

I appreciated your kind comments about RFK on p. 22 of WW 2. In this time, when so many of the critics of the Report are lambasting RFK for siding with the Establishment, remarks as kind as yours are few and far between. I think many of the critics forget that RFK has a most difficult position: he is trying to work from INSIDE the Establishment; this is harder to do than Harold Feldman and Vince Salandria (for example) realize. What is your opinion on the death of Dean Markham (RFK's best friend) and George Sakal, Ethel Kennedy's brother?

I am interested in the determination on the arrest (11/22/63) of "Mr. Farry"? Why was this done? What became of it? This is the same man, is it not, involved in the CAP with Oswald in NO?

Mamantov's testimony proves in my opinion that Marina thought the only weapon in Lee's possession was the Russian shotgun.

De Mohrenschildt is back in Dallas making conforming noises, that Lee shot Kennedy because Marina wanted a washing machine. Actually in my opinion De M. is back in Dallas about to make a report in detail to certain government agencies about the Devalier government. De M. is a friend of George and Herman Brown (close friends of LBJ). De M. is (or was) a business partner of theirs, according to the Report. (Reference deleted, but one can read between the lines) George and Herman Brown (one now deceased) got their start and are what they are today because of LBJ. This company (Brown & Root) has biggest contracts of all now in South Vietnam and Philippines, etc., for building airfields, dredging harbors, etc.

De M. also friend of attorney Morris Jaffe (San Antonio). This is a name very familiar in Tulsa. Jaffe and LBJ have been intimates for a long time. De M. is remarkable man; makes the dream of American democracy almost seem believable. He is friend to friends of the mighty, but at the same time is a close friend (Oswald's only friend) to a Marxist day-laborer. Glory be.

Manchester is alleged to believe Lee shot Kennedy out of sudden spur of the moment anger at Marina because she chose to stay with Ruth Paine. If so, he had forethought to take home, under his shirt, the paper bag and tape to wrap weapon in. Interesting contradiction. Truly told me in March '64: "He took that paper home Thursday night under his shirt." Ruth Paine told me February 1964: "He brought the paper home under his shirt." This was long before Report came out, but they all had the same story already. No one can remember seeing this paper bulging under Oswald's shirt however. Not even Wesley Frazier/

Ruth Paine admitted to me that things she told the commission as factual were only hearsay: Lee wanted Marina to return to Russia; Lee was mean to her; Lee wouldn't let her learn English. Ruth told all these slanderous things to Commission--when I asked her if she had actually HEARD Lee say them, she replied: No; Marina told me!!!!

Michael Paine is a wet-handed, goiter prone, nervous fish. He is far inferior to his wife in conducting normal life relationships. Smug and self-satisfied; yet altogether not a bad man, just pitiful.

1/9/67

Harold: Our letters crossed; as I finished mine, yours arrived. Thanks so much for the book. I had already bought WW1 and WW2, but will treasure the signed one more.

Am disappointed that the description of Castorr (by Rich) does not fit Jones Harris' eye-view. What about the wife? As I recall, there is a brief description of her. Could Rich's testimony have been changed in commission-transcript (to protect the innocent!)? I doubt it.

Do you have the reference that Lee was specifically ordered (by Shelley, I think) to move certain boxes to the sixth floor on Friday morning? I will try to check back on that today.

Jarman's testimony that people were gathering on street corners in-Dealy Plaza as early as 9:30 am must be wrong. Even the police say that crowds did not begin to gather until after 11. I think Lee and Jarman had their lunch-confrontation after 11:30 and before 12. (Some TSBDB employees went to lunch at 11:45) This, combined with Williams perch in the critical window-area until 12:20 would negate Lee's premeditation, re-forming the rifle with a dime, etc. Combine this with the fact that the motorcade was late (in other words Lee, if he was the killer, should have been in place at 12 at the latest) and there is a real fairy-story as far as Lee Oswald and the assassination is concerned.

I must run. The kids are late for school. I have 4 children, 12 dogs, a cat and a bird, so you see why my letters are so chaotic. Forgive me. The days are never long enough for everything that needs to be done.

Had an interesting conversation with Eva Grant in March, 1966. I said: Is Jack miserable in jail? She answered: "Oh, no. Jack always says if you HAVE to be in jail, the place for it is Dallas." Walthers told me he saw Ruby frequently and that Ruby looked "great". (This conversation with Walthers, however, took place Nov. 22, 1964.) In March Eva also told me Jack Ruby was just fine; however, she insisted to me that his mind was gone. She has a huge colored photograph of President Kennedy on the wall of her room.

*As I wrote, Eva acknowledged
Dave Cherry.
"Do you know Dave Cherry?"
"Oh, yes, I know Dave."*

*His journal,
I don't know what at
The time as I did not
have the information
then*

November 24, 1966

Why is it so hard to understand a man when he speaks in English?

Is Governor Connally stupid, or am I?

Connally says he agrees with the Warren Commission that there was only one assassin. Yet he insists that he was hit by a bullet fired 1.3 seconds AFTER the Kennedy bullet was fired.

But since it took 2.3 seconds for each shot of the 6.5 Italian carbine to be fired, Governor Connally's insistence that he was hit by a separate bullet other than the one which hit Kennedy indicates two assassins.

How can Governor Connally have it both ways? How can he insist on two bullets fired within a physically impossible 1.3 seconds, while at the same time demanding we accept the Warren Commission's assessment on the lone assassin?

Nor does Governor Connally do himself, his country or his state credit by employing character assassination against the critics of the Warren Report. I am such a critic and have been at work on this case since November 24, 1963. I neither appreciate nor understand Governor Connally's obtuseness and waspishness in this regard.

Certainly it is neither the background nor the political affiliations of the critics which counts. It is what they have to say that should be considered. Because if the critics are correct, we may have a solution, not only to the assassination, but to the whole sorry mess our foreign policy is in.

Wouldn't this be worth a few questions, Mr. Connally?

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Shirley Martin

P. O. Box 226
Owasso, Oklahoma