

27 February 1968

Mr. Mark Lane
617 Dauphine Street
New Orleans, La. 70112

Dear Mark,

I feel obliged to make some comments on your letter of 23 February to Robert Ockene, copy of which you sent me. First, I wish to emphasize that I was not consulted about the ad for my book that appeared in a number of newspapers earlier this month and saw the copy for the first time when I bought the New York Times. You may feel sure that if I had known in advance that your quote was included, I would have made the most strenuous efforts to have it deleted.

Second, I am pleased to note that you exonerate Mr. Ockene of any attempt to mislead or trick you into an "endorsement" of my book. Unfortunately, the NBC radio audience will not be aware of this exoneration but only of the defamatory hit-and-run attack made on my publishers and myself by your spokesman, Mort Sahl, on November 14-15, 1967. Sahl said explicitly, "I want you to know that I talked to Mark Lane before I made that statement." It seems inescapable that you bear some responsibility for the broadcast of unfounded and damaging allegations which you now acknowledge to be unwarranted, at least so far as my publishers are concerned.

It is not clear whether or not you also concede that I personally made no attempt to mislead or trick you into providing a jacket quote for my book. So that the record may be quite definite on this point, I enclose herewith a copy of a letter I directed to Robert Ockene on May 30, 1967. You will perhaps understand, after reading this letter, that if it had entered my mind that the revision of my comments on Garrison would cause you to withhold your "endorsement," I would have moved mountains to make sure that you saw the revised text.


There is no mystery about my "motivation" for repudiating Garrison and his "investigation." You will find chapter and verse in the enclosed copies of my letters on this subject to editors of various periodicals. It is true, as you say, that I have never met Mr. Garrison. Nor have I met Earl Warren. As for the "evidence in his possession," it can hardly nullify or legitimize Garrison's continuous stream of public pronouncements about codes, conspiratorial meetings, and all the other nonsense piled on nonsense. It cannot invest Messrs. Russo and Bundy with one iota of credibility nor can it justify Garrison's persistent attempts to incriminate Lee Harvey Oswald in the assassination conspiracy on the basis of the most contrived and suspect "evidence."

Source: SA. Spence, (1966 (4C))
NOTE: Miss Filed

Let me make it quite clear that I make no apology whatsoever for having changed my opinion of Garrison as soon as the nature of his "evidence" became apparent. Rather, it is for those critics of the Warren Report who continue to condone and defend the lunatic vaudeville in New Orleans to justify their failure to denounce the violence done by Garrison to fact and logic.

Now that your long-awaited letter withdrawing your "endorsement" of my book has finally arrived, you may be sure that I will renew my effort to ensure that your name is not associated with Accessories After the Fact in any manner, shape or form. As to your reasons for qualifying or retracting your comments, I think they have about the same merit as your earlier complaint with respect to The National Guardian.

Yours sincerely,



Sylvia Meagher
1302 West 12 Street
New York, N.Y. 10014

Enclosures (4)

cc: R. Ockene, et al