

IN 1971

1. By prior arrangement with Mr. Richard Pollard and through him with his ~~assistant~~ assistant ~~Miss~~ Ms. Anne Drayton, then both of the Life magazine photographic department, in 1971 I examined contact prints of the photographs taken by Joseph Leuw at the time Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated.

2. Thereafter I wrote Mr. Pollard and Ms. Drayton thanking them and offering to show them other values in the photographs they had not published and had not released to the commercial news agencies. In my letter of May 8, 1971 to Mr. Pollard I told him "There is some possibly significant evidentiary value in your film I have seen in no others." I cannot tell you this with ~~absolute~~ assurance because examination of contacts makes it indefinite, but this is my belief." I concluded by stating that these pictures could have a "second life" if the Ray appeal reached federal court.

3. Neither then nor at any subsequent time has Time, Inc. or any of its representatives expressed any interest in learning what I, from my investigations and knowledge, saw in those pictures or in any information that could help the corporation ~~sell~~ <sup>it</sup> ~~if owned,~~ had not published and I believed would have made the basis of a story and further sales of rights and <sup>o</sup> copies of pictures.

4. In 1966 and 1967 I had been of assistance to Time magazine through its then senior editor, Richard Billings. <sup>included</sup> his assistance ~~consisted of~~ <sup>or</sup> arranging for interviews, providing numerous copies of records I had obtained and other matter, <sup>4</sup> for which I received no pay or any other compensation. In fact <sup>1</sup> not only did not get my records back - they were given to another.

5. Time, Inc. has a consistent history of publishing what is consistent with the official accounts of the assassinations, ~~xxx~~ to a large degree suppressing what is not consistent with these official accounts, deprecating those who are not in accord with the official accounts, and of using its considerable corporate wealth to buy up the photographs of others and then neither publish these pictures nor let anyone else have them.

6. As of the time in question there were ~~rumored~~ reports that officials and employees of the corporation had intelligence-agency connection. One name I recall mentioned in

has~~ing~~ mentioned as of intelligence connection is Mr. Medley Donovan, then one of the top people in the publishing enterprise.

7. Whether or not there is <sup>such</sup> ~~such~~ a connection and whether or not if there is it would be relevant, it is a fact that after purchasing the motion pictures of the assassination of President Kennedy from Mr. Abraham Zapruder Life magazine suppressed most of this footage for many years.

8. Life kept possession of the original of the Zapruder film. It showed the original to some members of the Commission on one occasion. The Commission had a copy of a copy to view for its work.

9. The official account of the assassination of President Kennedy is that he could not have been shot before a certain point in the Zapruder film identified as Frame 210.

10. <sup>FRAME 210</sup> This and a few frames on both sides of it are missing in the original. This was kept secret until I exposed it in my first book of the Whitewash series. It is not mentioned in the Warren Report, the testimony, the appended exhibits in 26 volumes or in any Commission record of which I know.

insert 11

11. When ~~with~~ 8 mm. motion picture films is exposed it captures an image on all the film. When the processed film is projected or duplicated all the <sup>image</sup> ~~image~~ around the sprocket holes by which the film is moved is masked. Thus about 20 percent of the Zapruder film at this crucial point no longer exists and was never available for the study of the Warren Commission.

12. After I exposed this Life announced that it was making copies of these frames available to the news agencies. I was not able to obtain a copy from any news agency. I wrote Life asking for copies and never received an answer.

13. <sup>15</sup> My interest in the Time/Life, Inc. pictures is for study, not for publication. I have given written assurances that I would make no publishing use of them, should I develop any such interest in the future, without paying prevailing commercial rates for such use.

14. Time, Inc. wants me to pay it more than \$1,000 for a set of these photographs for my study of them. The FBI's rate would be about \$40.

~~It is impossible for me to pay so extortionate a charge~~  
for pictures for study.

14. The numbering of Mr. "ow's pictures from my 1971 notes indicates he exposed 5 reels of 35mm film each of 30 exposures. The ~~prints~~ prints displayed to me by the FBI are a few over a hundred. Of all of these pictures I have seen only a few ever published anywhere.

~~15. With the exception of the 1971 film regarding these pictures in particular evidence~~  
relating to

15. Based on the work I have done ~~on~~ and what I have learned about the assassination of Dr. King I believe these pictures hold ~~in~~ evidence the <sup>of</sup> importance of which can be apparent only to a subject expert, which I believe I am. It is for this purpose that I want to study clear enlargements of them *rather than small contact prints*

~~16.~~ 16. The publicly reported commercial arrangements with Mr. Zapruder have Time, Inc payments to him in six figures. <sup>public</sup> Yet from the time of initial use of a few of the frames of that motion pictures I know of no authorized use of any other frames. Thus those frames have not been available for other than official study except for some that can be seen <sup>at</sup> the National Archives by those Americans who are able to get to the National Archives. These frames also are limited to those of official interest.

Insert as 11 on p. 2: 11 In its serial reproduction of some frames of the Zapruder film the Warren Commission did not publish these missing frames or mention them.