

Sylvia Meagher  
302 West 12 St  
NYC 10014 NY

Mr. Harrison E. Salisbury  
Assistant Managing Editor  
The New York Times  
Times Square  
New York City 10036

25 October 1964

*Not Sent*

Dear Mr. Salisbury,

I truly appreciate your letter of 21 October 1964. There are, I realize, very heavy demands on your time, and I shall understand if you do not find yourself able to reply to this second letter. However, I should be grateful if you will read it and consider seriously the following points.

It is true that up to this time there is no clear evidence which incriminates any individual or individuals other than Oswald. However, it does not follow that the Warren Commission has established a solid case against Oswald. On the contrary, in my opinion, the long-awaited report has not only failed to dissipate the serious doubts of his sole guilt which attached to earlier conclusions stated by the Dallas authorities or "leaked" by the FBI—it has raised new and serious questions. Nor does the lack of evidence against other persons necessarily mean that the Warren Commission has exhausted every avenue of inquiry in that respect. If there were grounds to believe that the Commission lacked impartiality and had no objective from the first other than to tailor the evidence to fit Oswald and to justify so far as possible its verdict that he was the sole assassin, it could be taken for granted that other avenues of inquiry had been avoided deliberately.

After a very close and careful study of the report of the Warren Commission over the last four weeks, I believe that I can demonstrate that there are such grounds. I would appeal to you to read again "Chronology" on page 198 of the report, and then to re-examine Appendix XI. I am sure that you will find, as I did, an inconsistency and omission so grave as to raise fundamental questions about the reliability of the report. Second, please examine very carefully (with a magnifying glass if possible) the exhibits on page 120 of the report, then the second paragraph on page 119, and finally the actual ad in the February 1963 issue of the American Rifleman magazine. You will find another very startling discrepancy with respect to the length, weight, and order number of the rifle. Third, please scrutinize again the section of Appendix XV which begins with the last para-

*Not Sent*

graph on page 755 and ends on the following page. I wonder if you will not agree that the description of the application, its "copy," "carbon copy," and "actual signed copy" which is "not a carbon copy of the copy sent to the Department" is intended to obfuscate and not to inform. Fourth (although it is not tactful of me), please re-examine Exhibit 134 on page 126, with attention to the shadows (the version of the photograph which appeared on the cover of LIFE 21 February 1964 is clearer). Bearing in mind the fixed relationship between Oswald's height (5'9") and the length of the Carcano (40.2"), I believe you will find as I did a significant and sinister discrepancy in the proportions as they exist in the photograph.

I recognize that it is not tactful to focus attention on this photograph in view of the fact that the New York Times retouched it before publishing it in such a way as to obliterate completely the telescopic sight--a fact which the Warren Commission has been tactful enough not to specify. Nor criticize.

You say in your letter that you have directed the efforts of reporters of the New York Times in many months of inquiry and exhaustive research. That, indeed, was the proper function of the press in the circumstances and climate of the investigation conducted by the Dallas authorities and others. But has the New York Times been completely impartial? It co-published an edition of the report with an introduction in which you yourself endorsed it without seeming reservation, at a time when it seems unlikely that you had had an opportunity for the critical and painstaking study of the report which must precede any meaningful assessment. And, if you will forgive me, your introduction lends itself to the interpretation that it seeks to discourage criticism of and dissent from the findings of the Warren Commission. When one considers the pains taken by your paper to furnish the full text of the report as soon as it was released, and the fact that you and the Times have to some degree assumed the role of sponsor, I suppose it is not too difficult to understand why the Times on 29 October did not carry any report of the "debate" held the night before between Melvin Belli and Mark Lane before a capacity audience at Manhattan Center (with a number equivalent to half the audience turned away for lack of space)--an eminently newsworthy item.

You do not say in your letter whether or not you have had an opportunity to look at the article by George and Pat Wash, "The Other Witnesses," or the column by Robert Ruark. I hope that you will manage to read both. You might also obtain from Mark Lane a photocopy of the affidavit of Seymour

T-1  
 SYLVIA MEEHNER  
 302 West 12 St  
 New York City 10014

25 October 1964

Weitzman (I understand the original has been "lost" or has "disappeared") in which he identified the rifle found on the sixth floor.

Many apologists for the Warren Commission insist that it is unthinkable to question the report in the light of the eminence and integrity of its authors. So long as they refuse to confront and refute criticisms of specific elements of the report, it seems to me that they are merely piling injustice upon possible injustice. It is not enough to say that there is no evidence pointing to others, or that the Commission produced a report of unprecedented weight and literary style: it is necessary to determine after the most careful scrutiny whether or not the report contains serious omissions, inconsistencies, and misrepresentations. I am absolutely certain that it does, and I have mentioned in this letter only a very few of the anomalies which I have found which have led me inevitably to that conviction.

I will be happy at any time to indicate the other defects which I have thus far discovered, should you wish.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher

*Not Sent*