

12 June 1966

Dearest Maggie,

I thank you very much for sending me the Mark Lane brochure. Perhaps I should be past surprise but I really boggled at his unashamed assertion that the FBI Summary Report saying that there was no point of exit for the bullet in the back was "quoted here for the first time." Lane, like Weisberg, had no clue about that FBI report until they read Salandria's article in the April TMO. Harold Weisberg at least did go to the Archives as soon as I told him about Salandria's article and did read the whole FBI Summary Report for himself; but I am told that Lane, who states in the brochure that he visited the Archives in April 1966 and "discovered" that the FBI Report had been declassified, did not even go to the Archives! He merely used Salandria's article!

Perhaps I should add something I have only just learned—that Salandria knew that Epstein would expose the FBI Summary Report in his book, and did not feel that he should write an article on it since it would be revealed in due course anyhow. However, when he took that position with Arnoni, Arnoni disagreed and urged him to write the article, as a duty to the public. No one takes issue with Salandria for so doing, including Epstein. Ed feels that it was perfectly proper for Salandria to write the article, even though it reduced the shock-value of his book and even though it had the unforeseen and unforeseeable effect of causing Weisberg and Lane to rush into print with claims of priority and credit which are wholly unwarranted and unprincipled.

I visited Vince Salandria yesterday at Philadelphia, for the second time. He had called and urged me to come in order to meet and talk with a group of academicians who had contacted Salandria after reading Inquest, fired with zeal to organize a methodical investigation of the various matters that the WC left uninvestigated, using various facilities and expertise at their disposal at the University. I thought it was worth talking, at least, to these additions to our ranks, and was encouraged by Vince's description to think that they might be a second-generation set of investigators who might bring new ideas and skills and energies to the research that has pretty much exhausted the earlier group. And, in fact, I thought after talking to them for the better part of the day that they had a potential contribution to make—they have the intelligence and the enthusiasm—but I was not really hopeful that they would really organize themselves and set about doing some concrete investigation. They need a full year of research on the H & E before they can acquire real authority and judgment; and being healthy young males, they are preoccupied or committed to social and personal pursuits which can be very distracting. (One of the boys was immediately "distracted" by my niece Susan who was good enough to chauffeur me to Philadelphia.)

Vince is extremely negative toward Ed's book, for reasons similar to your own but stated in far more extreme and really intemperate terms. It is one thing to judge Ed as oriented toward the Establishment; but it is quite another thing, and irrational in my view, to postulate sinister connections and to say ominously such things as that RFK had made it his business to be out of the country when Ed's book came out! (He made his plans to travel to South Africa before the book was even written, much less published!) Vince manages from time to time to astonish me—and even to worry me a little by his value-judgments.

Maggie, I hope that you are quickly recovering your energy and well-being. I am much tempted to phone you now, without waiting a few more days, but held back by reluctance to tax you too soon. I am sending you the Detroit News story under separate cover, in case you haven't seen it; will you please (if possible) show it to William O'Connell but ultimately send it back, as I have no other copy? I send you all my love, dear, as you surely know.