

Please keep quotes from my  
meeting with Liebler  
confidential. Assuming lines are  
tapped, it would be a good idea  
not to mention anything about the  
Xerox correspondence on the  
phone.

Dave

November 6, 1965

Dear Sylvia,

Mrs. Castellano told me about your inquiries about Thorpe, Orth at Life Magazine, and I would like to be able to coordinate our inquiries to Life Magazine for reasons I will presently discuss.

I told you that I had spoken to Liebeler, and that he seemed very impressed and disturbed by the splice in the film and the curved lines. He told me he was going to get to the bottom of it, and that I should come back in several weeks.

Last week, I returned to his office, with Salandria's Liberation articles ~~XXXX~~. I had no sooner walked in than he tossed three letters at me. "Here", he said, "read these". One was a two page typewritten letter which Liebeler had sent to Rankin, with "copy sent" to Redlich, Goldberg, and Willens. The letter starts ~~XXX~~ with the fact that a graduate student walked into his office and pointed out the splice and the streaks. He explained the significance of the streaks, and that this would involve another gunman ~~XX~~ in the assassination. He then spends a paragraph recollecting that the signs had indeed been moved. He called it "unfortunate" that the frames had been omitted without explanation. "Apparently", his letter states, "the people who discovered this absence have consulted Shaneyfelt and after some pulling and hauling, he told them that the frames were omitted because they were damaged. This is obviously not so since 210 is included in CE 893. If there is already explanation for the omission of the frames and the appearance of the marks on the back of the sign, I would certainly be relieved to know what it is. If there is none, I think it would be appropriate for us to raise this matter formally with the F.B.I. Since Life magazine ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ has the original film, they might be able to tell us what appears on the frames that are missing....".

Now here is what happened. The letter was addressed to Rankin. Redlich, who received a "copy sent", answered with a seven point rebuttal ~~XXXXXXXX~~ each point of which is either false or irrelevant. Then Rankin, receiving one of Redlich's "copy sent's" wrote a brief one paragraph letter in which he says "I have not made analyses of the questions that are raised by your letter.....but I did examine the copy of the letter from Norman Redlich...on the face of it his letter seems to dispose of the matter to me. I confess that I am reluctant to dig into the matter further at this time unless there is more doubt raised... "

Thus, Rankin is on record as not really having considered the point Liebeler raised, but of having done his duty by reading Redlich's reply.

Finally, he ends with a short jibe: "...I am looking forward to seeing some of your writings in the legal periodicals when you find time to make contributions of that kind."

While Liebeler ran to a Xerox machine to make copies of Salandria's articles, I was reading and studying all three letters. I pointed out to Liebeler that Redlich's answer was loaded with false statements, starting with his point number 1: "The sign to which you refer was, to the best of my knowledge, never removed from its location..." His point "4" says that the film was possibly damaged. Finally, he concludes with point 7: "My conclusion is that the presence of these curved lines does not warrant any request to the F.B.I. for an investigation, either formal or otherwise."

Mr. Liebeler agreed with me that Redlich's reply was not adequate. "Besides", I said, "you yourself took the testimony where Emmet Hudson SAYS the signs have been changed".

<sup>and showed him</sup>  
"I did???", he explained, and I snatched his Volume 7 off the shelf. Furthermore, I said, there are several other ways of illustrating that the signs have been changed. (I had in mind material Mrs. Castellano has which can also be used---photos taken IN DALLAS by the Commission for the re-enactment).

"Look," ~~XX~~ he said "you get all this material together so that I can answer this letter". I indicated that this was fine with me. Furthermore, I'd ~~XXX~~ all the material to answer every one of the seven points raised.

Finally, I pulled out a copy of Sylvan Fox's book. "Have you seen this?", I asked, flashing the cover so that light would go through the three bullet holes. Then I turned it over, slowly read the endorsement and who it was signed by. He took the book, looked at it with quite a bit of consternation, and said: "Well, don't let it ever be said that WE don't have friends in the Justice Department". He immediately wanted to buy my copy from me. Meanwhile, I had asked to have Xerox'd copies of all three letters, and he had hedged. Now I asked again, he said OK, and we just traded, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ and we went off to the Xerox machine together where he made me copies of the letters. (They are sort of letters you want to show to your grandchildren).

Meanwhile, I kept up my ever running stream of comment that its only a matter of time now until the whole thing is going to come apart at the seams, and that I feel sorry for the staff attorney's who were "used" and who still have their whole careers ahead of them. Every piece of straw helps break the camel's back, you know.

In the course of this part of the conversation, Mr. Liebler actually made a comment to the effect that now the different attorney's might try to "hang it on each other" (sic). He indicated to me that it was he, after all, who had urged that the Commission ~~had~~ be kept in existence to handle any questions that might come up, but that he was in a losing minority on this point.

Furthermore, he pointed out that he definitely wants to get those missing frames in the archives. Besides, as Mr. Liebler pointed out, to fully appreciate this, one must understand that he hates Redlich's guts and vice-versa.

"But Mr. Liebeler", I said, "this is an important historical document!". "My boy," he replied, "history sometimes turns on petty hates and jealousies"!

Like a person who plays chess, I have carefully figured out just what avenues of escape are open to the commission. One easy one, of course, is for them to claim film damage. As Mrs. Castellano told you, she contacted Orth and he said there was no film damage. It is crucial that we get such a statement from someone qualified to speak for Life as quickly as possible, **IN WRITING**. I was going to draft an innocuous little letter ~~XXXX~~ asking to be assured that the film was not been damaged. If you have already done so, or if you can do so quickly and easily, please do. If you want me to do it, I will. I want four copies of such a letter. One for myself, ~~XXXX~~ and the other three are for Liebler and the three men to whom he is corresponding on this matter---Rankin, Willens, and Goldberg.

I realize of course, that its even in the record that Orth was sent down to Washington to run the film so that it wouldn't be damaged, but this would be even better. Naturally, it would be ideal to get from them in writing a statement that they gave to the Government a complete set of slides, with no omissions; however,

~~XXX~~ the more specific the incoming letter is, the more suspicious they are liable to get. ~~XXXXXX~~

If you wish to handle this matter or have already done so, please let me know. On the other hand, if you have phoned and, for that reason, a followup letter would appear to them to be a bit suspicious, I'll handle it. What I want, as soon as possible, is a letter on a Life letterhead, signed by someone whom they can't later say was not in a position to speak with authority, that the Zapruder film is undamaged and in their possession. If you can get more specifics from them, fine. Please let me know as soon as you can what action you intend to take on this matter, and I will act accordingly.

~~XXXXX~~ Once this avenue of escape is closed off, they either will or will not publish those frames. If they do, we enter a new phase. The frames will almost certainly have to be doctored, for if the intersection point of those curved lines were shown, I'm certain there will be a bullet hole there. On the other hand, an obstinate refusal to release the frames for public viewing naturally makes our case stronger.

Meanwhile, I intend to set up an experiment whereby we fire a bullet through a sign and film the shooting; then, I will turn the film into ~~8X~~ 35mm slides; the whole purpose will be to show that a bullet piercing a sign will indeed produce streaks of that nature which can be picked up by a camera. ~~XX~~ The experiment, of course, can not be called "controlled", since I don't know the ~~XXXXXX~~ ~~XXXX~~ type~~XX~~ of gun that was used, or the range, or the nature of the ammunition. Such an experiment still will have some use, however, and I think it would add a certain amount of "color" to any attempt to get a newspaper to do a sotry on the splice, and those curved lines. (INcidentally, if anyone tries to argue that there are other lines on other frames (as does Mr. Redlich) the chief answer~~X~~ is that these tiny "scrathes" are nowhere near ~~XXXX~~ as intensely black as ours, nor do they oscillate with decreasing amplitude, a characteristic of many dissipative phenomena in nature)

\*\*\*\*\*

24

Mrs. Castellano has acquired a sheaf of about ~~12~~ ~~28~~ photos which were taken from the Nix, Muchmore, and Zapruder position. At each position, a tripod mounted camera was set up. Then the photographer started at the extreme counterclockwise position and snapped one picture, rotated the camera through 15 or 20 degrees, snapped another etc. The result is three sequences of pictures. From each sequence, I picked ~~XXXX~~ out a subsequence, with a minimum of "overlap". Copy negatives will be ready ~~XXXXX~~ late next week. The three sets I have chosen are an excellent orientation to Dealey Plaza from three important positions, and without the necessity of making a trip to Dallas. The photos overlap without any "breaks", so that, spreading each set out in the proper order, you can get three sweeping views of Dealey Plaza, with no "breaks"; that is, the left hand of each photo just overlaps slightly the right hand side of the one immediately to its left and vice versa. Some of these photos are important because they contain the ~~XXXXXX~~ ~~XXXXXX~~ Thorton and the Stemmons signs. Used in conjunction with 2114 (B)---page 544 vol 24---they prove conclusively that the signs in use during the reenactment were not the same signs that were~~XXXX~~ there on the day of the assassination. Because of the high cost of the negatives, ~~XX~~ I'm going to have to 95¢ apiece for the~~XX~~ prints. I understand the Dallas source wants over \$30 for a complete set. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Once I get three or four orders, I'll be able to part with them at much less apiece. If you are interested, let me know. (If you buy any of them

at this initial price, I'll give you as many as you want in the future at my absolute cost for the prints alone).

\*\*\*\*\*

I received Mrs. Castellano's development, and wanted to make some comments on it. The proof that Willis 5 and Zapruder 202 are simultaneous in time is based on the following:

IF A and B look across space at each other, and if C is some object in between them, then if A sees B to the left of C, B will see A to the right of C and vice-versa. Thus, left and right are switched. Up and down, however, are not. If A sees B above C, then, likewise, B will see A above C. The reciprocal nature of these two views is ~~XX~~ a self evident postulate of our space, and ~~XXX~~ Mrs. Castellano's whole proof depends on this fact, plus the observation that Clint Hill's shoulder appears along the line of sight between the Zapruder camera and the Willis camera at only one point in time. Since the motorcade is going at 10 to 12 mph (~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~) this is almost 3/4 foot PER ZAPRUDER FRAME, and hence her determination is very accurate.

When Mrs. Castellano goes to the maps and draws those lines, all she is doing is this:

Given frame 202 and Willis 5 as simultaneous in time, ~~XXXXXX~~ determine where on the platt map frame 202 lies.

Her work with the platt map does not "prove" that Willis snapped W-5 at frame 202; rather, this is a starting point. She simply goes through ~~XXXX~~ valid geometric construction which utilizes the optical correspondence of 202 and W-5 to determine just where 202 is located ON THE MAP, (NOT IN TIME).

\*\*\*\*\*

Shaneyfelt's proof is of an entirely different nature. He attempts, starting with the plat map, ~~XXXX~~ Willis 5, and the known position of Willis, to determine ~~XXXXXX~~ WHEN W-5 was snapped IN TIME. His method would work if he drew his lines accurately, and if there was no fudging on the platt map itself. Neither, however, is the case.

By looking at Willis 5, it is possible to find something in the background that is in line with JFK's head. If such a line is drawn correctly on the platt map, it SHOULD intersect the correct frame number. This is the line Shaneyfelt talks about on the bottom of page 696 (Volume XV). It is the one after the lavender line, but before the green line. First of all, the "sign" end of the line is TO FAR TO THE LEFT on the Platt map. (Mrs. Castellano's line is much more accurate). In this regard, note that Mrs. Castellano's line intersects the wall at approximately where we see it in Willis five, whereas Shaneyfelt's line would intersect the wall much nearer the corner. You will recall, now, that this is the line from the eye (ie camera) of Willis over JFK's head). Second of all, Shaneyfelt does not draw this crucial line STARTING at the Willis position, but "from an area about that far from the sign to the area where Mr. Willis ~~XXX~~ was reported to be standing". But he has previously noted that Willis is standing AT THE CURB, and therefore, where his lavender line (line of sight Willis to Zapruder) intersects the curb). Instead, he draws this line to a point back from the curve along his lavender line. The result of this chicanery is that the "jiggled and wiggled" line now intersects up at frame 208, rather than 202.

The chicanery is completed by ACTUALLY CHANGING the "208" point on the platt map to read 210. Although we cannot read the platt map as published in the volumes, (this would take a trip to Washington) we know that Mrs. Castellano does indeed have an original. Page 3 at the top contains the tabulations off her original. Page 3 at the bottom contains the tabulations off ~~XXXX CE884~~ 884.

Frame number 208 has been changed to 210---but in the FIRST COLUMN only---ie: all other "readings" are the same! This is indeed fishy. Furthermore~~XXX~~ we are fortunate in that the handrail distance was originally and accidentally written as 248.9 rather than ~~348.9~~ on the original. On CE 884, we can see that the~~XX~~ "3" in "348.8" has been changed from a "2", further testifying to the fact that CE 884 is a copy made from an original, and hence, that Mrs. Castellano does indeed have ~~XXXXXX~~ copies made from an original blueprint negative.

Mrs. Castellano thinks that the other two changes are there so that the crucial one at 210 won't stand out. She may be right. Of course, this cannot be proved.

What it is crucial to realize is that Shaneyfelt's chart and Mrs. Castellano's chart are two different animals. The ~~XXXXXX~~ latter attempts to place frame 202 on the platt map, that is, to start with certain information that has to do with the photographic TIME correspondence of 202 and W-5, and determine where 202 is on the platt.

Shaneyfelt starts with Willis position (which he then ignores), plus ~~XX~~ W-5, plus a supposedly accurate plat, and attempts to place W-5 in time. In other words, he attempts to use the platt map to determine the time correspondence between ~~XX~~ W-5 and the Zapruder film, without using the Zapruder film, itself.

all defined

(In this respect, it should be noted that Mr. Shaneyfelt's green line ---the last one---is completely superfluous, and the intersection produced by it with the second line he drew has nothing to do with anything. Literally, it is a complete non-sequiter. The fact that ~~XXX~~ a line from ~~Shaneyfelt's~~ Zapruder to frame 210 on the plat, and the fact that it passes through "position "3" " doesn't add a thing to what he is trying to prove, though it does add enough confusion to the situation to leave one with the feeling that "Mr. Shaneyfelt knows what he is doing, I guess, but I can't follow him on that one". Besides, the intersection looks good there on Shaneyfelt #25!) Thus, it is Shaneyfelt's second line which is all important, and the intersection of this line with the numbers on the platt map which determines when W-5 was snapped, according to the method he is using.

\*\*\*\*\*

I read your letter and am essentially in agreement with what you said. As I pointed out, the main reason for the phone call was to let you know of an area in which I am working, ~~not only~~ so that I am not working in a vacuum, but also so that you could funnel any information my way that you may think I'll find useful. I'm sorry to hear you were that dismayed. Anyway, I was just as dismayed when I started to find things of this nature. It is quite upsetting for the eyes to perceive things the mind says cannot ~~and~~ must not be. That is why I'm making such an effort to get the best possible photos before I mail them to anyone. If I can get the right pictures, a hell of a lot of people are going to be buying me dinners.

Sincerely,  
Dave