

10 June 1967

Mr. Gyveind Fahlstrom  
Kopparnagatan 8  
Stockholm 4

Dear Mr. Fahlstrom,

Although I am working against time to complete work on the galley proofs of my book, I do want to try to answer the questions you posed in your undated letter (received today), because I remember that I did offer to comment on specific points of evidence when we spoke before you left for Sweden. I will answer mainly out of my head, since I cannot spare the time to do any checking or research on questions where I do not have the necessary answers already at hand.

- (1) Oswald begins to show discontent in the Soviet Union only in January 1963, when he had been there over a year. His discontent seems mainly personal, not political, as does his reaction upon his arrival. Indeed, for a dedicated Marxist, he is surprisingly unaffected by his arrival on Russian soil. Without being myself a Marxist, I think I had more reaction during my own visit to Moscow and to Leningrad than Oswald reveals in his diary, reaction to the squalid history which surrounded the Kremlin Square.
- (2) Oswald definitely did offer and in writing to give "special knowledge I have accumulated through my experience since my release from active duty in the Naval Service" (i.e., during his stay in the USSR) (see CE 2661 and/or my article on Oswald and the State Department in the Minority of One of October 1966).
- (3) That is a possibility. I cannot form a definite conclusion on the sincerity of his denunciation of the USSR and/or the USA. At times, he seems quite sincere in his contempt and disappointment.
- (4) Your question is not clear to me. I feel certain that Oswald did come to see Andrews about reversing his "undesirable" discharge (NOT "dishonorable"). However, I have no evidence that this was conspiratorial or a deliberate trace-leaving incident. As for Garrison's charges and claims, I have absolutely no confidence in anything he says—the evidence suggests to me that he is nothing but a self-seeking charlatan.
- (5) You should read all the available testimony and/or documents on Oswald's stay in New Orleans, and you should not take it for granted that any of Garrison's declarations on this subject are grounded in fact. In my Subject Index, the listings for New Orleans in themselves occupy two whole pages. It is not clear to me whether or not you have available either the 26 volumes or my Index. I do not have the time to copy out all the listings. In a general way, you will find information in the Warren Report pages 726-733; in Volumes VIII and XI; also in Volume X; and in the testimony of Marina Oswald, Ruth Paine, Quigley, and others.
- (6) No; so far as I know, there is no evidence from any source establishing contacts or acquaintance between Ferris and Oswald in 1963.
- (7) See (6) above.
- (8) Oswald did try to "infiltrate" the Bringuler camp, although clumsily and without apparent real desire to succeed. As to his motives, I have no firm opinion.
- (9) I feel convinced that Oswald did not use "Hidell" as an alias, but as the designation for a person other than himself.
- (10) I believe it at least possible that some of the "Hidell" cards, etc., were fabricated in order to incriminate Oswald and tie him to the order for the rifle.
- (11) At the same time, one must overcome the purchase order evidence, which does seem to involve Oswald in sending the order for a rifle, in that the number of the post office box given corresponds with his box, and the prosecution handwriting

experts have linked the purchase papers to Oswald (though in part from block printing and from microfilm rather than original papers, which suggests the possibility at least that defense experts, had there been any, might have been able to cast doubt upon or to discredit the identification).

(12) Yes, I am satisfied that the undated note is authentic, and does refer to the time period in question. But I reject the claim made by Marina Oswald and accepted by the Commission that the note had something to do with the attempt to shoot Walker. I think it referred to a different plan, one known to Marina, from the general tone and the specific contents (which suggest that she knew just what he was up to).

(13) See (12)

(14) The evidence that Oswald had planned to commit an illegal act for which he would risk jail or worse (whether or not it was "terroristic activity") would not necessarily implicate him in an assassination plot.

(15) Yes, I agree with your thought here.

(16) No, I do not accept Popkin's theory of Oswald's deliberate self-incrimination but I think he was incriminated, and even manipulated, without his knowledge or consent; and I think that he might have begun to suspect this after the shooting, which might explain a certain uneasiness and indecisiveness in his subsequent movements, what the Warren Report calls his "escape."

(17) and (18) See (16). About the paper bag: I have a very long chapter on the paper bag, some 20 or 30 pages, in which I analyze the known evidence and come to the conclusion that the bag (palmprint and all) was planted or fabricated evidence.

(19) I agree with you.

(20) As indicated above, I tend to dismiss each and all of Garrison's pronouncements and theories, unless and until he makes public acceptable and firm evidence to support his statements. This, he has not done; but I am quite scornful of the so-called evidence that he has been compelled to make public (i.e., the witnesses Russo and Bundy, who lack all credibility).

(21) Yes, it is possible although there is no evidence to confirm it.

(22) Yes. (23) Yes. (24) Yes. But in each case, there is no specific evidence to corroborate this. Also, you write of "the assassin." I feel convinced that there were at least two assassins, one firing from a point somewhere behind the car, and one from in front of and to the right of the car.

(25) Craig's story is very hard to evaluate. If he saw real Oswald jump into the station wagon, then the witnesses to the bus and taxi rides are lying, and Oswald himself (since he agreed to the bus and taxi rides). If it was a pseudo-Oswald who entered the station wagon, then how can one account for the remarks made by Oswald as reported by Craig? but denied by Fritz? I cannot give you answers to such problems—I wish that I had such answers, for myself—because the evidence is unresolved, incomplete, and conflicting.

(26) There seems to be firm photographic evidence that it was the Carcano that was discovered and carried out of the building by Lt. Day shortly afterward. This is not to say that I rule out a substitution, or rule out the presence of a Mauser as well as a Carcano.

(27) Your question is not clear to me.

(28) The sign said "Stemmons Freeway." It was not hit by any bullet, so far as I know. One researcher did have such a theory, based on "stress lines" seen on the back of the sign in certain frames of the Zapruder film. However, examination of a good print of the Zapruder film proved that the stress lines were in the film itself, not on the back of the sign (i.e., the lines ran beyond the sign and were present "in the air" so to speak, which effectively destroyed the ingenious theory of stress lines resulting from bullet impact). HOWEVER: It is a strange and unexplained fact that the sign was removed, on an unknown date, and during the May 1964 FBI onsite reenactment tests, the "Stemmons" sign in the reenactment photos seems to be a new a different one, when compared to the sign shown in the Zapruder film. At some later date, after May 1964, the Stemmons sign was removed entirely and not replaced.

(29) The fact that Ruby was a police informer emerges from the testimony of Detective Eberhardt (XIII, pages 181-186).

(30) Yes, I agree that he was indeed vulnerable, on the grounds you list.

(31) This is a valid question to those who claim Oswald was "escaping." I have never believed that he was indeed attempting to escape (he could so easily have taken a Greyhound Bus, instead of a taxi, in the terminal, and got out of Dallas and out of Texas, for that matter.).

(32) The number ~~7~~ "488" appears only one time in the radio log and I think there is no such number. The corresponding entry in another transcript of the radio log, CE 705, says "78" where the FBI transcript says "488" (or vice versa). "78" was, of course, Tippit's number. (I do not understand your reference to "58".)

(32) You will be aware by now that my views on Garrison are totally negative.

(33) See (32) above. I have not seen the Der Stern interview of Garrison and hear for the first time, in your letter, the wild and lunatic allegations he made, about Breck Wall, etc. I am very glad to see from the direction and tone of your questions about Garrison that you have also learned to regard his grandiose claims with extreme scepticism. Unfortunately, many of the critics are completely charmed and enchanted with him, and I have been deeply disappointed by the lengths to which they are willing to go, and by the violence they do to reason and logic, in attempting to rationalize and defend him.

(34) No, there has been quite a shortage of new articles, and I have not seen or heard of the Cavalier magazine article. Can you send me the reference? There is a pro-Garrison piece in the June 1967 RAMPARTS; and an (irrelevant) article in THE NEW YORKER of June 10, 1967, "The Buffs," dealing with the personalities of the critics, which of course has little to do with the evidence. (It is, however, mildly "friendly.")

(35) Yes, there is a Whitewash II, available from "Harold Weisberg, Hyattstown, Md." and soon to be published commercially by Dell Books. (36) The Penn Jones' findings were in RAMPARTS of November 1966.

I trust this is of some help. With kind regards,

SYLVIA MEACHER