

14 May 1965

Dear Mrs. Castellano,

Thank you very much for sending the photograph and the extremely interesting letter. You are exceptionally thorough and perceptive in your scrutiny, with attention to detail which very few people are able to give. I am sure that you have discovered discrepancies that no other researcher has noticed—certainly, I had not caught some of the anomalies you pointed out. Let me comment on them.

The cropping-out of the portion of the R.L. Thornton sign which appears in Willis Slide 5, in all three reproductions included in the Hearings and Exhibits, certainly justifies suspicion. I would be inclined to rule out coincidence. Adding to the cropping the testimony of the park attendant that the signs have been shifted, and now one sign removed completely, can only be interpreted as sinister.

I had noticed soon after the Hearings arrived that Zapruder frames 208 through 211 were missing. When a fellow-researcher visited the archives in January and saw the Zapruder color slides, I asked him at once if he had found the missing frames, and he said that he had not—they were missing from the slides, and there was an indication (the form of which he does not now remember) that there had been splicing. Subsequently, I discovered that frame 210, which is omitted from CE 885, is included with the FBI reenactment photographs, both in the Warren Report and in (if I recall correctly) CE 893. But in those versions, the frame is far too small to yield any clear details. At the time I first noticed frame 210 I discussed this curious affair with the same chap and it was his opinion that 210 was taken from a copy of the Zapruder film, whereas the color slides were made from the original. I know so little about photography that I was inclined to think that only a technical difficulty but not deliberate suppression was involved. Now I will have to reconsider the whole thing in the light of what you have told me about frame 212. I don't know whether to say that you were acute to catch the crude patching job or to admit that I was very careless not to notice it—but you are quite right, and it constitutes still another reason to suspect manipulation, of the Zapruder film as well as the traffic signs.

Turning to the Life photograph which corresponds with Zapruder frame 232, I have some difficulty in interpreting it as showing the right hand grasping the handhold. The hand does appear to be near, nearly touching, but not actually holding the handhold because the line is <sup>not</sup> interrupted, as it would be if the hand was in contact with the metal. There is also the element of perspective. It is possible that the hand is actually at the chest, in that frame, as a reaction to pain. However, if you are correct and the hand was clutching, your subsequent reasoning is very persuasive. The glaring defect in Frazier's reasoning, on the other hand, is that while he rules out a bullet from the TSBDB after 225, it merely leads him to say that the man was shot before 225; while logic and objectivity demand that Frazier, and the Commission et al, should at least have studied the possibility of a shot from a different location, in relation to the time and the frame at which the victim himself felt he had been shot. Their pervasive pre-disposition to a single hypothesis (or let us say frankly, their pre-instructions) excluded a scientific approach even on the elementary level. I do agree that it is entirely possible, perhaps probable, that Conally was shot from a location other than the TSBDB, and that the Commission's failure to explore that possibility is inexcusable.

On Glen Bennett: judging from the testimony, most of the cast of characters in this case have considerable difficulty differentiating between "right" and "left" as well as "east" and "west," sometimes with almost comical results. I would have to admit the likelihood of a natural error in this case, rather than necessarily deliberate or sinister misrepresentation—not because I trust Glen Bennett, but because Willis slide 5 and other photographs seem to show the SS agents in the follow-up car craning to their right. I should also add that I have found a number of errors in the List of Witnesses and in the index of the Warren Report; the omission of a reference to Shaneyfelt's testimony of 9/1/64 may well be clerical error.