

8/9/66

Dear Sylvia,

You are in every detail correct in your letter of 8/5. I wanted to make you think in a way you have not, so my letter failed and I'll drop it.

I went even further in my letter to Cohen, which he has never answered but Lane did - a nasty, cheap, evasive letter answering nothing. I told Cohen I was not the first to quote it, but that I had my book with it in before Lane was at the Archives, so he was not only first- he wasn't even second.

After a hasty reading of Lane's book, I find the uncomplimentary things you said about him flattery.

They are a pair.

I called certain factual inaccuracy to Cohen's attention. It is uncorrected.

The second printing is almost exhausted. I stay too busy.

Sincerely,

5 August 1966

Dear Harold,

Your letter of 8/2/66 was delayed because it was addressed to 320 W 12 instead of 302. Having received and read it now, I will comment on one matter which needs clarification. In my letter to you of 30 July 1966 I said:

"...when I get a brochure from Holt Rinehart etc. in which Mark Lane has the unblushing gall to claim first publication of the 12/9/63 FBI Summary Report--which was first mentioned as you well know by Salandria in TMO--I consider that 'proof to the contrary.' "

Apparently I was imprecise in using the phrase "first mentioned" although it seemed that the context made it unmistakably clear that I was referring to the first published quotation from and revelation of the description of the back wound ("...just below his shoulder...no point of exit...") in that FBI Summary Report.

It never occurred to me that the use of the phrase "first mentioned" would result in a literal interpretation; in any case, there is surely no controversy about first mention of that FBI Summary Report in the literal sense, since many commentators on the Warren Report have discussed the non-publication of the 5-volume FBI Report. I would not use precious time to research this but there comes to mind at once Curtis Crawford's comments of September 29, 1964 and Leo Sauvage's in L'Affaire Oswald which I read early in 1965.

The point I attempted to make in my 30 July letter was that Lane was claiming credit that indisputably belongs to Salandria when he wrote in his brochure:

"...the recent release of the FBI Report (declassified only recently and quoted here for the first time...)...corroborates the view that the bullet...had not first traveled through the President's body."

The key phrase is "quoted here for the first time." The relevant part of the FBI Report was quoted for the first time by Salandria in the April issue of Minority of One, which was in print and circulating no later than Saturday March 26, 1966, when my secretary happened to obtain a copy. She mentioned it to me on Monday March 28 and, at my request, brought me her copy on Tuesday morning the 29th; and when you phoned me at my office later that day before leaving New York, I read you the relevant excerpt from the pages of Vince's article in TMO. Lane, by his own admission, did not visit the Archives nor "discover" that the FBI Report had been declassified until some time "during April, 1966." In fact--I just remembered this--didn't you yourself write to Lane's publishers sometime in May 1966, contesting Lane's claim of priority?

I am sorry that I did not make myself sufficiently clear in my 30 July letter and I trust that it is now apparent that I was not referring to "mention" in the literal sense.

Sincerely yours,


Sylvia Meagher

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Hyattstown, Maryland 20734