

302 West 12 Street  
New York, N.Y. 10014

29 April 1969

Mr. Whitney Joy  
5809 East Roseweed St.  
Tucson, Arizona 85711

Dear Mr. Joy,

Bobbs-Merrill has forwarded your most interesting letter of the 18th, for which I thank you warmly. In addition to our common interest in the Warren Report, we seem also to share the same kind of health problem, and your letter finds me struggling with a recurrent bronchial asthma attack. For that reason, this reply will not be as lengthy as your letter deserves, but I feel sure that you will understand with sympathy.

Your analysis of the lateral angle of the non-fatal wound, and your conclusion that the corresponding shot came from near-ground level, parallel closely an unpublished monograph written about two years ago by a Wisconsin anthropologist, Dr. Robert Forman. Forman's paper came to my attention back in about December 1967, and for the next year or more I tried to do everything I could to get it published, without success. Only a few months ago, early in 1969, the monograph was appended to a brief arguing for the JFK autopsy photographs and X-rays to be made available for examination to an eminent forensic pathologist (Dr. Cyril H. Wecht), in connection with a hearing before Judge Charles Halleck, Jr., in the District of Columbia. The brief with the Forman monograph appended was released to the press but received with thunderous indifference and never even was mentioned in any newspaper stories on the hearing, if memory serves.

Some of your other points have also been made, in fairly similar terms, in unpublished and/or published work, again without arousing the interest or attention ~~action~~. The fate of Thompson's book *Six Seconds in Dallas*, and of my own book, illustrate this. Both were widely and even prominently reviewed, in many major newspapers and widely-read magazines, and the reviews were predominantly favorable. My book presented proof after proof of the WR's deliberate misrepresentation and suppression of material evidence, and Thompson's book presented central new evidence constituting a distinct prima facie case of several riflemen firing from different locations. But the two books might no fundamental change in the situation --produced no reopening of the case, and no change in the official status of the WR.

Meanwhile, the situation has become even more discouraging, thanks to the activities of the New Orleans district attorney, the preposterous fiasco of the prosecution of Clay Shaw, and the loss of credibility by the WR critics who supported and condoned Garrison's continuous indignities to fact and logic --and, I am ashamed to say, many or most of the critics did so, and continue even now in their attempts to justify on Garrison's part the very same abuses for which they denounced the Warren Commission. The net result of the antics of this mountebank Garrison and his accessories among the WR critics (Lane, Penn Jones, Salandria, Weisberg, Turner, Popkin, Marcus, Field, and still others), and the repeated attempts of that pseudo-WR critic Edward Jay Epstein (now an out-and-out propagandist on behalf of the WR) has been to create a general disgust and furious impatience with any further attempts to question the official version of the Dallas assassination. It is practically impossible to place articles or books on this subject for publication, I am very sorry *to say*.

I regret, more than I can tell you, to state such a discouraging opinion. I have always done everything in my power to encourage new researchers in their work, have cheerfully read many manuscripts and offered detailed comments and suggestions (some of which were published, but many of which remain unpublished --some, because of inherent lack of merit, I am constrained to admit), and in several instances (as in the case of Forman's monograph) have done what I could to get a publisher. In spite of the very negative situation of the moment, I intend to pursue the same policy, and will readily agree to look at your ms. if you wish me to do so, so long as you do understand how bleak the prospects are.

Personally, I have no plans at the present time for any further major writing on the WR. In recent months, it has been increasingly hard to place even short articles or book reviews, with magazine after magazine disappearing from the scene.

One last comment, on your remarks about the head shot and the forceful head-thrust backward and to the left. Have you actually seen the Zapruder film? If you did not, then I would urge you to reserve judgment as to the reconcilability of that backward thrust with a bullet that entered the back of the head slightly above the external occipital protuberance. When you actually view the film, you are left with the absolute and irresistible conviction that that backward slam simply cannot be reconciled with a shot entering the back of the head--and this is not my opinion alone, but also the opinion of Thompson, Wecht, physicist R.A.J. Riddle, pathologist John Nichols, critics Lifton, Stamm, Marcus, and still others. I am neither an engineer nor a physicist and cannot dispute your analogy of the billiard ball--although I would wonder why the head, when struck by a missile of such force and momentum, should thrust back with such greater speed and distance than the very slight, short forward movement, and why it did not simply pull the whole limp body forward with it in the same direction as the alleged bullet.

NOT SHOWN... the haste in accepting the autopsy findings on the head wounds as necessarily valid. The report of the 1968 medical panel (Dr. Russell Fisher et al) on the autopsy photos and X-rays locates the wound of entrance not slightly above but 100 mm. (4 inches!) above the external occipital protuberance. Moreover, the 1968 panel reports a large unidentified object  $\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{3}{4}$  inches--apparently a bullet fragment--in the brain, which hitherto has been invisible. I think we should all proceed with utmost caution in reaching conclusions about the nature, site, and direction of the head wounds, until such time as we have a secure and complete set of data in place of the present inconsistent, conflicting, contradictory, and suspect series of findings.

Again, my thanks for your interesting and welcome letter, and with the hope that you will remain in touch,

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher