

(Carbon copy
omitted)

14 September 1967

Dear Cyril,

I was glad to hear from you, in fact I've been meaning to drop you a line but had not got around to it. As you know, I've been giving Tink a hand with his ms., mainly by indexing it, so I got to read your Appendix on the autopsy report. I wanted to tell you that it seems to me a very forceful analysis and a real contribution to the book, and to the case. I was struck by your new argument (about the heart massage theory, if the wound was really in the higher position, in the neck), which strengthens the case against Humes et al even further. (I did raise some questions with Tink about the testimony in re: the development and examination of the x-rays during the autopsy; but I am sure this is now straightened out.)

Normally I would have consulted you before sending the letter to Manhattan East but there was a deadline and I took the chance that I was representing your views accurately. I'm glad to learn that you called Lister and blistered him personally for his shameful letter. I have no difficulty in agreeing that he is quite stupid; I think he is also the worst kind of lackey and hypocrite. I feel sorry for Bob Richter, having to work with such specimens of humanity. Bob told me in confidence that the letters from the public who watched the four-hour whitewash were predominantly negative and hostile to CBS--by a quite dramatic ratio. That explains why CBS abandoned the idea of devoting a fifth hour to the public response.

You have probably seen the Playboy interview of Garrison by now. I sent them a letter, too, of course, roughly similar to the one to the NY Review of Books, I won't burden you with a copy. Garrison mangled the facts (insofar as he cited material in the 26 volumes) so mercilessly that I felt that some of the more gross misstatements had to be answered or corrected. How in hell did he get to be "underdog"? Norden, who did the interview, had been calling me and (as he himself put it) picking my brain, before his trip to New Orleans. In spite of everything, he did not challenge Garrison (for example, on the so-called "code" or other absurdities) and came back no less mesmerized than the others who have made the pilgrimage. I am glad that at least I helped persuade Tink not to go and not to associate his really good work with the likes of Garrison--who, at best, must be a megalomaniac/paranoic, and who is a terrible danger to the whole cause of criticism and investigation.

I'm told that my book will be in the bookshops in October sometime, although the official date of publication will be at least six weeks later (to give book reviewers time to get through it and write their reviews). A copy will be going to you, with my thanks for all the help you gave me on forensic questions, as soon as the first copies arrive from Indianapolis. It may be that Tink's book will be out at the same time, although the lateness of the page proofs (which are not yet here) is discouraging.

All the best,

Sylvia

P.S. Are you ever in touch with
Jan Schwartz? He still interested in the case? I'd like him to read my book and perhaps review it for one of the legal journals. What do you think?