



by Robert Groden

Last November in Dallas, at a symposium sponsored by JFK/Lancer, the rumor that the original Zapruder film was and is a fake received a great deal of attention. The story (which is on par with the Truman Capote created fairy-tale that President Kennedy had survived Dallas and was living on one of Aristotle Onassis' islands) was started by disinformation mongers in the Kennedy case in an attempt to discredit what is probably the single most important piece of evidence that we have.

There is absolutely no basis in fact to back up this theory, and as long as the story was only being spread by the same "researchers" that were claiming that the "Z" film is a cartoon, that it doesn't matter what it shows, and that the president's head wounds were tampered with on his (stolen) body before the autopsy, the story was little more than an obvious attempt by the propaganda machine of the cover-up to confuse new and uninformed critics of the Warren Report and give the establishment press an excuse to ridicule the genuine critics and paint us all with the same brush as the nuts. These rumors were created as disinformation in the first place.

What was so frightening about the Dallas Lancer conference was that the disinformation peddlers had convinced some legitimate researchers that there was merit in the farce. People whom I had respected in their own fields, where they know what they are doing, were now attempting to present

themselves as photo-analysts and following the suggestions and theories of frauds and pretenders who couldn't tell an f-stop from a bus stop if their lives depended on it.

At the COPA symposium at Georgetown University in Washington this past June, Dr. David Mantik gave a presentation outlining the issues presented by the faction that claims that the Zapruder film is a fake. Ninety-five percent of the issues presented can easily be explained right off the bat. The other five percent would require expensive demonstrations (which were not shown) to illustrate the issues in question to see if his interpretations of the issues have any merit. As yet no such presentation has taken place.

Most of the problems seem to come from these "researchers" not understanding things such as the difference between focus and blur, ghost images, and linear edge stretch. The misinterpretation of film damage, emulsion flaws, and defects as artifact beyond reality also contribute to this problem. Faulty analysis and misinterpretation based on assumption of how motion picture film works has led so-called researchers to rush to judgment and create the fiction about the film being forged. One might ask, "To what end?" The fact that the Zapruder film has hurt those attempting to further the cover-up of the conspiracy more than any other piece of evidence and the lack of logic that for the film to be altered in the manner suggested, would work against the cover-up where leaving it alone would hurt the seekers of the truth doesn't bother the rumor mongers. If the film were faked, how come the forgers didn't make the President's head go forward (to back the lone assassin theory) instead of to the rear, which *destroys* the theory? Why would they leave shot timing gaps both too short and too long to fit any of the official theories? The clarity and resolution as well as the tonal range and the film emulsion and wind as well as copies made the same day also prove that the original film is genuine.

But these are the same "assassination researchers" that want us to believe that the grassy knoll was created by the CIA out of paper mache so that the assassins would have

cover (even though the plaza has been there since 1938, a quarter century prior to the assassination), that the entire Republican party and/or the Secret Service assassinated President Kennedy, that Governor Connally was actually shot from the front, and under threat of death, allowed himself to be surgically altered to make it appear that he was shot from behind. This allegedly took place before he regained consciousness while still in Parkland Hospital on the afternoon of the assassination. This should give us a clue to the degree of validity of the Z-film claim. For years these characters have altered the evidence to fit their illogical and far-out theories. This claim is no exception. Some, such as Dr. Mantik are sincere and believe what is being shown to them, but there are those who are using people such as him to promote their theories. On the final day at the Georgetown symposium {a certain author} started ranting and raving that Dr. Mantik's presentation was his work.

This, Dr. Mantik denied, but [the author] continued to insist that the "work" was his. If this was true, it explains everything. For the vast majority of the items presented by Dr. Mantik, simple and provable explanations answer the questions raised. I have not had the time nor the energy to deal with the other five percent or so.

Fortunately, very few people really believe that the film is a fake, but the resulting confusion and doubt create the danger of further disinformation.

One researcher has tried to "prove" that the Secret Service killed President Kennedy and has bootlegged a copy of the Zapruder film, increased the contrast and reduced the chroma (color saturation) and gray scale to make it appear as if the reflection of sunlight from the forehead and hair on Roy Kellerman's head was, "a nickel plated automatic pistol" fired by the limo driver, Bill Greer. Since the original Zapruder film proves that he was either wrong, lying, or crazy, he attacks the authenticity of the film.

Another, more well known but just as demented "researcher" has tried to convince his readership that the limousine stopped in the

middle of Elm Street (which it did not), and since the Zapruder, Nix, Muchmore, and Bronson films all prove that it didn't stop, he claims that all of the films of the assassination are faked. This also creates another problem for those who are trying to destroy the Zapruder film as evidence. If the film is faked, then the other three films, which confirm the authenticity of the Z-film would all have to be faked as well. The others, clearly, have not been faked either.

It also needs to be mentioned that not one of the originators of this ludicrous rumor have ever seen, held or inspected the "camera original" of the Zapruder film. I have. There is not one genuine earmark of forgery anywhere in the film. Both Dr. Mantik and myself have agreed to try to get together and try to resolve the remaining 5% of the "discoveries." However, because of the vast expense involved, and the fact that we live 1,700 miles apart, that has not yet occurred. I hope we will be able to do this before the end of the year.

THE LARRY HOWARD FILM

In 1991, while we were working on Oliver Stone's JFK, Larry Howard filmed the motorcade from Abraham Zapruder's perch using the same type of Bell and Howell 8mm movie camera. The artifacts cited by those promoting the story of the film being false are all present in the film shot by Larry.

Measurements, blur, focus, distance, the works. The measurements and blur of the Stemmons Freeway road sign which was placed back in its original spot by Oliver Stone are identical on the Howard and Zapruder films. The Howard film bears out the authenticity of the Zapruder film, as does everything else.

Once again I will state that I have no problem with the sincerity of Dr. Mantik. I believe and know that his conclusion here is wrong. But there are others who are using him and then hiding while they accomplish their foul work. These frauds know that the film is real and must be laughing their heads off at the amount of work and time that is being wasted on this hogwash.

Is the Zapruder film a fake? No! Just

because someone believes a fairy tale doesn't make it true. I clearly can't spare the weeks that it would take twiddle with every one of the issues that are being raised by this fairy tale.

Nor is it worth the expense to disprove a story that which is already proven as fiction. Disinformation such as the fake-Z-film story can only hurt the search for the truth.

May all the truth be known...soon!

(Used by special permission of the author. JFK/DPQ gratefully acknowledge the cooperation of Dallas researcher Greg Jaynes who first featured this article on his internet website.)



Dear Editors:

I enjoyed this piece on the reported death of a Secret Service man in Dallas on 22nd November 1963. This has always been a source of interest to me although I cannot claim to have studied it too deeply or got as close to it as Mark Crouch obviously has.

It was long my opinion that the story had originated through people seeing the prone form of Clint Hill across the back of the limo and assuming that he had been shot dead, maybe whilst returning fire. Incidentally, I am still not a hundred percent sure that isn't the origin of the rumor!

Mark Crouch states that the "dead guy story" broke at about the same time that Air Force One was leaving Love Field for Washington -- shortly before 4:00pm EST. I have reason to believe that it was about half an hour before that. I purchased the complete collection of news flashes which had come across the

Atlantic from Dallas into the BBC in London.

Those in respect of the JFK assassination start at 6:42pm GMT (12:42pm CST, 1:42pm EST) and continue through until 9:15pm (3:15pm, 4:15pm EST). I think I'm correct in putting EST one hour behind CST. My basis for all the times is GMT (Greenwich Mean Time).

Anyway, a Reuter newflash into the BBC in London, timed at 8:21pm GMT (2:21pm CST, 3:21pm EST) reads exactly as follows: SHOOTING DALLAS NOV 22 REUTER. A SECRET SERVICEMAN AND A DALLAS POLICEMAN WERE SHOT TODAY SOME DISTANCE FROM WHERE PRESIDENT KENNEDY WAS ASSASSINATED. MORE 2021. (The 2021 at the end is the GMT time - 8:21pm.)

That's the one and only mention of the mysterious dead Secret Service man in the whole of the news flashes. I do not have an address or contact number for Mark Crouch so I would ask if you would kindly pass it on to him. I don't think it will help to establish exactly where the story came from but at least it cuts down the time frame a little.

Ian Griggs

Dear Walt and Jan,

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I received this week from the National Archives.

I thought you and your readers might find it of interest. Though I bought many slides at \$3.50 each, I find \$11.25 prohibitive. Maybe that's the idea.

Maybe the Federal Government should go to WalMart where it costs only \$.47 to duplicate a color slide.

Rob Tindle

[Enclosed with Rob's letter was a transmittal from the Archives, saying just what he wrote, "The next schedule reflects the cost of 2x2 slides at US \$11.25 per copy. The new order form reflects these changes." Sincerely, Ramona Branch Oliver]