

28 July 1967

Senator Thomas E. Ruchel
The U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir,

Your statement, "Wounds of Distrust," as set forth in the Congressional Record of July 13, 1967, has just come to my attention. I have the impression that your remarks were based solely on the "research" of such "authorities" as the Associated Press writers, Bernard Givner and Sid Moody, and the producers of the CBS "news inquiry" on the Warren Report. Nothing in your speech suggests that you have personally read the 26 volumes of the Hearings and Exhibits of the Warren Commission, or any of the responsible critical works which you have disparaged. But the study of these volumes, books, and articles are the only informed basis for a judgment of the merits of the controversy about the Warren Report; and it is a matter for surprise and disappointment that a United States Senator should take a position on the issue on the basis of such slight, second-hand acquaintance with the evidence and the facts.

Although your statement gives me the impression that you have made up your mind and do not wish to be bothered with the facts, I am nevertheless sending you herewith copies of my letters of July 3 and 23, 1967 to CBS News. Do you challenge any of the statements therein on questions of evidence? I will certainly be interested in your counter-arguments, since CBS has failed to offer any.

Your remarks about "commercialization of the event" of the assassination seem directed solely at writers who have questioned or disputed the findings of the Warren Commission. Do you suggest that none of these writers can have been motivated by a sense of justice and a desire for the truth? As the author of the Subject Index to the Warren Report and the Hearings and Exhibits (Scarcecrow Press, New York and London, 1966), I resent and reject your ugly and unwarranted insinuations. The charge of commercialization might better have been addressed to Senator Gerald Ford, who published the book, "Portrait of the Assassin," which exploits his unique experience as a member of the Warren Commission; to William Manchester, who has earned about two million dollars from his maudlin, irresponsible, and false "history" of the assassination; and to the cross scavenger who had the audacity to put that name to critics, after he himself had served as a literary agent for the family of Jack Ruby at a share of 35 percent of earnings (Hearings, Volume XIV, pp. 402, 474, 475).

I am sending copies of this letter to my many friends in California.

Yours very truly,

Sylvia Maegher
302 West 12 St. NYC NY 10014

Enclosures: (2)