

4 December 1967

Mr. Tom Bethell
Office of the District Attorney
2700 Tulane Avenue
New Orleans 70119

Dear Tom:

Thank you for your last two letters, one sent with the Texas AG's correspondence file (it looks interesting, I will get to it the minute I can) and the other enclosing the Allen/Scott column on Oswald's last letter. Yes, I do know something about other Allen/Scott work, unfortunately for myself. Enclosed is a copy of their syndicated column of 2/24/67, published all over the country, in which they distinctly gave the impression that my Subject Index was a CIA-commissioned job. I do not have an extra copy of the letters I sent immediately after seeing this column, to the Oakland Tribune and to others, including a letter to Rep. Kupferman, who was good enough to make some inquiries on my behalf. I enclose a copy of my subsequent letter to Kupferman, dated 22 April 1967, from which you will get a sufficient picture. My letter to Scott still awaits a reply; his statement to Kupferman (not reflected in the enclosed correspondence) that he would publish another column clarifying the question of the CIA-subsidized subject index, so that it would not be confused with my Index, has yet to appear. From this, you will realize that it is unwise to accept Allen/Scott articles as necessarily authoritative.

With reference to the column on Oswald's final letter: the letter in question is CE 15, Volume XVI (it is mentioned indirectly in Accessories, pp. 217-218). Allen/Scott did not need to go to the Archives for the CIA's memorandum to the Commission, which they have quoted only in part, omitting a significant two sentences without the usual indications of elision. The first omitted sentence, which comes after "four days before the assassination," says: "Azque had been in Mexico for 18 years and it was known as early as September 1963 that Azque was to be replaced." The second omitted sentence, which follows immediately, says: "His replacement did arrive in September." You will find the full text of the CIA memorandum in CE 3126; most of it is quoted in the WR, page 310.

What is so interesting about this Allen/Scott column is that they (or someone who sold them a bill of goods) deliberately excised, without indication, two sentences which change somewhat the alleged "mystery" of Oswald's foreknowledge of Azque's recall. This was done quite deliberately. Why? I would surmise that it is still another trial balloon, designed to revive the weary and dubious hypothesis of a Cuban--Castro Cuban--organized assassination, or a Communist--Soviet Union Communist--plot, utilizing the all-purpose Oswald (where else would they find an assassin with such superhuman marksmanship?). These balloons have a way of rising skyward whenever a new attack on the WR "hurts." (Remember the Manila plant, the Puerto Rican who was headlined on 4/22/67, when Garrison's case still had some plausibility for the public? Or the attempt by Stanley Ross to exploit that poor old mentally ill Cuban, Gongora? I suspect that this Allen/Scott "expose" will be quietly filed away, like the Manila story and poor Gongora.)

Another point of interest is the bland statement that the FBI intercepted Oswald's mail. Cf., Accessories, pp. 220-222, 312-313. Well, Allen/Scott should be called, on their bluff. I would like to know whether they themselves, or the ubiquitous FBI, were responsible for the sneaky "editing" of the CIA memo. All the best, I'll be in touch again as soon as I can,

Sincerely yours,

Sylvia Meagher 302 W 12 St NYC 10011