

Private  
Friedrich - H.C.  
Abraham of Penn  
Garrison Lake  
"House of Silence"  
Universal thing - has  
been absent with  
him - woman  
called in - mother  
of police man -  
John Abraham  
Hobbes &  
Brooklyn - father  
Carl Mayer Stone  
called policeman -  
Two - Hoffmann  
in New York in  
Car - not caught  
in hunting -  
all were taken to  
London after  
attainment

Arthur Luman in  
Mexico - passport -  
not only taken -  
with Mexican  
nationality - British  
Agent Mexican  
Detective  
Allen 2 -

3/28/68

Dear Allen,

Before I get to the interesting things you told me last night, here are the only three duplicates I have of some of the frames of the Zapruder film. These are photographs directly from Volume 18 of the Commission "evidence", the word we have to use for lack of a proper description of that conspicuous abandonment of every American concept of proper evidence.

There are a number of things I can illustrate-prove-by it and also explain why Jim Garrison has subpoenaed the original of the Zapruder film rather than any copy. You will note sprocket holes in the left-hand margin of the film. These come close to being a third of the entire area of the film and by content, are about a quarter. Now it happens that when the film is projected, the material between the sprocket holes is invisible-not seen at all. This extends to slightly to the right of the sprocket holes as you look at the pictures. When an 8. mm film is copied, that same area is automatically masked by the machines that do the copying. Hence any copy of the Zapruder film has this same material automatically eliminated. For home movies this is okay. For evidence, it amounts to the destruction of evidence. Any body that uses a copy instead of the original is automatically suppressing evidence if the original is available.

In the appendices to my first two books, pp. 209 and 248, respectively, I reproduce one of the Commission's basic exhibits, Shaneyfelt 25. The top half is an enlargement of a 35mm picture taken by Phil Willis. The Commission agreed with 100% of the evidence, that this picture was taken after Willis heard a shot, after the President had been hit, in response to that shot-taken before Willis was ready to snap his picture because the shot caused his automatic reaction. Note that in approximately the middle of the background of this picture, Abraham Zapruder stands taking his movies. This means that at that point, Willis must be in Zapruder's pictures, close to the middle. The Commission estimates the Willis picture was taken after Zapruder Frame 210 and before 225. It also says the shot could not have been fired before 210, which, in addition, it says is the first time the shot could have been fired by Oswald in the sixth-floor TSD window.

Now it happens that by a remarkable "coincidence" Frame 210 and those surrounding it was destroyed. Without acknowledging this, the Commission said it printed all the frames seriatim. As you will see in the picture, the splicing at this point is quite amateurish. There is no Frame 210 in the evidence. It goes from an altered 207 to a combination 208-212 called 212. The Commission was and has been totally silent about the destruction or elimination of the frame at which it says the President could, for the first time, have been hit!

But if we take the pictures I send herewith and look at the left-hand edge of Frame 207, we can see Willis, just at the sprocket holes, beginning to walk into the street. In 202 this is more clear, and you can see the camera beginning to come down from his eye. He has, at this point, taken that picture. Here, all or in part, he is out of any copy, out of what is seen on projection. He has disappeared into the space between the sprocket holes at this point. My examination of the slides made from the original, from which these pictures were printed, shows he is entirely out of any part of the Zapruder film at Frame 205. In short, this proves that the President was hit before the Commission says he was and at a time when Oswald could not have done it. I go into this at some length in Whitewash II, "Willis in His Own Name".

Total official silence has greeted my exposure in WHITEWASH of the



destruction of these crucial frames of the film, as well as my exposure in WWII of this destruction of the official fairy tale we have been fed as a substitute for the solution of the crime.

A reporter friend of mine on the Baltimore Sun bugged LIFE about this for me. He got an "expansion", that the film was destroyed by accident and that led to the publicity that prompted LIFE to say they were "releasing" these frames. How they "released" you will find at the beginning of Photographic Whitewash, beginning on page 14 (not that I do not recommend the few pages before that). On page 19 you will find a direct quotation from J. Edgar Hoover answering charges he said had been made, meaning by me, but actually not yet made-included for the first time in WWII not then printed-in fact, my printer didn't have a copy at that time (if you'd care to enlarge on our conversation on bugging). And on p. 23 you will read my unanswered request of LIFE for copies of the "released" frames and the hitherto secret AP attachment to its copies, "For release only if forced to", and that day has not yet come!

This is our constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press, 1960s -style!

\* \* \* \*

Now for your call. Just about everything in it is important, and I'll explain why. It is evidence.

Throughout the country I now have responsible people who have read my books, gotten the Commission's 26 volumes, and asked what they can do to help. One man in Canada, as a consequence, has undertaken to make exhibits on these three things for me: all references to arrests (there were at least 10, suppressed by the Commission, before Oswald was arrested), of vehicles (and here certain cars make repeated appearances), and of weapons. If the incident of the two men and the paper-wrapped rifles can be given me in detail, with no public reference of any names, we can, perhaps, add materially to what we know. For the future, this information also is vital. If there is now an official record of it, most of the essential things should be recorded (since the FBI did not make that record!). *(Of office, Sam C. ...)*

The letter from the woman in Mexico relates to a number of things possibly involving Mexico and Mexicans. In confidence, I would like to have her letter. I will not disclose her name. Let me tell you a few of the newer things I have learned about Mexicans in this: Oswald was seen with a Mexican, described by Dean Andrews as a man who could go to "fist city". I have several witnesses never called by the Commission and, to the best of my knowledge, never interviewed by the FBI, who saw O regularly in N.O. with a man who was or who was thought to be a Mexican newspaperman. A Mexican restaurant figures in another new part. West-coast minuteman involvement with an officer in Mexican intelligence is still another. And there are more. So, everything you can put on paper, including an account of the ~~prizi~~ pistoleros, could be very important. Only specify what you want confidential, and I will not give that even to Garrison. But we really must know these things if we are ever to establish truth and come as close as possible to solving the crime. One other Mexican aspect that may be important has to do with gun-running.

Allen, what people will do to help is still inspirational. Almost two years ago I got a phone call from a woman who told me of knowing some of the characters in this story. What she then said then seemed far out. Yet I was impressed by her sincerity and reasonableness. Clearly, she was an educated woman and from her language, one of culture. I made notes and decided to learn a lot more before talking to her again. Six weeks ago, I decided the time had come. She moved and left no



new phone number. One day I decided how I might learn where she was. I tried it and it worked! She was surprised that I had found her (I never did ask why she made it difficult, knowing it had nothing to do with me). She was still willing to talk. I have four hours of her on tape, and it certainly helps piece much of that period of which she knew together. She has come up with an enormous number of names, many of which we will have to systematically check out. In the course of time I will. I am having some done by friends, by mail, right now. It is within the realm of possibility that her knowledge may lead us to what is really vital.

Had I tried to talk to her at great length two years ago, I doubt if I would have believed her because I just didn't know enough.

And I'm looking forward to the book.

Many thanks. Hope you can see your way to putting everything else about and from Shand on paper. Why not show him the reports I sent you, explain that with what he has already said he has subjected himself to the maximum jeopardy, and that his maximum protection lies in making a record of everything else he knows, thus eliminating every rational reason for anyone wanting to harm him, to close his mouth. If he does this, I can, I think, arrange an additional insurance policy if he wants it. Assure him that what he says will be preserved in confidence, that his name will not be connected with it without his permission, and that there is much other information on the Minutemen that cannot be connected with him, so he need have no fear on that score.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg