

3 August 1966

Dear Paul,

The letter from Knebel is both interesting and exasperating. I expect Ed to drop in tomorrow and I am sure he will be glad to have the information. Ed was on a radio interview last night (local NYC station) and the Knebel article was thrown at him, of course; he made a fairly strong presentation of the Hudkins matter, specifically SS767, which was sent to Knebel by Viking on 7/15/66, without acknowledgment, retraction, apology, or rebuttal, to date.

The Rowland matter is important—but not in the terms in which Knebel presents it. Whether or not Rowland is "prone to exaggerate" about himself is immaterial because his observations on Dealey Plaza were corroborated—by Roger Craig, directly; by Mrs. Walther, indirectly; and by Barbara Rowland, in part. In any case, Knebel is on completely untenable ground in attacking Rowland's credibility while at the same time maintaining silence about three witnesses (Marina Oswald, Brennan and Marikham) who are known or even self-confessed liars but who were treated by the Commission with veritable deference, against the passionate protests of their own lawyers. How in the world can that possibly be justified, even by Knebel?

Your industry and efficiency in drawing up the new index of CEs/CDs is a marvel. Congratulations. Long ago I spent an agonizing week making some 1500 squares on a sheet of paper and then checking each square for which the corresponding CD number had been converted into a CE. However, that did not take account of CDs converted only in part nor of the specific page numbers converted. At that time there was nothing in the Archives except the Zapruder color slides; and my chart (in the crudest form) was intended merely to provide an indication of how many CDs were not published as CEs. The results were not really valid because they did not take account of the instances in which only a few pages of a CD became a CE while the remainder of the pages were withheld.

Consequently, I should be grateful if you would send me the whole index and I should be glad to pay any costs. If possible, could you send a copy also to Robert Silvers, editor of the New York Review of Books, 250 West 57 Street, NYC, N.Y. He would find the index very useful, as he has become intrigued personally and mentioned that he is afraid he will spend the rest of his life on the case.

I am not sure what to make of the Goodwin proposal for a new inquest. I was with Vince and his wife that Sunday when the story came out in the NY Times and we all agreed that it was the most important development since the recent revival of interest in the WR. But I don't know whether it is part of a strategy—there are some indications that it may be—or just a random manifestation, a trial balloon, or what-have-you. Anyhow, I urged the editor of TMO, Arnoni, to emphasize that if a new investigation is to be done, it must be in the framework of an adversary proceeding, must utilize the expertise of the 20 or 30 researchers on the case, and employ all possible safeguards against ending up with only another, less crude, Warren Report. I believe that he will have such an editorial in the September issue; also, an excerpt from a chapter of my unpublished manuscript, on the subject of the auto demonstration (Bogard). Again, my grateful thanks for your many kindnesses.

Sincerely yours,

Sylvia Meagher

*Ed or separate sheet added, as by FK's letter for cc of Ed.*