

Mr. Gary Schoener  
Box 392 Mayo Hospital  
Minneapolis 55455

16 November 1968

Dear Mr. Schoener,

I will not try to reply in full to your letter of the 13th, since we will have an opportunity to discuss all these questions before too long. But I must deal with one point before the sun goes down this day--the allegation that Garrison "came to New York to see me" and that I "did not even meet with him."

This "widely known story" is false, foolish, and irrelevant to the position I hold on Garrison's investigation. At no time did Garrison come to New York for the purpose of seeing me, or even for that among several purposes. At no time did I refuse an invitation or request to meet with him at a stated time or place, and at no time did he ever indicate in his letters or by phone that he wanted to see me.

It is true that in April 1967 Ray Marcus took the initiative of suggesting that I should meet Garrison, who was visiting New York at the time incognito. Although I had then developed doubt and uneasiness about Garrison, I was ready to meet him and told Ray to go ahead. Ray was to see Garrison on Sunday morning and I was standing by to go to his hotel anytime that day. But Garrison cancelled his appointment with Ray in order to see some reporters or TV people, and Ray himself suggested that we let it drop for the time being.

A month or two later, after Garrison had announced his discovery of the "code" and after I had reached a firm conclusion that he was a crude charlatan, he made another visit to New York. Ray again suggested that I should try to contact and meet Garrison, and at that point I told him that there was no longer any reason for me to meet him, since my doubts had been resolved. I told Vince the same thing, on the various occasions when he urged me to accompany him to New Orleans or to go there on my own.

Does anyone really think that a personal meeting with Garrison would have overcome my objections to his fatuous, irresponsible, and repugnant conduct? If so, they misjudge me and they misjudge the strength of my convictions. I am aware, of course, how difficult it is for Garrison's supporters to explain why an uncompromising critic of the WR also dismisses Garrison with contempt: I cannot be smeared as an agent for NBC or Newsweek or the CIA, and I certainly cannot be accused of being an apologist for the WR or the establishment. But, difficult or not, they have no license to misrepresent my views or actions.

Reports have found their way to me of other attempts, no less false than the "widely known story" you mention, to explain my position on Garrison in perjorative terms. One attempt said that I cannot bear to have anyone else "solve" the case--an "explanation" all the more grotesque because its author was visiting me in February 1967 and joined me in a wild dance of pure joy that a public official at last had come forward to relieve the terrible burden and frustration that the critics had carried on their own up to that time. Another "explanation" was that I was resentful that Garrison's "investigation" might hurt the sale of my book. Need I add that the author of this ingenious theory, in which he betrayed his own preoccupations by projecting them on to me, was Mark Lane?

The rest will wait until we meet.

Yours very sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher  
302 West 12 Street NYC NY 10014