

2/4/67

Dear Bill,

Especially after a phone call from Sylvia night before last I do not know what to say about Dean. As Sylvia phoned Maggie, there ^{was} ~~was~~ to have been an effort to "plant" someone or some bad material. After her call I got one that may be exactly what she is warning against. I suppose there is always the chance Dean is one such thing. I have no way of knowing. If he has really worthwhile information I see no reason why he cannot write it. I've heard nothing from the last two, one who said he was a Marine Corps buddy of Oswald's (and all of whose information I could check stands up) and another who said he took pictures of the assassination scene right before the motorcade passed. He promised to make copies of these pictures but hasn't.

Liebeler has all the devotion to principle of a wolf with sheep. Before I got tossed off the WNEW Special he declined to appear after finding out I'd be on it on the ground he could not appear with Lane, then has a debate with Lane in Calif. Arlen Specter has declined the same thing seven times that I know of and more recently with WNEW, then flew to England to debate Lane. I wouldn't trust Liebeler with yesterday's sweat. One of the most dishonorable things in my experience ~~is~~ ^{is} what he did with Epstein and Specter. I think Ray did well to note debate him, because the odds ~~is~~ ^{is} would have been too much Liebeler's way. Liebeler will not debate anyone who really knows the material in a broad sense, and he certainly will not debate anyone who knows anything at all about the part he played. One thing that fascinated me in the working papers I was in is the total lack of any mention of his name. Yet he was at least as active as Specter. These two were the most active. Not a single memo from Liebeler, not a single reference to him! He may have purged the files before he left. Or, I may just not have been in the right files.

The slides are an experience, are they not? In the archive set, unless they've changed it since last I studied them, after all the people including me who had seen them one was still misnumbered, 317. My opinion on what the missing frames show is not changed a bit, and what you report confirms it. The point is what they do not show. Willis is not in them, in the space between the sprocket holes. There was no need to cut off this space in the remote-generation copy the Commission used, but it was done. I've never bought the stress-marks theory, but I know so little of these scientific matters I consider I have no basis for a valid opinion. Eventually we will know, and I'm content to wait until then, for more than when I was out there I'm convinced we are in a new era on this whole matter.

The conflicts between us are unavoidable but we will, for most of us at least, be able to overcome them. I shudder when I hear of such things as the sexual speculations you report were engaged in. In a way Penn has it rougher than any of us, perhaps explaining his tendency to go into such things that I believe would be irrelevant even if true. He will be up this way in two weeks. Had I know his schedule better I could have lined him up with a very good Washington radio appearance yesterday when I was on the biggest station. I'm writing him to let me know what it is in case something can work out on his way back, if it interests him.

Ray told me the same thing about the Capitol record and the horn and I told him he is insane. In ~~any~~ ^{any} case, although it is impossible not to argue with Ray unless you are willing to sit mute or agree blindly, I think too much of the fault is mine, for I'm older, have the same intensity, and ~~and~~ ^{and} have learned, as he has not yet, to curb some of it. But there is no doubt, swell guy that he is, that he can become

close to intolerable. His intention is exactly the opposite. He is fine, sincere, willing, decent and helpful and devoutly persuaded he knows all the political answers. There were many such people in Germany in the early 1930s, a period of which I often think with great misgivings.

The few times I think of him I wonder about Dave Lifton. Whatever he is working on, if my opinion is worth anything, you are right to preserve his confidence. Either you do not accept it or you live with it. Had mine not been so badly abused in the past year I'd perhaps feel less strongly about this. But especially with something that is either scholarly or commercial, a man is entitled to what is his. In his case, I hope Liebel uses him less than I think he will.

Going back to the slides, I wish you all, especially Lillian, could now see the movie. Each helps understand the other. The backward motion of the President's head at 313 is so pronounced, as perhaps you may recall, I went over that part if the ms of II and weakened it, fearing people just would not believe it. What no one else seems to have noticed is the abrupt forward motion of the head right before that. I'd like to see the original or a first copy, for the color would be much better. There is another copy I'd like to see, because I think the contrast might be better. A black and white print was made from the original in Chicago the night of 11/22/67. I have examined the letter frames in an editor and under these very adverse conditions could see nothing of significance on the grassy knoll. The shadows are too numerous and too pronounced. Nothing that Manchester says can be credited. I do not believe LIFE doctored the original film. Incidentally, they have most of this footage. I keep finding other films no one knows about and that they own.

Schiller is a photographer, not a "journalist", hence Lewis. Schiller used to work for the Sat Eve Post. I'd never trust any photographic work he did. I don't think Liebel will ever use any of it where others could make a copy.

I certainly would appreciate a tape of the affair. What I did, until late at night when I got the earlier Liebel tape you sent me was to sit by the tape machine and record his lies and evasions as the tape ran, stopping it at each lie, digression, evasion, etc. My notes follow his tape. I'd do the same with this ~~ass~~ soon as I get it, even if I never use it. I have from the beginning felt that Liebel is the key man in this, still believe he may not decide he is really Jekyll, but know there is the Hyde in his character. He is more worried, I'm convinced, than most realize. He demeans himself so in running away from me. I do not chase him, but I'm going to keep ready to. He is more than capable of pulling another stunt like what he did to Specter with Epstein.

If Oswald's public hairs had been "shaved", as you quote Penn as saying, then the more important question is a constitutional issue, he ~~was~~ and his public hairs parted company in the police station.

I also have an academic interest in the Lane part of the tape. I find he is increasingly using my material as his. I shall do nothing about it. I made this decision when I did nothing about the plagiarism almost confirmed by his publisher, when I did nothing about their effort to ruin me early, on the Alan Burke show when Holt's attorney led a passel of four who tried to ruin me in public. When I was ~~in~~ in New York to debate Nizer I was also on a dull show against the former head of the Trial Lawyers's Association, who confirmed to me that despite their pretense, these lawyers on the Burke show did not represent the association. He as the then head declined to have the assn. participate. Playboy asked me for a letter on the Lane interview. I sent what I consider a subdued one. They phoned me in advance of the interview and I declined to do anything on the record against him.

The Yale Law Review has decided too late that their format on their piece was wrong. Last summer the author told me what his Commission was: a piece on Lane. Now, after he has written it and with a deadline at hand, they have asked him to tone this down. I met with him yesterday at his request and found some errors in the several pages of it he asked me to examine. The net result again is that I'll get very little, despite the author's contrary desire. These advance editorial determinations by people who know nothing may be unavoidable but they are less than honest. Why the YLR should decide in advance what the field is and what the author should do I just cannot begin to understand in any rational terms.

I hope Penn was speaking figuratively about wall-to-wall carpeting. Elmer Gertz was very bitter about this when I met him in Chicago a month ago.

Aside from the invalidity of this type of approach, there is a futility and from my way of looking at it, a lack of integrity in deciding on the basis of theory and political prejudice that the members of the Commission were conscious members of a conscious conspiracy. I find no evidence to support this. These men are politicians and live political lives. Those who hold these views do not know how such bodies function. Their unhappiness at Earl Warren's California career I understand. What they seek to now do to him, which is unrelated to his past but not his present, I cannot understand. I think they are wrong and if they succeed will not be long in deeply regretting it. This is one of their bonds with Lane, whose polemics in this direction are legally wrong but very effective. Lane's handling of this and the lawyers is perhaps his greatest of many dishonesties.

Save for Lane, none of this diminishes my personal liking for the people who hold these views I think are wrong and of political rather than factual basis. I have discussed this with Ray alone, without achieving anything, and I shall not mention it or your views again. Ray and I had what would have been a terrible fight on the way to the airport. It wasn't because I remembered myself 20 years ago and could restrain myself. Without realizing he was but knowing that a row could ensue he said some very nasty things, saying he had to be honest. We didn't fight and I think I understand him better for it. One of his complaints was that I hadn't plugged his monograph. As I told him, it hadn't occurred to me. As I asked him, why did he not suggest it? He then recalled the basis I had laid for it on Sehl. My own experience is that unless the work is accessible at the time, this does little good compared to exposure when it is available, and there is a limit to how much exposure one can get. He has been very helpful, as you know. I've been able to place his monograph only one place because I've not had time to go elsewhere, even for myself. But it is very hard to do business with Ray. He will not sell books the way they are sold. I could have placed a number by phone if he'd have sent them out on consignment. If you ever hear of him deciding to do what he should have done in the first place, do that over, make it more popular and more complete, please let me know and I'll send him a little more material that I have for III that no one else has seen.

I'm glad you told me some of the things you did, for I thought I was alone in this semi-isolation. You'd be really shocked if I showed you some of the letters I have, one from Arnoni, who I've never met, and the first from him, that is so slanderous, so unrestrained and irrational you'd never be able to believe it. I sent him an early copy of the book. He accused me of stealing the whole thing. Vince prevented a review in Liberation, against slandering me and going farthur, trying to blackmail me. Can you imagine how I felt when these were first letters, from people with whom I'd had no relationship of even an indirect nature. I do not have to tell you how hurtful they were, and not alone to me. I am satisfied that there is no one more Catholic than the Pope, but I've learned that others feels otherwise. I think that to the degree we can we should concentrate on what we are in accord on.

The BBC thing was grossly unfair to Lane. But there is another thing on which I am in a minority (of one, apparently, too). There was nothing BBC could have done

to help Lane more, and it will sell books like mad. His book was not doing very well in England, where the subject is not doing well at all. Neither is Epstein's. I wish it were possible for me to get there. WHITEWASH is coming out in paper there this month.

Very few people are interested in or impressed by a quiet, seemingly reasoned approach on TV or radio. The intellectuals are. The masses are not. More than any one thing, what helped me most and what really opened this subject up for the remarkable effective exploitation of Hit, Rinehart, is that fight I had on the Burke show with those who really represented Lane. My phone was a nightmare from the time the show went off about 2 a.m. on a Sunday, and I got hundreds of letters. I sold several thousand books in a week, and could have sold more if all the wholesalers had it in stock. To me it is a measure of the ineffectiveness of Lane's approach and of their fear of him and his knowledge that Arlen Specter has declined three radio and two TV confrontations with me in Philadelphia alone yet flies to England to meet Lane. Now for the first time in England Lane will appear like a human being, a man with deep feelings fighting a cause of principle, and most helpful of all, abused and the underdog. Sylvia and a very few others have indicated their unhappiness over my appearance against Louis Nizer. For all his consummate skills and great reputation, I made that show dramatic (and Lane had to do on BBC what I did in New York) and I hurt Nizer's reputation as it has never been done. To the average person, the people who have to reach, I am satisfied as I can be without having heard the show that I got through.

Nizer has had no end of NY appearances and on top shows. There never has been a reaction to any of his shows as there was to this one- 7,000 phone calls the first hour and 2,700 letters the first day. Do you think it was Nizer, who they knew and had had the week before, who got them to run two hours extra when they planned two hour only and considered the possibility of running to a maximum of 2 1/2? So, there was a total exposure of 8 hours, all without commercials or even newscasts. Nizer's pertinens were hurt and may have been antagonized. They cost us nothing, for they are and would be against us. I really have no measure of the specific effects of this overly-dramatic thing except that I know of one man who has a radio show who wrote me with nothing but condemnations for WOR and another who on the air said he had been with me in the studio for hours without having heard me raise my voice even under provocation (Curtis Crawford), but what choice had I? Indeed, that is the question Sylvia begs. With a nonstop Nizer who has already corrupted the program and the format, it was silence or fight. Perhaps I didn't make maximum use of what time I wrested from him, but I am satisfied that it is he who had me thrown off the TV show. I've asked an honest man with a good and effective program to invite Nizer to debate me on his show. I think he will not. Sylvia tells me the TV thing is but fair. And I tell you that what I wrote that station and the messages I sent the moderator were tremendous help to Lane on camera, for they were warned.

I'm thankful for what BBC did to Lane, even if it costs me money in England, as it well can. Is there not something in your own profession and its concepts that tells you that in terms of popular appeal I am right? There comes a time when men expect other men to be aroused and suspect them if not. One way I can measure it is this: The next week Dell promised a check. It is to have been delivered yesterday. When I get my 90% of it we'll be a little more than half-way out of debt. Dell immediately offered a deal on WHITEWASH II, which they'd declined in September, with a better royalty and a \$10,000 advance. It was hard for me to demur, but I did unless the deal included immediate hardback (here is where we get our exposure, our critical attention, and that is the basis for my decision). I'm waiting for an answer from them. But there is another hardback interest from a publisher ~~xxxx~~ who would not even talk to me before and who on four or five different approaches I made would not even read WHITEWASH. This followed my clash with Nizer, in both cases. Maybe it is coincidence. I think not.

When you can, please give me your opinion of an (anti)Manchester book. I'm thinking seriously of doing one, tentatively entitled Manchester Machiavelli: The

Unintended Unofficial Whitewash. I've done 10,000 words already on just his second serialization. I plan a short book, and I do believe that if it can come out at all close to his (It can beat it if a publisher really wants to) has the possibility of attracting some attention and doing some good if, as I intend, it is all fact and shows Manchester is all fiction. I know there will be an uncritical, critical burst that this is an effort to capitalize, etc., but I've learned that means little today. Except for the minuscule Eastern intellectual community, nobody pays serious attention to reviewers on controversial books. I'll bet right now I've sold more books on this subject than anyone, without a single major review, without a single review of my own, and without a single favorable mention in the major press, most of which has boycotted WHITEWASH entirely.

My real concern is not how long I can continue this pace, for I began at 2:15 a.m. yesterday and could have kept going longer when I retired at 11 last night. I hate every minute I am not in the archive or on III. My recent finds have been, I think, quite important. I worked on them yesterday until 9 a.m. when I had to leave for Washington, to take Lil to the doctor and be on a radio show. Liebelier will be anything but happy at the dredging of the staff papers. I will not be able to spend as much time in them as I'd like to, but my first couple of days were very good, on the subject, on Specter, on the autopsy, the pictures, the doctors, the FBI, the photographers and even the bar association and Craig! In any other context, on any other subject, my last hundred sheets of papers would in themselves be a major scandal. For example, I have Specter, after he read the autopsy report, after he interviewed the doctors, reporting their report of not a neck but a back wound with the correction of but a single word - back - clearly visible. Regardless of what was there to begin with, it ends ~~xxx~~ up "back". I have the experts saying Kennedy could have been shot by Frame 163, Connally saying it was 190, the doctors saying Connally was hit by two bullets (and I think here is the origin of the single-bullet theory) and that 399 could not have caused his wrist wound (including Light and Dolce, who was never called as a witness), and much more. I wish I did not still have financial problems, for there are more papers I'd have copied on hunch. I think it is possible they took depositions never printed. I may be wrong, but I saw names I do not recall in the hearings.

Aside from not getting it out when I'd planned, money is my great fear about III. I do not think I can charge more than \$4.95 (which gives me but \$2.50 on most copies) ~~xxxx~~ and have the book pay for itself even if it sells well.

Now I've got to get back to work. Thanks for your long, chatty letter. If you can, drop us a note when you expect the Lucy show to be aired. Lil wants very much to see what you look like. Our best to all (and I'm very happy Lillian is coming out of it. I wish she could see the original film of the Wolper film. I've not got all the names and addresses of those who contributed to it). One other thing, I've got more and interesting stuff on the False Oswald story.

Sincerely,

Dear Harold:

I just phoned the telephone number attributed to Harold Dean in your recent letter. It's a janitorial service that operates, apparently, day and night. ("Out of the mouths of very babes shall.....") Do you really think I should follow through on this? I guess I'll give him a call during the daylight hours in the hope of finding him in. It's not, after all, his home phone.

Everyone is very frayed at the nerve ends out here. Maggie seemed at the end of her tether for the past few days. Some student from Liebler's class phoned her and by a rather cool, unemotional pitch for an hour or more had her convinced (only momentarily, of course) that we were not all paranoid: i.e. the Commissions supporters weren't, just the critics. She felt that it was "Jim" that himself had put the student up to calling her. Liebler told Lillian Castellano by phone that we should all be "sharing" our information one with the other, i.e. critics with commission staff! Said Liebler to Lillian "I suppose that Sylvia Meagher thinks I'm some kind of monster." He then went on to offer Lillian a chance to see the Zapruder slides. This last offer was put forth at a meeting of the exclusive Hollywood Hills Democratic Club where Ray and Liebler were originally scheduled to have some kind of colloquy. Ray finally demurred for a number of reasons even though they had agreed to undertake the expenses of duplicating some photographic materials that Ray had asked to be made up if he were to confront Liebler. They actually wanted a debate, however, and Ray wasn't in any mood for polemics. So Guy Endore the novelist took Ray's place and Lillian attended. Lomax and Walker were there with their wives and Schiller, of all people, was introduced as an "outstanding photographic expert" who answered questions about the Zapruder slides no less! Even Robert Vaughn put in a brief appearance as the Man From UNCLE. (He's never said a thing to me since I put all those books in his hands some months ago.)

The long and short of it is that Lillian never got to see the Zapruder slides through Liebler's intervention. Although she did see them. But only after extraordinary representations made to Ed Kearn by Ray over the phone. All of us trooped down to the local TIME-LIFE Bldg last Friday morning and spent several hours (just the four of us Ray, Lillian, Maggie and myself.) carefully sorting them out and comparing them with those printed in the volumes. Some of them were out of order and a few misnumbered as a result. One was missing compared to the equivalent in the volumes. Shocking treatment to be accorded to primary evidence by a major mass media publication. But after seeing the missing frames with the sprocket holes on the bottom and top of a blacked-out portion of the extension to the left of each of four frames I was unable to conclude there was anything sinister about the whole controversy. The portion between the sprocket holes on the frame of the first generation copy set from the original shows the secret service men on the right hand running board of the follow-up car. That is on the last slide before the missing frame series begins. The SS men are looking up in the direction of Zapruder or the knoll. There is a slight movement of the free arm of the agent furthest forward on the running board but nothing indicative of anything in particular. I can't believe in 4/18.3 seconds later there is a substantial revelation of which we are deprived. There is a slight loss of color fidelity in the missing frames. Presumably they have been made up from one of the other copies in Dallas that day and given to LIFE or the Secret Service. In the process of printing or enlarging the portion between the sprocket holes has not been reproduced. I think there may be non-sinister reasons that could explain this. Further there are no stress marks on the road sign as David Lifton has argued.

Although Dave is reluctant to admit that he has been wrong on this. What he sees and what we all see are scratch marks at various points on different frames. Ray Marcus argues that these are a result of the spliced frames. This may well be possible especially if it can be shown that these marks radiate uniformly from the top and bottom sprocket holes, but while this is possible it is not always evident or demonstrable to a layman such as myself. Similar marks or scratches of a more irregular variety appear elsewhere and are not part of such "rays" that could have been caused by a splice.

Sylvia's visit was "heady wine" to most of us. She arrived from Toronto (I think I mean Victoria, B.C.) which she found not particularly rewarding in retrospect. As the Grover Whalen of the "Critic Establishment" I met her at the airport while Ray was supposed to be picking up Penn and L.A. from Bakersfield. When I showed Sylvia her letter from you (in carbon copy form) she was genuinely touched by your feeling and consideration for her at this particular time. What with the pressures of the book and her work at the WHO. We had a talk on the way back to Maggie's and then I left them to return home before collecting at Ray & Letha's for dinner where Mr. Field appeared with Maggie and Lillian was on hand as well. Penn was in particularly high spirits. I had never seen him quite so ebullient, although a stronger, livelier more colorful set of adjectives would be applicable to this bawdy Texan. After dinner Penn and Sylvia adjourned to KLAC for a fifteen or twenty minute dialogue with Mort Sahl who spoke from Las Vegas where he is appearing in a night club act. The nature of the hookup didn't permit Penn or Sylvia to answer questions. They just spoke with Mort. Saturday night Arnoni gave a talk that went off like 20,000 tons of TNT! Maggie and Sylvia were introduced from the floor as was Penn for their work on the Warren Commission (their "scholarly research" was saluted) and the whole thing was under the auspices of "The Minority of One" subscribers in Los Angeles. Maggie gave a reception afterward for Arnoni and we talked until 2:00 in the morning. Sylvia and Ray had a real contretemps over Schiller with Ray saying "I hope that record is purchased by millions just so they can hear the beeps on the horn of the police car signaling Ruby to do what he did". Sylvia retorted that it was rather thoughtless to wish that record well on the basis of its(lack of)intrinsic merit and because of what it did to the critics. Ray countered "You too involved to have any objectivity about it." At which point Sylvia justifiably lashed out "Now you're really becoming objectionable" and turned on her heel and went to another portion of the room. Ray does have something more than a mere argumentative streak about him to be sure. A person of great personal integrity and uncompromising honesty, but awfully intractable and rigid sometimes. There has been a distinct cooling of relations for reasons beyond my comprehension between Ray and myself. Indeed, between Maggie and me. I think it stems from the Lifton business. It's all so petty. I would agree that Lifton has, perhaps knowingly, compromised himself by his association with Liebler. Has been used by Liebler. And the fruits to Lifton from this kind of symbiotic relationship would seem to be small indeed. But earlier Maggie urged me to keep up my contacts with him to learn what was going on in the other camp. The biggest factor may be the fact that Lifton has confided in me certain fundamental lines and details from his new thesis on the case that he is attempting to evolve. I think it is of major importance and I am pledged not to reveal its contents. I didn't ask to be put in that position either, but there are certain trusts that are placed etc., and for the same reason that I would not, have not, reveal something you told me in confidence. Sylvia wanted this information and urged that it be shared with the critical community. But Lifton thought otherwise and his isolation began. I think he was perhaps mistaken, but we can only judge the merit of his work and the decision to keep it secret when it finally appears.

Lillian remains her usually delightful self. I was so glad she could see the slides inasmuch as her expertise in the Zapruder film is almost as great as Ray's. It is really remarkable the way she has gone back into the case with the enthusiasm and gusto of the past weeks shows. She is working in Pasadena several days a week doing some kind of accounting or book keeping I gather. Apparently, the financial drain of her husband's illness and death have been terrific. I know Ray was helping her find work and Maggie wanted her to do some work on the panoplys for money, but that would have been only a small amount for a limited period of work.

Going back to the slides I think I should note something about the head shot. Someone has speculated that the particular frame showing the gore flying out of the President's head was touched up. The first generation slides reveal a golden yellow blur of certain definition covering an area above the right ear and forward of it extending over the right temple area. In short, one does not see the right rear portion of the President's head as having been hollowed out. The wound is thus advanced to a different area more forward than we had been led to by the autopsy findings as the situs for the head wound. On the other hand it is difficult to conclude from the pattern of the explosion as to the site of and nature of the head wound. It is difficult to impeach the autopsy on the basis of these slides. But questions are raised that should be answered. William Manchester on his appearance on NETelevision in the fall of 1965 said that some of the slides were never published because they were too gruesome. If this is so, then LIFE may have brushed them of some of that gore. I think Manchester is more likely mistaken and that the record shows that LIFE did indeed publish the head shot rather early on. As for the movement of the President's body sharply backward and then left in to Mrs. Kennedy's arms has already been noted by Thomas Stamm in his memorandum. I found it clearly discernable from my three hour study of the slides. It was, I felt, a movement independent of that of the car or any other of its occupants.

The Lane-Liebler debate was for the most part a "ho-hum" affair with a few new nuances. I felt Liebler showed that he had prepared well for the encounter and that Lane had not. Ray and Maggie were in ecstasy over Lane and thought Liebler dismal. I think this ingrown attitude is unnecessary and not particularly helpful, but we've been through all that before and I don't think I need recapitulate. Liebler tried to use the head shot to his own purposes although he had not mastered Lifton's research on it and his extrapolations were quite dishonest. Lane's retort indicated he has yet to master the photographic evidence of the case. Lifton had briefed Lane on what Liebler had been doing and what he might pull in debate but he failed to mention the preparation of an exhibit by Schiller for Liebler that was a photograph, blown up to huge proportions, indicating that the nose shadow could be duplicated short of a dual solar system. Lifton indicated to me that some of this had been fudged and didn't represent an "honest" attempt on the part of Liebler or Schiller to answer the discrepancy posed by the famed Oswald photograph. If you want a tape of the affair I'll be glad to make you a copy. Getting Liebler to sign a release for broadcast was a touchy affair, although we finally made it.

One other interesting conflict that took place during Sylvia's visit occurred just before we went to the Mort Sahl taping on Sunday night at which Penn and Sylvia made appearances. Penn started on about how the assassination was planned in Houston and that Johnson (President) was a homosexual and so was Oswald and otherwise why would the latter's pubic hairs have been discovered to have been shaved when the autopsy on him was performed; Ray adding embellishments about the prostitutes involved in the case and that was also a key that should

be run to earth. Sylvia quietly demurred from the whole tenor of the discussion and privately told me such unscientific meanderings could only do the cause harm. That we musn't depart from an evidentiary way of research and become involved with things we can't really grapple with on a factual basis. It was interesting to see that there were great conflicts between critics on how best to proceed. Of course I would agree that if an investigation into anyone's sexuality can lead us to crucial findings in the case it must be pursued, but not bandied about in a sensational manner. Ray and Maggie both seem adamant on this business of hanging a conspiracy noose around Earl Warren and the Commission members and if that's the test of trust and loyalty within the Critic Establishment (and let's call it what it really has become without any invidious overtones) then I'm afraid both you and I are beyond the pale. The other thing that oppressed Sylvia was the fact that Penn is on record as speaking of the wall-to-wall carpeting in Ruby's cell and the TV set. I really don't know his source or basis in fact for such an assertion but it does tend to undercut his credibility rating with many people and that is too bad because he is basically a level headed fellow with decency and honesty about him.

I didn't mean to ramble on needlessly about all this, but it has been on my mind and I did want to share it with you privately. And it must be private as I'm sure you understand since I am thinking out loud as it were. I hope some of my imaginings are wrong and that the petty differences that seem to exist are of a transitory nature and therefore will pass.

The letterhead is most elegant on the bonded onion skin paper! Congrats/ I left my number with Harry Dean's place of employment and will let you know if he calls back as he wasn't in when I phoned during the day.

Apparently, the Lane BBC appearance transpired night before last and was grossly unfair to Lane; the press here carried a report that switchboard operators at the BBC were busy taking the protests for the manner in which he was treated.

I worked on the Lucy show last week and I was most grateful for the job. She was delightful and we performed before a live audience after two days of intensive rehearsal. I had only a small role, but amusing. Tennessee Ernie Ford was the guest and it was the last show of the season so you can watch for it probably next month.

Best wishes to you and Lil,

Bill