

10/17/67

Dear Maggie,

Dirty handed, waterless, without current hence light, hi! We're still in the throes of moving in, bogged down in the bureaucracy of the utilities which, snare by snare, I have to unthread, and with the view from my window, once magnificent, today of a deep gash in the earth two utility trucks, two TV installer's trucks, and a number of cars I cannot count. Good day for letter writing, not for other kinds.

I hope Steve has relayed to you my tentative plans. I wrote him in haste last night, when I learned them, hoping he could formalize the speech at UCLA 11/15. That morning I expect to arrive. I'll go to N.O. about 11/5, thence to Chicago, thence San Francisco. If Liebler was uneasy over my other writing, wait until he sees OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS! I think this time he'll have to say something, and I hope you people can line up things as well as last time so I can make it more uncomfortable for him to avoid. This book has what he had and didn't use, what he would have been led to had he any willingness to seek the truth, the fact not consistent with the pre-determined case...I hope also when I'm there that we can have some time to chat, and without the arguments that we began with last time. I hope nothing is bugging Ray. I've not heard from him for a while. I want to be able to tell you what I now have, in the same small group. I assume it will be arranged so that, if we can get together privately, it will exclude Lifton. Would not your presence assure this? If someone does undertake to arrange something of this sort and wants to avoid personal embarrassment, can it be put on the basis that I absolutely insist on your presence? More than anyone else, I in fact do want to talk to you. If we cannot do it any other way, perhaps with just Bill, if a large group cannot be private enough.

I do not believe the stuff on 1026 either. It was my hunch that this document represented part of a coverup and had that value.

What you say about the Armoni article express my sentiments, but not exactly. I have a stronger feeling about the dishonesty and I so told him. He sent me a marked copy of the magazine, to which I do not subscribe. My initial experience was so utterly shocking (almost two years ago) that in respect for his past and his decent objectives, I just fell silent and ignored him. I wondered if Sylvia had asked him to send it to me (he had my last name close to phonetic) and, indeed, if she had drafted the piece. She will not like my response. I also wrote her separately asking her to closely examine herself to see if she can find an emotional involvement in this, for her speaking, thinking and writing are so unlike her when she addresses Garrison. We have had several rather stiff exchanges, including a rather emotional personal confrontation last time I was in New York. She is also straining at gnats in the few instances where she is on other than imaginary grounds. I asked her to preserve silence until she read my New Orleans book, but that also she would not do. Having made herself heard, having said what she had to say, she now repeats the same charges whenever she can, adding nothing but repetition. This disturbs me, very much,

She is wrong on his going out on his way to "court" the critics, of course. What she might have said is that he welcomed us. What is wrong or unnatural about that? Where else is he to get help. He has never written me, phoned me fewer than a half dozen time, and not once for "courtship!"

Your position on the trial is the same as mine. I said this on leaving the grand-jury room 4/28, as I wish others had, for then the possibility of the trial coming

off and the decision sticking both would be greater. I wish I had a tape of what I then said. ABC taped me for an hour, right on the stair, and it was pretty hot for a while, simply because I could not be cajoled or pressured into making the kind of comment they wanted (and would sell books). I was promised a copy.

Perhaps most troubling to me of all is my conviction that if it should turn out that Garrison's motives are doubtful (and I do not consider this at all probable), this cannot make Sylvia right in what she has done. I also fear its ultimate effect on her, when she comes to realize it. I have been aware of the breach between you and save for a few possibly strong hints to her have been silent, hoping thereby to not widen it. And when I told her that when she saw my book, with nothing from Garrison in it, she'd see a prima facie case, she declined to believe me. I tried to tell her that he, certainly, had more than I gave him, and if I had close to enough to satisfy reasonable people on probability, there should be little doubt about his case. I have two worries: whether the case has been made untriable and whether the proper protections of the law can be distorted to the same end. I have no doubt on the central fact.

I am making arrangements, as soon as Steve replies, to have a supply of C in N.C. available to you all, without charge. Someone will have to pick them up at the wholesaler's, that is all. Perhaps Steve can do that and subdivide.

As soon as my plans are more definite, I'll be writing Bill or Steve. I addressed Steve because he is trying to line up the speech.

Looking forward to seeing you all again!

Best regards,

1115<sup>th</sup> BEVERLY DRIVE  
BEVERLY HILLS CALIFORNIA  
October 15, 1967

Dear Harold,

Many thanks for the Jenner memo on "Oswald's Weight". It bears out the strong point I made of the utter impossibility of Tippit's having apprehended Oswald on the basis of Brennan's description via the police bulletin. Poor old Jenner! He really doesn't know his stuff at all, because what is far more to the point than the August 1963 New Orleans police record of Oswald's weight, is the one done during the weekend of November 22 - 24 by the Dallas police, which lists his weight as 131 pounds, 5 pounds less than the New Orleans record indicates! As for memos on 1026, anything you can find on that score is, of course, of interest to me but I seriously doubt that Fritz knew the address as early as 2:30 P.M. If one is to believe that the Dallas police had no previous knowledge of that address, I do not accept the premise for the simple reason that the evidence shows that the police were at 1026 North Beckley by 1:30, a time when Oswald had not yet even been apprehended. In other words, according to the evidence from Fritz, Hill, and other policemen, no one knew anything about the Beckley address until mid-afternoon, yet it is clear from Earlene Roberts that the police arrived at Beckley within half an hour after Oswald left there.

I was absolutely horrified to learn of the tragedy which has befallen Shirley Martin. From all reports, she and Vickie were very close. Additionally, Anne-Lise Lane writes me that Vickie was to have been married in three weeks. Whatever the circumstances, I can think of nothing more overwhelmingly sad than for a parent to lose a child.

What did you think of Arnoni's piece in the current T.M.O.? While I agree that there are many doubtful areas in the Garrison probe, many things which trouble me, I nevertheless continue to feel that the trial must be allowed to take place and that Garrison must be allowed to show what evidence he has. The campaign to stop him only adds to the suspicion that he will develop too much damaging evidence, as far as our adversaries are concerned. What I dislike about the Arnoni article, in particular, is the fact that I detect an underlying dishonesty in the case he has built against Garrison and while I welcome honest debate and constructive criticism, even though it may be directed against Garrison, I cannot help but be dismayed when the criticism is as unfair as it is in the Arnoni article.

For example, Arnoni makes a very strong point to the effect that G. has gone out of his way to court the critics. In my case, although I have sent him material repeatedly over the past six months, I never received a single response from him until about two weeks ago when he finally acknowledged receipt of my most recent communication. For another example, Arnoni chastises Garrison for procrastinating about the trial, as if it were not the defense which has moved to postpone the trial. My own policy, where the Garrison probe is concerned, has been and continues to be one of "wait and see, let him go to court, and let him stand or fall on the evidence he can produce; why try to stop him". I do not know what evidence he has, and as I have said before, there are many questionable areas, but I am willing to give him the opportunity to make his case. Incidentally, he is here at the present time and we have all met with him.

Thank you again, Harold, for the items you have sent. We are all eagerly looking forward to "Oswald in New Orleans" and I wish you great success with it. Much happiness, too, in your new "digs". Best wishes always,

Maggie