. late October 1964) was the fact that she was militantly and actively campaigning for the election of Robert Kennedy in the N.Y. Senatorial Contest - particularly in view of my feeling that she ~~was~~ ^{had been} a political conservative and certainly an avowed Republican prior to her emergence in "the case." Ruark's death may be connected. I have heard, however, that he was quite a heavy drinker and that that may have been a contributing factor. In the Kilgallen situation, I would like to know - if all is free of suspicion (!) - why there was complete silence, after the autopsy was performed. Why was the public never told what the autopsy revealed and how strange that there wasn't a peep out of her

husband, her father or any of her co-workers and friends? ²
Arlene Francis, who appeared last week on the TODAY show,
said she was in excellent health & was in especially good
spirits because of the fact that Bennett (Crf) had agreed to
publish the book she had just completed dealing with her
experiences, over the years, "as a reporter." I find this
whole business quite chilling!

It has occurred to me recently that, while we have all tend
ed to concentrate on the Oswald aspect of the case, the real
key is Ruby. More and more I become convinced of this. And,
in thinking back (of) over the "peripheral crimes" which
we know about, (& the threats, suicides, stranglings, shootings
etc.) in nearly every instance they are connected in some
way with Ruby, rather than with LHO. — for example, Little
Hymn Carlin was threatened by Kirkwood Betty Mooney McPhee
worked for Ruby, Theresa Norton worked for Ruby, Jim Koethe
entered Ruby's apartment, the Long Beach newspaperman who
was "accidentally" shot by the policeman had been in Ruby's
apartment. (I tried to find the article about that case but
have been unsuccessful, so far; — it should be among my
myriad clippings. If not, if you can pin-point the date of
the killing, I can look it up in the library & will then get
Xerox copies & mail them to you)

After seeing Kaplan ^{on TV} (the one who teaches at Stanford & wrote
"The Trial of Jack Ruby") I have decided that he is an
utter fool and a waste of time. I have no intention of
buying his book. He did not attend the trial — and he is
completely ignorant of the case — and, while I agree with
his attack on Belli — my agreement does not evolve for
the same reasons at all. He appears to be saying that Belli
didn't have to persist in the psychomotor epilepsy argumen
in order save Ruby from electrocution — that he could have
brought about a light sentence or even acquittal without resor

to such a complicated premise — "after all, says Kaplan, Ruby did kill a Communist who murdered the President of the U.S." — so why should the jury not be lenient with him? !!! I take Belli to task for being a charlatan of the first degree + a money-oriented, unprincipled, publicity-grabbing egomaniac — but, curiously enough, his indictment of Dallas + the police + everybody connected with the case, in his book "Dallas Justice" all about points the finger of plot, conspiracy at every one of them! Incidentally, have you read the current piece (November issue) in the "Minority of One" called "What Ruby Did Not Tell" by Thomas C. Fiddick? He makes that very point. This Kaplan individual, on the other hand, sounds to me as though he had been hired by some one — and he never even questions Ruby's motives or involvement. It goes without saying, therefore, that he has read neither the H+S. nor the WR. The gall of these people turning out books! I have sent you a book I came across in Paris. — I believe I've already mentioned it to you — it's called "Procès de Dallas" by Frédéric Pottecher. You should be receiving it shortly. After you've read it, if you don't mind, you might call Savage + tell him about it — as, perhaps, he'd be interested in borrowing your copy. — it's quite short + I think interesting in its way.

I'm still waiting for Dave to call as I'm dying to question ^{him} about the witness you spoke of who saw the men gathering behind the wall!! That's absolutely electrifying + I can't imagine why he hasn't phoned to tell me — (or ~~call~~ Ray! I sincerely hope Dave isn't having a pipe-dream!

Must close for the moment. I'll be looking forward to the next wind-fall from you; everything you say + send is of tremendous value + interest. Carry on, keep well + God bless —
Fondly, Maggie