

29 March 1966

Personal

Mr Melvin Eisenberg  
Kaye, Scholer, Fierman,  
Hays and Handler  
425 Park Ave  
New York, N Y

Dear Mr Eisenberg,

The last time that we talked on the telephone you accused me of being intolerant. Because I was nonplussed, I did not argue that on logical grounds. When I thought about it later it seemed indisputable to me that to question the discrepancies in the Report, individually and in the aggregate, was nothing less than a responsibility and a duty; and if such questioning and the inevitable inferences drawn from the failure to obtain satisfactory answers can be equated with "intolerance," then I will readily admit that your accusation was deserved. In that sense, I can only wish that the news media and the public at large had been intolerant in evaluating the documentation.

I did not write earlier to clarify my feelings because it seemed extravagant to engage in polemics.

However, I have just read an article by Vincent Salandria in the April 1966 issue of THE MINORITY OF ONE which seems to me to vindicate the inferences I have drawn from the discrepancies in the Report as well as the intolerance of which you complained. I commend that article to you, especially the excerpt on page 13 from the FBI Report to the Commission, hitherto unpublished but apparently now in the Archives.

If you have any comment on that excerpt, which I interpret as strong evidence against the official medical findings and as raising the question of fabrication, I should of course find your views of the greatest interest. I understand that you feel inhibited by what I believe you called the lawyer/client relationship; but perhaps you will agree that Salandria's article makes it imperative for an official spokesman to make a public clarification.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher  
302 West 12 Street  
New York, N Y 10014

Source: *S. Epstein, 1966 (4)*