

b) double head hit and c) one high angle forward shot.

I give my reasons for rejecting (a), with which I think you will agree. What remains is that either we have here a double hit, or one high-angle forward shot.

One of the implications of a high angle forward shot is to buttress the camouflage theory. An alternative would be that some vehicle pulled up behind the wall and fence area that had on it a mechanism that could hold a man elevated (lets say) 20 feet off the ground. (The trucks utility companys use to replace light bulbs would do). However, there is no evidence of this. It stretches my credulity to believe that vehicles were behind the knoll and yet have not come to the attention of any witness or investigator.

My personal belief is that there are people in the tree line, either supported by some type of structural trellacing, or by the structural nature of one or more false trees. I think my own photo work supports this conclusion. If there are people who are interested in the assassination who think that this is all very funny, theres not much I can do about it. C'est la vie.

The main point is that the JFK head moves "forward" between 312 and 313; therefore, anyone who understands the principles which govern that motion must accept the following "either-or" statement: "Either there is a double hit, OR this is a strong indication that camouflage was used."

In this connection, there is the problem of the smoke coming out of the trees during the assassination. Holland's initial statement says "out of the trees", I believe. (Sheriff's affidavit). Reilley says the same thing. I recently acquired a tape recording made in 1965 with Luke Winborn, and he talks of ~~EM~~ "all this smoke coming out of the trees to my left". ~~EMEM~~ Many of the critics insist in changing the language these witnesses used to describe their perceptions that day, in order to fit with their own theories as to where the people with the guns are. They then also have to explain the smoke, so they do so by stretching the language in Hoover's letter. (Potter, by the way, says smoke rose from trees in front of TSBD.)

These tactics may be legitimate tactics if all you want to do is knock down commission conclusions, but if you are counter-solution oriented, and want to develop evidence to find out what did happen, then they are no substitute for objective inquiry.

I hope you will find my memo of use, and will read it when you have the time.

Sincerely yours,

*David*

David S. Lifton

regarding  
the  
source  
of the  
shots.

(See XXII, 8?)