

30 March 1967

Mr. Dick Sprague
c/o Northampton Inn
Northampton, Mass.

SPECIAL DELIVERY

Dear Dick,

Thanks for sending me your paper on the photographic evidence. I have several comments, which follow.

Conclusions Page 1, item 3: You place the first shot as probably at frame 185 when "the large oak tree was between the sixth floor..." etc. But it is exactly at frame 185 that there was a one-frame break. Apologists for the Warren Report (Professor Bickel, in particular) have tried to suggest (upon the demise of the single-missile theory) that Oswald could have fired at frame 185, leaving enough time to fire a second time at about 234-238, hitting Connally. This is of course specious; but I think you might refer to the break at 185 for one frame, indicating why the Bickel theory must be rejected.

At the end of the same item, the language is not entirely clear. You might rephrase it to read something like, "...shows neither a rifle nor any human form in the sixth floor Depository window two seconds before the first shot and throughout the preceding period of about one minute (or more than 100 frames)."

Page 2, item 5: Since you specify the second floor window of the Dal Tex, you should also suggest the likely floor of the Depository, in relation to the presumed trajectory.

Page 2, item 6: Here you should indicate why this shot was not fired by the same man who fired the second shot--presumably, because no non-automatic rifle could operate again in only 8 frames or 8/18th of a second.

Page 2, item 9: The first shot could not have been fired from the sixth floor window not only because of the tree but because no person is present in the window, with or without weapon, only 2 seconds before the shot, while 2.3 seconds are needed to operate the bolt of the Carcano rifle, not counting aiming time.

Page 2, item 11: If you argue the presence of FIVE men on the grassy knoll (personally I am not convinced that some of them are not optical illusions) you have to anticipate scepticism and many questions--why so many gunmen needed? how come none of them were seen by Lee Bowers from behind, or by witnesses facing the grassy knoll, etc.? (I realize that you later mention that some witnesses saw one person, but that doesn't account for the invisibility of the other four.) Incidentally, Sauvage has received a very cloak-and-dagger letter (this is confidential) calling his attention to the Moorman photo and referring him to AP photo DN-18 and/or UPI photo 112339, which apparently purport to be photographs taken from the parking lot which show the backs of the Moorman assassins, thus confirming their material reality.

Page 2, item 17: Meaning of final sentence is not clear.

Theory: Page 2, paragraph 2: Why a "diversionary puff of smoke" at all? Surely object was to divert, not attract, attention of bystanders. Page 4, para. 1: You

theorize here that an assassin escaped from the Dal Tex back stairway but do not deal with eyewitness reports that a man ran out of the back of the Depository and escaped—i.e., James Worrell, and another witness whose name is unknown but who is mentioned in the testimony of Amos Ruins as having reported to the police that he saw a man escape. (The unknown man can not be Worrell, who made no report of his fleeing man until the next day.)

Other comments Your map is a step forward but it is not as clear as it might be. At some later stage you may wish to have professional lettering or printing.

One more thing: As I recall my conversations with Thompson, he believes that the Hughes film does show a man in the sixth floor window, and possibly a second man in another window of the same floor. (I cannot vouch for this.) If you have no objection, perhaps I should send a copy of your paper to Thompson, suggesting that you and he get together. Let me know.

I hope it proves possible to rid you of the ear problem; I have my fingers crossed. All the best,

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher