

18 August 1965

Professor Paul L Freese
c/o Kindel and Anderson
510 South Spring Street
Los Angeles California 90013

My dear Professor Freese,

Your contribution to the symposium on the Warren Report in the May 1965 issue of the NYU Law Review seemed to me the most perceptive, independent, and important of the five articles. Your qualification in footnote 28 regarding the vast amount of pertinent data collected and the chance of oversight or misimpression is surely well-founded; and a refreshing departure from "authoritative" critiques by writers who have not read the Report carefully, much less the Hearings and Exhibits.

That very chance of oversight or misimpression has led me to devote the last several months to the preparation of a subject index of some 300 classifications, covering all the material available in the testimony and documents as well as the Report. Like you, I was struck by the energy mobilized for the purpose of discrediting Arnold Rowland (by the way, Forrest V. Sorrels is with the Secret Service, not the FBI). I agree with you that both Rowland and Gertrude Hunter were victimized by the defamatory material published by the Warren Commission. I would add to this the Commission's treatment of other witnesses, rather parallel to the two cases you cite—Dial Ryder, whose credibility was impugned despite the unqualified character reference provided by his employer, Charles Greener; G.A. Hamblen, whose credibility was dismissed because his employers considered his story a figment of his imagination; and Seth Kantor, Wilma Tice, etc. The Commission's bias is especially glaring in the case of Kantor's testimony about his encounter with Ruby at Parkland Hospital. Kantor could not be dismissed as easily as Rowland; he was a trained observer, a man of professional stature and his story had internal logic. The speculation in which the Commission indulged in an attempt to discredit Kantor's story does not suffer from the same attribute. On the contrary, in its haste to transpose the incident chronologically the Commission placed it at a time when Ruby would not have asked Kantor the questions he is said to have asked, since he had resolved the problem by then.

And Mrs. Tice—the very soul of logic—did not insist that the man she saw was Ruby; she agreed readily that he may only have been someone who looked and acted just like Ruby and whose first name was "Jack" also.

I believe that you have done an important service by demonstrating in your analysis of the Report the disturbing evidence of bias on the part of the Commission and its servants. My own study has identified appalling instances of factual inaccuracy and misrepresentation in the Report of material found in the corresponding Hearings and Exhibits. If this is of interest to you, I should be glad to provide chapter and verse. (Reverting to the Seth Kantor testimony, I neglected to comment, as I intended, on the assertion in the Report that Ruby denied that he had visited Parkland Hospital and the credibility attached to that denial by the Commission. It is noteworthy that the Commission did not ask Ruby if he encountered and conversed with Kantor elsewhere that day, but merely speculated that the incident had occurred at the police station near midnight. A curious departure from decorum...)

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher

302 West 12 Street
New York NY 10014

Chelsea 2-4293