

DAL McGUIRK
93 PAH ROAD EPSOM
AUCKLAND 1003 NZ
PH: 0-9-625 4844

Auckland, 20th January 1993

Dear Harold

Thank you very much for your long and very interesting letter of 19th December. It is a letter I have read several times, enjoying it every time.

The letter arrived while I was away in Wellington doing some research in the NZ National Archives, and my wife brought it with her when she flew down with our children to join me for a holiday. We had our friends' home to stay in Wellington while they were holidaying in the South Island. Our friends' home is in Hataitai, a suburb scattered across a high hillside above a very beautiful bay, and from their glassed in front verandah there is a magnificent panoramic view over Evans Bay and the airport and beyond to the open ocean. I have to tell you this because I read your letter one evening sitting out on this glassed in verandah with a cup of tea while the light slowly faded from the sky all around and above us. It was a very peaceful and beautiful evening. While I read your letter I wished you and your wife could have been there too.

We have been back from Wellington for a few days, and among everything else I am catching up on correspondence. Yours is the first on my list of letters to answer.

Since last writing to you I have read two recently published (1992) books dealing with the JFK assassination. I am very disappointed by both books. My local library has a standing order to reserve for me any new titles they acquire to do with the JFK assassination, and this was how I came to read these two books. I suppose you will be aware of these two titles, even if you have not read them.

The first I read was "JFK The Last Dissenting Witness", by Bill Sloan with Jean Hill. This is a rather unique book in that fact and fiction become one as the story develops into Jean Hill's involvement with Oliver Stone backgrounding the movie JFK. The movie and the memories Jean Hill has of 1963 are nicely confused by the end of the book. There is very little hard factual material in the book, apart from her account as an eyewitness of the assassination, and her subsequent interrogation by the FBI in Dallas and her encounter with Arlen Specter when he questioned her in Dallas on behalf of the Warren Commission. Jean Hill had an affair with a Dallas Police Officer, one of the motorcyclist out-riders who escorted the presidential limousine. Her affair with this officer J.B. Marshall makes up a large part of the book too, mainly because of the 'inside' information this man is supposed to have shared with Jean Hill. This is pretty wild stuff, gossip from inside the Dallas Police community, all

2.

hearsay, all unsubstantiated, and the man who is alleged to have made these claims to Jean Hill is now dead. As far as I am concerned, time I spent reading this book was wasted.

The next book is one I feel you must be aware of, your name is mentioned in several places. This book is "MORTAL ERROR The Shot that killed JFK". It is written by one Bonar Menninger in collaboration with Howard Donahue, whose story it is. I will not go into details as I know you must be aware of what this book is about, but it is a classic example I think of somebody taking one small part of a very large and complex picture and concentrating on that one area (in this case, ballistics) to the almost total exclusion of the other parts of the picture. This book never questions the assumption Oswald fired shots from the so-called snipers nest on the sixth floor of the TSBD building. Incredible. This book made me feel quite sad, no, dispirited would be a better word, to see what is being published in 1992 and presumably read by a lot of people.

A recent news item seen here concerned the apparent forward movement of Kennedy's head as seen in the Zapruder film in the split second after the shot was fired that struck his head. A friend who works for a newspaper sent me the unedited text of the release as it came over the wires. I will photocopy this text for you. It is not the first time I have read news items very like this, where somebody with "scientific" qualifications makes the 'discovery' after examining the Zapruder film that Kennedy's head snaps forward in the instant of the impact of the head shot before moving backwards, and this is then offered as 'evidence' that Kennedy was not shot from the front. However, there are Zapruder films and there are other Zapruder films are there not? (I mean they are not all the same are they?)

I cannot find just where I read it in your books, but I do remember you made the point that frames 314 and 315 had been reversed in the b/w prints made by the FBI for the Commission exhibits, and I also recall reading where you described how the original Zapruder film had been accidentally (sic) damaged and spliced at just this critical point, and that this re-spliced film showed the wrong order of frames. Am I right? Can I assume that this version was the one that was copied and circulated and has been used ever since by TV programmes, and presumably by Oliver Stone?

I know it would be ~~a~~ possible for me to go back into your books to try to find some of this information, but it may be better if I can ask you the questions here. I hope that these points are all ones that you can resolve easily for me using your memory without having to go into your files. These questions all relate to the Zapruder film.

- Where is the original Zapruder film today?
- Who has access to view this original film?

- What is the condition on the original Zapruder film?
- Where are the copies made from the original film by the Kodak Lab in Dallas on the afternoon of the assassination?
- Has the splicing on the original been properly repaired?
- Are the critical frames in their original sequence on the original film?
- From which film (=film copy) has the version now on file in TV libraries around the world been made?
- Which version of the film did the CIA obtain?

Harold, I will be very happy if you are able to provide me with this information. Thank YOU in anticipation.

I know that I told you I intended to read your books again over the summer vacation but I have not done so. Very simply I have not had the time. The two books I mentioned above were ones I read through quickly, whereas with your books it was my intention more to study them rather than just re-read them. I will still do that, but over a longer period through the year, from the beginning, starting with your original **Whitewash**.

I have no urgent need to read your books now as was the case when I bought them from you. I am convinced that there was a conspiracy to assassinate Kennedy. I do not know who did it, but it no longer seems as important now to find out 'who' was behind it, to put a name or a face to it I mean. It is evident the assassination was covered up by the US government. It is evident that one or more of the governments own intelligence agencies was involved to some degree, whoever did it had to know about Oswald, his background, and where he worked. The assassination was carried out very efficiently, professionally if one can use the word in this context, and this speaks a lot about the experience and confidence of those involved. The cover up has continued to this day, in some form or other, and that to me says that the establishment or the power structure or whatever you wish to call those with real power in the USA see it in their interest to continue the cover up. Obviously some of those people who were intimately involved in the planning of the assassination, or who knew about it and did nothing to stop it, or were privy to the cover up, must still be alive and in positions they wish to protect.

I have read quite a bit lately about the generation that Bill Clinton represents, those born after the war, taking up the reins of power in the USA. But I do not accept that, given that the cover up of the Kennedy assassination is still operating. And today for me that seems far more important than trying to uncover further evidence or connections between known facts that might show how the assassination was carried out, or who was behind it. The many implications of the assassination, and of the cover up, are in themselves more significant, are more worrying, and in the end are more frightening.

I do not mean that I think you should stop looking into the things you have doing for the past 29 years. But as far I am situated, relying on what comes into the Auckland public libraries, there seems little likelihood I am going to find out much more than I already know. As you have reminded me many times, the assassination was never investigated. It is a different situation with you, and your continuing exposure to original documentary material.

This year will be the 30th anniversary of the death of JFK, and I imagine that this will generate a number of newspaper stories. I am thinking I may start writing something myself that a local paper might take covering the essential elements of the criticism of the official version of the assassination.

If you do not mind, I would be grateful if you would read and comment on anything I manage to write up. If I start writing these ~~up~~ articles soon there will be plenty of time for me to send them to you and then receive your criticism well before November.

I am very impressed by your hard work to get a new book out. I am intrigued by the comment (quote) that your new book would "revolutionise thinking about the JFK assassination". I look forward to reading it. I assume this is the one you entitled "Never Again!" Please put one aside for me. I am glad to see you are writing another on Oswald. It seems to me the way to have tracked those who planned the assassination would have been through Oswald. If only you could be certain who Oswald's masters were, it may have told you who knew about Oswald. This would have needed to be done at the time though, the track must be very cold now but if the right records could only be opened the trail must still be there. Maybe your projected book, "Agent Oswald", will answer a few of these questions? I have always assumed Oswald was either a CIA or a Naval Intell. agent of some sort, most probably CIA, though he could have been used by more than one agency, could he not?

To a few other things in your letter- among copies of the released papers you mention being in your basement were CIA files. I was not aware that anything much had been released by the CIA who have always denied they held a working file on Oswald before 1963. Are you referring to CIA files on the assassination that date from the post-1963 period? I had the impression that the greater part of your released papers were obtained from the FBI.

Thanks for the stories of the Afrikakorps prisoners you guarded in 1943, very interesting. Tell me, did you keep any souvenirs, that is German souvenirs from this time, things like bits of uniform or insignia or medals/badges/buttons? If your answer to this question is a 'yes', would you be prepared to sell them to me?

with best wishes, and looking forward to hearing from you again,
Da.

SL: DAL BY: REX :03/01 OP: REX
FR: REX-USR :03/01 22:46 EG: FM: HJ:
PC: LB: PUR: EDN: SEC: PG: PDATE: VE#: 00
NOTE: KEYWORD: CA:

7 USA-JFK

8 SCIENTIST SAYS KENNEDY SHOT FROM THE REAR

9 Narragansett, Rhode Island, Jan 2, Reuter -- The home movie of the
10 assassination of President John F Kennedy reveals that he was shot in the head
11 from the rear -- not from the front -- as several assassination theories claim
12 a scientist said on Saturday.

13 University of Rhode Island chemist Kenneth Rahn said he analysed the
14 dramatic film by Abraham Zapruder and found that at the instant Kennedy was hi
15 -- a moment marked by the cloud of blood that appears around the face -- the
16 president's head snapped forward 6.4cm.

17 It is not until a fraction of a second later, after the bullet passed
18 through Kennedy's skull, that the president began to lurch backwards and to th
19 right, he said.

20 That movement has convinced many people that the fatal shot must have come
21 from a grassy knoll to Kennedy's right.

22 But Rahn, who usually studies the path of pollution particles in the
23 atmosphere, said the laws of physics made it impossible for a bullet to move a
24 target after it had finished passing through.

25 Kennedy's backward lurch doesn't begin until about a 10th of a second after
26 the bullet passed through, Rahn said, a delay consistent with the time it woul
27 take for reflexes to make his body jume back involuntarily.

28 Rahn became intrigued by the assassination movie after watching director
29 Oliver Stone's controversial film JFK.

30 "There's no doubt that Oliver Stone believes that the fatal shot came fro
31 the front and now there's no doubt he blew it his time," Rahn said.

32 A spokeswoman said the filmmaker was tied up with a new project and
33 declined to comment.

34 Kennedy, killed in Dallas on November 22, 1963, was also struck in the
35 throat before being shot in the head.

36 Zahn's theory is consistent with the Warren Commission's findings, which
37 said the shot that hit Kennedy in the head came from above and to the rear. Th
38 commission concluded that Kennedy was killed by a lone gunman, Lee Harvey
39 Oswald.

40 Many conspiracy theories assert that Kennedy was killed by a shot from the
41 front but Rahn said the forward snap of Kennedy's head, seen on frames 312 and
42 313 of the Zapruder film, destroyed most of these theories.

43 Rahn said it was still possible there was more than one assassin. But if
44 other assassins pulled the trigger, he said, there was no convincing evidence
45 their shots made any difference.

46 Rahn said his analysis required little more than a basic background in
47 physics, a laserdisk version of JFK -- which permitted the detailed, frame-by-
48 frame analysis of the Zapruder film -- and tracing paper to compare the motion
49 of Kennedy's head to immobile objects in the scene.

50 Reuter bt 1/4N7P

51 03/01/93 13-26N7

53 (END)