

7 March 1968

Mrs. Ralph Pomerance
Cos Cob, Connecticut

Dear Mrs. Pomerance,

In reply to your letter of the 3rd of March, let me clarify one question at the outset: I am not the author of a book or article on the Garrison affair, nor could I stop or delay publication of such a work even if I wanted to do so. However, I completely endorse and support the publication of the truth about the "investigation" of the assassination of President Kennedy, whether that conducted by the Warren Commission or that being pursued at this time by the New Orleans district attorney.

The truth is its own justification and its own imperative. It cannot be "timed" in order to accommodate irrelevant purposes, however worthy those purposes may seem to their advocates, without becoming less than truth and the opposite of truth.

You suggest that "Garrison's mistakes will be discovered at the trial," but the fact is that his "mistakes," and his violences to fact and logic, have already been discovered. The trial, if it takes place, cannot convert perjured testimony, fabricated "codes," and insupportable allegations or accusations, into credible or honest evidence. Since Garrison has not refrained from making his insupportable pronouncements, pending the trial, there is no obligation for his critics to remain silent. On the contrary --to remain silent in the face of demonstrable falsehood and injustice to accused persons living and dead is to incur moral responsibility for these iniquities.

Unwillingness to compromise this principle has already provoked perjoratives such as "moral prig," and will doubtless provoke them again. Nevertheless, I remain absolutely convinced that truth may not be the subject of bargaining or maneuver, regardless of the higher ends allegedly to be served.


Like you, I fervantly desire a new investigation of the events of Dallas, and I have worked unremittingly toward that end for four years. When you have a chance to look at my book, you will find a full statement of my position on the urgency of such an investigation and on the methodology which must be utilized in order to insure its impartiality, competence, and credibility. But, quite apart from considerations of principle and morality, the Garrison "investigation" is the greatest possible danger to the prospects of obtaining a new investigation. Such a lunatic vaudeville must create the impression

that all challenges of the Warren Report are equally deranged and sordid. Responsible criticism of the Report has already been displaced, for many people, by the sensations improvised in New Orleans with so sure an instinct for the headlines. It will be all too easy to dismiss talk of a reopening of the case on the ground that the lurid, promiscuous, and absurd claims and charges made by Garrison characterize and discredit all dissent from the Warren Report. Such an attitude will be encouraged by the fact that many of the serious scholars and critics of the Report, to their shame, have elected to associate themselves with, and to endorse, the New Orleans "investigation."

Nothing will persuade me to follow that ugly example. I intend to apply to any investigation of the assassination, now or in the future, the same standard of strictness which governed my study of the Warren Report, and to repudiate falsehoods and fabrications impartially and regardless of their source.

On this basis, I would be ready to cooperate in any new inquiry into the assassination, in a technical capacity based upon my study of and familiarity with the evidence and without commitment to any objective other than the determination of the true facts, whatever they may be. Please feel free to call on me for any assistance which I may be able to render in this context.

Yours very sincerely,



Sylvia Meagher
302 West 12 Street
New York, N.Y. 10014