

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
OXFORD

Telephone: 49310

26th August 1965

Dear Miss Meagher,

Thank you for your letter of 19th August, which I have read with interest.

I am glad that you are preparing a subject index of the hearings and exhibits, as I am certain that it will be of value. The Warren Report will be the subject of discussion for many years to come.

I do not want to seem pedantic when I suggest that my statement that "all the evidence has been published" is correct. Under the English practice, "off the record" interruptions would not be regarded as part of the evidence.

I have not got a copy of the Exhibits here at Oxford so I do not know why the photographs and X-rays were not published. You use the phrase "suppression of that evidence". Is this meant to have the same meaning as "omission", which is the other word that you use? It would take strong evidence to make me believe that the Chief Justice of the United States had deliberately suppressed evidence. What motive could he have for doing so?

I do not think that the Warren Commission thought that Marina Oswald's evidence was a clear invention. It seemed to me to be saying that perhaps Oswald had himself made up the story about his intention to shoot Nixon, or that she had misunderstood his reference to the Vice-President. I cannot see what "mercenary purposes" she could have had. On the point regarding the variations in her testimony in forty-odd interviews, ~~she~~ suggests that her statements were probably true; my experience has been that where a witness repeats the same statement word for word on a number of occasions, this probably means that he has learned it by heart.

In regard to Mr. Lane's refusal to produce the tape-recording, you say that "Lane was the only possible source of the tape-recording." Does this mean that he no longer

....

held the view that producing the recording would be a violation of the "sanctity of working documents of an attorney"? I am not certain that I understand what your sentence means.

I have not seen Mr. Manchester's statement in the New York Times. It seems to me a strange one to have been made by an author who intends to publish an authoritative book.

I am not clear concerning your remark in the last paragraph about the "dereliction of duty by the commission." As I suggested in my article, I think that it would have been wiser if the commission had referred the matter to a federal court for action so that it could determine whether Mr. Lane should have answered the question or not. This would not involve an assumption one way or the other concerning the truth of the allegation. The sole point at issue was whether a witness can refuse to answer a relevant question. Whether the answer will show that the allegation was true or false is ~~irrelevant~~. The commission may, however, have felt that it was too late in the proceedings to raise this collateral matter, as its findings would not have been affected whatever the answer might have been.

Yours sincerely,

Arthur L. Goodhart

Miss Sylvia Meagher,
302 West Twelfth Street,
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10014.
U.S.A.