302 West 12 Street New York City 10014 U.S.A.

5 January 1965

Professor Hugh Trevor-Roper Regius Professor of Modern History Oxford University Oxford, England

My dear Professor Trevor-Roper,

Further to my letter of 14 December 1964, I congratulate you again—this time on your reply to Mr. Sparrow in the Sunday Times of 3 January. Your rebuttal was effective and eminently reasonable. However, one statement puzzles me and I should be most grateful if you would clarify it. You say, "Two other possible witnesses, one known to Oswald, the other to Ruby, died vialently before being able to testify." I am aware of the mysterious deaths of Betty Mooney MacDonald, Teresa Norton, and Jim Koethe, but so far as I know these persons had a definite or possible link to Ruby only. Is there still another fatality involving someone connected with Oswald?

You will not take it amiss, I hope, if I mention some minor inaccuracies in your 3 January article. Craig actually asked two questions (Volume II pages 112 and 130), one of which was irrelevant to Oswald's interests and the other calculated to strengthen the prosecution case. On page 59 of the same volume Craig's observer, Rhyne, did question Mark Lane on the allegation that Oswald's legal rights had been violated while he was in custody, with the apparent purpose of establishing that his rights had not been violated.

You say that two witnesses saw Oswald enter the Depository building carrying a parcel. No doubt you had in mind Wesley Frazier and his sister, Mrs. Randle. Both testified that he carried a parcel but neither saw him enter the Depository. The one witness who did see him enter, Dougherty, did not see any parcel.

On the question of Brennan and the source of the description sent out over the police radio at 12.43 p.m., the Warren Commission distinctly avoided the opportunity to clarify the matter. The transcripts of the police radio logs show that the description originated with Inspector Sawyer. When Sawyer was testifying, counsel failed to ask him the source of his description. It is noteworthy that only a few moments later Sawyer said, according to the transcripts, that it was not known if the assassin was, or had been, in the Depository. This clearly eliminates Brennan as his source of the description of the suspect.

The specious nature of the Warren Commission's treatment of the medical and autopsy findings is exposed on page 95 of the report, in which the Commission states that the three doctors at Parkland who attended the Governor expressed independently their opinion that a single bullet had passed through his body, causing all his wounds, and had fallen out of the thigh wound. According to the footnote, the statement is based on testimony rendered on 23 March 1964, in Volume VI. But the Commission has ignored and concealed the crucial fact that the same doctors testified again in April (Volume IV) and reversed their first opinions, after seeing for the first time the stretcher bullet and other material evidence.

May I call to your attention a few additional glaring examples of the defects, deliberate or inadvertent, in the report. The Commission states that Captain Westbrook of the Dallas Police found the jacket which the killer of Tippit discarded as he fled from the scene. Westbrook in his testimony denies that he himself found the jacket and calims that it was actually discovered by a policeman, whose name he is unable to give. The police radio log contains a report by "279" that he had just found the jacket. The Warren Commission made by attempt to ascertain the identify of the officer whose number was 279 but attributed the finding of the jacket to a man who clearly denied that he had done so.

The Warren Commission has not provided us with the autopsy report on Tippit but has said that he was shot four times and that four bullets were extracted from his corpse. However, Captain Glen King of the Dallas Police said in a public speech that Tippit was hit by three bullets (see King Exhibit 5). What is more, the four bullets allegedly extracted from Tippit's body do not match the four shells found at the scene.

It is noteworthy that the Warren Commission has failed to establish purchase or possession by Oswald of the Western Cartridge Company ammunition allegedly used to shoot the President and the Governor. Attempts were made to trace purchase of the ammunition by Oswald (XXVI page 62) but they were futile. Oswald's wife denied that he ever possessed rifle ammunition (XXII page 778). The absence of this vital link in the chain of evidence which is alleged to incriminate Oswald with respect to the rifle casts further doubt on his guilt.

I do not wish to impose further on your time but before closing I invite your attention to Exhibit 826 (pages 754-5), from which it becomes crystal-clear that the FBI was maintaining a "mail cover" on Oswald at the very time in 1963 when it is claimed that he received a rifle and a pistol through the mails. The implications of this fact are most grave.

With kind regards, and the hope that you will find a moment to reply to my question in the first paragraph of this letter,

Yours sincerely.

Sylvia Meagher