97 Beaumont Street Newtonville, Massachusetts July 12, 1967

Mr. Charles Wyckoff E. G. & G., Inc. 95 Brookline Street Boston, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Wyckoff:

After our meeting in your office yesterday, I contacted Mr. Leo Kelly as you suggested, and explained to him my interest in the case and why I believe it important to have a clear understanding of your findings re: The Zapruder Film. We agreed that the best way to do this was to write to you, asking specific questions; therefore, I would appreciate your answers to the following:

- 1. Approximately how many hours did your analysis of the Zapruder Film require?
- 2. Where did your study of the films take place?
- 3. Based on your analysis of the film, what conclusions, if any, did you draw as to the number of shots fired?
- 4. Based on your analysis of the film, what conclusions, if any, did you draw as to the specific Zapruder frames at which shots were fired?
- 5. Blurred Zapruder frames, as seen in Volume 18, occur at the following points:

190-192, 195-197, 203, 227, 234-235, 240, 243-244, 249-252, 256-258, 260-262, 264-266, 268-270, 279, 289-291, 295-296, 301-302, 308, 311-313, 318-319, and 331-332.

Which of these do you consider significant, in terms of possible relation to shots fired?

6.

What factors lead you to believe the blurred frames you specify are (or may be) related to shots, whereas the others listed above are not (or probably not)?

- 7. In your office I showed you enlarged frames from the Zapruder film. Included was a sequence covering frames 183-206. In this sequence it can be observed (1) that President Kennedy's right hand was lowered suddenly from a forehead-high position to a throat-level position between frames 193-198, where it remains until 206; after which he is hidden from camera view by the sign; and (2) that at approximately this same time. Mrs. Kennedy turns her head sharply to her right, and appears to be fully facing the President at approximately frame 200. Also noted was the three-frame blur at 190-192, I believe you agreed with these observations.
  - a. Had you observed the above described motions, by the President and Mrs. Mennedy, prior to our meeting?
  - b. What interpretation, if any, do you place on the described motions?
- 8. Little change is noted in the position of President Kennedy's arms, elbows, and hands between frames 225-226. However, between frames 226-228 a dramatic change in position of his arms and elbows is observed, in that they are much higher in the latter than in the former.
  - a. Had you noted this motion?
  - b. What interpretation, if any, do you place upon it?
- 9.

the company of the second

UL

In your office I showed you an 8 x 10 color enlargement of frame 232, and pointed out (1) that since the Governor's right wrist and hand are elevated at approximately shoulder level (knuckles up, fingers down), his wrist is not in position at this frame to be struck by a bullet exiting on a downward path from beneath his right nipple; and (2) at this frame his hand is <u>not</u> dangling, and instead is held erect in an ascending attitude from the wrist, as can be observed from the alignment of his knuckles in relation to his right shirt-sleeve cuff. (In contrast, I also showed you frame 258, by which time the Governor's hand clearly <u>is</u> dangling)

I believe you agreed with my observations of the above.

- a. Had you noted the above prior to our meeting?
- b. Do you agree with my conclusion from (2) that the Governor could not hold his hand erect as seen in frame 232, if his wrist had been shattered by that time?
- 10. In your office, I pointed out that, during a turn to his right, Governor Connally's right shoulder drops markedly between frames 237-238; and that his turn is temporarily halted for several frames thereafter. You agreed with this observation.

I stated my opinion this was the relatively instantaneous impact-reaction to an external force, as distinguished from a possible delayed pain-reaction to an earlier blow.

- a. Had you noted the above prior to our meeting?
- b. What interpretation, if any, would you place on the above?

In view of the important conclusions CBS drew, apparently based in important measure on some of your observations. I would be grateful for your cooperation in answering the above questions as soon as possible. If you wish, I would be happy to make available to you for further study the enlargements I showed you.

Yours truly,

Raymond J. Marcus

RJM/rak CC: Mr. Leo M. Kelly