

These were pieces of
correspondence I
received from her
files.

Special Delivery
Airmail

23 February 1967

Personal and Confidential

District Attorney James Garrison
Office of the District Attorney
New Orleans, La.

Dear Mr. Garrison,

Bob Richter of CBS today asked for a copy of my Subject Index to the Warren Report and the Hearings and Exhibits (Scarcecrow Press, New York and London, 1966) which he is dispatching to you immediately. I was happy to be able to provide this copy of the Index and I hope it will prove to be useful, because, as I wired you yesterday, I should like to be of any possible service in your further investigation.

In addition to the Index, I have written a book-length manuscript criticizing the Warren Report and rejecting its conclusions. This book will be published by Bobbs-Merrill Company in the fall. My editor at Bobbs-Merrill has just telephoned me to urge that I send you a chapter from my manuscript which he feels will be of special interest to you ("The Proof of the Plot," pp. 362-374A). The very same thought had already occurred to me, but I did not wish to risk sending you material on my own initiative which you might consider intrusive. However, after the telephone calls I received from Bob Richter and then from my editor, I now believe that I should send the enclosed chapter from my book. If I have exceeded the bounds of propriety, I hope that you will pardon me and understand that my last wish is to intrude or interfere in any way with your investigation. You need only return the chapter unread, if you wish.

It is difficult for me to tell you, without lapsing into extravagant prose, how deeply grateful my colleagues among the critics and I personally feel for your enormous courage and independence in this case. let justice be done, though the heavens fall. With my heartfelt gratitude and respect,

Yours sincerely,

sdj sdonna
r nbx AM-MD-- 07-12 0718
AM-MD--

Handwritten:
RAN on wire
7-12-93

Deb, sorry this took so long. I'm still trying to get into the 'swing' of things. Hope it's the right piece.

Shawn

g6314 mmd-
r nbx THE CHW
AM-MD--JFK Collection, 8jt, 640(
Second JFK Researcher's Papers Donated to Hood College(
By DEB RIECHMANN=
Associated Press Writer=

FREDERICK, Md. (AP) — Sylvia Meagher spent much of her life delving into the John F. Kennedy assassination, but while she had a fondness for mysteries, she steered clear of theories and whodunits in the case.

Meagher's allegiance to only facts and evidence is apparent in the 24 file drawers of her papers on the subject that now are available to the public at the Hood College library in Frederick.

"The value of the collection is definitely going to be the personal correspondence she maintained with everybody in the assassination arena," said Gerald McKnight, a Hood history professor who teaches a course titled "Politics of Assassination."

"The Kennedy assassination was dinner left on the table and it stinks to high heaven," McKnight said. "There is going to have to be a time when we come to terms with it. She was in the center of it. (The papers) will make for good cultural and political history."

McKnight said the Meagher papers are a good addition to the more than 200,000 pages of information that assassination researcher Harold Weisberg recently donated to Hood College. Weisberg, a former journalist, Senate investigator and Office of Strategic Services analyst, has written several books on the case.

Weisberg and Meagher did not agree on all aspects of their investigations, but both criticized the conclusions of the Warren Commission. Included in Meagher's collection is an index she compiled and had published of the 26 volumes of the Warren Commission report, which comprises 10 million words.

The collection also includes her book, "Accessories After the Facts: The Warren Commission, The Authorities and the Report," scores of other books on the subject, government documents, reel-to-reel tapes and clippings on the assassination.

In Feb. 23, 1967, Meagher wrote a letter to New Orleans, La. District Attorney James Garrison accompanying a copy of her index of the Warren Commission Report, the only index on record.

"I hope it will prove to be useful, because, as I wired you yesterday, I should like to be of any possible service in your further investigation," Meagher wrote. "Let justice be done, though the heavens fall."

However, her feelings for Garrison soon soured. A year later in

(Note)

2 (copy) to 2 friends, meager words.

If I permit myself to become indiscriminate and over-enthusiastic in my friendships with those who, knowingly or unknowingly, are helping or condoning or fronting for that waster of an embassy and unscrupulousness in New Orleans, I could not survive one high school company with my conscience.

Her note, even everything from JFK's car to the article, reads that Lee Harvey Oswald said he was carrying in own papers, said Don Schumaker, Jr., a spokesman for Hood. She even clipped a legal notice in a Dallas newspaper that the U.S. Treasury Department went to see if anyone had claims to the Mannlicher-Garcano rifle that was allegedly used by Oswald to shoot Kennedy.

Her niece, Susan Kaplan of East Brunswick, N.J., said her aunt lived most her life in Greenwich Village, N.Y. She was an avid reader, often reading a book a day. She had a diversified group of friends, a "delightful sense of humor," and had a passion for baseball, ballet and poker, she said.

Her health failed as she got older, and she became very sedentary after she retired from her career as an administrator and writer of analytical reports at the World Health Organization, a affiliate of the United Nations. Her niece said she died on Jan. 14, 1989, at the age of 67.

Before she died she asked Grell Stone, an expert in the death of Robert Kennedy, to find a place where her papers could be used by serious researchers. Stone moved them from her apartment to Hood College for safekeeping, and before he died, he will be Meagher's papers to the institution, McKittrick said.

AP BAL-07 12-93 1309EDTV

(Handwritten initials)

25 May 1968

Dear Shirley, *MARTIN = ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~*

I was not sure to which address to send this, but it will no doubt reach you. You had the old Owasso address on your undated letter, sent after your return from NYC. I am very sorry to learn that you found Teresa so ill and I do hope that she is better.

Having finally met you personally, I can understand why so many of our mutual acquaintances have described you as beautiful. You are certainly a lovely and very feminine woman, with a quality of great delicacy and even frailty--though I know that you are not frail but have great strength and endurance. The last thing I want to do is to cause you unhappiness; yet, your letter raises issues on which I can only respond honestly and frankly, and my reply is likely to disappoint you--if so, I am truly sorry.

You say in your letter that you want dear friends, not causes. How do we become friends with other people? We select from those individuals whom we meet some with whom we make friends, for a variety of reasons--temperament, shared interests, pleasure in talking and being together, ability to communicate and sympathize, and--above all--the implicit or explicit understanding that there is a common commitment to certain moral and ethical standards, which guarantee fairness and honesty in the friendship and which provide a basis for mutual respect. When this much is there, the differences which often alienate people, even such serious differences as political views, cease to matter. Thus, I have been able to become good friends with Sauvage, for example, whose political position is very different from my own, but whose integrity as a human being is absolute and whom I trust and respect wholly. Mark Lane's political stand is rather similar to my own; but as a human being, he is unethical, untrustworthy, untruthful, and despicable. I cannot be his friend, and I can only grieve that he is on the ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ "same side" as I am, in the public eye, instead of on the side of the Warren Commission where he belongs, since he has as little regard for truth as they had. This is evident from his partnership with Garrison in a sinister and lunatic game which includes harrassment, entrapment of innocent bystanders, and other sordid practices. The fact that "he was so kind and compassionate" at a time when you were cast into a terrible human tragedy is irrelevant--in fact, only a monster could have failed to suffer with you, and I am sure that Lane has human qualities and feelings. That is not to say that he has the moral and ethical qualities essential for respect and friendship. Indeed, I feel sure that Earl Warren himself would have felt great sympathy, true compassion, had he known the circumstances--and I am not about to become Warren's admirer.

Now, I am sorry to learn that Mike was "not too happy" with me when we met here two Fridays ago. If he considered that I was wrong--about Lane, or about Garrison, or any other subject of our conversation--why didn't he say so, and why didn't he argue for what he believed? He did do so, to an extent, on the issue of why he had joined Lane's "team" in the first instance. As I recall his reasoning, he felt that Lane was going to talk to the public with or without Mike's help, so he might as well try to keep him as accurate and honest as possible. By that kind of rationalization, one becomes a collaborator of that amount of dishonesty which one does not succeed in preventing. But why is Lane's abuse of facts or ethics to be loyally hidden, or condoned, while the dishonesty of the Warren Commission is to be denounced? If one is opposed to false evidence, to false accusation, to falseness itself, there can be no amnesty and no escape hatches for privileged individuals who are relieved of obligations we demand of others. We critics who have been demanding truth and justice about the Kennedy assassination for almost five years cannot, in plain decency, accept less from each other.

I cannot love people on request, even on request from those whom I may indeed love, and I cannot love out of sentimentality but only from respect and confidence. If I have an opportunity to know and understand Mike much better, it may be that I will have great rapport and admiration for him; on the basis of the one evening

letter passed just 1
year later

we spent together, I have no strong feelings one way or the other. He seemed a well-intending, pleasant, person but perhaps vague in projecting his convictions and guarded. Honestly, Shirley, I just didn't have enough sense of contact to be able to react, and I am certainly not hostile to Mike or anything like that. He said nothing that offended me; but he said little or nothing when I made statements that perhaps offended him, which I regret, because it left him ambiguous and remote. If he feels there is a case to be made in defense of Lane, Garrison, or what-have-you, good! let me hear, let us communicate, I am willing to listen, I am even capable of changing my mind. You see, I knew you so very well from our long correspondence that meeting you was a mere extension, a corroboration. But I never knew Mike Lester and I still feel that I do not know him, but have only met him. So when you say, "Please love Mike," you place me in an impossible dilemma. How can I love someone I don't know?

Another point, not in your letter but in our snatched conversation as we were walking to the restaurant, is the prospect you saw of my reconciliation with those critics from whom I am alienated. I was shocked by the suggestion, because it made me realize that I have never really made you understand how I feel and why I am alienated from them. I have lost the respect and the trust which is indispensable for friendship and for partnership. How can I possibly resume friendships when there is no respect and no confidence? The loss of those relationships was a terrible loss, I don't pretend that I am not often lonely, that I don't feel isolated. But this way, I can at least live with myself. If I permit myself to become indiscriminate and promiscuous in my "friendships" with those who, knowingly or unknowingly, are helping or condoning or fronting for that master of fantasy and unscrupulousness in New Orleans, I could not survive one night in company with my conscience. It would be the same as making friends with Specter or Jenner. What is the difference, really, between two sets of people who are willing to abuse truth and condone injustice, each for their own stated cause? To me, there is no compatibility possible with either set, including the set willing to engage in such tactics in furtherance of a position of opposition to the Warren Report, which is my own position.

Well, Shirley, for the warmth of your letter, I have returned only the cold water of a purist and inflexible abstractions. I have been called intolerant for taking such a position--by one of the lawyers for the Warren Commission, no less. And I am intolerant--of quacks, liars, fabricators, and perpetrators of injustice, and I only hope that I will never deviate from such intolerance.

Hood storing sleuth's probe of JFK murder

Sylvia Meagher did not miss much gathering information about the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

But she never gave up her full-time career at the United Nations, leaving her assassinations investigation for part-time pursuits.

Her collection of books, personal letters, clippings, notes on evidence, copies of government documents, tapes and even her old reel-to-reel machines, now belong to Hood College, stored in the archives in the Beneficial-Hodson Library and Information Technology Center.

The late Ms. Meagher was considered one of the premiere assassinations researchers, said Hood history professor Gerald McKnight, who is cataloging the collection.

"It's the 'A to Z' on the assassination," said Dr. McKnight, who teaches Politics of Assassination, one of the most popular courses at Hood. "This is a gold mine for Hood and for anyone who is serious about trying to find out what really happened in Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963, and then after the murder, too."

Included in the collection is Ms. Meagher's manuscript of the subject index of the Warren Commission report, the only index on record, Dr. McKnight said.

"Her prime concern," he said, "was the disaster we now call the Warren Commission. She knew the Warren Commission report inside and out and was one of the few knowledgeable and responsible critics of the work of the Warren Commission."

But Ms. Meagher, he noted, did not waste her time on theories or "whodunits." She was more interested in exposing the falsehoods of the government's investigation into the "Crime of the Century." However, she does point out in many of her personal letters and to other researchers, that in her opinion, Lee Harvey Oswald did not kill anyone on Nov. 22, 1963.

"She calls him the second victim of Dallas," Dr. McKnight said. "Sure, maybe he was involved in a conspiracy, but she did not think he killed the president."

Although only a partial catalog is

available now, researchers can view the collection, Hood library director Charles Kuhn said. He said he expects a full catalog later this year.

Much of the collection is personal. It includes letters from people such as Robert MacNeil of MacNeil-Lehrer Newshour, who as a reporter for the BBC was covering Kennedy's trip to Dallas; Cyril Wecht, a pathologist who has disputed much of the autopsy evidence in the JFK case; and Mark Lane, another assassinations researcher. She even criticizes Truman Capote, who, with the government's urging, supported the findings of the Warren Commission.

And her notes cover everything from JFK's car to the curtain rods that Oswald said he was carrying in brown paper. She even clipped a legal notice in a Dallas newspaper that the U.S. Treasury Department ran to see if anyone laid claim to the Mannlicher-Carcano rifle that was allegedly used by Oswald to shoot Kennedy. Many of the notes are written on the flip side of old United Nations memos. One notes a message about a Turkish Air Force fighter violating Cyprus air space and the ensuing diplomatic struggle.

"It is a wonderful collection that will give you a sense of this group of Warren Commission dissenters. . . . It is an invaluable collection for any researcher who wants an intimate and detailed look into the kinds of associations that developed among these critics," Dr. McKnight said. "She was wedded to get to the truth in this matter and she did all she could to help anyone who was working toward that goal, too."

There is a large collection of books, including Ms. Meagher's own acclaimed, "Accessories After the Fact: The Warren Commission, The Authorities and The Report," and perhaps a hundred books and manuscripts by other authors about the JFK murder. Other researchers so respected Ms. Meagher that they often sent her manuscripts to critique, Dr. McKnight said.

"She held the work, critics and apologists alike, to the same uncompromising standards," Dr. McKnight said.

Also, there is a complete set of Warren Commission documents and the materials used in the 1970s by the House Select Committee on Assassinations, which studied the murders of Kennedy, Martin Luther King Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy.

7/12/93
Fleed post

AP Associated Press

P. O. Box 648
Hagerstown, MD 21741



HAROLD WEISBERG

7627 OLD RECEIVER RD.

FREDENICK, MD 21701