

14 February 1968

Mr. Edward Jay Epstein
295 Harvard Street
Cambridge, Mass.

Dear Ed,

Aaron Asher was good enough to send the ms. over by messenger on Monday and I have now done a "first reading," rather hastily. I have a few minor comments, which are enclosed separately.

The article seems to me an unanswerable expose of Garrison, perhaps the more powerful for its understated, clinical tone. The chicanery and demagoguery which characterize the man are shown with clarity and force. You have succeeded also in converting the bewildering agglomeration of contrived events into a coherent story.

The only questions I would raise relate to omissions from the article rather than its contents. It may create the impression that there are no legitimate grounds for criticism of the CIA, since Garrison's lurid charges against the Agency are transparently improvised and cynical, when in fact the CIA has been revealed--in contexts other than the assassination--to be a dangerous influence on foreign policy and domestic institutions. Indeed, its vulnerability to legitimate attack has probably encouraged Garrison in his deranged and bold accusations.

More serious is the omission of the very compelling argument which you yourself have made in conversation: that the lunatic New Orleans investigation of the assassination increases the urgency of setting into motion a responsible, professional investigation in which the rights of the individual will be scrupulously respected and the facts elucidated and evaluated with uncompromising impartiality, divorced from any political pressures. The article as it now stands may encourage the impression, in the casual reader, that the Warren Report is probably all right and that all criticism of the Commission is Garrison-like and to be dismissed as more of the same crack-pottery.

I am looking forward to the weekend, when I hope to have time for a more careful and leisurely re-reading, after which I will probably write again.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher
302 West 12 Street
New York City 10014

Page 3 You should qualify your statement that Ferrie was Oswald's commander. See Voebel's testimony, 8H 14, in which he thinks it might have been Ferrie but is rather dubious.

Page 11 lines 1-4: Garrison's supporters will point out that while "PO" yields at least six different prefixes, it yields only one that corresponds with an existing telephone exchange in Dallas. Lines 4-5: True, and in Garrison's press release unveiling the "code" in the first instance he repeatedly said that the "PO 19106" code was rigid, invariable, and undeviating.

Page 15 middle of page: Suggest you delete "Much like Oswald." I don't think there is a true analogy but will not burden you with arguments against it unless you want to hear them.

Page 18 para. 1: I didn't know that Martin admitted that he had invented the story. Has that been in print anywhere? (I assumed that he had invented it out of malice of some kind.) Did Garrison know that Martin admitted the story was false?

Page 18 para. 2: I believe that I was told in January 1967 that Garrison also had a wiretap on Ferrie, for what that is worth.

Page 20 penultimate line: Oswald received an honorable discharge from the Marine Corps but subsequently was discharged from the Marine Reserves, not with a "dishonorable discharge" but an "undesirable discharge" (see WR 689).

Page 21 para. 3, line 3: young assistant district attorney

Page 29 line 7: imported from Cuba, when? If from pre-Castro Cuba, it should be indicated.

Page 40 When Andrews testified, he explained why he had told the FBI that Bertrand was only a figment of his imagination, as indicated in 11H 334. He was trying to get the FBI out of his hair. This might be mentioned, in fairness to Andrews.

Page 45 Marcus never claimed the men were in cowboy hats, not, at least, to my knowledge.

Page 74 footnote: The frames are missing from the original film, according to George Hunt, publisher of Life, who states that in the excitement on 11/22/63 the film broke and had to be spliced. However, these frames do appear in the first-generation copies of the Zapruder film. See full account in SIX SECONDS IN DALLAS.

Page 80 para. 1: Although you are dealing with Garrison's evidence primarily and not the Commission's, I think you really must qualify the statement that "a palmprint was discovered...which three different experts positively identified as Oswald's." It is not the identity but the authenticity of the lift that is in question; and you might indicate some reservations without going into chapter and verse.

Page 81 para. 2: I strongly disagree with your presentation. The encounter could not have taken place as long as five minutes after the shots; even the Commission stipulates that Oswald left the TSBD by 12:33 p.m., to get him out before any policeman could stop him at the door (one officer testified that he sealed the front door 2 or no more than 3 minutes after the shots), and to get him on to the bus on time. The reenactments were inexact and unfair; and you must take into account also Sandra Styles and Victoria Adams, even if the Commission did not.