

# THE FOURTH DECADE

1963

1973

1983

1993

2003

VOLUME 6, NUMBER 5

JULY, 1999

## Contents

THIS'LL JUST TAKE A MINUTE .....	3
By Kevin Brown	
THE SCHOOLBOOK BUSINESSMAN .....	4
By William Weston	
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR .....	10
THE ZAPRUDER FILM: A STUDY IN DECEPTION, PART TWO .....	12
By Harrison E. Livingstone	
FORGING AHEAD: FURTHER QUESTIONS ABOUT OSWALD IDENTITY DOCUMENTS .....	27
By Jerry D. Rose	

A JOURNAL OF RESEARCH  
ON THE  
JOHN F. KENNEDY ASSASSINATION

ISSN 0888-5230

**THE FOURTH DECADE** (formerly **THE THIRD DECADE**) is published bimonthly at State University College, Fredonia NY 14063. Editor and publisher: Jerry D. Rose. Subscription rates: \$25 for one year; \$45 for two years; \$65 for three years. Single issues \$5.

**Notice to contributors:** **THE FOURTH DECADE** encourages submission of articles and Letters to the Editor from all interested parties. Articles should be confined to no more than 5,000 words, letters to no more than 1,000 words. Any author wishing copyright of his/her material should arrange that copyright upon submitting that material. All publication is at the discretion of the publisher and is subject to editorial revision.

**Back cover illustration: the ARRB and the Zapruder film.**

The Assassination Records and Review Board, in its investigation of the authenticity of the Zapruder film, interviewed a number of people at the CIA's National Photographic Interpretation Center (NPIC) about their handling of the film in November, 1963. Shown is the report of one such meeting, in which there are a number of recollections about the film and its handling that are at stark variance with the "official" version of same. For discussion of this and many other fruits of ARRB investigation, see "The Zapruder Film: A Study in Deception," this issue.

**This issue is dedicated to the memory of my friend and fellow-seeker, John E. Long.**

## THIS'LL JUST TAKE A MINUTE

by  
Kevin Brown

Even though I've always strongly felt that John Kennedy's assassination came as the result of a conspiracy, I must admit I'm starting to soften up a bit. Usually the conspiracy articles I find in these pages are well thought out, with authors speculating on the known facts, but every so often one comes along that seems to defy all logic, delving into an expanded plot featuring a cast of thousands that even DeMille would have found excessive.

It's at these moments when I'm reminded that no matter whose argument makes more sense to you, whether it's Gerald Posner or Oliver Stone, you still have to take a leap of faith in order to believe it, because after we're done memorizing all the names, dates, and places of this ugly slice of American history, all we have are our opinions of what the evidence means. We don't have proof we're right, one way or the other.

I know this is a distressing notion for some critics. I could be accused of copping out, or even of being some government stooge on a propagandist mission for his sinister overlords. But I believe that any chance of getting the truth died with Oswald (and possibly Ruby), and I refuse to tell myself I know something that is unknowable. The rallying cries of some—the notion that we must toss aside the questions in this highly debatable body of evidence and agree on one answer—is the same thing in my mind as standing on a street corner, screaming at passers-by that they're going to Hell if they don't repent.

I don't mean to sound as if researching the JFK murder is a waste of time, because it certainly isn't. We continue to learn more about Oswald, even at this late date. One topic I always felt we weren't getting the whole story on was his defection, and the real nature of his American intelligence link, starting with his Marine service. With hard work and a little luck, hopefully we'll see that resolved. But if it should happen, will the house of cards really fall? Will that lead us straight to the answer of who pulled the trigger(s) in Dallas? I doubt it. The conspiracy I envision was a small one, with no di-

rectly incriminating paper trail.

Denial over the probability that we will never know what happened has been eating away at the conspiracy argument from the inside. With no answer in sight, some critics have turned on each other, debunking opposing personal theories in order to attain as many temporary victories as they can. This doesn't help the image of the critical community. Neither does the stigma that is automatically given to anyone who enters the debate on the side of Earl Warren and Co. When these strangers arrive in town, the question immediately looms: who are they really working for?

The biggest name of this group is Gerald Posner. While I disagree with practically everything in *CASE CLOSED* other than the fact that Kennedy was shot on a Friday, I really feel the accusations leveled at Posner have reached the level of self-satire.

I recently met Posner at the New York Hilton for the 28<sup>th</sup> Annual American Society of Journalists and Authors (ASJA) writer's conference. Posner spoke at the midday luncheon, as did Lindbergh author A. Scott Berg. He talked at length about the various ways he has gone about acquiring information for his books, and when it came to *CASE CLOSED*, he discussed Yuri Nosenko.

As we know, Nosenko was the KGB officer who handled Oswald's file while he lived in Russia. Nosenko defected in 1964 and was held as a prisoner by the CIA under suspicion of being a false defector and spy. After eventually having been cleared of any wrongdoing, Nosenko was relocated by the CIA and now lives somewhere in the US under a different name.

Obviously, access to Nosenko isn't easy, and any investigator seeking it needs to go through the CIA first. When Posner did just that, it raised the question of how does one go about keeping their objectivity intact while relying on the CIA for help? This has always been a valid question for me.

In his speech Posner maintained it was ultimately Nosenko's decision whether or not to answer his requests. He related that it was Nosenko's fear that he was still on a KGB hit list, and that was enough to keep him silent. By luck, Posner said his requests to meet Nosenko happened to coincide with the dissolution of the Soviet government, and Nosenko felt it was safe to talk.

This will undoubtedly sound like too convenient a story for some of you, even though it's plausible. Afterwards I asked Posner that even if the CIA didn't get involved

---

Kevin B. Brown  
406 Society Place  
Newton, PA 18940

other than to act as the middle man between Nosenko and him, didn't he think they were glad he came along?

He replied that it was likely, but really not that important since the Nosenko/Oswald connection was ultimately devoid of any real juicy details.

I must admit that answered the question for me. Of course there were many other things that I wanted to get to, but there wasn't time. As I left the conference I couldn't help thinking about the extreme negative reaction Posner has received, and finally the question emerged: Did the critical community miss a grand opportunity?

You know, the greatest thing about the film JFK when it came out was that it forced a dead issue back into the national spotlight and filled newspapers and TV shows with rabid debates. Suddenly, dignified old men like Gerald Ford and David Belin were hopping into the ring with Stone. Numerous Warren friendly journalists like Tom Wicker and George Lardner also joined the fray, reacting like sleeping lions who had just been poked with a stick. I loved every second of it. It was a renewed chance for the public to see if the old arguments for Oswald as a Communist misanthrope had stood the test of time, or if they were justified in voting for a conspiracy in all those opinion polls.

When Posner came along, things quickly reversed. It was the critics' turn to defend themselves, and instead of rising to the challenge, they reacted just as poorly as their opponents did. Even though we continue to see sound rebuttals of some of Posner's arguments, what seemed to stick was the name-calling and accusations of hidden motives. It's a shame, because all debate over this assassination should be healthy and thought-provoking, especially for the benefit of those who are new to it, and are undecided about where they stand.

In a few years the assassination will turn 40 and this journal will undergo another name change. I'll still be a conspiracy proponent then, but one who's willing to tolerate that someone else could interpret the evidence differently. I might even be so bold as to suggest that this wouldn't be a bad starting point for everyone who takes this case to heart.

•

## THE SCHOOLBOOK BUSINESSMAN

by  
*William Weston*

In a book called REASONABLE DOUBT, author Henry Hurt makes a compelling argument that Oswald's gun purchases were done as an assignment to gather evidence for a Senate Investigative Committee chaired by Senator Thomas J. Dodd. The Committee was trying to show that anyone with a little money could get guns through the mail. There was no control over who could get them. Children, criminals, and cranks using fictitious names could get any kind of weapons. To prove it, "Hidell," was to order a Mannlicher-Carcano rifle from Kleins Sporting Goods in Chicago. During the summer, when Oswald was living in New Orleans, he was often seen reading gun magazines in Adrian Alba's parking garage. From one of the magazines he tore out a mail order coupon, which he kept in his possession but never used. Oswald asked Alba a lot of questions regarding mail order purchases, such as how many guns Alba had ordered how long it took to get them, and where he had to send for them.

Hurt does not believe that the Dodd Committee had an official connection to Oswald, but he thinks that someone falsely representing himself as a committee investigator had met with Oswald in order to steer him into a self-incriminating direction. The purchase of firearms through the mail left a paper trail that could be used later in a frame-up job. As it turned out, the rifle that Oswald bought was tied into the Kennedy assassination and his revolver was tied into the Tippit shooting. [1]

Another Oswald connection to guns popped up in San Antonio, Texas during the fall of that same year. The San Antonio offices of the FBI and the Army Criminal Investigative Division (CID) were getting frantic in their search for some way to infiltrate a military ordinance smuggling ring that was operating out of Fort Hood. M-16's by the hundreds were being loaded onto flatbed trucks and taken out the back gate. The culprits even stole a medium tank. These weapons were being used in the secret war against Castro. A break in the Fort Hood case finally came when an undercover agent named

---

*William Weston*  
10291 D'Este Drive  
Anaheim, CA 92804

Frank Ellsworth managed to infiltrate the operation through his contact, John Masen, a gun dealer in Dallas. Masen just happened to be an Oswald look-alike. To make a long story short, Captain George Nonte, the chief officer in charge of ordinance, was exposed as the ring leader on October 24, 1963 and consequently became an informant for the FBI. [2]

The investigation of Nonte's gun smugglers was conducted at a federal office building in Alamo Plaza, where the FBI and CID offices were located. Five miles from that building was the city airport. Here Oswald - the real one I believe - made the claim that he was in the business of "schoolbooks." Strangely enough, this claim was made more than five weeks before he got his job at the Texas School Book Depository. His reference to "schoolbooks", I believe, was not made in anticipation of a new career in the field of educational materials, but rather it was made in accordance with an ongoing assignment to gather more information on the gun trade. In an article called "The Glaze Letters," I presented a theory that illegal shipments of firearms were being transported under the guise of schoolbooks. The main points in that article were the following:

1. The assistant manager of the Book Depository, William Shelley, was revealed by a journalist named Elzie Dean Glaze to have been an agent in the CIA. On the day of the assassination, Shelley was engaged in activities that were highly suspicious, such as observing the escape of an assassin and failing to report it. He also seemed to have had a role in making sure Oswald got away in a Nash Rambler station wagon, ten to fifteen minutes after the assassination.

2. The building occupied by the Book Depository was owned by D.H. Byrd, a wealthy, right-wing Texas oilman, who along with Hunt and Murchison had much to lose if Kennedy accomplished his goal of taking away the oil depletion allowance.

3. Byrd was the head man in charge of the Civil Air Patrol in the states of Texas and Louisiana. Among those in the Louisiana unit were Lee Harvey Oswald, David Ferrie, and Barry Seal. These three men were undoubtedly linked to the CIA; it therefore stands to reason that their commander was too.

4. Ferrie and Seal under the guise of Byrd's Civil Air Patrol were involved in transporting illegal shipments of firearms in big wooden crates from Moissant Airport. [3]

It is interesting to note that on the premises of the Book

Depository were big wooden crates which were too large and too heavy for schoolbooks, yet as containers for military hardware they would have been perfect. Later in this article, I will present more information on the Book Depository crates.

If the real Oswald (and not the look-alike John Masen) was looking for information on the weapons and ammo traffic, then his reference to "schoolbooks" would be an important clue. It was probably in his capacity as an undercover man that he had been guided into his job at the Book Depository. Little did he realize that he was walking into a delayed-action patsy trap. Six weeks after he got this job he became the lone suspect in the assassination of President Kennedy.

The place where Oswald uttered the portentous word "schoolbooks" was located at the terminal building of the San Antonio International Airport. [4] Inside the glass and concrete structure were four different airlines: American, Eastern, Continental, and Braniff. Out front was a big parking lot which in 1963 was free to the public. Off to one side of the building was a covered, open-air baggage area, where travelers could pick up their suitcases and bags. Nearby and parked along the curb were four to six taxicabs of the Yellow Cab Company. A taxicab dispatch office occupied a section of the terminal building. Near the dispatch office was another office with a sign out front that said "Car Rentals" followed by an arrow.

The car rental office was tiny. It had a glass front and two glass doors. Inside was a counter about twenty-one feet long, divided by two plastic partitions. Above the counter hung three signs. As customers came in, they would see from left to right: Avis, National Car, and Hertz. Behind the counter and sitting on stools were three women, each wearing the cap and uniform of the company she was representing. The two bigger companies, Avis and Hertz, each had counter space of about eight feet, whereas National Car was sandwiched in with five feet. Behind the counter was a distance of six feet to the back wall. In front of the counter was a narrow space of only three feet. Not many people could get inside the office, but that was hardly ever a problem. Usually only one or two customers would be renting cars at any one time. Most people who came in were airline travelers who already had reservations. Walk-in customers formed but a small fraction of the business. The afternoon of Thursday, September 5, 1963 was hot and sunny. The temperature was well into the 90's. The

date was an unforgettable one for the Hertz agent, Martha J. Doyle, for it happened to be her birthday. She started her shift at 3:00 pm, and she was glad to get into an air-conditioned office. Also starting at the same time were Joanne Dunsmore, who worked for National Car, and Linda Meyers, who worked for Avis. The three women were good friends, even though the companies they worked for were highly competitive. When Joanne was hired by National Car in 1962, she got a lot of advice and help from Martha, who had been with Hertz since 1959. Linda's home was near Joanne's, so the two women would share rides to work. All three enjoyed the business of renting cars, and it was a good occupation for them, even though it meant working eight hours straight through without the benefit of a meal break.

It was about 5:00 in the afternoon when Martha noticed through the front glass a couple approaching from the right. This direction meant something to her, for people coming from the right hardly ever stopped in. The big parking lot was to the right and anyone coming from that direction usually had their own means of transportation. Those who came from the left were airline travelers just getting off the planes.

Martha watched as the man opened the door nearest the Hertz side of the counter and allowed his wife to pass through. Draped on her folded arms was a blanket, and cradled in the blanket was a baby girl. The man and the woman were a seedy-looking pair, dressed in shabby clothing - an odd contrast to the well-groomed clientele which usually came in to rent cars. Judging by their appearance alone, Martha was certain that she did not want to do business with them. Nevertheless, for politeness sake, she would treat them in the same way that she treated all her walk-in customers.

The man was about 27 years old, had light brown hair, weighed 140 to 150 pounds and stood about five feet, eight inches tall. He was wearing a long-sleeve shirt that must have been white at one time but now had a dingy grayish tint to it. He was definitely the dominant one, for he did all the talking. The woman said not a single word. She had a big smile on her face, which never changed or relaxed and grew more disturbing as the minutes went by. At close range, this odd smile gave Martha an inescapable view of some ugly-looking teeth. She noticed a brownish stain on them, probably due to a smoking habit, and the two upper front teeth were slightly chipped. The woman was about the same age as the man, stood about three inches shorter, and

weighed about 125 pounds. Her hair was almost black in color, parted in the middle, and combed in a severely tight fashion toward the back. Martha could not see how it was arranged behind her head, but it was probably tied into a bun. She wore a white blouse and a dark skirt. The skirt went halfway between the knees and ankles and the material looked too heavy for the hot weather. Her overall appearance was that of a foreigner who had just entered the country.

The baby in her arms was fast asleep. She was about three months old, and she was wearing a short summer outfit which left her legs uncovered. Martha thought she looked beautiful. Her complexion was fair, and her hair was light blonde. Indeed her hair was so blond that Martha could scarcely believe that the dark-haired woman could be her mother. Then Martha glanced at the light brownish color of the man's hair and satisfied herself that the hair color must have come from his side.

"I would like to rent a car," the man said.

"I need to see a driver's license and some form of credit card."

"I don't have a credit card."

"Do you have a passport?"

"No."

"Do you have a charge account with one of the airlines?"

"I am not traveling by air."

"How did you get to the airport?"

"I came in a friend's car."

"Well, I can't rent you a car without sufficient identification. What kind of work do you do?"

"I am in the publishing business."

At these words, Martha immediately thought that he was one of those overzealous and obnoxious magazine salesmen.

"Do you mean magazines?" she asked politely.

"No, schoolbooks." [5]

At the mention of schoolbooks, Martha almost reconsidered her initial decision to turn down his request to rent a car. There was after all a great deal of money in that line of work. If she had decided at this point to go through the qualification process, she would have pulled out the necessary paperwork and filled them out herself by asking the man a series of routine questions. The man would have had to produce a driver's license for identification and come up with a deposit of at least three hundred dollars. (Quite likely Martha would have required a much higher deposit, considering the fact that

she suspected him of being a poor risk.) After filling out the papers and receiving the deposit, she would have given him a key and directed him to a nearby parking area where the Hertz cars were lined up in designated spaces. The cost of renting a car was fourteen dollars a day and fourteen cents a mile. (These were extravagant rates for the average wage-earner in those days.) But Martha never did get that far with him. In spite of the lucrateness of the schoolbook business, she followed her first impression and turned him down.

"I am sorry, but I cannot rent you a car."

Throughout her long career as a car rental agent, there were very few times when she had to reject a customer. This was one of them. The man accepted this decision without a word of complaint. Having been turned down by Hertz, he might have tried National Car or Avis, yet it would have been futile for him to do so. Even though Joanne and Linda were unable to see the couple from behind their partitions, they would nonetheless have heard the conversation. If Martha did not want to rent him a car, they certainly were not going to take a chance either.

The man turned and opened the door. He went outside, holding the door open as his wife followed him out. After they were gone, they became a topic of conversation between Martha and Joanne. A few minutes later, Joanne interrupted to exclaim:

"Did you see what that man just did?"

She was looking through the front glass toward the baggage area. Martha asked her what happened.

"He took a pacifier out of that baby's mouth and put it in his own mouth."

Martha tried to see, but they were already gone out of sight. The sheer oddity of a man putting a pacifier in his mouth increased her curiosity to such an extent, that she felt compelled to go outside to see what else he was going to do. But getting outside was a not a straightforward thing to do. Even though the front door was almost within her reach, there was no way of getting around the counter. She had to go through the back door. She opened it and went into a hallway, turning right. She walked to the end of the hallway and opened a door on the right hand side leading into the taxicab dispatch office. She went through the office and opened the front door. When she finally reached the baggage area, the family was nowhere to be seen. Perhaps one of the cab drivers had seen something. She went up to a passenger window and leaned her head in.

"Did you see that couple with the baby?" she asked the driver.

"I sure did."

"Did you see the man putting a pacifier in his mouth?"

"Yeah, I did. Then I saw him take it out and throw it on the ground. I'm sure going to stay away from that nut."

Martha learned nothing more about this man until two and a half months later when she saw his picture in the newspaper. She also saw pictures of the wife at the burial service of her husband. There was no doubt in her mind that both Lee and Marina Oswald were the ones she saw in the car rental office. On Monday, she called the FBI, and two days later, the evening of November 27, 1963, an agent named Tom Neal came by to ask her some questions. Joanne was also interviewed, who said that she definitely had a recollection of these people, and that she had witnessed the incident with the pacifier, but her view was not good enough to enable her to make a positive identification. The FBI agent asked questions for about twenty minutes and then left. That was the one and only time the two women would be interviewed by anyone from the government.

In the account given above, there are four matters mentioned which I would like to touch on for further comment. These are: (1) the blonde haired baby; (2) the incident with the pacifier; (3) the possibility that Oswald possessed a driver's license; and (4) Oswald's claim that he was in the business of schoolbooks.

#### **The Blonde-Haired Baby**

June Oswald, the daughter of Lee and Marina, was eighteen months old in September 1963. The baby Martha saw was not more than three or four months old. Martha distinctly remembers light blonde hair, whereas June had dark hair. The blonde-haired baby must have been some other woman's child, born sometime during the spring of 1963. Beyond the fact that the woman must have been a friend of the Oswalds, there are no additional clues that would enable us to identify her. Since Lee happened to mention that a friend brought them to the airport, it is quite probable that he was referring to the mother of the baby. Little June might have been waiting in the car with her. Perhaps Marina had been holding the baby while the mother drove to the airport. When the baby had fallen asleep in her arms, the two women might have agreed that Marina should take her into the car rental office, so that her rest would remain undisturbed.

It should be noted here that in early September 1963, Marina was seven and a half months pregnant with her second child. Martha did not notice her condition for she was getting only an upper view of Marina's body as she stood at the counter. Additionally, the bulge of her stomach would have been obscured by the blanket under the baby. While it is true that Martha did notice the length and color of Marina's skirt, these would of course have been observable as Marina was entering and leaving the office.

### **The Baby Pacifier**

The incident with the pacifier has an echo in the memoirs of George de Mohrenschildt. In a passage describing the Oswalds as a family, he wrote that his wife Jeanne was particularly appalled by the unsanitary way Marina handled pacifiers:

Marina would pick up a pacifier from the floor, then tried it herself before putting it in June's mouth. Unfortunately she had infected teeth at the time, so the baby was exposed also. [6]

In her testimony to the Warren Commission, Jeanne De Mohrenschildt had more to say on the subject.

*Mrs. De Mohrenschildt: I told her, "You are living in a civilized country now. You have to raise a baby correctly."*

*She constantly put the pacifier in the mouth, dropping it on the floor, putting it in her mouth (with) infected teeth and putting it in the baby's mouth. It is fantastic the baby wasn't sick all the time. Seeing all that, I couldn't stand it. I insisted on her taking the baby to the clinic helping her, extract all these teeth.*

*Mr. Jenner: Marina's teeth?*

*Mrs. De Mohrenschildt: Yes; Marina's teeth that were infected because they weren't doing her any good, anyway. It was too dangerous for the baby to be close to the mother, with all this infection. In fact, I was trying to make arrangements to make some bridges for her later on that could be paid gradually, you know, and that is what I was trying to do for her. This was logical and natural. Anybody would do the same thing.*

*Mr. Jenner: Yes, of course.*

*Mrs. De Mohrenschildt: She just didn't know any better, you know....The child was more or less clean, but with this pacifier thing.*

*Mr. Jenner: The pacifier would fall on the floor, she would pick it up and stick it in the baby's*

*mouth?*

*Mrs. De Mohrenschildt: No; first she put it in her mouth and then in the baby's mouth, it was even worse. That is what I objected. Pick it up off the floor. The floor was less moistened than her infected teeth, but she was not aware of it. [7]*

Jeanne's description of Marina's teeth dovetails with the observations made by Martha Doyle. It also conforms to the recollections of two dentists who saw Marina in October 1962. (Jeanne made a special point of taking her to the dentist office.) One of the dentists said that "her teeth were in poor condition, she had many cavities and needed much dental attention." The dentists cleaned her teeth and performed five tooth extractions. [8] These observations indicate that the woman in the car rental office was the real Marina and not an impostor. The man standing beside her must therefore have been the real Lee and not some look-alike such as John Masen.

Considering the poor condition of her teeth, it would have been alarming for someone acutely afraid of germs to observe Marina moistening a pacifier in her mouth. If Lee had the same horror regarding the possible transmission of germs that Jeanne had, then we move closer to an understanding of the peculiar scene outside the car rental office. Perhaps as they went outside, the heat of the hot sun on the baby's face woke her up and she started crying. Marina might have tried to calm the baby with a pre-moistened pacifier. Lee did not notice what Marina had done until the pacifier was already in the baby's mouth. Impulsively he took it out and put it in his own mouth, perhaps thinking he could cleanse Marina's germs off it. When he tried to put the pacifier back in the baby's mouth, the angry infant refused to take it. The act of throwing the pacifier on the ground might have been due to the frustration of his effort to calm the baby.

### **Oswald's Driver's License**

According to the Warren Commission, Lee Harvey Oswald never had a driver's license. This conclusion was based on the testimony of Marina Oswald and her friend Ruth Paine, both of whom were adamant in denying that he had one. [9] Such testimony has little value, since both women also conceded that Lee oftentimes left them in the dark regarding his activities and whereabouts. If it can be demonstrated that he had a license, even a forged one, then the veracity of the incident in the car rental office would be sustained. The story be-



low is about a man, who personally saw a driver's license in Oswald's possession. [10]

Edward Brand was an insurance salesman who worked at the Tower Insurance Agency, 1045 North Zangs, in the Dallas suburb of Oak Cliff. Sometime during the daylight hours about two weeks before the President's trip to Texas, a man entered Brand's office, came up to the counter and inquired about auto insurance. He identified himself as O.H. Lee. He said that he had just moved into Dallas from San Antonio, that he was living directly across the street at the rooming house at 1026 N. Beckley Avenue, and that his landlord was A.C. Johnson. Brand knew about the rooming house, for he had a clear view of it through his office window. He had seen some of the tenants sitting on the front lawn, talking and smoking under the shade of the trees. Oftentimes the landlord A. C. could be seen among them, getting drunk and talking loudly. Johnson liked to carry a bullwhip which he snapped about aimlessly to amuse himself. He was a tall, slender man, who spent a lot of time at the gas station across the street, which he also owned. Many times he could be seen at the station pumping gas.

O.H. Lee said he did not want the comprehensive auto insurance. All he wanted was the liability kind, and he asked how much it would cost. Before Brand would give him a price, he needed some information. He asked to see Lee's driver's license. Lee pulled out his wallet, got his license out and handed it to him. Brand saw that it was a Texas License and that the last name on it was Lee. He did not pay attention to what the first part of the name was. There was no identification photo, for in those days licenses did not have any.

Brand handed the license back and asked Lee if he had been in any accidents or got any tickets. Lee said he got one ticket in San Antonio (in September 1963?). When Brand asked about the kind of car he was driving, Lee said that he did not have one but that he would be purchasing one very soon. [11] Brand was not able to give him an exact quote until he knew what kind of car he would be driving. He invited him to come back, as soon as he got one. Lee never did come back.

### **The Schoolbook Business**

Oswald's claim that he was in the business of schoolbooks was a last ditch attempt to convince a skeptical car rental agent that he was qualified to rent a car. To the car rental agent, his claim meant nothing more than the buying and selling of educational materials. But to

Oswald and his handlers, "schoolbooks" might have been a code word for illegal guns.

Henry Hurt seems to have recognized the link between guns and schoolbooks when he made a visit to the empty 411 Elm Street building in 1983. On the sixth floor were seven heavily framed wooden crates of various odd dimensions. On each box was stamped the name of a publishing company and addressed to the Texas School Book Depository. Three of these boxes appear in a photograph in his book. By comparing the nearest box to the window behind it, I would say that it measured four feet long by three feet wide by one and a half feet high. Such a box would have had a spacious capacity of 18 cubic feet. If it were filled with schoolbooks, it would have weighed over five hundred pounds - far too heavy to move without a forklift, and the Book Depository did not have forklifts. It was certainly not the kind of container to haul around books. On the other hand, such a crate would have been ideal for transporting a rack of M-16 automatic rifles - exactly the kind of stuff being stolen out of Fort Hood in the fall of 1963. [12]

### **Notes**

1. Henry Hurt, *REASONABLE DOUBT* (Holt, Rinehart, Winston: New York, 1985), pp. 296-302.
2. Noel Twyman, *BLOODY TREASON* (Laurel Publishing Co.: Rancho Sante Fe, Ca, 1997), pp. 580-585.
3. "The Glaze Letters" in the May 1999 issue of *The Fourth Decade*.
4. Sources for this story came from two FBI reports by SA Tom Neal, dated November 27, 1963 of Martha Doyle and Joanne Dunsmore. Supplementing the details of this story were phone calls to Martha Doyle and Joanne (Dunsmore) Arthur.
5. In the FBI report of the interview of Martha Doyle, it was recorded that Oswald said that he was in the publishing business, but no mention in the report was made of schoolbooks. Martha Doyle clearly remembers telling the FBI agent that Oswald said that he was in the schoolbook business. This detail was probably omitted from the report, because it had the potential of opening up a messy can of worms.
6. The quote came from an unpublished manuscript "I Am a Patsy" by George De Mohrenschildt,

which was printed as an appendix in HSCA XII.

7. 9H322-324 (J. De Mohrenschildt)
8. FBI reports of interviews of Dr. Harvey Waldo Allen, DDS, and Albert Franklin Staples, DDS and DMD, by SA Arthur E. Carter, dated December 9, 1963.
9. Warren Report, p. 665; 3H35 (R. Paine); 1H112-113 (M. Oswald).
10. Report of Edward Brand interview by SA James R. Cranam, dated December 2, 1963, supplemented by a phone call to Edward Brand, January 1, 1997.
11. The words "very soon" were emphasized by Oswald in a heavily ominous way. This significant detail leaves open the question that an impostor had visited Brand, in order to lay an incriminating trail leading to the real Oswald.
12. Hurt, REASONABLE DOUBT, pp. 359 and 387. A majority of the boxes forming the sniper's nest each measured 18 in. by 12 in. by 14 in. and weighed 55 pounds. Using this as a norm, the average cubic foot of schoolbooks weighs 31 pounds. Multiplying 31 by 18 yields 558 pounds.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### To the Editor:

Recently, on the way to Minneapolis for a JFK assassination conference, I spent two days in Winnipeg. While there, I was able to watch a ten-minute interview conducted by the late Richard Giesbrecht for a CBC-TV program called "Open Season;" the interview took place at the very table where Mr. Giesbrecht allegedly overheard the suspicious conversation, in the Horizon Room at the Winnipeg International Airport.

The interview was broadcast on Dec. 12, 1968, only a month or so before the Shaw trial got underway. This is almost a year since Giesbrecht had been interviewed by the National Enquirer and referred to briefly in William Turner's Ramparts report. It also took place on the heels of the assassinations of both Martin Luther King and Robert F. Kennedy, and the turbulence at the Chicago Democratic convention. Under the circumstances, Mr. Giesbrecht would have been fully justified to cancel his agreement made with the New Orleans District Attorney, Jim Garrison, to testify at Shaw's trial (which he had expected to begin in June, 1968.) I was led to believe that Giesbrecht had, in fact, already notified Garrison that he would not be coming to New Orleans, as a result of threats to his family's welfare. However, when asked about his concern for his own safety during the interview, Giesbrecht indicated that since he had told the RCMP, the FBI and Garrison's staff everything he knew, he didn't feel there was any reason why he would be harmed, although he did state at a later point that his days were probably "numbered," and had "mixed feelings" about having come forward in the first place. He also was familiar with Penn Jones' study suggesting that there were as many as "32 mysterious deaths" associated with the JFK assassination (which had been discussed in a Canadian magazine the previous fall.) There was no indication that any threat had been made towards his wife or four children, however (one of whom drowned in 1969 in a motel pool in Detroit Lakes, Minn. at the age of nine.)

In addition to reviewing the highlights of his experience at the Winnipeg Airport on Feb. 13, 1964 (with no mention of David Ferrie, oddly enough, by either



## THE ZAPRUDER FILM: A STUDY IN DECEPTION, PART TWO

by  
Harrison E. Livingstone

My second and third books, *High Treason 2*, and *Killing the Truth* contain the first major public attack on the Zapruder film. One other researcher, in Fort Worth, claims to have been saying some of what I published there earlier, but he would have published this among his many articles. Among the major problems with the film which I pointed out in my fourth book, *Killing Kennedy and the Hoax of the Century*, is the fact that Clint Hill has an entirely different scene in the Nix film. When Jacqueline Kennedy climbed out on the trunk of the car to retrieve a portion of her husband's head, Hill testified that he climbed up on the trunk and placed Jacqueline back in her seat,<sup>1</sup> which is what we see him doing in the Nix film when he puts his arms around her and moves her back to her seat. The Zapruder film only shows the two reach their hands towards each other, then Jacqueline turns and crawls back to her seat on her own. Obviously, the car could not be going very fast.

To mention just one more incredible anomaly, just after Kennedy is struck in the head, what appears to be his entire brain hangs from his right eye and temple area in front of his face and bobs about. I called this "The Blob," and it is totally unexplainable in anatomical terms. Nothing like this was seen moments later at the hospital, nor was any damage seen to that part of the face. Certainly there was no scalp flap of any kind there. All attempts by others to explain it have failed, and consensus has built that it is a painted on artifact moved from frame to frame, then re-photographed and a new "original" film created. Why? To give the appearance of a shot from behind which took out a portion of the front side of his head. Correspondingly fake X-rays were created to back this up. Even false autopsy pictures were created (now missing) which we actually saw in a researcher's house to show an open wound on the right front side of the head.

One major researcher has questioned whether there ever were any shots from behind, but the record is massive that the president was actually shot at least twice

from behind, and we are compelled to accept this along with strong evidence of shots from in front. Such a complex plot involving faking evidence in federal hands would have created an ambush and shooters from behind essential to insuring the car was pushed forward by shots from behind—to the absolute sure kill-shots facing the car.

### National Photographic Interpretation Center

We examined (far too briefly) the National Photographic Interpretation Center (NPIC) flats. These are four large mats with poor quality (possibly from age) paper photos glued on (they look suspiciously like magazine photos and we need to go back and check to see if they had been screened. That would certainly put the lie to the "prints" that NPIC supposedly mounted on the boards), and markers saying how many frames are missing in between each blow-up which were made with blown-up frames from the Zapruder film. The NPIC men told the ARRB that a Secret Service man came with the film from Kodak in Rochester, New York and told them the film had been processed and developed there. There is great confusion about the date but the NPIC employees told the Board that this occurred either the night of the assassination or shortly after, and before the funeral.<sup>2</sup> Paul Hoch, who originally uncovered the fact that the film had been at the NPIC (which is funded by the CIA and used to interpret photos taken by our high-flying spy planes, the U-2) obtained NPIC's notes, but they had no date on them. The notes stated that three prints had been made from the film, but recent testimony three and a half decades later tells us that meant three copies of the blown up photos and not actual prints of the film.

NPIC staff also said that the film showed JFK struck six to eight times from three directions,<sup>3</sup> but that the "Secret Service" man, who used the name "Bill Smith," who brought the films, he said, from Kodak in Rochester, New York, told them this was wrong and re-programmed them to the official story as it later turned out with the Warren Commission—a three shot scenario. *This might have been told them the night of the assassination*, to their shock, since they were looking at the film themselves.

"About two days after the assassination of President Kennedy, but before the funeral took place, a Secret Service agent named 'Bill Smith' delivered an amateur film of the assassination to NPIC and requested that color prints be made of frames believed associated with wounding ('frames in which shots occurred'), for purposes of assembling a briefing board."<sup>4</sup> We might note

---

Harrison E. Livingstone  
P.O. Box 7149  
Baltimore, MD 21218

that they had a hell of a lot of frames (28) blown up and glued to the boards, if they all meant to show shots. So this must be a mistake. He did not explain who the briefing boards would be for, or who would be briefed. Beside "Smith," only McMahon's assistant, Ben Hunter, witnessed this work.

"Smith told McMahon that the subject matter was to be treated as 'above top secret;' McMahon said that not even his supervisor was allowed to know what he had worked on, nor was his supervisor allowed to participate. Smith told McMahon that he had personally picked up the film (in an undeveloped condition from the man who exposed it) in Dallas, flown it to Rochester, N.Y. (where it was developed by Kodak), and then flown it down to NPIC in Washington so that enlargements of selected frames could be made on NPIC's state-of-the-art equipment. . . (description of the process used to make the blow-ups). He recalled that a minimum of 20, and a maximum of 40 frames were duplicated via internegatives and prints. All prints, internegatives, and scraps were turned over to Bill Smith at the conclusion of the work." Yeah, well how come all this stuff was turned over by the CIA and not the Secret Service and remains in the CIA's Segregated Collection at the National Archives? All I know is, we've got a man running around a top secret CIA facility saying that he is Secret Service agent "Bill Smith," getting them to cooperate with him, and the whole deal smells fishy to me, especially the guy's name, although I know quite a few Bill Smiths.

McMahon did not construct the briefing boards once he had made the pictures for them, and didn't know who did at NPIC.

"McMahon stated definitely that at no point did NPIC reproduce the assassination movie (the Zapruder film) as a motion picture; all the NPIC did was produce internegatives and color prints of selected still frames."<sup>5</sup> A lot of spilled ink in numerous research articles has besotted us with the unquestioned assumption of many researchers that the *films* were actually copied by NPIC due to the language used that "three prints" were made. That was a misinterpretation, according to McMahon.

"Although the process of selecting which frames depicted events surrounding the wounding of limousine occupants (Kennedy and Connally) was a 'joint process,' McMahon said his opinion, which was that President Kennedy was shot 6 to 8 times from three directions, was ultimately ignored, and the opinion of USSS agent

Smith, that there were 3 shots from the Book Depository, ultimately was employed in selecting frames in the movie for reproduction. At one point he said, 'you can't fight city hall,' and then reminded us that his job was to produce internegatives and photographs, not to do analysis. He said that it was clear that the Secret Service agent had previously viewed the film and already had opinions about which frames depicted woundings."<sup>6</sup>

Doug Horne notes in this government report that the film was either an "unslit original" or possibly a duplicate and that it was viewed more than once on a 16 mm projector in a briefing room at NPIC, and then "the original (a double-8 mm unslit original) was placed in a 10 x 20 x 40 precision enlarger, and 5" x 7" format internegative were made from selected frames." Three copies were made of each frame. That is the "three prints" that researchers thought meant three copies of the film were made. But nobody is going to believe this. I'll accept it for now.

McMahon was shown the same four briefing board panels and said that some additional prints that he had made were missing. "When asked what was missing, he said that he thought that motorcade images from prior to frame 188 (i.e., earlier in the motorcade, before the limousine disappeared behind the road sign) were the photographs that he produced which were not on the briefing board panels."

Finally, Horne's report of his interview notes that McMahon felt that the blown-up photos had been trimmed somewhat. This might fit in, as David Mantik noted, with our belief that the film itself had each frame trimmed down to remove data in the picture, and then the frames were blown up to their original measurements.

Doug Mizzer and I viewed the four large flat mats with 28 selected blow up frames from the Zapruder film glued on which were made by the National Photographic Interpretation Center in November or December, 1963. We found the photos of poor quality (probably due to the paper they were printed on, and that they were blown up from very small 8 mm frames) and of little interest. They almost looked like they were cut out of *Life* magazine's pictures made from the Zapruder film of the assassination. We did not see any frames prior to the appearance of the limousine and the motorcade seen on the film now. We had hoped we might see frames from the portion of the film we believe to have been excised (censored?).

We were shown the NPIC's handwritten charts on yellow legal pads, mentioned in the above interview with McMahan, and which Martha Murphy graciously copied for us, with the frame numbers listed. Dr. David Mantik has noted on my copy of the ARRB interview with Homer McMahan that the fact that the frames were numbered at that early point seemed contrary to the testimony of the FBI's Lyndal Shaneyfelt.

There was corroboration for McMahan's statement that a Secret Service man brought the films to the NPIC in Washington from Rochester and said that they were developed and copied there. Ben Hunter, McMahan's assistant who helped with the work on the Zapruder film, said that the SS agent told them "don't discuss this with anyone, and if people persist in knowing what you were doing, refer them to Captain Sands." Ben Hunter said that Sands was a high-ranking employee at NPIC. Sands may have been present during the manufacture of internegatives and prints from selected frames of the Zapruder film.<sup>7</sup>

Both men (Hunter and McMahan) were questioned at the Archives about the material on the briefing boards, which Doug Mizzer and I have also seen, and they stated that it was the material they copied the weekend of the assassination. But they only recall making about eight prints, and there are some 28 photos or so on the briefing boards. The conflict in their statements that some were missing and the fact that we now have 28 pictures seems very odd, as though information continues to be withheld. They "reiterated again that the prints on the briefing boards are the same work material/subject matter he and Homer printed that night at NPIC in November, 1963." Both men "emphatically" said that they had done this work prior to the President's funeral. "Mr. McMahan said he believes they performed their work the night of the same day the President was assassinated, and Bennett Hunter said he was of the opinion they did their work on the second night after the assassination."<sup>8</sup>

Another employee made the briefing boards, but they would not say who it was. "They both felt, following discussion, that some of the photogrammetry experts at NPIC in 1963 probably produced those notes regarding the 3 different shot-scenarios, film speed, seconds between shots, etc. Homer McMahan remembered again that the Secret Service agent stated definitively that the assassination movie was developed in Rochester, and that copies of it were made in Rochester also, and that he personally watched one of those copies projected at

least 10 times that night prior to making the internegatives of selected frames. Mr. Hunter agreed that it seemed very likely to him that the copies of the motion picture film would "probably have been made at Rochester."<sup>9</sup> The fact that there is no "R" (Rochester) on the edge printing and instead there is a "D" (Dallas) means nothing when films are forged.

Doug Horne, who conducted this interview, along with Jim Goslee, phoned Roland Zavada and dissuaded any idea that the film had been processed, developed, or copies made at Kodak in Rochester. First Horne brought up this discrepancy: the "affidavits executed by Zapruder with the Jamieson and Kodak film lab people cite Kodachrome II film as the medium used for copying the original assassination movie, not Kodachrome IIA; however the edge print on the 2 Secret Service copies at NARA reads "Kodachrome IIA" If ordinary Kodachrome II film had been used, the time involved in copying the films on the contact printer would have been vastly longer: one quarter of a second per frame versus one one-hundredth of a second. Zavada's answer was to the effect that it was a simple mistake to record the film type on the affidavits without the full designation.<sup>10</sup>

Does this sound familiar? All these folks are paid not to make mistakes.

### **The Numbers**

Zavada was then asked about the punched numbers and where did Kodak put them on a film: "the unique, punched numbers would routinely be punched into the tail end of side two of the double 8 mm movie film following developing. One reason for this is because the emulsion number (a 7 digit punched number) was always punched into the head end of side one at the factory."<sup>11</sup> The tail end of side two would be the end of the assassination or motorcade sequence of the Zapruder film, but that isn't where we have the number, which is at the end of the home movie. It also seems clear that the only punched through number we have for the three Jamieson copies was either at the beginning of the motorcade sequence, or somewhere else but certainly not where it should have been, lending fuel to the supposition that the film is not one of the Jamieson copies. That number is followed by a photographic splice.

Zavada wrote me about that splice, and some other matters: "The perforated number is at the end of the roll—therefore to thread a printer or to rewind for the subsequent printing, additionally physically spliced-on leader is necessary. When printing onto the Type A stock to

generate the three first generation copies, the *physical splice 'prints' and is appropriately located.*" I think this is inadequate to explain why there is a spliced on punched through number on Secret Service Copy No. 2 when in the same letter he writes that "Splice perforated numbers: you asked if the perforated processing identification numbers were ever spliced onto the customer rolls. The answer is **NO!** The purpose of the number is to ensure identification—splicing would allow for errors."<sup>12</sup> Doug Mizzer, as we shall see, finds it impossible for the copy to have enough film to copy both head and tail leaders, if they had been added before the original went to Jamieson to be copied, because the original film was never trimmed from its maximum length of 32-33 feet, and the film used to make the copies was the same length.

Doug Horne continues his end of this investigation, talking to Mr. Zavada: "I asked him where physical splices might normally appear in a normally processed film coming out of a Kodak lab. He said that there should normally be 3 splices: 'one between the white leader and the beginning of the film (so that the film could be threaded into the projector); one in the middle marrying side one and side two after slitting; and one at the tail end, if leader was added to the tail of the film.'"

"I asked him whether there was any reason to normally separate (cut) the punched number applied by the processing lab off of the tail end of side two of the film and splice it into another part of the film, and he said, 'no, not unless there was a lot of fogged area on the developed film between the end of the image and the punched number.'"<sup>13</sup>

Doug Mizzer and I had become convinced that the number "0183" which had been punched at what we were sure was the tail end of the "home movie" (at its end, the tail of Side A) was in the wrong place and should have been at the beginning. The next day the above letter arrived from Zavada confirming this: "Typical practice is described on page 18 of Study 1. The roll as received for processing has side A *heads* out and side B *tails* out. The three or so feet of integral leader is removed and the film processing perforation is placed on the *tails* of side B, which winds onto the core of the return reel. The Zapruder original and prints received special handling—similar to customer practice. But! The typical integral leader and trailer was not removed and perforated number is on the *tail* of side A (author's note: the home movie) indicating rewinding prior to process-

ing identification placement. (It was possibly, as it was placed on a core rather than using the camera spool, for processing machine feed.)"<sup>14</sup>

Those who have an aversion to smelling conspiracy at every turn must put aside their normal proclivities and add up the countless anomalies described in this article. There are simply too many things that are not according to the rules, or practice. To make it worse, the employee, Mrs. Kathryn Kirby, who handled the number punching of the film, is deceased, so we can't talk to her. "We don't know which perforator was used, an older one at the head-end of the processing machine, or a newer one in the pre-process make-up roll room. *We do know that both perforators perform the same function.*"<sup>15</sup> Zavada is speaking of the two different styles of perforators, one of which was recent and resulted from faster film processing machines which required a differently placed device.

The assassination sequence had to have been at the beginning after the two sides were split and spliced together and because the action ("time") is going from left to right. The home movie section follows and has to be going from left to right (we assume) and this is followed by "0183" which is in the identical position on SS No. 2 when both home movies are aligned. In other words, the home movie was *never* spliced on at the beginning, and they made a new "original" and stamped it "0183" at the end of the home movie, which, under this scenario, always at the end of the film, contrary to Kodak's usual practice, because they knew that the interesting part was not at the beginning.

Above all, we must not forget that one of the Dallas Kodak employees, Kenny Anderson, the production foreman, emphatically stated that a "federal official" present during the developing process may have asked them to turn off the edge printer (the cabinet light was also off). Why? That means that there should be no edge print at all on any part of the film, including the home movie, but we have it on the home movie. Why? Forrest Sorrels, the Secret Service man who was there, is deceased. The home movie we now have appended to the Zapruder film, which has far too much film length to have come from one roll of film, could have been shot at another time on another roll. My suspicion remains that we really may have had two rolls of film and there was a shell game between them that no one picked up. At the end of this article I'll propose a theory that will raise a few eyebrows.

On April 21, 1999, I had another talk with Roland Zavada, and he patiently answered more of my questions. He was unfailingly polite and patient, and said that after accepting the task of learning what he could about the films and preparing a report for the government, he had developed an interest in the assassination and the film, something that had not interested him previously.

I was always impressed with Roland Zavada's acute mental faculties and memory. He could instantly tell me what page of his report I'd find the answer to my question, and then pretty much recite the answer. It was all very carefully worked out. So, senility wasn't the problem.

He told me that Kodak had a uniform policy in its labs around the world with regard to processing of Double 8mm film. They returned fifty feet to the customer for each roll of film that was sold as a fifty foot (actually 25') roll. The "25'" roll actually had about 64'-66' of film when split, but the ends were cut off. The extra film was helpful in the processing of the film, and the labs spliced on their own leaders at both ends of the film which were marked with "Processed by Kodak." (Does the customer lose some of what he or she shot?)

Then he told me something rather shocking. He said that every lab in the world followed the same exact policy in several regards, but on that one day, November 22, 1963, when President Kennedy was assassinated, the policy was overlooked. One lab in the world, the one in Dallas that Zapruder went to, did not cut off the ends of either the original or the Jamieson copies of the film that day. Normally, the Kodak labs cut off fourteen to sixteen feet of film before returning it with about 50' of frames.

But how can it be longer than the maximum of 64 feet? We measured about 77-78 feet. The take up reels will only hold about 54 feet, and so the projectionist would end up with a lot of film on the floor. The 50' reels allowed about a quarter of an inch for extra film so that it would not overflow. Richard Blair is the person who removed the roll of film from Zapruder's camera, since Zapruder had not touched it, we are told.

Since the new Kodachrome IIA Double-eight mm film sent over by Kodak to Jamieson to use for copies was identical in length to the new roll of Kodachrome II film Zapruder used, both 25', or when split and with the excess film cut off, 50', with 14-16 maximum additional which in this case was not cut off by Kodak, how could

they copy the "Processed by Kodak" leaders? How can this now appear on these copies? It means that much exposed film was removed from the movie.

Zavada traveled to Dallas from his home in Rochester and "challenged" two of the men from the Kodak lab; Dick Blair and Phillip Chamberlain commiserated upon this, and they could not explain it.

Zavada also obtained an identical camera and shot several test rolls in Dealey Plaza, something I wanted to do. I managed to buy similar film and located Brian Edwards with an identical camera and he shot film in Dealey Plaza, spoken of below.

### **The Wrong Splice**

Zavada expressed surprise that there was a photographic splice following the punched through "0186" in the middle of Secret Service Copy No. 2. When asked how he could explain this, he said they did not examine the film for "content" and he could not explain what it meant. I asked him if he understood that it meant that it was a copy of a copy, and he, said yes, he understood it. But I could get no more out of him at that time. The splice was marked as photographic on Doug Horne's film map which seems to have been included with the Kodak/Zavada report of some 400 pages. If he was so precise in other respects, how could so much go by him, like "mistaking" a 16 mm film for a double 8 mm film which would have two adjoining film strips? Again, Zavada told me the splices were "content," and of no interest to him in his study!

Zavada corrected what all of us have been calling "fade out" or "bleed out" or "bleed in". He said that what we see at the end of the "woman in blue" (he calls her the "woman in black") sequence at the end of the home movie is "loading fog." "Loading fog" is caused by outside light when the film is being loaded into the camera and about 18 inches of film are pulled off the spool to thread into the camera and onto the sprocket. That part of the film is already exposed, so when the home movie film comes to an end, we see a fade or bleed out of the scene from frame to frame as the open aperture captures pictures on film that is already exposed.

The Bell & Howell was designed for "jump starts" which means that when it was turned on, it took pictures just as a still camera does, so there is no fade in when the action begins. Zavada told me that Kodak would have cut this off, anyway. But we have it at the end of the home movie. What we have, however, are a few over exposed frames each time the camera starts.



Another shocking piece of news was the fact that Kodak Dallas did not have a good explanation for the film with "0184" on it. They not only did not develop another film while the Jamieson prints were being made, when they had finished with the original Zapruder film which was stamped with "0183", but the only explanation was that they simply tested the automatic number punch that placed the numerals at the end of a film. The test eliminated the next number (0184) in sequence. Neat, eh? But this was Dallas, and we already just learned that this was the only time in the history of hundreds of Kodak labs when normal procedure wasn't followed. After all, it was the assassination of a president on that film.

I might speculate, since I'm a writer and can do these things, that perhaps there was in fact another copy of the Zapruder film but this was erased from everyone's memory.

There is apparently no good guess or evidence as to what the number was for Secret Service Copy No. 1, which has no number punched through. This, to me, is highly suspicious when one is trying to determine if it is a Jamieson copy. Until now, the presence of a punched through number on copy No. 2 was the main reason to claim that it was an original made by Jamieson. Archives staff poking a pencil point through the tiny holes distracted attention from (and covered) the photographic splice close to it, which showed that it was not a Jamieson first generation copy, but a copy of a copy.

FBI 65 JFK 24 is identical to SS No. 2 when it was still in one piece, with an optical image of "0186" on it. This has the full motorcycle sequence of 132 frames.

Doug Mizzer also noticed that in almost all cases, the "Processed by Kodak" appearing on the leaders is in red, but before the assassination sequences, it is in blue. We called Roland Zavada about this, and speaking for Kodak unofficially, he said that it was highly unusual and did not know of it as a regular occurrence, but elsewhere he writes that the inscription might be in red or blue.

#### **Original Zapruder Film, Item 200 ZAP 1:**

The memo prepared by the N.A. for the film after the inspection of the original Zapruder film had this to say: "Beginning head leader is yellow; has 'ORC' scratched in it; followed with splice and white leader with letters 'ORIG' written in blue ink and smeared over; film shrinkage measured as 0.5%; six frames missing at actual splice; both base and emulsion scratches evident throughout, but the observed scratches are minor, do

not impair the image and are consistent with the handling history of the film (i.e. printing and previous projection); images are visible in intersprocket area; overall color quality very good, the emulsion exhibits no evidence of deterioration or adhesion/cohesion failure; the film is generally in very good condition considering its age and known deficiencies (broken sprocket hole, splice etc.)."<sup>16</sup>

This has got to be the most inadequate comment on what some call the most important film in history.

#### **MPI's Zapruder Video**

In 1998, MPI, a video marketing company, issued a tape which showed the original Zapruder film along with its intersprocket area pictures. I find it most unfortunate that this version of the film was altered. That is, the film is Rotoscoped (optically enhanced), stabilized so that the camera does not respond, as Zapruder did, to the gunshots in what the HSCA called a "startle" reaction of which he had about six, according to the HSCA's "blur analysis."<sup>17</sup> At the very least, MPI, which worked in secret with the owners and the National Archives just before the government officially "took" the film from them, could have also run the original film just as it is, without stabilizing it, so that we could compare the two in some fashion.

This version of the film is digitized, which leads us to wonder how come Kodak was not allowed to do so after the film was "taken" by the government. The participation of the Archives promoted the marketing of the film just before the "taking" by the government, and is disturbing. Apparently, the Zapruder interests were able to continue to maintain control and prevent a second digitization of the film, which is reprehensible and serves to feed the suspicion of numerous critics about the constant appearance of "coincidence" and "conspiracy" of sinister intent at every step of the way.

It was long claimed that one of the lead motorcycle policemen on the right side of the street left the motorcycle on Elm Street as it rounded the corner from Houston and either stayed on Houston or turned down Elm Street extension. This is the way it looked during the first frames of the Zapruder film, because he simply disappears from view. Many insisted that he can be seen passing beneath the triple overpass, and now we can see him in fact coming down Elm Street on the extreme right side near the curb (on the viewer's left) when we view the new versions of the Zapruder film put out by MPI in 1998. That is because the motorcycle is visible in the

intersprocket area only, starting at frame 120 to 132, when the segment abruptly ends and the limousine comes into view, thus eliminating perhaps hundreds of frames and several moments in real time since a major part of the motorcade is missing.

The MPI version also shows Mary Moorman standing a few feet back from the curb on the grass, next to Jean Hill, as she pans her Polaroid camera and takes a picture at the moment Kennedy is struck in the head. Some will insist that the film is altered in this respect, but I find it unreasonable. They think so because the mathematics of her snapshot line up with a point behind JFK which indicate to them that she was standing in the street near the curb at that moment, and the camera angle is lower.

We have seen much confusion over so much connected with the film, such as the ghost images and the "condor," as I call it, visible in the upper intersprocket area of most of the frames. Many of the problems are probably technical and not sinister, but they detract greatly from what is sinister in the film, such as the "blob" we see on Kennedy's face after he is shot in the head.

Kennedy's face is terribly mottled, bumpy, and swollen before he is shot in the head, and this indicates to me that the frames are not real. The faces appear to be paintings, in places, as I pointed out several books back, and certainly when Jackie is on the trunk before the car disappears beneath the bridge, her face appears painted, as it did when there was the "frozen tableau" for long seconds before the head shot.

Further technical problems will be discussed in the following. Charles W. Mayn, an engineer with the Special Media Preservation Branch of the National Archives has graciously assisted us in 1999 in our examination of the alleged Jamieson copies or Secret Service copies of the Zapruder film. On 21 December, 1995, Mayn wrote a "technical review" of the film which was held in their courtesy storage holdings, in which he wrote that the original has two different segments of identification leader spliced to its head with identification information handwritten on the leader. "The edge of the examined film element has image in the area surrounding the sprocket holes and extending across the entire width of the film. This is typical of film which has been exposed in an 8mm motion picture camera. . . In most regular 8mm cameras the taking aperture is sized such that image is captured across the entire width of the film including the area between and outside the sprocket holes.

Conversely, 'printers' in which subsequent generation copies would have been made typically have apertures sized such that the sprocket hole area is rendered opaque or heavily fogged with no recognizable image."

The last statement is not at all what we see on the rest of Zapruder's film known as the "home movie," which was shot on the same roll. The intersprocket area is almost filled—and in some instances—appears to be completely filled with image. In addition, Bruce Jamieson, whose lab copied the film, told us repeatedly that both his Bell & Howell printer and his custom made printer would have copied clear images from the original in the intersprocket area. That is what we see on the Home Movie, except that they are not complete in some stretches of frames. That is, they do not appear to extend all the way to the left edge or the edge printing. But most of the area is filled with *clear* image. There is no "fogging" or opacity.

Mayn found nothing (he was not looking at the content of the film) to indicate forgery: "Close examination of the film element does not indicate any apparent 'printed' artifacts from previous generations of film such as film identifying numbers, images of splices, images of damage to a previous generation film element, etc." Mayn defines the original out of camera film as "first generation," and any copies made directly from it as "second generation." He ends his memo with a statement that the examined film (represented to be the original) is "most probably the first generation, out-of-camera, original Zapruder film of the Assassination of JFK." "Probably."

Researchers wanting a bit more information might want to see Mayn's additional memo for the file, also dated 21 December, 1995, which is headed "Technical Review of the 'Zapruder' film elements from RG 200, NARA Gift Collection" in which he and members of the ARRB staff examined two copies made by Time-Life, Inc. Mayn writes that these are at best "Second generation," made from the original which *Life* had, or some generation farther down the line. He found that "Both of the elements examined were opaque or heavily fogged in the area of the film surrounding the sprocket holes. This is an indication that these elements were produced in a motion picture 'printer' rather than in a motion picture camera." The area in the sprocket holes was "heavily fogged since the area is not normally projected when the 'print' is projected on a screen." So we know these are not the Secret Service films which have no fogging

at least on the home movie. Mayn must only be referring to the assassination sequence, which is in fact opaque on the Secret Service or Dallas copies (we are discussing copies made by *Life*), contrary to the indications which Jamieson himself insisted upon: That the copies he made would have complete images in the intersprocket areas.

Somehow, the National Archives then conflated the Jamieson/Secret Service copies (and one more which he made which went to *Life*) with copies represented to have been made by *Life* later. The key thing in the above is the assumption by the engineer and his staff at the National Archives that "'printers' in which subsequent generation copies would have been made typically have apertures sized such that the sprocket hole area is rendered opaque or heavily fogged with no recognizable image." Again, we have clear images in all of the home movies that survived. There is no "fogging," except perhaps in some frames on the extreme left.

For the record, both copies of what are alleged to be those made in Dallas from the camera-original the day of the assassination have the missing frames and do not have splices where those famous frames were lost on the original—where the film was known to have been broken while in the possession of *Life*, so they are authentic copies of the "original" (even if a forgery) in that regard, but not proven to have been made in Dallas November 22, 1963.

It is my opinion that those "breaks" in the film were precisely at places where the first shots were fired and struck the President. There might have been evidence of shots or puffs of smoke from among bystanders, or evidence of shots striking. It is certain in my mind that Kennedy was hit just after the car turned the corner and perhaps stopped (where many frames have evidently been removed) before the car went behind the highway sign.

Doug Horne prepared a chart of the "Zapruder Film Copies at National Archives" dated 31 March, 1997. He writes, "Correct orientation of home movie is not known." I find it terribly upsetting, when so much technical information rides on that film that after all of these decades, no one has projected it to tell us which way the scenes and the people in them are going. I have assumed that the "Lady in Blue" is at the end because it seems irrational to me that Kodak, or someone else, would have spliced the home movie to the end of the assassination sequence going the wrong way. She has

to be at the end for another reason as well, explained below. We might be able to tell by the direction the edge printing reads at both ends of the entire film that they begin with the boy behind the tree outside, and end with the "Lady In Blue," and we might not know for sure, except that the sprocket holes give us our answer. With emulsion side up throughout both halves of the film, the holes have to stay on the same side, so the "Lady in Blue" is in fact at the end.

This is entirely opposite of what Horne seems to conclude on the above chart, since he writes the following: "To read printed number 0183 and edge print info 'Processed by Kodak Nov 63 (Blue Lettering)' on home movie correctly, images must be viewed with base (shiny side) up. (Author's note: the film is dull, or emulsion side up to view it correctly with the action going from left to right in the motorcade sequence. That must be true for the home movie as well). On the assassination sequence, when the frames are viewed correctly, the edge print information (Kodachrome IIA—'date code' of dot, triangle—Safety Film) is read backwards."

Horne read the *direction* of the home movie incorrectly (backwards) in his chart when he listed the sequences in this order: "kid playing, baby in green grass, kid behind tree, and lady in blue on telephone." The boy behind the tree is first, followed by the baby on the grass, the boy with a shovel in the distance, and finally the woman in blue inside. He did not chart where each scene was, as I later did myself, and I may still not have it perfect. Did you ever stare at 8mm films with a magnifying glass for hours on end? We all make mistakes. But this is too important for our bunch of amateurs stumbling through the swamp.

There is trouble in knowing which end of the home movie is the actual start because there is so little movement and the films cannot be projected to see if they are going backwards. I feel that everyone has misread them because the Archives marked the end of one of the reels the "head" when it is the tail. That is the end which follows the "0183" print-through perforated number, which one might normally assume was the start of the film, but in order for that to be true, the film would have to be turned around and spliced head to tail with the assassination sequence and I cannot imagine anyone doing that (?).

Secondly, we don't know if Kodak Dallas spliced the home movie to the end of the assassination sequence in Dallas, contrary to procedure at Kodak. Certainly they

would not have spliced it on backwards. If so, they or someone did the same for the Jamieson copies.

Undoubtedly due to the agitation developing among researchers insisting that the purportedly original film is a fake, the Department of Justice sent some of its people to take a look at the film at the National Archives. No conclusion was reached in a note for the file by Les Waffan, head of the NNSM at the Archives, in his two page report on this dated 30 October, 1996. He makes the same mistake Horne made on his film map. Even Les Waffan got SS No 2 going backwards when he wrote "Copy 2 is heavily spliced with film in segments, with family footage, then partial motorcade footage, leader, more family footage, then continuation of motorcade footage. In family footage segments, on edge is printed 'processed by Kodak Nov 1963'; printer notches evident; overall color tones sharp, natural, better resolution and overall quality than Copy 1."<sup>18</sup> Both Secret Service copies were cut in half by the Secret Service, we assume, and the limousine or assassination sequence was put at the front of both, rather than the home movie. More extensive rearranging was done with No. 2, as the Dealey Plaza bystander sequence and all but two of the motorcycle frames were placed later on the reel, so that the reel starts out with the last two motorcycle frames (131-132) followed by the assassination or limousine sequence. This is followed by the first Dealey Plaza scene of the bystanders (Zapruder's friends, the Hesters, and his secretary, Marilyn Sitzman) and then the motorcycle sequence and the home movie.

This same paper makes clear the distinction between "Time-Life copy 1 and copy 2 of Z film" that these are later generation and have no images in intersprocket areas. "Both copy 1 and copy 2 identical in length to original Z film, both have six frames missing with print-through of splice from original Z evidence."

Secret Service Copy No. 2 is actually longer than Copy No. 1 because it has 90 frames (13 1/2") at the start of the home movie more than No. 1. Copy No. 2 of the home movie of exposed frames is, therefore 33'8 1/4" long, not counting leaders at the end. This is too long.

Somehow we are all being led around by the ring through our noses. Horne thinks that Jamieson No. 3 is with Zapruder. Consider his footnotes on his 11 April, 1997 missive on his examination of films at Silverberg's office. Now he thinks he has it, and two days before he wrote a memo saying that "the third was noted to be 'unlocated' in my April 9, 1997 memo titled 'Examina-

tion of Zapruder Film Original and Selected Copies at the National Archives.' That mystery is now solved." He ignores documentation that the National Archives has it.

Horne does not list the item number so that we know for sure whereof he speaks. He writes "Item No. 2 is a first-generation copy of the Zapruder film, in incomplete and badly damaged condition (Footnote here quoted above ending with "That mystery is now solved"). Its identification as a 'first-day' first generation copy is a certainty: the emulsion (or 'dull') side is 'up' when the frames are . . ." This is no proof of anything, and he is authenticating something backwards. He first tells us that there is a label on the can which reads "first generation dupe made from the original and turned over to Time Inc by Zapruder. Frames were cut out of this 8mm roll to replace damaged frames in making the work print. The first half of the assassination sequence, prior to the Stemmons Freeway sign, is missing; the remainder of the assassination sequence (side 'B') is badly damaged—numerous tears, slices, actual breaks in the film, and ripped sprocket holes were observed, and had been repaired previously using ordinary scotch tape. . . ." and then tells us on p. 2 that "although I did not observe either of the remaining (unused) unique, perforated numbers—'0185' or '0187'—on this film in the processed film and carrier strip, there is no doubt in my mind that this is a bonafide first-generation, 'first-day' copy." He failed to completely unroll the film, but believes it to be authentic because he also noted the Dallas edge printing "**D NOV 63**" on the Home Movie.

The accession report of the N.A. dated 12 May, 1975, and then note the N.A.'s inventory dated 13 December, 1996, p. 5. Note again on the Inventory (p. 5) that these are "duplicate copies made for the Secret Service by Time-Life, Inc. 59 feet. Copy 1 has a written note in the can on blue paper stating 'original Secret Service copy of Zapruder film.'"

The Kodak lab in Dallas could only develop Zapruder's film, but not copy it. The Jamieson lab could, so Zapruder and his film were sent there. Doug Horne interviewed Frank Sloan, the manager of Jamieson Lab in Dallas, and was told that Robert Colley was the man who actually operated the printer, which he believed was Bell & Howell's standard printer which Jamieson possessed (the Model J.) and not the custom model Jamieson built.<sup>19</sup> He said that a contact printing process was used and he thought that any images in the intersprocket area of the

original film would have been copied onto unexposed film (we do not have images in that area on the assassination or side B of the film, but we have them on the home movie side). He "suggested that one way to check whether the films in the Archives represented to be first-generation copies really are first-generation, would be as follows: since the Jamieson film Co. ran off contact prints, he said a first-generation contact print should be read "correctly" (i.e., not backwards) on the *base side* (i.e., the shiny side), not the emulsion side (i.e., the dull side)." This is the *opposite* of what we've been told.

*According to this, we don't have and can't have first generation copies, because the only way to read the films in the National Archives correctly is emulsion side up.*

Sloan recalled that Robert Colley operated the printer at Jamieson. He had no memory at all of signing the affidavit with his name on it the day of the assassination. I have always wondered if these affidavits were prepared after the fact, and if they were forgeries of some kind. Zavada says that Colley told him that Marshall Collier operated the printer, and that it was the Bell & Howell Model J, which corroborates Sloan on both scores. Interestingly, his "current status and whereabouts—unknown"<sup>20</sup> Collier was just north of Enid, Oklahoma. Also, the affidavits have the type of film used entirely wrong—a crucial error.

Sloan "did not believe that Jamieson's custom-built, one-of-a-kind 16 mm contact printer with 3 heads was used to copy the Zapruder film. Instead, he seemed fairly certain that a Bell and Howell commercially produced, pedestal-mounted 16 mm contact printer was used to make the 3 prints of the Zapruder film; he confirmed that the original film came into direct contact with the raw film stock, inside an aperture in the 16 mm printer, and that light from the illumination source shone directly onto the raw film stock immediately after passing through the original film." He was reasonably sure that the intersprocket area images would have been copied onto the new copy from the original. He thought the commercial B & H printer could either copy the intersprocket images or not copy them depending on what was wanted.

Zavada's report to the ARRB tells us that the identifying number "0183" was perforated on the original film before it was processed.<sup>21</sup> He indicates the same thing for the three Jamieson copies when they came back to Kodak: the numbers were perforated before the films were processed.<sup>22</sup> If true, all the numbers were put on

original film stock before any leaders were spliced on. The "0186" is close to the end of the images on the home movie.

But Zavada accidentally misled Robert Colley: "Further, the initial belief that the prints were printed 'full aperture', picture plus sound, also proved incorrect based on the examination of the images of the resulting prints." This is an assumption based on what copies we have now, assuming they are the first generation copies. It is clear they are not. Why not let Colley examine them in the Archives?

Jamieson recalled that Zapruder was accompanied by Secret Service or FBI agents when he came to the lab.<sup>23</sup> Both he and Sloan said that Zapruder went into the dark room to insure that no extra copies were made. Jamieson said that no test prints or extra prints were made. He said that the Kodachrome IIA film that Kodak sent over to him with Zapruder posed real problems for them because it was "faster" than normal print film, and also presented color balance problems. Again, the affidavits are for a different type of film, maybe just a mistake that hectic day, but one might think they were planted in the evidence just as easily. We already have other examples that look all too familiar. The Carl Belcher (of the Department of Justice) papers with regard to the autopsy photos are another example.

Jamieson told the ARRB's Horne, though, that he used his custom-made 16mm printer, not the standard Bell & Howell Model J. His custom model, which he built, used a contact printing process—not an optical printer. "That is, instead of the film image being copied after optically passing through a lens—as in an optical printer—during a contact printing process, such as Jamieson Film Company employed on its 16mm contact print machine, the emulsion on the original film product actually comes into contact with the blank film stock, a light is projected through the original film, and the contact print is thus exposed." He said this printer was literally a custom-made product, "equipment we made ourselves." He said it was much more sophisticated than what was required for the Zapruder job, because it was made for commercial applications." Jamieson lab was in the process of becoming an equipment manufacturer as the years went by, so Jamieson knew what he was doing.

"I explained to Mr. Jamieson that the original Zapruder film contains images between the sprocket holes, and asked him whether the prints made on his company's contact printer would have had transferred to them the

image content between the sprocket holes on the original film. He paused a considerably amount of time before carefully answering, as follows: 'yes, I believe so. . . it is very likely.' He then said that if the images between the sprocket holes were transferred, that it would *not* have been through the picture aperture in the printer, but instead through the edge printer aperture. When I informed Mr. Jamieson that the Zapruder film first generation copies in the National Archives did not have image content between the sprocket holes, he then expressed some doubt about this earlier conclusion and said that the Jamieson film lab printing machine may, after all, not have transferred this portion from the original, depending on how it was set up."<sup>24</sup>

But the home movie portion of the film *does* have the sprocket hole images, so Horne's forgetfulness misled the witness. True, we don't have them in the assassination sequence, but that might have been a product of another technical problem entirely. Like a house of cards, the record of how the copies were made began to collapse because Horne did not mention that there were sprocket hole images carried over from the main frame in the home movie, that pretty much the entire scene Zapruder's lens captured was copied on the home movie. Why not on the assassination sequence?

In other words, it is possible that Jamieson's printing process should and did transfer the full images—if they were on the original as we now see them—meaning his copies are *gone*. That is, if the original assassination sequence is not a fabrication—blown up and reframed from the original.

Daryll Weatherly noticed a curious anomaly on February 24, 1998 when we were in the film labs and he commented that a "partial copy" of the film (listed by the N.A. as 65 JFK 08, which was a succeeding generation from SS No. 2 (0186 was printed on it) and which had the emulsion side down), that the home movie, which had no intersprocket areas, was a second or third generation. "It is curious that it had *edge prints*, possibly multiple, but no intersprocket images (Weatherly)." I don't recall if they were manufacturer's codes, processing lab printing, or both.

### Ghosts

One of the troubling aspects in the film was something I noticed many years ago on the slides made from the frames of the motorcade sequence by *Life*: ghost images in the intersprocket areas on the left side of the frame. This seemed to occur twice during the motor-

cade. The first time, an image of a motorcycle's right front fender and wheel appears for a number of frames in the upper right half of the intersprocket area above the image of the limousine as though it is flying. This motorcycle does not appear in the main frame's picture itself but certainly was the motorcycle closest behind the right rear fender of the limousine. Apparently it is a refracted or reflected image from the claw mechanism of the camera, or from some other part, and seems to belong to an adjoining frame. One can see this image in Vol. 18 of the Warren Report and Hearings in many of the frames reproduced there.

Dr. David Mantik comments that Zavada claims that the ghost image is exposed at the same time as the *preceding* central image (see the aperture plate). "I don't think his explanation works for all these ghost images, though."

Evidently, no one ever commented on the second ghost image in the motorcade sequence which appears toward the end, after the fatal head shot, as the car comes close to the tunnel beneath the triple overpass. I see another ghost image of the stockade fence in the upper right portion of the intersprocket area, which goes black or opaque. This is the place where I am certain a shooter fired from the storm drain at the juncture of that fence with the cement balustrade of the bridge (where in the films we see many people run and are stopped by those obstacles after the shooting). It is disturbing to me that throughout the motorcade sequence we have more or less perfect (except for the ghost images described above) images in the intersprocket areas continuous with the central frame image we see projected on the screen, and these disappear completely when the camera is aimed at the corner on the west end of Dealey Plaza where there had to have been the shooter on the "Grassy Knoll." I cannot believe that there ever was a shooter in the position of "badge man" or anywhere near Zapruder's pedestal just behind him and the wooden fence. The shooter was another 100-150 feet to the West, but still behind the fence on the Knoll.

Again, without the third copy and without the camera original home movie, we cannot determine very much, and in this the ARRB failed miserably, thanks to the rigidity of the Zapruder family who feel the pressure holding on to their cash cow reputed to be the "hoax of the century." The original home movie was very essential to decoding the forgery. Where is it?

What we ended up with from the ARRB, and the Na-

tional Archives on the Zapruder film and its copies is the military's "limited hang-out," as Victor Marchetti once told us the House Select Committee on Assassinations would do twenty years before when they found that there had been a conspiracy in the assassination because they had evidence of the shooter on the Grassy Knoll. On balance the HSCA investigation had to have been one of the most dishonest in history in terms of their final report, considering what they had really learned from the autopsy doctors.

That was something they dare not listen to.

### The Camera

On December 4, 1963, The FBI interviewed Zapruder and he told them that after he had shot the first 25 feet of film, (author's note: this is known as the "home movie") which appears to be in his backyard, ending inside a house or a building with a shot of a woman, he reversed the film and "shot a few feet on November 22, 1963, at the park area of some girls who work in his office, prior to the arrival of the Presidential motorcade. He stated his camera was fully wound, was set, manually, on maximum zoom-lens. The camera was set to take normal speed movie film or 24 frames per second. The control buttons for the zoom-lens were not touched once he started taking photographs of the Presidential motorcade.

"Zapruder stated that he first picked up the motorcade as it made the turn on to Elm Street from Houston Street. The motorcade then passed behind a street directional sign and from that point on until it disappeared from sight to him right, or the west, he was taking moving pictures of the President's car. He stated that he had started taking pictures prior to the first shot being fired and continued taking pictures until the motorcade disappeared to his right. . . He stated he took the exposed film immediately to the Jamieson Film Company on Bryan Street." Jamieson is not Kodak, and first he went to the *Dallas Morning News*, then to WFAA-TV.

The FBI agent, Robert Barrett, failed to clarify a few key points. Was the camera turned on or off during the motorcade (we have a major break in the action between frames 132 and 133)? And, the camera only shot some 18 frames per second at normal speed and he has it at 24 frames. Bell & Howell rated the shutter speed at 18.3 fps. We cannot gauge the speed of the car and the time lapse between visible shots without knowing how fast the camera was going. If the camera was moving at 24 frames per second, there was 30% less time for the shooting and the car to move from point to point, than

at 18 frames per second. One shooter could not fire three shots fast enough for the rifle, if the camera was running at 24 frames per second. Some so-called "time clock of the assassination!"

Bell & Howell's own instruction sheet for their "Director Series" 8 mm Model 414-414P camera states that the normal camera speed when running was 16 frames per second, but later agreed with the FBI tests (after conducting their own) that the camera ran at 18.5 frames per second. This meant that the shutter speed was 1/35th of a second. The slow motion speed was 48 frames per second, or 1/100 of a second for shutter speed. Differing speeds were obtained by pressure downwards on the starting button which had four positions, including the top position was for single frame exposure. How the figure of 24 frames per second got into the equation is beyond my knowledge. The speed otherwise was not variable.

Bell & Howell had obtained the camera back from Zapruder and in 1966 donated it to the National Archives. Now that we have so many questions about this film, the camera is crucial for some of the questions. Why has it been put out of reach in Dallas when it belongs in the National Archives for us to study?

Malcolm Townsley, a former Bell & Howell engineer, worked with Roland Zavada on his quest to learn more about their 1962-3 camera, and the Model J. printer used by Jamieson, if that is what he in fact used. Townsley, in his letter of 20 of April, 1998, endeavored to answer some of the questions. First he says that "there is nothing out of the expected range in all of the displays which you have shown me. Every artifact which you have shown me is consistent with the structure of the camera and its lens." So how come he ignores the absence of over-exposure in Z 133?! He addressed the over-exposed frame which we see at the start of each scene on the film: "It is due to inertia in the camera mechanism. It is a phenomenon with which every camera designer is familiar and expends a considerable design effort to minimize.

"The 'ghosts' are surely caused by incidental internal reflections in the interior of the gate area, and, as you pointed out, double exposure in the area outside the frame which provides room for the travel of the shuttle tooth. If one were to remove the gate arm so as to have access to the aperture area, and examine the space with a periscope magnifier, one might even be able to see the actual reflecting surfaces which caused the inciden-

tal exposure."<sup>25</sup>

For some reason, Zavada suggested to Townsley that the camera was shifted into slow motion speed at the time of the first shot. What gave Zavada a reason to think that? The slow speed of the car? "It seemed to me that shifting into slow motion required a significant extra push on the starting button."

"There is one 'fact' which you have cited in your analysis which I think bears checking. You report that the exposed field is smaller for the wide angle lens setting. In fact, the frames which I saw which seemed to show this effect, do not, in my opinion show this at all." In his letter of 25 August, 1998, Townsley says that Zavada had listed two significant characteristics of the Secret Service prints: septum line and different densities (note: one film is lighter than the other). It seems to me that the fact that the area between perforations is not printed in the 'assassination' half of the film is important, because this area in the original contains information which may be of interest. The septum line occurs only in the other 'strand' of the film, the first exposed half, with the family scenes. When we come to the discussion of the printer aperture and the septum line, my conclusion is quite different from your text.

"My conclusion would be that the printer was threaded with the edge of the film corresponding to the second 'assassination' half placed on the sprocket flange, so that the sprocket flange itself limits the printed area. This edge is sharply defined in the Secret Service prints, as it would be with the base side of the original in contact with the sprocket, and is in line with the end of the perforation radius, which is about where I think I remember the film was guided to pass over the sprocket.

"The other half of the film, with the first exposures of the family scenes, is printed, with a 'septum' just at the inner edge of the perforations. You cite records of 16mm Model J printers with a wire in this position. I therefore conclude that the two Secret Service prints were made with the 'second' edge on the sprocket flange, and the sound and picture aperture, probably with a wire septum.

"It is your understanding that a third copy, the second of three prints, is in the possession of Time-Life (Authors note: this is in error and the feeling is that the film is in the possession of Zapruder's son, though I found evidence that it might be at the National Archives). The fact that the two Secret Service prints are similar, with the area between perforations masked, would indicate that

the original was rewound after each printing pass, or that it was not rewound at all. If the original was not rewound, then the Time-Life print will show the area beyond the normal frame, with the septum line. Unfortunately, I am afraid that normal procedure, and quite a firm habit, would have been to rewind the original."

As for the edge printing on the film strip, Townsley writes that "I find it far fetched to believe that Jamieson would have threaded up an edge printing attachment to make this print, even if there was one on the printer, and I would need to see some specifics on an edge printing attachment to believe that it would expose the entire area of the edge and the perforations. Edge printing with the normal light pipe exposure unit would have exposed only the area beyond the sprocket flange." To which side?

Then Townsley deals with the issue of the ghosts of the motorcycle policeman seen in the upper right hand corner of the intersprocket image seen to the left of the central frame in each of numerous frames of the motorcade assassination sequence. He says, "I have made a further review of my thinking on the double exposure, and concur that there is a double exposure in the limousine scene of the Zapruder original. The small, arc-shaped areas just above the perforation, as the film is examined with the image in the inverted position as it would be in the camera, may be from the portion of the lens image to the near side of the rear of the limousine." Townsley failed to notice that the "arc-shaped" image is the front fender of a motorcycle that is completely out of place in the whole picture, floating *above* the limousine, but clearly is a complete image of the front of a motorcycle captured on film by light (the image) reflected off some surface in the mechanism.

The duplicating printer used by Jamieson and nearly everyone else was primarily designed for 16mm film, but it could print Double 8mm (16mm) film such as Zapruder used, before it was slit in half. The printer also would copy the soundtrack and edge prints from the 16mm film, but 8mm film did not have a soundtrack. Apparently the soundtrack was only on one side of the film, so the printer was designed with special mechanisms on one side to copy that. The argument is made that the reason why the copies of the Zapruder film not have processing lab identification and intersprocket area images on the motorcade side of the film is that it was on the wrong side of the printer's sprocket. But this does not seem to answer all the questions because of the sep-



tum line that showed up on the "home movie."

The septum line was suspicious because some might think it was a joiner where the forged film was melded to the old edge printing, and also because it seemed too unique to be a legitimate copy.

Roland Zavada attempted to duplicate the septum line we see on some test prints from 8mm film, and was unable to do so. "How did the family pictures side of the double 8mm—16mm wide—unslit original, the camera captured between-perforation image information become partially printed?"<sup>26</sup> He then comments "It is highly unlikely that anyone, at that time, would be aware that the image extension into the perforation area would be of importance." This comes after a discussion of the soundtrack area of the film and the fact that it was not needed in the silent movie Zapruder apparently shot<sup>27</sup> (if this is a fact, it is not yet proven to me, though I don't assume that the film had sound and don't see anything in the camera manual that indicates it recorded sound on the film).

Zavada draws the conclusion that "in the thread-up original, the motorcade images were located on the soundtrack side of the 16mm printer aperture and the 'picture-only' setting was selected." He bases this on several assumptions, including "that is what Jamieson believes; the fact that Jamieson recognized that there is no soundtrack area on a double-8mm original—would not logically consider printing (exposing) the sound track area; Further, a printer operator might have been concerned that 8mm perforation holes would be positioned over the soundtrack area of the printer aperture without a mechanism for protecting the picture area. If the soundtrack area were illuminated, the perforation holes would have permitted unobstructed light to reach the print film with some risk of fog into the adjacent area of the print."<sup>28</sup> Yet, this is what I think we see through much or all of the home movie when there is an apparent white rectangle, a little smaller, but in the shape of a sprocket hole, attendant to the actual sprocket hole in the film in the Secret Service copies. This fact may entirely negate the conclusions drawn above. Mizzer feels that the image of a sprocket hole is strictly a product of the camera.

"The remaining question is how did the family pictures side of the double 8mm—16mm wide—unslit original, the camera captured between-perforation image information become partially printed? The edge print image quality was a good match for intensity and color

balance to the picture image. Our belief is that this was accomplished by an edge print or footage printer light (adjacent to, but outboard the printer sprocket or by a separate footage/edge mark printer with an independent light source). In either case the light source and printing configuration left a thin black (no exposure) septum line."<sup>29</sup>

There were, of course, technical difficulties in attempting to use old equipment, and they were unable to locate Jamieson's printer.

Zavada ends his report on the Septum Line Study with the comment that the Kodachrome II A film sent over from the Dallas lab to Jamieson to make copies of the Zapruder film "was not designed as a camera film for commercial reproduction, but rather had proper visual contrast for direct viewing. When a camera film is reproduced onto a camera film, significant contrast builds up with an attendant loss of tonal range, often with significant shifts in color reproduction (i.e. the films have been 'asked' to do a job they were not designed to do.) The 1963 film process combination had a greater opportunity to yield good quality than our practical test. The Secret Service copies attest to this fact. . . We were very impressed at the tremendously effective retention of resolution through three generations of contact printing. . . We doubt, therefore, that the Secret Service copies are first and third generation, but rather both are first generation with significant density differences (as noted above)."<sup>30</sup> Here, his use of the term "first generation" means copies made from the camera original. Very inconsistent, all this! It doesn't explain this last muddled sentence about doubting they are "first and third generation," however.

I wonder if it was possible to sandwich two blank films together while copying from the original? This might explain the great density difference in the two Secret Service films, if it was technically feasible to make two copies at once. I'm sure the first response by someone in the film industry hearing this would be to dismiss the idea. Perhaps because the printer might not be able to accommodate two films together like that, along with the original. But the contact printer certainly accommodated two films in contact with each other when exposing each frame to make one copy. Could it make two copies at once, in a pinch? For those with more interest in the density problem, Zavada approaches the question in Part 3 of his report, "Print Density Differences of First Generation Copies."<sup>31</sup>

He writes, "I'm sure the reader is aware that our attempt to exactly replicate the 1963 Jamieson produced septum line has not been successful."<sup>32</sup> He consulted Ted Farmer about the septum line who had the idea that there had been a fine wire soldered into the aperture area, but then he modified that thought. Jamieson also said that his lab had never soldered a wire in a printer aperture. "We agreed that the characteristics of the septum favored the printing sprocket modification. The manual and Kodak's Model J provided for a milled-out slot and this approach would best account for the matching image density in the perforation area of the family pictures."<sup>33</sup>

Meanwhile, everyone was trying to find other film copies on 8mm that had a similar septum line. One was found, and it was Jamieson who conveniently found it: "Bruce provided an additional Kodachrome film clip made about four years earlier showing a similar septum line . . . This sample ensures that the septum seen on the Secret Service copies was not unique."<sup>34</sup> It was evidence, but thin evidence. "Conclusion: The Jamieson film company's equipment produced the septum line seen on the Secret Service copies; The exact modification to the Model J printer to produce the narrow 'perf-to-perf septum line' has not been determined; The occurrence of the septum was not unique to copies made November 22, 1963; Two highly probable approaches discussed above could have produced the septum."<sup>35</sup>

Zavada then discusses the fact that there is a major difference in density between the two Secret Service films and what the possible causes are. He thinks that because the hue is similar, the "difference is primarily printer light intensity while maintaining the same filter pack. The difference in density is significant—more than one would expect from a printer operator trying to 'bracket' a presumed correct exposure. However, it is possible that three different light levels were chosen—and that the copies Agent Sorrels received were the bracketed high and low and that Time-Life received the nominal. *Examination of the Time-Life generation print is needed: to confirm successive head, or heads and tails printing orientation; and to compare the time-Life print density to the Secret Service copies.*"<sup>36</sup> But he was unable to get Henry Zapruder and his lawyer, Jamie Silverberg, to agree.

Zavada makes one final comment that Josiah Thompson, the author, had worked with Time-Life and had noted in his book, *Six Seconds In Dallas*, that his obser-

vations of the first generation copy which they had bought along with the original showed it to be 'infinitely brighter and clearer' than the original now in the National Archives." No explanation is offered as to why this should be.

The Justice Department asked the LMH company, which is the Zapruder family, to allow a study to be made of the third Jamieson copy. As of this writing, the issue has not been resolved.

"Our initial trials on Kodak's old Model J printer proved that we could not replicate Jamieson's septum line characteristics and placement. . . "<sup>37</sup>

I wonder why? TO BE CONTINUED

#### Notes

1. 2 H 139; See *Killing Kennedy and the Hoax of the Century* by the author, p. 138.
2. ARRB report of interview with Homer McMahon, 14 July, 1997.
3. ARRB report of interview with Homer McMahon, 14 July, 1997.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Doug Horne report of call to Ben Hunter, ARRB, 26 June 1997.
8. Doug Horne ARRB interview with Homer McMahon and Bennett Hunter, 14 August 1997.
9. Ibid.
10. Doug Horne report of call to Roland Zavada, 16 June 1997.
11. Ibid.
12. Letter of Roland Zavada to the author, May 10, 1999.
13. Ibid, Horne, ARRB 16 (created 17 June) June 1997.
14. Zavada letter to the author, 10 May 1999.
15. Ibid.
16. Memo to file by Les Waffin, Assistant Branch Chief, Motion Picture, Sound & Video Branch, National Archives, October 30, 1996.
17. See *High Treason*, pp 185, 188.
18. Memo to file of Les Waffin, NNSM, The National Archives II, October 30, 1996, p.2.
19. ARRB report of interview with Frank R. Sloan, March 10, 1997.
20. Zavada report to the ARRB, p. 3 of Study 3. ARRB
21. Zavada report to the ARRB, his footnote 1, p. 2 of Study 3, referring us to his report in detail in Study 1, Part 2. See also p. 26 of his report, Study 1, where he says that "perforation identification (No. 0183)

was most likely done at this time and then the film was given to the production foreman—J. Kenny Anderson—for processing.

22. Zavada, *Ibid*, his footnote 3 referring to the Affidavit by Mr. Tom Nulty referenced in Zavada's Study 1, Part 2. Zavada's report to the ARRB.
23. ARRB interview (Doug Horne and Dave Montague) with Bruce Jamieson, March 7, 1997.
24. *Ibid*, p 2-3.
25. Townsley to Zavada, 20 April, 1998.
26. Zavada report to the ARRB, Part 2, Printer Aperture Selection and Septum Line Study, p. 8.
27. *Ibid*, p. 8.
28. *Ibid*, p. 8.
29. *Ibid*, p. 8.
30. Zavada report to the ARRB, Part 2, Printer Aperture Selection and Septum Line Study, p. 25.
31. Zavada report to the ARRB, Part 2, Printer Aperture Selection and Septum Line Study, p. 20.
32. *Ibid*, p. 17.
33. *Ibid*, p. 18.
34. *Ibid*.
35. *Ibid*, p.19.
36. *Ibid*, pp 20-1.
37. *Ibid*. p. 24.

## FORGING AHEAD: FURTHER QUESTIONS ABOUT OSWALD IDENTITY DOCUMENTS

by  
*Jerry D. Rose*

Several years ago, my research focussed on a number of instances of apparent forgery in the documents used to identify Lee Harvey Oswald and identify him with the assassination of President Kennedy. Among others, I tried to raise questions about his employment application at the TSBD [1], his 1963 passport application [2], his letter to the Soviet embassy on November 1, 1963 [3], his "Hidell" identification cards [4] and much more. Taken together, this research provides the basis, I believe, of a somewhat plausible thesis to the effect that, after the assassination, there was a massive and largely effective project of forging these documents in an "Oswald" handwriting, with a few "slip-ups" in the operation like the apocryphal "non-Oswald" signatures on one of his post-arrest fingerprint cards [5], his "O.H. Lee" signature on the tenants' registry at 1026 N. Beckley [6] and the signature attesting his receipt of pay from the Texas School Book Depository [7] In this article I hope to increase somewhat the credibility of this "extreme" interpretation by looking with the reader at anomalies in other Oswald identity documents.

### HISTORIC DIARY

Beginning in October, 1959, Oswald presumably kept a running diary of his experiences in the Soviet Union: his would-be defection, disillusionment, marriage, attempts to return to the United States, etc. [8] This "diary" made excellent copy for the tabloid magazines and was "evidence" for Oswald's handwriting and much else, especially his political naivete and his lifelong difficulty in spelling.

The authenticity of this diary as a record of Oswald's stay in the Soviet Union is open to the gravest doubt. In the first place, the diary contains the biographical "mistakes" that plague the Oswald documentation.

---

*Jerry D. Rose*  
*State University College*  
*Fredonia, NY 14063*

In that document, it will be seen that he makes the same mistake on his wedding date (April 31) that he made on his passport application, accentuating his consciousness of what he was doing by listing April 1-30 as the period of his whirlwind courtship of Marina and the 31st as the wedding date. Describing his visit to the American Embassy in Moscow in October, 1959, he refers to John McVickar as "now head consular" when in fact McVickar did not assume that position until 1961. [9] Also, as Summers points out, Oswald records his pay in Russian new rubbles, although the revaluation of the ruble did not occur until a year after the pay period in question. [10]

As though such mistakes were not problems enough for the diary's authenticity, the handwriting experts of the House Select Committee had one other disquieting bit of news. The diary was not, in their opinion written over the period of time—nearly two years—that it supposedly covered, but in one or two "sittings." [11] The same handwriting experts authenticated the diary as in Oswald's handwriting, so we are apparently expected to believe that he fabricated a diary in this fashion. For once I can almost be convinced by an "official" account of events; one can assign a possible motive for Oswald's action. Apparently he made several attempts to write a book on his Russian experiences, and he gave at least one formal talk (at the Jesuit seminary in Mobile, Alabama) on this subject. [12] This one-or-two sitting diary could have been Oswald's "notes" from which books and lectures could be prepared, and the mistakes were based on his own imperfect recall. Were I not aware of so many other Oswald "mistakes" on so many other documents with absolutely no self-serving motives involved, I think I should join in the universal assumption that the historic diary is at least in Oswald's handwriting, however defective it might be as a record of events. With so much other material in the same handwriting so suspect, one must include the historic diary among the roster of possibly forged Oswald documents.

#### NOTEBOOK

Police who searched Oswald's residences on November 22 and 23 allegedly found a notebook in Oswald's handwriting. [13] The book contained many

personal phone numbers and notes to himself, as well as such bombshells as the name, address, phone and license plate numbers of FBI agent James Hosty, the unlisted telephone number of General Edwin A. Walker and the name and address of a leading Nazi functionary in New York City. Although the appearance of these and other items in the book are mysterious, I am willing to believe that most of the entries were written by Oswald himself at some point. The question is whether the notebook was, like the historic diary and much else might have been, copied from original Oswald documents into the handwriting of the Oswald forger. Is there any evidence of this?

One suspicious circumstance about the notebook is that it was not released from the DPD to the FBI until November 27. [14] Although the tardy delivery of "physical evidence" to the FBI was not all that uncommon, there seems to be a method in the pattern of items initially withheld from the FBI. [15] There are suspicions at least that either the item in question had not been "fabricated" until after November 22; [16] or else that local or federal authorities may have "improved" it in the direction of increased incrimination of Oswald.

The above is sheer speculation, of course. One intriguing circumstance, suggestive of forgery, is a matter of fact and public record. When Oswald was arrested in New Orleans on August 9, 1963 after a street scuffle with anti-Castro Cuban exiles, he was interviewed by a New Orleans police Lieutenant, Frances Martello. [17] At 3 A.M. on November 23 a Secret Service agent, Adrian Vial, called Martello and asked him to review his file on Oswald. [18] Later that day, Vial was given an interesting item that Martello found in the Oswald file: a 2" by 3" slip of paper containing a number of phone numbers, unexplained other numbers, names of Oswald acquaintances, some words in Russian and a list of sizes of different items of clothing. Martello explained that this slip of paper was found on Oswald's person at his arrest and that he had inadvertently failed to return it to Oswald on his release and had put it in his office file on Oswald. Before relinquishing his slip of paper to Vial, Martello made a copy of the entries in his own handwriting.

Martello's "copy," reproduced here, was entered as a

focussing on such major "loose ends" as the identity of Sylvia Odio's visitors in September 1963 and the possibility that the DPD's "lift" of an Oswald palmprint from the rifle may in fact have been "listed" from Oswald's dead body, J. Edgar Hoover responded to an urgent request from Warren Commission Chief Counsel J. Lee Rankin. [20] Hoover relayed the request to SAC New Orleans, explaining that "The President's Commission has requested that it be furnished the exact document that was prepared by Lieutenant Martello from the slip of paper that was found in Oswald's wallet by the New Orleans Police Department. The Commission is in possession of actual slip of paper that was found in Oswald's wallet by the New Orleans Police Department but now also desires the original draft that was prepared by Lieutenant Martello before he turned original piece of evidence over to the Secret Service." In a further note on this memorandum, Hoover writes that "We have furnished the Commission a copy of Lieutenant Martello's document, but the Commission desires the original be prepared (sic!) for completion of Commission's files." New Orleans promptly forwarded this document On September 11 and the Commission could thereby "complete its files." [21] Whew!

What does this episode have to do with Oswald's notebook? A great deal, as it turns out. Harold Weisberg discovered that most of the items on Martello's slip of paper correspond exactly with en-

MAPURIS HA PUS;  
22182  
AMEP 1733242  
Russ Leg 2pa 1/2 1731477  
Russ 4YT HA Kum: J  
AA 549466

ROBERT 7313 Davingport  
PE 23245  
757 French St Murriet  
Socks 25  
Shoes 40-41  
Hat 56  
SHIRT 37

Review 5/21/64

Zoe MURK Rose 92463  
ПРОМЧК. 76AT. MOKK X 28545  
" " MURK 25994, EX39  
Pague Zuboy 4/24 3-29-56  
221-82  
HOTEL KOJOW MOKY X42980  
Pouch gen Xof 20244  
TOB WAPAEB 279 Kow. HAPOKOB.  
TOB WAPATOB 20525  
Leo SETAB Pague MOKK B-3688  
United Press 726681 Golding  
Cis Press 776430 Mosby  
MADIA-33853  
George 7-14-53

COMMISSION EXHIBIT 827

Warren Commission exhibit. Although he supposedly gave the original to Vial, that agent was not questioned about it during his Commission testimony, and the copy in "Oswald's" handwriting, also reproduced here, appears only in volume 22 of the Commission's Hearings and Exhibits, without any attribution of how it was entered into evidence. [19] For some reason (maybe someone on the Commission was putting two-and-two together), the Warren Commission became very concerned about Martello's piece of paper. On September 11, 1964, as the Warren Report was about to be finished, and investigation was

Zoe MURK Rose 92463  
ПРОМЧК. 76AT. MOKK X 28545  
" " MURK 25994, EX39  
Pague Zuboy 4/24 3-29-56  
221-82  
HOTEL KOJOW MOKY X42980  
Pouch gen Xof 20244  
TOB WAPAEB 279 Kow. HAPOKOB.  
TOB WAPATOB 20525  
Leo SETAB Pague MOKK B3688  
United Press 726681 Golding  
Cis Press 776430 Mosby  
MADIA-33853  
George 7-14-53

COMMISSION EXHIBIT No. 1438

Martello's slip  
22182  
AMEP 1733242  
Russ leg 2pa 1/2 1731477  
RUS 4YT HA Kum: J  
AA 549466

Robert 7313 Davingport ST  
PE 23245  
757 French St Murriet  
Socks 25  
Shoes 40-41  
HAT 56  
SHIRT 37  
OVERCOAT 48  
UNDERWEARS - 48

COMMISSION EXHIBIT No. 1438 - Continued

tries in the notebook: for example, the strange list of sizes of different clothing items. [22] It would thus appear that, for some unfathomable reason, Oswald had copied items from his notebook onto the slip of paper prior to his August 9 arrest. The peculiarities of Oswald's behavior at the time of his arrest have frequently been commented upon. [23] For none of the possible explanations of what Oswald was "up to" at the time does Martello's slip of paper make any sense.

There is no easy explanation to the riddle of Martello's slip of paper. One possibility worth considering is that Oswald did not copy this material from his notebook; but that the notebook was copied using information from the slip of paper and from other sources. It would be interesting, indeed, to have handwriting experts' determination of whether the notebook was, like the historic diary, prepared in one or two "sittings" rather than across the interval of time that one ordinarily requires to fill a book of addresses and phone numbers. [24] If the book was written in that fashion it is possible that Oswald himself did the relevant "sitting" as I indicated may have happened in the case of the historic diary. However one cannot, I think, assign any more credible motive for Oswald's copying information from slips of paper into a notebook than one can understand why he might have copied information from the book onto a slip of paper. On the other hand, one can understand that document forgers would use such trivia as sources of information that "should" be in Oswald's notebook.

This interpretation could also make some sense of Lt. Martello's apparently strange behavior with reference to the slip of paper. The relevant questions are: (1) Why did he make a handwritten copy before turning it over to the Secret Service? and (2) Why did he, as Weisberg notes, make such a point of putting copies of the slip of paper into the hands of the Secret Service, the FBI and the Warren Commission, all three of which agencies displayed no apparent interest in this "information"—until the Commission's belated interest in September, 1964?

Could it be that, in the 12 hours between Vial's request for material from Oswald's file and his turning over of the paper, Martello saw samples of "Oswald's" handwriting in a newspaper (several newspapers were

running on the assassination weekend such examples of Oswald writing as his letter to John Connally requesting help in reversing his undesirable discharge from the Marines) or elsewhere and could likewise see that the handwriting was not that on the slip of paper in his Oswald file? If so, Martello may have smelled a rat: discerned the outlines of a possible Oswald frame-up. Martello testified to the Warren Commission that, based on his rather amicable interview with Oswald in August, he would have "bet my head on a chopping block" that Oswald would not have killed the President. [25] In that state of mind on November 23, he may have been amenable to doubts about the developing official case against Oswald; and he may accordingly have taken a self-protective action in handcopying the slip of paper. He may have suspected—as may actually have happened—that the Secret Service would destroy the original piece of paper. He may have feared—as has not happened yet—that investigators would treat such apparent destruction as evidence of a frame-up conspiracy. If he had such suspicions and fears, his copying of the note could serve to detach him from the conspiracy; he could show that he at least had tried to preserve information that was doomed to destruction.

If this speculation has any validity, one may wonder why Martello did not protect himself by blowing the whistle on the whole conspiracy, retaining a photocopy of the slip of paper which would expose any later forgery of its contents. The answer to this is fairly obvious: if Martello were astute enough to smell a conspiracy, he was probably knowledgeable enough about law enforcement agencies to know that the exposure of a police fraud can be dangerous to the health of the exposer. The man who would have, in retrospect, "bet his head" that Oswald would not have been an assassin may understandably have not been willing to risk his life when the very real possibility of the "chopping block" was presented to his mind.

What of Martello's later insistence on displaying his copy of the slip of paper to federal authorities? This may have been some combination of: (1) a public display of disengagement of himself from any frame-up conspiracy that might surface; (2) a self-protective demonstration to the feared police agencies (Secret

Service and FBI) that his was only a harmless personally-copied version of the slip of paper and not a photocopy which, if it existed and were exposed, would blow the whistle on the forgery operation; and (3) Martello's subtle way of trying to "say something" to the Warren Commission that he could not say openly for fear of his life. Probing questions by Commission counsel about the circumstances of his finding, copying and turning over the slip of paper could have allowed the Commission to nibble around the edges of a frame-up conspiracy. If this was Martello's "game" in promoting his slip of paper, it failed as completely as a similar game that may have been played by Jack Ruby. Ruby gave the Commission broad hints that it could "get more out of me" on sensitive topics. [26] He was to learn, to his apparent dismay, that his testimony was a hot potato that the Commission hoped to toss aside as soon as possible. Lieutenant Martello and his slip of paper seem to have received the same brush-off treatment. When the Commission was apparently finally forced by some process to confront that hot potato during the twilight of its existence in September, 1964, it "completed its files" on the matter but hardly completed a decent investigation of it.

#### Notes

1. Jerry D. Rose, "Brian's Song," The Third Decade 4#4 May 1988 pp. 20, 21.
2. Jerry D. Rose, "These Are a Few of My Favorite Forgeries," The Third Decade 2#3 March, 1986, pp. 13-19
3. Jerry D. Rose, "What's in a Postmark?" The Third Decade 2#5 July 1986, pp. 15-17.
4. Jerry D. Rose, "In the Name of A. Hidell," The Third Decade 5#4 May, 1989, pp. 5-9.
5. Warren Commission Hearings and Exhibits, vol. 17, p. 282. References to this source cited hereafter in format: 17H282.
6. Jerry D. Rose, "O.H. Lee," The Third Decade 3#1 November 1986, pp. 6-9.
7. House Select Committee on Assassinations, vol. VIII p 371..  
References to this source cited hereafter in format HSCA VIII371.
8. 16H94-105
9. 16H96.
10. Anthony Summers, Conspiracy (New York: McGraw Hill, 1980), p. 185.
11. HSCA VIII 247.
12. 8H192
13. 16H37-70
14. Texas Commission of Inquiry, Files of Evidence vol. 1, p. 292.
15. As Armstrong's research indicates, even items turned in promptly to the Bureau may have been altered at FBI headquarters before they were returned to Dallas. John Armstrong, "Oswald's Possessions," Proceedings of the Research Conference of The Fourth Decade at Fredonia NY July 19-21, 1996, pp. 303-311.
16. For example, some of the post-mortem fingerprinting as covered in Jerry D. Rose, "Sebastian Latona, Where Are You When We Need You?" The Third Decade 1#4 May, 1985, pp. 9-14.
17. 10H51-62.
18. 22H823. This was the same interview in which Martello planted seeds of suspicion about the relationship between Oswald and the Southern Conference Educational Fund (SCEF) as well as the New Orleans Council for Peaceful Alternatives (a pacifist group).
19. 22H848.
20. FBI #105-82555-4830 NARA Record #124-10043-10198.
21. FBI #105-82555-4830 NARA Record #124-10043-10200.
22. Harold Weisberg, Whitewash II, pp. 62, 63.
23. For example, Sylvia Meagher, "Oswald's Arrest in New Orleans," The Third Decade vol. 1#2 January 1985, pp. 1-8.
24. The notebook was not included among the 63 "Oswald" documents examined by HSCH handwriting experts. HSCH VIII 228-232.
25. 10H60,61
26. See, for example, Ruby's unaccepted invitation to the Commission to subject him to "biting" questions on his associations with Bernard Weisman and "Texas oil men." 5H203,204.

# MEETING REPORT



Document's Author: Douglas Horne/ARRB Date Created: 07/15/97

## Meeting Logistics

Date: 07/14/97  
Agency Name: Witnesses/Consultants  
Attendees: Homer McMahon, Jeremy Gunn, Doug Horne, Michelle Combs, and Marie Fagnant  
Topic: ARRB Interviewed Homer McMahon

## Summary of the Meeting

ARRB staff followed up its June 9, 1997 telephonic initial assessment interview of Mr. McMahon with an in-depth, in-person interview at Archives II during which the original working notes from NPIC and a surviving photographic briefing board could be used as exhibits to test the recollections of the witness. The interview was audiotaped; therefore, this meeting report will only recount substantive highlights of the interview. (All statements which read as if they were "facts" are actually Mr. McMahon's recounting of events as he remembers them in 1997.)

Mr. McMahon was manager of the NPIC (National Photo Interpretation Center) color lab in 1963. About two days after the assassination of President Kennedy, but before the funeral took place, a Secret Service agent named "Bill Smith" delivered an amateur film of the assassination to NPIC and requested that color prints be made of frames believed associated with wounding ("frames in which shots occurred"), for purposes of assembling a briefing board. Mr. Smith did not explain who the briefing boards would be for, or who would be briefed. The only persons who witnessed this activity (which McMahon described as an "all night job") were USSS agent Smith, Homer McMahon, and Ben Hunter (McMahon's assistant). Although no materials produced were stamped with classification markings, Smith told McMahon that the subject matter was to be treated as "above top secret;" McMahon said that not even his supervisor was allowed to know what he had worked on, nor was his supervisor allowed to participate. Smith told McMahon that he had personally picked up the film (in an undeveloped condition from the man who exposed it) in Dallas, flown it to Rochester, N.Y. (where it was developed by Kodak), and then flown it down to NPIC in Washington so that enlargements of selected frames could be made on NPIC's state-of-the-art equipment.

After the film (either an unslit original or possibly a duplicate) was viewed more than once on a 16 mm projector in a briefing room at NPIC, the original (a double-8 mm unslit original) was placed in a 10X20X40 precision enlarger, and 5" X 7" format internegatives were made from selected frames. A full-immersion "wet-gate" or liquid gate process was used on the original film to reduce refractivity of the film and maximize the optical quality of the internegatives. Subsequently, three each 5" X 7" contact prints were made from the internegatives. He recalled that a minimum of 20, and a maximum of 40 frames were duplicated via internegatives and prints. All prints, internegatives, and scraps were turned over to Bill Smith at the conclusion of the work. Some working notes were created on a yellow legal pad, and they were turned over also. At the conclusion of the work, McMahon said he knew that briefing boards were going to be constructed at NPIC from the prints, but he did not participate in that, and did not know who did. McMahon stated definitively that at no point did NPIC reproduce the assassination movie (the Zapruder film) as a motion picture; all NPIC did was produce internegatives and color prints of selected still frames.

Although the process of selecting which frames depicted events surrounding the wounding of limousine occupants (Kennedy and Connally) was a "joint process," McMahon said his opinion, which was that President Kennedy was shot 6 to 8 times from at least three directions, was ultimately ignored, and the opinion of USSS agent Smith, that there were 3 shots from behind from the Book Depository, ultimately was employed in selecting frames in the movie for reproduction. At one point he said "you can't fight city hall," and then reminded us that his job was to produce internegatives and photographs, not to do analysis. He said that it was clear that the Secret Service agent had previously viewed the film and already had opinions about which frames depicted woundings.

At one point in the interview, Mr. McMahon described in some detail various health-related memory problems which he claims to suffer from. Details are on the tape.

Toward the end of the interview, McMahon was shown the NPIC working notes and the surviving briefing board (there are four panels), which are both in the JFK Collection in flat # 90A.

NPIC Working Notes: McMahon recognized the half-sized sheet of yellow legal paper containing a handwritten description of briefing board panel contents, and on its reverse side containing a description of the work performed that night and how long each step took, as being written in his own handwriting (and partially in Ben Hunter's). He said that three other full-length yellow legal pad pages of notes (containing three possible 3-shot scenarios, a 16 FPS and 18 FPS timing analysis, and additional timing computations) were not in his handwriting, and were not made by him or previously seen by him.

Briefing Board Panels (4): McMahon looked at the 28 photographs on all four briefing board panels, and said that he had made all of them; he also said that some were missing. I asked him which types of images that he had produced he thought were missing, and he said he thought motorcade images from prior to frame 188 (i.e., earlier in the motorcade, before the limousine disappeared behind the road sign) were the photographs he produced which were not on the briefing board panels. He said it looked to him like the prints he had produced had been trimmed, i.e., made smaller. END