

APPENDIX

(The Unanswered Letters)

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL  
NOT FOR PUBLICATION

THE MYSTERY OF THE  
UNANSWERED LETTERS

8 June 1965

Dear Mr Eisenberg,

Two questions arise from study of the Warren Report and Hearings and Exhibits, which appear to be in your special area of competence. I should be grateful if you would be kind enough to clarify the following matters.

(1) The Warren Report (page 646) states that the ammunition used in the assassination rifle was "recently made by the Western Cartridge Co., which manufactures such ammunition currently." There is no footnote indicating the source of this assertion. Can you please indicate the authority for the statement? I have not found any document among the Exhibits corroborating this assertion but perhaps I have overlooked it?

(2) Commission Exhibit 2560, the telephone message addressed to you which indicates that the gunsmith at the Aberdeen Proving Ground found that the scope on the rifle as received was mounted "as if for a left-handed man," does not appear to be supplemented by testimony or documents elaborating on the significance of that opinion. Can you advise me please whether or not any conclusion was reached as to the "left-handedness" of the mount? If so, can it be assumed that Oswald was left-handed or ambidextrous? Or that the rifle nevertheless could be fired without difficulty by a right-handed man? Was it possible to determine on what basis, or on whose instructions, the gunsmith at Klein's mounted the scope on the C2766 rifle for a left-handed man?

I have taken the liberty of addressing these queries to you since I am not aware that the Warren Commission, before it dissolved, assigned any residual responsibility for providing clarification requested by members of the public or students of the case. Some members of Commission's counsel have been ready, I am told, to clear up questions of this sort. This encourages me to hope for your sympathetic response by letter or if you prefer by telephone (Chelsea ——— or Plaza ———). With thanks,

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Neagher

25 June 1965

Dear Mr Eisenberg,

You will recall that I telephoned you on Friday 18 June 1965 and that you said at that time that you would respond to my letter of 8 June 1965 (copy enclosed) by the middle of the week which is just ending. I have been surprised and disappointed to hear nothing from you. Perhaps my request appears to be an imposition on a private person that should have been addressed elsewhere. As I have already mentioned, however, I am not aware of any residual arrangements made by the Warren Commission when it dissolved; and I am sure that you will agree that a moral obligation does exist to clarify for any member of the American public legitimate questions posed in good faith.

I should be reluctant indeed to conclude that you are not able, or not willing for unknown reasons, to respond to an appeal for clarification which I was unable to find in the Hearings and Exhibits despite careful study of the twenty-six volumes in their entirety over a period of several months. It was only after failure to find the necessary information in those volumes that I ventured to write to you on two matters which appear to fall within your special province.

May I still hope to hear from you the answers to the questions posed in my letter of 8 June 1965?

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher

10 July 1965

Dear Mr Eisenberg,

Here is the photocopy of Klein's full-page ad in the February 1963 issue of the American Rifleman magazine.\* You will see that the mail-order coupon at the bottom of the ad gives the address "Dept. 358," which identifies the publication in which the ad appears and which corresponds with the actual mail-order from "Hidell" (CF 773). Mr Waldman of Klein's testified (7H 367) that the coupon was taken from the February 1963 issue of the American Rifleman.

It is therefore clear that "Hidell" ordered the 36-inch Carcano weighing 5-1/2 lbs. which has the catalogue number C20-T750. The same catalogue number without the "T" identifies the 40-inch Carcano, as shown in Klein's full-page ad in the November 1963 issue of Field & Stream magazine (Holmes Exhibit No. 2).

Frankly, I was nonplussed by this combination of facts: that the advertisement which has direct relevance in establishing the purchase and possession of the assassination rifle is not found among the exhibits, which contain minutiae of less immediate relevance, in some abundance; and that direct reference to the advertisement reveals that it offers a different model than the Carcano identified as the assassination rifle. Secondary facts which struck me were the inclusion of the Field & Stream ad, which can be misleading to the vulnerable reader; and Oswald's specific interest in the effects of shortening a rifle barrel (10H 221, 224). One may wonder if he would have accepted without grumbling a rifle somewhat longer than the one he ordered.

Sincerely yours,

Sylvia Heagher

\*Sent to Mr Eisenberg, who said that he had never seen the ad, at his request during a telephone conversation.

Registered Mail  
Return Receipt Requested

12 September 1965

Dear Mr Eisenberg,

I trust that you received my letter of 10 July 1965 and the photocopy of the Klein's ad in the February 1963 American Rifleman. I assume that you did not disagree with my comments on the ad, but needless to say I should welcome any observations you may have.

You will recall that during our conversation on the first of July you were kind enough to offer to consider other questions which had arisen in the course of my study of the Hearings and Exhibits, if clarification was not forthcoming from other sources. I hope that the offer stands, because I am sorry to say that no answers have come by letter or telephone. Mr Jenner declined to put me to the expense of a collect call, assuring me that he would write after consulting his notes. However, he did not do so.

Mr. Rankin ignored two letters which I had addressed to him, as well as copies of an exchange of letters sent to him at the suggestion of Representative Gerald Ford. Mr Ford then ignored a further letter which I addressed to him. Dr. Goldberg did not respond to my letter. Mr Diebeler did not respond.

Perhaps it will be simpler to send you copies of this assorted correspondence rather than attempt to reformulate the questions posed in the letters. I realize that it will be time-consuming to read this correspondence and that I cannot expect any reply within a few days. However, I would be grateful for an indication that you intend to consider these matters when time permits, and I hope that you will be good enough to telephone or drop me a note.

In addition to the questions raised in the enclosed letters, another problem has arisen, only today. The Warren Report states on page 555 that "when the rifle was found in the Texas School Book Depository Building it contained a clip." The citation (footnote 23 on page 854) refers to the testimony of Captain Fritz (LH 205) and Lt. Day (LH 258). I have read both pages carefully but found no mention whatever of any ammunition clip. I do not recall from my first or second reading of the Hearings and Exhibits any testimony or

ments which suggest that the rifle contained an ammunition clip when the  
n was discovered. If I am incorrect and there is documentary evidence  
stimony to substantiate the statement on page 555, I should be grateful  
ven relieved to be informed. As I said when we spoke, I do not regard  
f as immune from error or oversight--nor free from the human malice that  
pleasure in catching an error or penetrating a pretext. But these issues  
do solemn and tragic for such pettiness, and I can tell you in honesty  
I would have welcomed answers to my unanswered letters even if those  
rs demonstrated that my inferences were unfounded and nonsensical.  
unhappy and disturbed that apart from your telephone call no one whom  
e approached has been willing to discuss the substance of the questions

One final word, and without intending any offense: I have invested a  
deal of time and effort in an attempt to satisfy myself about the  
ination. This is a commitment that I feel deeply indeed. If it is  
sible to get answers to legitimate questions--questions that require no  
gy, asked courteously and in good faith--I will feel it a duty to make  
effort to have the questions asked in a forum where they cannot be  
ed.

Our conversation in July gives me the confidence to express myself  
ly and to place these unanswered questions in your hands.

Yours very sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher

References

- to A E Jenner 6/22/65
- from " " 7/8/65
- to " " 8/20/65
- to W J Liebler 6/21/65
- to A Goldberg 7/2/65
- to J Lee Rankin 6/12/65
- to " " " 6/25/65
- to G R Ford 6/17/65
- from " " 7/8/65
- to " " 8/3/65

(No reply received)

22 June 1965

Dear Mr Jenner,

I am engaged in a comparative study of the Warren Report and the corresponding source data found in the Hearings and Exhibits. I hope that you can clarify a problem which I have encountered, on a subject with which you have special familiarity.

The difficulty arises from a careful reading of your examination of Ruth Paine at her home in Irving on March 23, 1964 (9H 398-401). I would infer from the transcript that it would have been impossible for Marina Oswald to see the license number on FBI agent Hosty's car from the bedroom window during his November 5, 1963 visit. The testimony suggests that it is extremely doubtful that she could have taken, or did take, the license number on the previous visit on November 1, when his car was parked at some distance from the Paine home.

After reading this transcript, I reviewed Marina Oswald's testimony of February 4, 1964 (1H 48) but found her replies vague as to the date and vantage point from which she wrote down the license number. Therefore, I turned to her later testimony—testimony subsequent to your examination in the Paine house and your questioning of Mrs Paine. However, to my surprise, I found no further reference to the license number in Marina Oswald's later testimony in June, July, or September 1964 (volumes V and XI).

Consequently, I have some difficulty in tracing the means by which the Commission satisfied itself that "Marina Oswald noted Hosty's license number which she gave to her husband" (Warren Report page 327). It is hardly possible to reconcile that assertion with the testimony, which raises serious problems about the feasibility of such an action by Marina Oswald, and the lack of any follow-up which could be said to resolve the question.

If I have overlooked documents relevant to this problem, and I may well have done so in scanning the abundance of Exhibits, will you please provide me with the references? If there are no such documents, will you please indicate the Commission's reasoning on this matter in reaching a conclusion—that Marina Oswald recorded the license number—for which the available testimony gives inadequate foundation.

Another facet of this same problem is the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover (5W 112) in which he explained the circumstances under which the FBI report of February 11, 1964 transmitted information which had been omitted from the FBI report of December 23, 1963, on the presence in Oswald's notebook of Hosty's name and numbers. He said explicitly that this information was furnished to the Commission prior to any inquiry concerning this matter. However, Marina Oswald was questioned about the license number on February 4, 1964, one week before the belated FBI report. Can you indicate how the Hosty entries in the notebook came to the Commission's attention, since apparently the FBI was not the primary source of the information?

Finally, can you provide me with the exhibit number for the affidavit executed by FBI special agent Robert P. Gemberling, transmitted to the Commission by letter dated February 27, 1964 (CE 833, page 15)? I have not been able to locate it, to my chagrin, in an effort to trace the various steps in the discovery and handling of the Hosty entries.

These questions are not posed out of idle curiosity, as I am sure you will realize, but in an attempt to complete what is a somewhat incomplete picture of the episode in the Hearings and Exhibits. Certainly I do not wish to make assumptions or criticisms which may prove wholly unwarranted in the light of clarifications which you are in a position to provide. For this reason, I hope that you will be good enough to provide such clarifications at your earliest convenience. I am sorry to impose on what I am sure is a busy and useful schedule of activities, some of which have been mentioned recently in the press and which I might say, without any attempt at ingratiating, were highly gratifying to all opponents of the witch-hunt.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Yeager



3 July 1965

Dear Mr Jenner,

Please refer to my letter of 22 June 1965 requesting clarification of questions which arise about FBI agent Hosty's auto license number. It occurs to me that a written reply may be something of a burden to prepare. May I therefore ask you to feel free to telephone me collect at my home, Code--- Chelsea---, at your convenience. As I mentioned in my previous letter, I am anxious to have the requested clarification for purposes of a comparative study on which I am engaged. However, I would not plan to quote or attribute any statements made but merely to delete from my thesis any discussion of the matter of the license number, once the problem is resolved.

With grateful thanks,

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Keagher

July 8, 1965

Dear Miss Meagher,

Your letter of June 22 reached me in the midst of a trial engagement, and your follow-up letter of July 3rd finds me in a period of recovery from the closing of the trial terms of both our federal and state courts.

I will be away from the city next week but will be able to review my notes and other materials during the week of the 19th. I will write you promptly rather than put you to the expense of a long distance telephone call.

Very truly yours,

Albert E Jenner, Jr.

20 August 1965

Dear Mr Jenner,

Forgive me if I say that I am surprised and concerned at the non-arrival of the letter you volunteered to write during the week of July 19th. It seems to me that the questions on which I requested clarification in my letter to you on June 22nd are legitimate and important, and that they should be answered. I hope that I may still expect the promised reply?

Yours very sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher

(No Reply Received)

21 June 1965

Dear Mr Liebler,

The American Psychiatric Association was kind enough to provide me with a thermofax copy of your paper on Oswald, which I found of special interest and value. In particular, I was impressed by your account of how investigation corroborated Oswald's story that he had picketed the fleet at New Orleans and how this and related information led you to abandon your tentative "fantasy" theory.

As a close student of the case, I had been struck before reading your important paper by similar instances of Oswald's "lies" which surprisingly turned out to be truthful statements. I have in mind especially his claim that he had seen a rifle handled in the Depository two days before the assassination and the mistaken assumption of the chief counsel, Mr Rankin, that Truly had denied this, only to correct himself later when a check of the record revealed that Truly had confirmed Oswald's story.

I had been struck also by the passage on page 183 of the Warren Report on Oswald's questions to James Jarman, Jr. during the morning, before the assassination, which suggested that he was not aware before this dialogue with Jarman that the motorcade was to pass the Depository. When I read this page of the Warren Report early in October 1964, I was rather electrified by the implications of Oswald's questions (assuming that they were honest)—it seemed clear that he could not have planned to shoot the President as the motorcade went by the building, if he was not aware of that route, and that he must have returned to Irving on Thursday for reasons unrelated to the assassination. Consequently, he could not have brought the rifle back to Dallas with him nor committed the vile crime which took the life of President Kennedy.

Subsequently, in mulling this over, I had to acknowledge one other possibility: that Oswald genuinely was not aware that the route would bring the motorcade past the Depository, as his questions to Jarman suggested, but that he was aware of the Presidential visit and had planned to commit his loathsome deed from another point along the route.

I was disappointed to find no indication in the Report of the Commission's reasoning or its evaluation of Jarman's testimony on this conversation with Oswald. I was also surprised, when I thought about it, that the conversation was mentioned in relation to Oswald's statements under detention rather than under the discussion of advance publicity on the exact motorcade route, which demonstrated that Oswald could have learned the exact route as early as November 19, 1963. The implication appears to be that the Commission classified Oswald's remarks to Jarman as disingenuous, and therefore reported them in the section dealing with his untruthful statements to the police while under detention. Is that assumption correct?

When the Hearings and Exhibits were released, I searched them for further information on the incident but found only Jarman's testimony (3H 200-201), which did not shed much more light nor resolve my uneasiness. Therefore, I should be very grateful to you if you would be good enough to indicate how the Commission evaluated this matter and the general contours of its reasoning.

I continue to feel troubled about this conversation between Oswald and Jarman, I must confess, especially when it is viewed against Oswald's statements and behaviour after the shooting of the President, as reported by other witnesses. Several witnesses reported that as he was being dragged out of the Texas Theater Oswald shouted several times that he was not resisting arrest. Does that not suggest the possibility that he feared that he might be killed on the pretext that he was attempting to escape? His reading habits suggest that his knowledge of cases in which suspects were shot on such grounds was a sophisticated one. Can you suggest any other reason for his declaiming that he was not resisting arrest? (7H 6 and CE 2003, pages 81 and 91)

It is striking also that Oswald refused the opportunity to conceal his face from bystanders as he was being taken into the police station, saying that he had nothing to be ashamed of (7H 59). Most of all, I was given pause by Combest's testimony (12H 185) that Oswald, when he knew that he was dying, shook his head to indicate that he had nothing to tell the police, even as his life was running out.

Many people and perhaps the Commission itself have been troubled by Oswald's unwavering assertion that he was innocent of the assassination and the other murder, in the face of confrontation with stunning evidence which appeared to incriminate him. When only the Report was available, I discussed this with a psychiatrist

with whom I am acquainted, only to be told with an air of authority that he would have confessed. I am not aware of any scientific foundation for such a judgment; but of course psychiatry is an art, not a science, I believe.

Now I find from the Hearings that Oswald, in effect, maintained his innocence even when he was moribund—that is one possible interpretation of Combest's testimony, as you perhaps will agree.

Since, according to your APA paper, you have particular competence in the area of Oswald's personality, motivation, and psychiatric status, I am taking the liberty of requesting your comments on these various points and, if possible, an indication of how these matters were evaluated by the Warren Commission in formulating its conclusions. Perhaps it is unnecessary, but I should make it clear that my request is not inspired by idle curiosity but by a serious purpose—a comparative study which I am in course of preparing, between the Warren Report, on the one hand, and the corresponding raw material in the Hearings and Exhibits. I am reluctant to make inferences which may prove unjustified in the light of further information on the process of the Commission's reasoning and the nature of its appraisal of facts and circumstances which, on the basis of the circumscribed information presently available to me, raise some serious problems.

I assure you that I will be very grateful indeed for any clarifications which you may be willing to provide.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher

(No reply received)

2 July 1965

Dear Dr Goldberg,

I have been advised that you prepared the Appendix on "Speculations and Rumors" which appears in the Warren Report and that you might be good enough to clarify a point which arises in that section. The statement is made on page 646 that the ammunition used in the assassination rifle was "recently made by the Western Cartridge Co., which manufactures such ammunition currently." There is no footnote indicating the source of the assertion and I have not been able to find any document among the exhibits which provides corroboration. I should therefore be most grateful if you would indicate the authority for the statement quoted.

Please feel free to reply by telephoning me collect at my home, Area Code --, C-----. With apologies for troubling you with this request, and with thanks,

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Heagher

(No reply received)

12 June 1965

Dear Mr Rankin,

I should be very glad if you would clarify some questions which arise from a comparison of assertions in the Warren Report with the corresponding source material in the Hearings and Exhibits. I am engaged in carrying out such a comparative study with a view to publication; naturally, I do not wish to draw conclusions on the basis of the published material alone which may prove unwarranted or unfair in the light of clarifications which you may be able to provide. I shall limit myself in this letter to questions which arise in the final paragraph on page 95 of the Warren Report.

According to that paragraph, all the evidence indicated that the bullet found on Governor Connally's stretcher could have caused all his wounds. This assertion appears to be in conflict with the testimony of Dr Shaw (4H 113), Dr Humes (2H 374-376), and Dr Finck (2H 382). Can you indicate why the opinions of these medical witnesses were discounted? I can appreciate that there may have been good reason to disqualify their testimony on this specific point but I believe that you will agree that the categorical reference to "all the evidence" creates an unfortunate impression when posed against that testimony, in the absence of mention in the Report of the opinions rendered by the three doctors together with an indication of the Commission's reasoning in reaching a contrary conclusion.

In the last sentence of the same paragraph, an assertion is made as to the independent opinion expressed by the three doctors who attended the Governor at Parkland Hospital that a single bullet had caused his wounds. The footnote refers to the March 23, 1964 depositions of Drs Gregory, Shaw, and Shires, but not to the testimony of Drs Gregory and Shaw on April 21, 1964 before the Commission. It appears from the later testimony that Dr Shaw, at least, clearly retracted his earlier opinion and indicated that two or even three bullets might have caused the Governor's wounds (4H 109). Commissioners Dulles and McCloy questioned Dr Shaw specifically on this point and explicitly acknowledged their understanding of his change of opinion, which he confirmed in his replies to their questions. In the light of this, do you consider that the assertion in the final sentence in the paragraph--which is literally true but maintains silence on the later change of opinion by one of the three doctors--can be defended? I would be less than honest if I did not say that the discrepancy between the Report and the testimony in this instance creates great uneasiness, if not alarm.

I am sure that you will agree that it will be a service to all concerned to clarify these issues as soon as possible, and I hope that you will do so by early letter or by telephone if you prefer (---- or ----).

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher



25 June 1965

Dear Mr Rankin,

Forgive me if I say that I am surprised and disappointed to have received no reply to my letter of 12 June 1965 (copy enclosed). The questions I posed seem to me to be entirely legitimate and deserving of serious attention. Perhaps my request appears to be an imposition on a private person but I am not aware of any residual arrangements made by the Warren Commission when it dissolved under which I might have addressed myself elsewhere.

I hope that you will agree that there is a moral obligation to clarify for any member of the American public responsible questions posed in good faith. It is my impression that you did provide clarification which was quoted in the New York Times some months ago with respect to a different aspect of evidence. May I still hope that you will respond also to my request for clarification?

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher

(No reply received)

11 JUNE 1963

Dear Representative Ford,

I am presently reading your book, Portrait of the Assassin, with the greatest interest and attention. Your first chapter is especially fascinating, since it gives the reader a look behind the scenes at the process of discussion and reasoning in which the Warren Commission engaged in confronting difficult and delicate problems.

Chairman Warren's statement on page 22, concerning the reporter Hudkins and the possibility that he might claim privilege, interested me very much. I find myself in complete agreement with the ultimate decision of the whole Commission that "the only way to proceed was to conduct extensive and thorough hearings of as many witnesses as was necessary...!There doubts were cast on any United States agency, independent experts would be hired ...to avoid reliance on a questioned authority..." etc.

With respect to the particular problem discussed in your first chapter—the rumor that Oswald was an FBI informant—I was anxious to pursue the Commission's interrogation of the reporter Hudkins, to see if he did indeed claim privilege and refuse to reveal the sources of his newspaper story, as well as the questioning of Waggoner Carr, William Alexander, Harold Feldman, and the other involved. However, the other references to Hudkins listed in your index merely mention again his role as a source of the Oswald/FBI rumors. As I am very interested in studying this matter in depth and have access to the Hearings and Exhibits, I should be very grateful if you would provide me with the appropriate references so that I can locate Hudkins' testimony as well as the others mentioned.

I should be most grateful if you will be good enough to provide me with those references as soon as possible. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,

Sylvia Neagher

July 8, 1965

Dear Ms. Leazer,

I have your letter of June 17th and have been doing some checking of the questions you raise. As you know Mr Hudkins is mentioned in the hearings of the Commission, Volume III pp. 105-108, and Volume V, Page 243 and 253.

It is quite possible that a member of the staff or a representative of another governmental agency did interview Mr Hudkins.

Undoubtedly Mr Lee Rankin who served as Chief Counsel for the Commission would be in a better position to answer your question. His present address is: \_\_\_\_\_.

Sincerely,

Gerald R Ford, H.C.

GRF:mr

3 August 1965

Dear Representative Ford,

I should like to thank you sincerely for your letter of 8 July 1965. I appreciated your suggestion that Mr Lee Rankin might better be able to provide answers to my questions; accordingly, I sent him the self-explanatory copies of our exchange of letters. This I did with some pessimism, I must admit, because I had already written twice to Mr Rankin on another facet of the Warren Report without any reply whatever. As I feared, he has also ignored your reply to my letter—a discourtesy which I do not appreciate.

It is a matter for concern that legitimate questions raised by a responsible person should meet with rude silence. It makes a most unfortunate impression when persons who had a major role in the work of the Warren Commission refuse to fulfill what is a distinct moral obligation. A foreign correspondent with whom I am acquainted recently expressed to me, in savage language, his opinion of a fact-finding process which terminated without arrangements for residual matters and refusal to discuss or clarify important questions arising from omissions or apparent contradictions in the fact-finding report. This gentleman, a journalist of some distinction, told me that his approaches had met with bland refusal to comment, to his indignation. As an American and a taxpayer, I am naturally offended personally by my similar experience, on the one hand, and on the other hand unable to justify to a European critic the policy of silence that astonishes me no less than a foreigner.

With these prefatory remarks, I should like now to return to the subject of my letter of 17 June 1965. When I did not receive a response from Mr Rankin, I decided to search the 26 volumes of Hearings and Exhibits for the desired information. I discovered one report of an interview with Lonnie Hudkins (CE 2003, page 327), but that was concerned with the events of November 24, 1963 and did not relate to Hudkins' later allegations about Oswald and the FBI. I did not find any interviews with other reporters concerned such as Joe Golden (Goulden) or Harold Feldman, nor testimony nor interviews on this subject with officials (other than Henry Wade) who, according to your book, believed that there was substance to the story—that is, Waggoner Carr, William Alexander, etc.

But, Representative Ford, I was dumbfounded by the implications of a passage in the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover, in which he referred to Hudkins without naming him explicitly (5H 116). On its face, that testimony appears to warrant the conclusions that despite the unanimous decision reached at the Commission's emergency meetings in January 1964, as described in the first chapter of your book, it was in fact the "questioned authority" that interrogated Hudkins, repudiated his allegations without have determined their source, and, in effect, investigated and exonerated itself.

Let me say that I do not have serious suspicion that Oswald was working secretly for the FBI. On the other hand, it is difficult to be satisfied with an inquiry carried out in seeming disregard of the Commission's unanimous decision--the more so when viewed against other not-wholly-resolved questions which involve the FBI and agent James P Hosty, Jr in particular. We still do not know the source of Hudkins' story or the earlier story by Joe Golden, nor the grounds which high officials of the State of Texas found so compelling that they brought the matter to the Commission. (I might mention that the other unresolved questions involving Hosty and the FBI have been posed by letter to former counsel who took testimony on the relevant points, thus far without eliciting answers.)

You will surely understand my dismay at finding that the admirable decisions taken by the Commission, as recounted in your informative book, apparently were scrapped, and that a method of inquiry which the Chairman and the members clearly had rejected as inadequate and inappropriate was, in fact, the method used.

If you could persuade the appropriate persons (Mr Rankin or others) to expound on this matter and indicate why my inferences are wrong--if wrong they are--it would be a real service, not to me alone but also to other researchers who are likely to follow the identical path to the same disillusioning climax. It seems to me that those associated with a major historical investigation in which "truth was the only client" would wish to do no less.

With thanks and good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher

cc J Lee Rankin

(No reply received)