PERSONAL

Mrs.T. G. P. Cann National Enquirer 655 Madison Ave. New York, N.Y. 10021

Dear Mrs. Cann,

I am returning herewith Mr. Joesten's list of questions, as you requested. The first six questions are predicated on the Miami tape, which came to light only recently, for the first time, and which is not mentioned at all in the 26 volumes. Some of those questions are valid but I know of no way to find the answers in the published record—one would have to subpens the individuals involved and seek to obtain from them the necessary information.

Questions 7-12 relate in part to the published record. See, for example, the citations in my Subject Index under Motorcade Route; Presidential Protection; and Secret Service.

Question 10: The police radio log indicates that in fact Curry's first reaction was that the shots came from the overpass and/or railroad track area (although he did later claim that he recognized immediately that the shots came from the Depository).

Question 11: The Jarnagin allegations should have been more thoroughly investigated, I suppose. You may agree after looking at the relevant testimony and documents (listed on page 121 of my Index under "Jarnegan") that his allegations are not entirely convincing. Nevertheless, I would agree that he should have been called to testify, in order to determine if possible whether or not his story should be dismissed or taken seriously.

Question 12: I am not aware that the FBI "cleared" Clay Shaw. I realize that the present U.S. Attorney General made certain remarks which could be so interpreted but it is my impression that he intended in fact to say that Clay Bertrand was investigated (see page 109 of the Index, "Bertrand"; see also listings under "Andrews, Dean Adams"). It has been alleged that Clay Shaw is Clay Bertrand, but that has not been proven. (It does not seem to me that Russo's testimony in itself constitutes proof.)

My correspondence with Joesten does not suggest to me that he is "ill" in any way. I have the impression that he is entirely rational. not to say, of course, that I share his views, agree with his interpretation of the evidence, or otherwise support in any way his "findings." I find only a few points of agreement with those of his views with which I am acquainted; but of course I have not read any of his works subsequent to the first book published early in 1964. Sorry, I don't know where you can get biographical material on Joesten; nor do I know anything about the article STERN rejected. As for Revilo Oliver—he is an extremist whose ultra-rightist views were too strong even for the John Birch Society, from which he had to "resign." In my opinion, he has nothing to offer on this or any other subject. Finally, I completely reject Marina Oswald's allegations about both Walker and Nixon. find little or no evidence to link Oswald with the Walker incident and much evidence against his involvement (see the Subject Index, listings under "Undated Note, " "Walker Bullet, "and" Walker Shooting").

As I have perhaps said during our conversations, I have always been happy to provide information on the evidence to any researcher and to be of any help possible to serious students of the case. Indeed, the purpose of my Index is to provide guidance to the official record on specific elements in the evidence or testimony. Unfortunately, I have been made conscious that I am perhaps spending excessive time on the telephone during office hours. I will have to be extremely prudent if I am to avoid difficulties with my boss.

This causes me considerable distress, as I like to respond fully to the many calls and letters I receive posing questions or asking for an appraisal of one or another item. For example, in the same mail which brought your letter of the 13th with its enclosures, I received letters from three other writers, one in Canada, one in Washington, and one in California, raising a series of questions, both factual and judgmental, and enclosing (in one other case) fairly dense material to read, evaluate, and criticize.

In order to fill the requests in the four letters, in the detail and with the fullness for which I would ordinarily strive, it would take me at least one full day of work--perhaps more, since a few of the questions raised require me to research the published literature and not merely to provide information that is already in my head.

Apart from mere time pressure—I don't have the leisure until the weekends, and while I am willing to use a great deal of my free time in answering such requests for information, I must perform various household and personal chores which are also time-consuming—many of the inquiries relate to matters covered in great detail in my forthcoming book. It means doing all over again what I have already done in the manuscript with the hope of bringing all the relevant information before the public and of course before other students of the case. I am not jealously guarding the contents of the book, i.e., the overnight trip to Havana, which has not been exposed in any of the already-published critical literature, although I would prefer to keep such material "new" unless it served an important and worthwhile purpose for it to be disclosed elsewhere earlier as a finding by someone else—but it is tedious to re-do the same material in response to individual requests.

I have outlined these considerations in considerable detail because I should like you to understand that I do encounter some difficulties in serving as a "consultant" on a regular or continuous basis, even when I have the most friendly feelings and every desire to be helpful. Certainly, I feel entirely cordial toward you personally, which I differentiate from the publication as such, which I cannot regard as a conscientious or responsible channel for criticism of the Warren Report, for reasons which are perhaps self-evident.

With all this said, let me add that I hope that you will stay in touch and that I will still try to answer any urgent questions that arise from time to time.

Yours very sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher