

Sylvia Meagher
302 West 12 St
New York City 10014

27 October 1964

Mr. Harrison E. Salisbury
Assistant Managing Editor
The New York Times
Times Square
New York City

Dear Mr. Salisbury,

I truly appreciate your letter of 21 October 1964. It may be true that up to the present there is no clear evidence which incriminates any individual(s) other than Oswald. But it does not follow that the Warren Commission has established a solid case against him nor that it has produced a report free of fundamental errors and serious defects.

If you will glance at the center photograph in the inside cover of the Bantam edition of the report, in the context of the conclusion that a single bullet penetrated both the President and the Governor via the President's throat, I think that you will agree that the conclusion is untenable. That being so, there were three shots which hit or four shots in a narrow time-span—either of which possibilities, by the Warren Commission's own criteria, eliminate the possibility that Oswald was the unassisted gunman.

Another and startling defect is the complete absence of any account of four interrogation sessions held on the day of Oswald's arrest (see Chapter V "Chronology" and Appendix XI).

A further and serious inconsistency emerges from the examination of the advertisement in the February 1963 issue of the American Rifleman magazine, from which it is purported that the mail order for the Carcano was sent.

These are only a few of the many difficulties I have with the report. Others are posed in the article by George and Pat Nash, "The Other Witnesses," and the column by Robert Ruark, to which I referred in my first letter. I will be pleased to indicate other anomalies in the report which compel me to question its central conclusions and to regret the haste and inadequate study with which eminent individuals and organizations rushed to endorse the findings of the Warren Commission.

I realize that your time is limited and shall not be offended if you do not reply to this letter, but I hope that you will make the time to consider the points I raised and to re-examine the report most closely.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher