

1 May 1966

Dr Cyril H Wecht  
1417 Friok Building  
Pittsburgh, Pa 15219

Dear Dr Wecht,

I am embarrassed and regretful that I inadvertently and in good faith included information in my letter to you dated 27 April 1966 which has now proven to be somewhat in doubt. I refer to the second and third paragraphs of my letter, in which I referred to information I had received from one of my fellow-researchers. The person involved did find a document, and did draw inferences which were not only natural but almost inevitable, and the information seemed absolutely reliable and conclusive.

Yesterday I received a call from the editor of a magazine which was so impressed with the solemn importance of the finding that they were about to put out a special issue devoted solely to this discovery. The editor asked me whether I had certain supporting photographic material which I could make available for the special issue, and whether I would be willing to read the article and check it for accuracy. I agreed at once to bring the photographic material and to make the check of the article by my colleague.

In the course of checking the material, I discovered a serious loophole—one which did not necessarily invalidate the finding, but which would serve for an official refutation and denunciation if the finding was published. The editor and I, and the author of the article, were in complete agreement that to publish the story under these circumstances would be highly irresponsible and a terrible disservice to anyone who later tried to publish criticism—inviting a response of "crying wolf" however valid and unassailable such future claims might be. Consequently, a decision was taken to drop the matter entirely pending a successful search for further material which would make the finding completely invulnerable.

I am deeply sorry that I mentioned the matter at all in my letter the other day, largely because I was in a state of shock at what it seemed to prove. I would like to assure you that the researcher was not careless nor unreliable but merely victimized—as anyone else would have been—by the fact that the Commission assigned the same exhibit number to two different items of evidence. It was miraculously lucky that I happened to recognize that, thanks to familiarity with the Hearings and Exhibits acquired by indexing them. Again, I apologize for mentioning the matter in the first place and now having to withdraw my statements, no doubt disappointing you as much as all the others who knew about it.

Very sincerely yours,

Sylvia Meagher  
302 West 12 St  
New York, NY 10014