

Friday May 21, 1965

Dear Miss Meagher:

I have still had no word from Dallas, either from Mr. Willis or the surveyor, Mr. West. I received your letter today & should like to mention some more odd things.

In my letter to Newsweek after I mentioned the missing frames and the one torn in half I said: "The re-enactment of Frame 210. Exhibit 893 has the back portion (what showed between the sprocket holes) cut off. Exhibits 888 and 889 - the re-enactment of Frames 161 and 166 (which do not even appear in Exhibit 885, which starts with 171) are cropped in the same manner, so as not to show what photographed between the sprocket holes. The back of the Thornton sign would show there. I do not know what would show between the sprocket holes of Frame 210 but I've got a good idea."

Exhibit 2114 - Arrow-B - photograph would have to have been made after, ^{the re-enactment of} December 5, 1963 and before the re-enactment of May 24, 1964. _(Ex 2114) In that photograph, the floral tributes are on the grass as in Exhibit 875 but the foliage has been trimmed off the tree. Therefore, the Stemmons sign was removed to conduct the 12/5/63 re-enactment of the Secret Service, Exhibit 875, (whose predications from that re-enactment would have to have been based on the wrong sign - the Thornton sign) then the Stemmons sign was put back in place and the foliage was trimmed off the tree, as is shown in Ex 2114 (perhaps for the purpose of another re-enactment which is not mentioned in the 26 volumes - Newsweek 6/8/64, p 48 mentioned that the re-enactment of 5/24/64 was the third) - then they ~~back. Stemmons~~ would have to wait for the foliage to grow back on the tree before conducting the re-enactment of 5/24/64. (A little judicious pruning work on that tree could greatly affect the predications from that re-enactment.) Then the Stemmons sign was removed for good and there is only one sign ^{left} there today in the spot where the Thornton sign stood. The present day sign has both "Stemmons" and "Thornton" freeway names on the same sign.

If you will examine the Life photograph of 10/2/64 with a magnifying glass, you will see the outline of Connally's fingers, the larger middle knuckle, the slant of the hand, the cuff of his shirt, - then if you put

your own hand in front of you in the same position, I believe you will agree that he was grasping something. The white blotch in the windowing is a reflection of the white-shirted arm upraised by the man on the curb.

Dr. Gregory is quite positive that one bullet made all Connally's wounds. The bullet through the back was a pristine or undeformed bullet because the entry was clean and because there were no threads carried into the wound from his suit. The bullet shattered his ribs and exited from the front of his chest. By now it was deformed from its contact with the breaking rib bones - then it went through his wrist - carrying with it threads from the sleeve of his coat which had snagged on its rough, deformed edges. Dr. Gregory found these threads in the wound. He also said that if the bullet had not been rough with sharp edges that it probably would have pushed the thumb tendon aside instead of ^{tearing} severing it as it did. Then the bullet went on through the wrist into Connally's thigh. The angle of the bullet through the wrist is such that his wrist had to be lying across his lap resting on his thigh at the time he was shot. He could not have had his wrist against his chest because the bullet entered the back of the hand side approximately 2 in. above the crease of the wrist and exited on the palm of the hand side right at the crease of the wrist. It would be impossible for the bullet to have taken that angle through his wrist if his wrist were in front of his chest, or for that matter, in sight to the Zapruder camera. From my study of the Zapruder film I believe Connally was shot in frame 239. If you will measure the distance between the point of his chin to the side of the car in the following frames and see how swiftly the distance diminished you will see that he is being thrust forward by the force of the bullet in his back. Since he was turned to the right, facing outside the car, the thrust forward was ^{forward} toward the right side of the car.

Why did Connally lie? I would have felt sorry for him if he hadn't deliberately lied about the direction in which he turned. He lied on television before millions of people. Then when the Zapruder film was published, the lie stood exposed and he was stuck with it. Then he had to change the story to conform so he changed it to the one that he turned first to the ^{right} ~~left~~ and then to the ^{left} ~~right~~. The pictures still show the lie because they show he did not ~~ever~~ turn to the left. He turned only to the right.

I notice that on page 28 of the May issue of the Minority of One there is a correction of Mark Lane's "CIA communication to the Warren Commission" which proves you to be absolutely correct.

There are lots of interesting discrepancies I should like to discuss but this is enough for now.

I'll let you know as soon as I hear anything from Dallas.

Sincerely

Lillian Castellano