

302 West 12 St NYC 10014  
11 July 1965

Mrs. Joseph A. Field, Jr.  
1115 ~~North~~ Beverly Drive  
Beverly Hills, California

Dear Maggie,

It is hard to cover all the ground one wants to cover during a telephone call, so I will add a few items that I did not mention on Friday. Regarding the bullet hole in the back of the Stemmons sign: I wanted to test what I thought I saw against someone who did not know what to look for. I called Thomas Stamm, who was one of the people in the New School course in whom I had considerable confidence, and asked him to examine the Zapruder frames concentrating on the back of the sign. About a week later he visited here and reported that he himself had been unable to find anything; however, he in turn had presented the problem to a friend who had dropped by, and the friend, without knowing what he was supposed to look for or find, had concluded that there was a bullet hole in the lower part of the sign. That is very satisfying, isn't it?

Another item: Mr. Lobenthal gave me the paper prepared by your group (Hypotheses A-G) which I read carefully. I was very gratified by the hypothesis dealing with Mrs. Kennedy's hat and head. When I first received the Hearings & Exhibits and was working (at that time) very closely with Curtis Crawford, I formed the same conclusions, and considered on the basis of the hat that the first shot had struck the President at about frame 204. Crawford was never able to see that; then he went to Washington to see the Zapruder color frames. When he returned he told me, in effect, that I was all wet about the hat. In fact, it was that trip that changed Crawford's position to support for the official conclusions--although he still agreed that the Report was a pretty bad job. I have never been able to grasp his rationale; I was hopeful that if he saw the photographic evidence you sent me he might re-convert and apply himself again to the case. He has the qualities needed for research and analysis, and a very retentive memory--which is particularly valuable in working with such massive data. However, it did not work out at all. Crawford turned up on Friday night, as did Stamm and Bill Crehan. Crawford was the only one who saw nothing; if that was not enough, he was snide and unpleasant, and took his leave very abruptly and rudely. I think I will give him up as a hopeless case.

The others (including Isabel Davis and Norma Aitchison, also from the New School) all saw what Lobenthal and I had seen. They felt, as I believe you feel also, that the situation remains fundamentally unaltered--that the photos are not decisive and, if called to the attention of any of the powerful groups or agencies which accept or promote the Warren Report, would be brushed off.

Incidentally, Thomas Stamm asked me for your address and will probably write to you. He intends to visit Dallas for a few days at Labor Day, en route back from Mexico. Please use your discretion about corresponding with him. I was reluctant to give your address without consulting you first; on the other hand, I did not wish to be in the position of refusing, when Stamm knew that Lobenthal had your address and had given it to me.

Finally, a few developments in my harassment campaign: On Eisenberg's advice, I wrote a follow-up note to Jenner in Chicago, inviting him to telephone me collect if he preferred to reply by that means rather than by letter. Now I have received a letter from him saying that he is going out of town but when he returns in the middle of the month, he will study his notes and papers and write me promptly, rather than putting me to the expense of a phonecall. Will wonders never cease? Of course, it betrays a great deal when Jenner has to consult his records before he can inform me how it was that the Commission said

that Marina Oswald copied Hosty's license number and gave it to Oswald, who put the number in his address-book, when Jenner's own inquiries and experiment demonstrated that it was physically impossible for her to have done so; and, moreover, why it was that on Marina Oswald's three or more subsequent appearances, when the question should have been reopened with her, not one word was said about the copying of the license number.

I got a reply also from Gerald Ford. I had written him after reading the first chapter of his book on Oswald, in which he described how the Commission in secret meetings reached certain brave and noble decisions about how they would proceed to investigate the allegations that Oswald was an FBI informant on the FBI payroll. I wrote him, knowing full well that instead of implementing their proper decision, the Commission had failed to take testimony from Hudkins and others involved and had in fact—in utter retreat from an appropriate decision—actually permitted the "questioned authority" to investigate itself and find itself innocent. To my request for the references to the thorough interrogation of Hudkins and the others, Ford said that it was "quite possible that Hudkins had been questioned by a member of the Commission's staff or by one of the government agencies" and that I should write to Lee Rankin, who would know more about this!

Little does Ford know that Rankin has already failed to reply to questions I put to him a month ago on the misrepresentation of medical testimony and testimony about the stretcher bullet, even though I wrote a follow-up letter designed to shame him into a reply. Nor does Ford know that Hoover's testimony reveals, without actually naming Hudkins, that the FBI itself "investigated" his allegations, that they went to him "to nail down the lie," and that, in other words, there was a complete and cowardly reversal of the Commission's decision not to permit a "questioned authority" to investigate the very information that made it "questioned".

I have sent Eisenberg the ad from the February 1963 American Rifleman, so that he will know, even at this late date, that "Hidell" ordered a rifle which is different from the one found on the sixth floor; I pointed out in the covering letter that it had been disturbing not to find that ad among the minutiae in the Exhibits, even though it was of direct relevance in establishing purchase and possession; but to find, instead, another full-page Klein's ad (Holmes Exhibit) which matched the rifle found and which could be misleading. Let us see what he will have to say.

As I mentioned, I have the next four or five weeks free. I had intended to work on the subject index and several other projects; in the light of the photos, however, I am not sure what would be the most useful activity. Perhaps I will concentrate on isolating all the testimony that relates the source of the shots to the concrete monument—on the other hand, you and your group may already have done that.

I shall look forward to your letter, when it is completed, and meanwhile will write or telephone if there are any further developments. My very best,

Sylvia Meagher