

18 October 1965

Dear Mr Epstein,

A definitive article on the direction of the shots written by Harold Feldman and titled "Fifty-One Witnesses: The Grassy Knoll" appeared in The Minority of One, March 1965, Vol. VII, No. 3(64). I commend that article to you, if you have not already seen it. If you have difficulty in obtaining that issue, I will send you my copy on loan if you can undertake to return it in a few days--I should not be able to replace it easily. I can give you some references from my own notes, which may or may not duplicate the citations in Feldman's article (I won't take the time to check). See:

- 6H 233 (Brown), on flight of pigeons from dry river bed
- 6H 252 (Foster), claims shot hit manhole cover
- CE 2089 (Henderson), saw two men on upper floor of TSBD
- 2H 195-196 (Worrell), saw ~~man~~ man run out of TSBD and
- 2H 205 (bottom of page) Euins, heard another man report that a man ran out of the back of the TSBD
- 3H 145 (Brennan), thought it was a plot (and, like many other witnesses, reported everyone searching railroad tracks and overpass area)
- 3H 268 (Baker), reports man fleeing and people pursuing
- 7H 509 (Mrs Baker), saw something hit pavement
- 2H 181 (Rowland), report of a man running away
- 21H 391, report of weapon on 2nd floor TSBD
- 21H 392, prisoner taken into custody at Elm & Houston at 12.40 pm
- 7H 576 (Zapruder), "you know there was indication there were two?"
- 6H 263 (Craig), confirmation of Rowland's story of 2 men in windows
- 6H 160 (Couch), thought police were chasing someone in shrubs
- 6H 237 (Skelton), smoke coming up off the cement
- 6H 243 (Holland), saw puff of smoke near trees (p 245) footprints near fence
- CE 2003 page ~~222~~ 222, man running toward railroad tracks
- 18H 755 (Paul Landis), saw man running away
- 19H 500 (Summers), thought someone was trapped at RR tracks
- 17H 390 (radio log), person hiding in box-car
- 19H 540 (Elkins), 3 prisoners arrested on the RR yards
- CE 2003 p. 45 (Newman), thought he was in direct line of fire
- CE 2088 (Mrs Hester), thought she was in direct line of fire
- CE 2091 (Chism), believed shots came from behind him (concrete memorial)
- 19H 516 (Smith) and CE 2084 (Woodward), shots came from fence or overpass area
- 19H 483 Julia Mercer's affidavit

I have not limited the above list to FBI interviews or other Commission Exhibits (CEs) alone but have included references to testimony as well, on the basis of my own experience. I know that I overlooked significant elements in the testimony on first reading, sometimes because I just did not realize their importance until I read a later volume. For example, I had not realized the importance of Ewins' testimony at the bottom of page 205 (Volume II) until rather recently, when it dawned on me that it establishes a second and unknown witness who saw a man running out of the Depository (the other witness being Worrell, who did not report his observation until the next day). The Commission seemed to take no interest in that witness and made no attempt to identify him by questioning the police or other sources. On the contrary, the opportunity was seized to cast doubt upon Worrell's testimony (via Romack and Rackley). This says something about the exhaustiveness of the investigation, in my opinion; and many of the other citations in the list refer to testimony or evidence which was not followed up or taken into due account.

Turning to the stretcher bullet and the Tague/curb bullet, your request presents me with something of a dilemma. I have written up an assessment of both bullets for my manuscript and it would be very time-consuming to paraphrase or synthesize it. On the other hand, I do want to give you all possible assistance; so I have decided to detach those pages of my manuscript and send them to you herewith, on loan, on the understanding that you will mail them back to me within a few days. Also, I will ask you not to make copies of those pages.

Incidentally, Thomas Stamm (who was present at my place that Sunday) did a much fuller treatment of the stretcher bullet in an unpublished article which he might be willing to send you. If you want to ask him about it, his address is 2705 Bainbridge Avenue, Bronx 58, New York.

When I said that your request presented me with a dilemma, I had in mind a question broader than the stretcher bullet or the Tague matter --I was thinking about my manuscript as a whole, which probably covers many of the same subjects as in your book. I believe that the airing of the facts about the Warren Report transcends any individual's personal concern about his own work, and I don't want to withhold any information or co-operation merely for the chance of retaining "exclusive" material in my own manuscript. Perhaps if you are in New York again soon we can discuss a modus of exchanging information or co-operating in some way. What I can offer even without discussion is to read your manuscript with a view to suggesting additional material from my own draft which might strengthen your presentation on specific aspects of the evidence, perhaps by sending you excerpts from my manuscript such as the enclosed. You could then decide whether you want to incorporate some of my material or leave your presentation as it is.

Now, at the risk of belaboring the point unduly, I will revert briefly to the failure of the police to send a search party to the sixth floor window despite several eyewitness reports which should have resulted in such police action. I feel convinced that the reason, whether it was preoccupation or something else, has a crucial bearing on the real and still-hidden events; and I am convinced that the Warren Commission in ignoring that lapse of elementary police procedure (not only in its Report but in the questioning of Sawyer and other police officers) is either evasive, seeking to avoid a detailed accounting which would further weaken the official conclusions, or is the most inept and careless fact-finding body in history.

With best regards,

Sylvia Meagher