

4/12/67

Dear Maggie,

Not intending to be impolite but to save a few minutes I have some notes for you in something I mailed Bill this morning. Your letter of 4/9 then arrived and there are some things I want to answer. I wrote Thayer Waldo several weeks ago and he hasn't answered. Until then, may I have his exact words on Schiller? I have some suspicions that bear on it and would like to know as much as possible.

Also, Penn has not shared with me his dire predictions of what may result for people like us from the Garrison exposures". Your own comment following it is provocative, referring as it does to hasty departures,

But the real purpose of this hasty letter is to ask you to remind me what it is you seek identification of. Whatever it is I sent you, of course you may use. But I do not now recall. Your sentence is, "may I use the 'memorandum' you sent me from the archives in my published work and if so how shall it be designated." There are only a few things I'd prefer to hold back, and these for special reasons, not pride or greed. I doubt if this is one. But unless I know what it is I cannot tell you how to identify it. Perhaps, if identification is difficult, you can send it back and I can tell ~~what~~ when I see it. If it is the same as the Griffin one of March 12, the identification, aside from what it bears, is from the staff working papers or the internal memoranda, if that is enough. On that, when you can, I'd like the unprocessed Xerox (which is why I'd hoped we could get it Xeroxed in NYC) because it is clearer and the crosses show. I gave you the Thermofax to have a copy to keep for yourself when you sent a Xeroxed copy to the publisher. This cost me but 15¢ but the Xeroxing would have cost you 60. I'll send it back, if you'd like.

Where do you get those cute plastic paper clips. They're very good for airmail.

On Lane, as you have noticed, I do not assault him publicly. When Playboy found out the vile thing he did in his interview they offered me the opportunity, for pay, to lacerate him. I refused. They had a lot of trouble with that piece and spent hours correcting his errors, those they could from the 26 volumes. Now it is bad enough when he steals my stuff and gets paid for it, as he has, and steals it just to promote himself, as he has, but when he attributes it to others just to hurt me, that is going to far. Yet I haven't clobbered him. Perhaps some day I'll have to. But I do not want to, especially not know. My objects, as I say in WHITEWASH to, is doctrinal. Further, these cheap and entirely unnecessary things he does are, aside from a reflection of character flaws (and I fear we all have these), hurtful to us, to all of us, and to what we all want. Here is my real objection. If you have read the Roberts book, which I am sure was assisted, if not inspired, you'd realize that it is he more even than Epstein who is use against us all,

The others zeroed in on him immediately. Why do you think Liebelor will debate him and not me? And why did I go out to California when I had no WHITEWASH II's outthere to sell, as it turned out at my expense because the San Francisco people did not keep their promise to repay my expenses, and then defend him all over? No, this is not a personal thing. Some day I'll tell you the vile personal-commercial things his people have done to me, here and abroad (they may have cost me publication in two foreign countries by the rottenest tricks. In at least one case he was publicly party to it). Marks contributions, aside from his initial and less than completely responsible defense of Oswald, has been to be the proper mate for a publisher who perfectly blended exactly the right amounts of unscrupulousness and aggressiveness. At this point and for some time he makes and has made no contribution and is a liability. What Roberts has done is by no means exhaustive. I've written Grosset & Dunlap, after he has declined to debate me, asking them to arrange it. Bill can show you the letter. But you should stop and think: can this unanimity of purpose that most of us still have continue with his conduct and thieveries? Is it bickering for the victim to protest? You'd hardly expect him to. I do not relish being in the position of the raped woman who finds herself charged as an attractive nuisance. There is going to have to come a time when he has to start behaving like a human being or get what is his overdue.

Bringuier's store if 107 Decatur. There appears to be no 1032 Canal. I had it checked. 117 Camp may be a mistake (117 Decatur is Pens's address) or it may be serious. There is a clothing store there.

A long time ago I heard that Liebelor was radical right. At the moment, were I a Democrat in his constituency, I'd like nothing better. It now looks as though I may be busy during the campaign anyway. But I'd sure love him to run and refuse a challenge to debate his record, and I do have his record! He spoke in Las Vegas before a Democrat is group, claiming there was no whitewash, no coverup, the closest he has come to mentioning me that I know of, and claimed he had no client but truth. No client. I recall only two things that may be called errors in II, both corrected. Both are his fault. One is the wording of the caption, where the text is right, on the road stripe, the other is the windshield, that Bill's sharp eye detected, on Willis E. If he attacks me for those he's in hornet's nest. Note also Specter's silence.

The Schiller and Garrison inquiries may be important. Jones Harris told me Schiller is au courant with what is going there as no one else is and before it happens or is announced. I like him less all the time. I spent some time working on the shirt for him, spent besides time and phone calls (that are tolls for me) \$40.00 for pictures for him, and am still waiting for repayment.

Hope we get together soon. I've an idea for the promotion of your book I'd like to mention. I wish there were time for asking you and Bill to read a carbon of Oswald in New Orleans, which I have just started to read and the last pages of which Lil is now typing. It will run 500 pages @ 275 words per page, without appendix. The appendix can be that long! I think I have a deal. If I do and can get gallons, would you be willing and have time to do it fast? Feltrinelli has expressed an interest in Italy. He let Dell Albergo have II (it is probably out, but I've not yet seen the contract) and there is British interest. Best

MRS JOSEPH A. FIELD JR
1115th BEVERLY DRIVE
BEVERLY HILLS CALIFORNIA 90210

April 9, 1967

Dear Harold,

Thank you so much for taking the time and trouble out of your staggeringly busy schedule to think of me and to send me your welcome enclosures.

At this time I am not going to go into the subject of Mark Lane re his present rôle in the Garrison investigation. I cannot help but feel that you have a legitimate reason for feeling that both your research and your grasp of the New Orleans phase of the case not only pre-dated Lane's but was certainly more extensive and knowledgeable. There is no question in my mind that the work you have done on the case, in every facet, is of the highest calibre and deserves the richest possible praise and recognition and one day this nation may well be made aware of its debt to you. I do not want to be in the position of choosing sides for, while I am in complete sympathy with your feelings, there are too few of us in this tight circle for any of us to engage in intramural bickering, no matter how legitimate the reasons may be. The real fight is just now beginning to take shape because of the Garrison involvement and we need all the unanimity of purpose and strength we can muster in order to stand our ground against what seems to me the inevitable power thrusts against us which are ahead. Before going on to specific questions I do want to say that I am one of your greatest champions (for what that may be worth) and that I feel enormously grateful to you not only for the immeasurable public contribution you have made but for the very unselfish private assistance you have offered me.

And now to answer a couple of your queries, 117 Camp, I believe, is at the Trade Mart, but I'm not certain at all; could 1032 Canal be Bringuier's store? Philip Geraci says he went into a store on Canal Street. I haven't checked this out in any sort of thorough way so I don't really know. As for your question about Liebler, as far as I know, he has been silent but I have heard rumors that he plans to run for Congress -- are you ready for that?? Incidentally, Curtis LeMay is rumored to be running for the Senate. It makes one so proud of one's home state

that I wonder how soon I can get the hell out of here. If Penn's dire predictions, of what may result for people like us from the Garrison exposures, are at all valid (and they well may be) I won't have to look up schedules, I'll be told to leave. Word from Thayer Waldo in Mexico a few days ago implies that the ubiquitous Mr. Schiller may be an agent of one sort or another which comes as no surprise to me, if true, and I suspect it is, for I have harbored that suspicion from the very beginning. Lifton has a copy of their "book" and I understand that they have done a pretty thorough job of dragging us through the mire from which they sprang. Although I have not seen it personally because I don't intend to shell out any of my shekels to further fatten the swine, imagine how poverty-stricken they are when they are obliged to use unknown and unimportant me as a "lure". Lifton says that on one of the covers of the book is a provocative statement, "THE TRUTH ABOUT MAGGIE FIELD." As for what Hal Verb had to say about discovering "a new proof of an Oswald-government connection on a radio program," it must be Sylvia's discovery for I know nothing about it. I'm delighted that you have a reliable source in New Orleans. You deserve that for your work in that field. But how horrifying to think that he was nearly killed and is in the hospital. I hope Garrison can not only protect him but himself as well, I can imagine that the New Orleans book must be a real challenge but, knowing you, it will be extremely valuable. I am returning your archives notations on the Rankin-Griffin exchanges of March 12, 1964. Very interesting, indeed, and ~~it~~ certainly does bear out my suspicions on the 1026 North Beckley business. Incidentally, Harold, may I use the "memorandum" you sent me from the archives in my published work and if so how shall it be designated? I see no references for it. Bill has astounded us all with the rapidity and facility of his recovery. He went home yesterday and he's already walked on his own steam. There is a great deal to be thankful for in that happy knowledge.

I have finished my book, for all intents and purposes, having mailed the last segments of it to the publisher on Thursday last, but, as you know, there is really no end to this case and I find myself adding more information every day. I hope I don't reach 26 volumes. I guess I've covered about everything I know for the moment. Next weekend husband, daughter and I go to San Francisco for the Spring Mobilization to end the war and later on I'll have to go to New York again. Do keep well and try not to overburden yourself any more than is absolutely essential. There are too few of us for any one of us to spread himself so thin.

Warm regards,

Maggie