

15 July 1967

Dr. Marcus G. Raskin
Co-Director
Institute for Policy Studies
1900 Florida Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

Dear Dr. Raskin,

I was very happy to receive your letter of July 11th. After my first letter to you, I discovered that we have two mutual friends: Bob Ockens, who is my editor at Bobbs-Merrill (which is publishing my book on the Warren Report, Accessories After The Fact, in the fall); and Joe Leenthal, with whom I became acquainted a few years ago as a result of our common interest in the Report.

How to proceed with research on the Report and the assassination is, as you say, a question that requires responsible thought and discussion. I have always felt that an effective new effort to discover what really happened in Dallas must be preceded by a decisive repudiation of the Warren Report, not only in terms of public opinion polls but on the official, Governmental level. I am even hopeful that the authors of the Report can be pressed to give up the ghost of the "lone assassin" and compelled, by the overpowering evidence against their thesis, to abandon their untenable conclusions.

Up to now, the "amateur" effort to expose the defects of the Report and simultaneously to reinvestigate and solve the assassination and the collateral crimes has had mixed results. There has been a marked change in public opinion, but not the decisive action which is needed. I continue to believe that a concerted, concentrated effort should be made to destroy completely the already disintegrating Warren Report, so that a new investigation will meet with support and cooperation, not the rather desperate resistance and attacks which are still manifested.

Your suggestion that some of the serious researchers might be brought together for a discussion at the Institute is certainly constructive and welcome, and I think it might well be done at some future time. Just now, there are some practical and policy problems in the way of such a gathering of the critics—specifically, the basic disagreement which has arisen on the question of the Garrison "investigation." Most of the critics are passionately committed to Garrison; a few of us consider him an unscrupulous charlatan who is jeopardizing legitimate criticism of the Warren Report. The Garrison supporters among the critics have placed all their hopes in the outcome of his investigation; I am afraid that it would be fruitless at this time to seek agreement among the two sets of critics on a common strategy. Perhaps this will become possible, if and when they become convinced that Garrison will not fulfill their hopes. If you ever get to New York (or if I should visit Washington), we might talk about this in greater detail. In any case, I hope that we will stay in touch. With warm regards,

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