

staff or the FBI to meet the minimum legal requirements of testimony and evidence, a proper identification of the camera seen in its characteristics, assumes significance. We have already seen in the chapter, "Gen Pictures Lie?" how Liebeler required Zapruder to bring nothing with him, did not ask him to identify his camera, his film or the lens or lenses used. Liebeler was consistent. He sought this knowledge of none of his photographic witnesses.

Specter likewise sought none of this information from Shaneyfelt, nor did Shaneyfelt volunteer it.

There is an explanation of this 30 percent difference that is so transparent every amateur movie photographer will understand it. Movie cameras have different speeds that are so easily changed they are sometimes shifted by accident. There are variations from manufacturer to manufacturer and model to model, but generally speaking, speeds are normal, usually 16 frames per second, or slow or fast motion.

This explanation should never have escaped the FBI's photographic expert. The possibility of this having happened should certainly have been presented to the Commission. Likewise, Specter should certainly have sought an explanation for an error of 30 percent in a reenactment that had to be the most exact in United States history for it to be depended upon. The Commission did depend entirely upon it.

Had this been my camera, the difference between the Zapruder film and the reenactment would almost certainly be accounted for by the assumption that the camera was filming at the wrong speed, or at 12 or 24 frames per second. Inquiry indicates this is also true of most cameras of the make of Zapruder's, Bell & Howell.

When the Zapruder film is examined in any version, the first impression is like looking at an ancient movie: It is going too fast. When I first studied the Zapruder film, this impression was so pronounced I asked the projectionist if the film were moving too fast. He assured me the projection speed was normal.

The simplest explanation for the impermissible difference of 30 percent is exposing the film at 24 frames per second in the original and at 18 frames per second in the reenactment and then projecting both at the same speed.

The simplest explanation of the failure of both counsel and witness to address what is so obvious is that it proved the impossibility of Oswald's having been the lone assassin - beyond the remotest possibility of any question.

Mr. McGloy. First is the original Zapruder.

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Original Zapruder. This is not the original. This is the first copy.

(Film)

Mr. Specter. Will you state for the record what film we just saw?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. This film we just viewed is a copy made directly from the original Zapruder film of the actual assassination (5H177).

Less subtly phrased, this is a first copy, one made in Delaware the day of the assassination. It is not the Commission's official copy, the copy of record in the official archive of the President's assassination. That copy is further removed from the original, is therefore less distinct, and has other undesirable attributes that we shall soon be discussing.

Mr. McGloy. Did Nix, Muchmore get a second shot of the head shot?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Mrs. Muchmore got the head shot and Mr. Nix got the head shot.

Nix got the head shot.

181

...the entire world, had taken it. There never was and can be no doubt of this. One possible explanation of the word "purportedly" is in the incompleteness of the photograph. It is one of a half-dozen always barbered versions in the record. Because the alteration of the photograph is at no point acknowledged, who doctored it is also not known. Among the possibilities is the photo lab. That might mean Shaneyfelt himself. But the photographs he produced could have been altered subsequently.

"After one of the shots" is an intriguing phrase. If Shaneyfelt meant only one shot had been fired, he was also saying, according to the careful limitations imposed by the Report's conclusion, that both men had been wounded before Frame 255 and that the shot that missed had not been fired by then. This allowed but 58 frames for the firing of two shots, barely the absolute mathematical minimum for the most expert and, from the performance of the Commission's own experts, beyond their capability, too (WHITEWASH 26).

Mr. Specter. What motion pictures, if any, were taken during the reenactment?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. During the reenactment the black-and-white photographs were made from Zapruder's position with a Speedgraphic camera and we also took motion pictures with Mr. Zapruder's camera from Zapruder's position with the car in the fixed locations as they were established with the car just stationary in those locations.

After establishing all those points and making these film records of it, we then had the car proceed along that Elm Street route at approximately 11 miles per hour, and filmed it with Mr. Zapruder's camera loaded with color film from Mr. Zapruder's position and simultaneously photographed it with Mr. Nix's camera from Mrs. Muchmore's position, and this was done twice (5H162).

Mr. Shaneyfelt. ... I found, in examining the film, that this is a shorter span of time than in the actual film. It is a span on the reenactment of about three and a half seconds between 222 and 313. The second frame stained is 313 but since it is running at a faster speed I have also stained a spot that represents 5 seconds which is what the time lapse was between frame 222 and frame 313 in the actual assassination films (5H176).

This cannot be passed over as blithely as Specter and those Commission members permitted. First, Shaneyfelt testified that his filmed reconstruction disagreed with the Zapruder film. This could have been caused by the Zapruder camera operating at a different speed than Shaneyfelt said, 18.3 frames per second (5H153), when Zapruder used it; by its going more rapidly when Shaneyfelt used it, or by other lack of faithfulness in the reenactment. An error of 30 percent cannot simply be ignored.

The entire case is absolutely and finally destroyed if the real time required to film Frames 222 through 313 required less than five seconds. Anything even close to 3.5 seconds requires an autopsy for the Report, for the minimum reloading time alone is more than that, or 4.6 seconds.

Specter's monumental indifference to this flaw, minute in seconds but astronomical in significance, is unfortunately characteristic of the entire Report and the staff work that went into it. One of two things is here inevitable: either the FBI's reconstruction was phony or the account of the assassination is false. Either is fatal to the Report.

Here the total and consistent failure of any of the Commission

180