

Aguilar about the additional ones I have now included. From my point of view, to state that virtually or nearly all witnesses are saying the "same thing" does not hold up. In a court of law proceeding, it wouldn't either.

And who of us, among members of the JFK research community, does not remember when we castigated Warren Commission attorney Arlen Specter for substituting "neck" for "back" in support of his absurd single bullet theory explaining the non-fatal first wounding of President Kennedy? He palmed this off on the Warren Commission as if he were herding a bunch of elephants running across a freshly painted sidewalk and not a single member of the Commission nor its staff publically denounced him for doing this. That's in the historical record for all to see. Should researchers and what they have stated not also be subjected to critical examination as the Warren Commission has? The answer should be obvious.

In conclusion: to paraphrase a well known phrase, perhaps the business of science is too important to be left to the scientists.

Back in the late 1960's, I taught a college course on the JFK case at San Francisco State University. If a student in that course had advanced a particular argument and a reply was offered in rebuttal and that student had stated that the reply was "irrelevant" but refused to explain why it was irrelevant, he probably would've flunked my course. This "irrelevance" comment would be rejected just as quickly as if someone had said he (or she) had to leave the class at that moment in order to attend the maiden voyage of the Titanic!

History is often a harsh judge and when the axe falls on myths, falsehoods and outrageous beliefs, that axe cuts swiftly and deep. I believe it was the writer, Oscar Wilde, who said it well when he wrote that the only obligation we owe to history is to change it.

That's the obligation all of us owe as serious students and researchers. I take that obligation very seriously; otherwise history is rendered meaningless.

Or maybe that brilliant Defense Attorney, Clarence Darrow, was right after all, when he said that the only thing we learn from history is that we don't learn from history. Can history absolve us? Only time will tell. I rest my case!

THE ZAPRUDER FILM: MEMO TO THE FILE

by

Harrison E. Livingstone

We examined most or all of the 8mm copies of the Zapruder film held by NARA during a number of visits in January and February this year. Accompanying me were my colleagues Doug Mizzer, Daryll Weatherly, and Officer Matthew Branham, Baltimore City Police. We are preparing a series of charts with measurements and other data on each of the films.

1) We found several films with the number 0186 printed on their leaders. This number was not punched through except in one case, (Secret Service No. 2; 87.010) and were otherwise printed on the film from original perforated copies, presumably, indicating that these films are not the copies made by Jamieson in Dallas on November 22, 1963. Also, they do not have the number "0183" printed on them, which, according to an affidavit made by Kodak November 22, 1963, they should have *in addition to the later numbers*. They are not the Jamieson copies because they have no sprocket hole images in the motorcade and Dealey Plaza sequences and the film is entirely black to the left of the "septum." Jamieson insists that the contact printing process used by his technician, Marshal Collier, would have copied all of the intersprocket areas we know are on the original film and which are on the present copies of the "home movie" which Zapruder took shortly before on the same roll of film. This film is documented by NARA as having been made by Life and given to the Secret Service. Why would they do this when they had two of Jamieson's copies? Both originals appear to have been substituted for by the two made by Life. Did the Secret Service damage them? The bottom line is that the disappearance of the Jamieson copies makes it impossible to compare the intersprocket areas with the "camera original" film.

2) One film, titled "Secret Service Copy No. 1" (87.010) had the number 0183 printed out, but not punched through. This purports to be a copy made from the original but is not a first generation copy because the sprocket areas, as in the above films, are completely black. This

Harrison E. Livingstone
P.O. Box 7149
Baltimore MD 21218

film is also documented as having been made by Life and was evidently given to the Secret Service. It lacks later numbers in the sequence, so the actual pedigree of this film is greatly in doubt. There is a physical splice at Z 133 but none at 207, indicating it is a multi-generation made from the original before it was damaged by Life.

3) The single film spoken of in item 1 above which had the perforated numbers, "0186" (Secret Service No. 2 (87.010) is not authentic because the black strip of film with the perforated numbers is spliced into the middle of the film between the motorcade and three people in Dealey Plaza segments, and the rest of the film containing assassination sequences does not have intersprocket area images.

4) Documentation provided to me by the Assassination Records Review Board from Eastman Kodak in Dallas dated November 22, 1963 (possibly postdated) indicates that the number 0183 was punched through the camera original film before it went to Jamieson to be copied. Jamieson Film Company made an affidavit on the same day stating "And that the end of the processed film carried the identification number 0183, which was printed onto the said duplicate copies." The later statement is of great importance because it means that the three Jamieson copies would have *both* 0183 printed on them, and one of the three numbers: "0185, 0186 or 0187" punched through them when the contact prints were processed at Kodak. We saw no such film at NARA.

5) Doug Mizzer discovered, in his study of home movies made by his father with a similar 8mm or Double 8 camera in the early Sixties, that there is a "fade in" and a "fade out" between scenes extending some three frames. We do not know what make camera was used. As a result of his study, we found that the first frame is overexposed in nearly all the films where a new sequence begins with one notable exception: the motorcade's appearance at 133. This may be a major indication that many frames were removed at a time when there is evidence that the limousine was stopped just after making the turn onto Elm. The driver admitted to moving at only 3-4 mph, and the brake light is on in the Towner film, which does not appear to be attributable to sunlight, as is the apparent lighting of the left brake light later on when the car is near Zapruder.

6) Another problem surfaces when we consider that there are a number of home movie strips of film in the NARA inventory in excess of the three that Jamieson

copied. How can we have all of them showing intersprocket area images? Technically, we can't have more than three, and each of them are spliced to motorcade sequences which have no intersprocket images at all.

7) I have studied C. Mayn's report of 21 December, 1995 concerning his technical review of the "camera original" Zapruder film. He does not find or does not mention the perforated identification number "0183" placed on the film in Dallas. He assumes that the camera original would contain an image covering the entire intersprocket area from the aperture, but we do not know if this is entirely true because it is controverted by the images we have on the home movie. He may or may not be correct, but it seems to me that the intersprocket areas we have on the home movies, in your inventory, which is greatly at variance with the total lack of images in the motorcade sequence intersprocket areas on the *same* film strips would tend to indicate that the opposite of what he says about the operation of film printers is true. That is, the home movie may be more accurate a representation, and it only shows the area half filled up towards the left side, but the edge printing is there.

Therefore, it may be impossible for the "camera original" film presently in possession of the Archives to be an original film because the intersprocket areas are at radical variance with those of the "home movie" in two major respects. a) the home movie lacks any evidence of ghost images in the upper right area adjoining the upper sprocket hole, and b) because the home movie intersprocket area of images carried over from the central frame area are perfect continuations of the central frame image, except for a "septum" dividing them, but only cover the right half of the intersprocket area. The area heading to the left edge and edgeprinting on all home movie copies we examined was black. The slides made from the "camera original" by Life and also reproduced by the Warren Commission in Vol. 18 of the Hearings, show a complete image all the way to the left edge, but with no septum. This image, however, has an upper area and a lower area, both comprising about half of the intersprocket area. The upper area is light, in contradistinction to the lower area which is dark. It is in this upper area where a "ghost image" appears in two separate long segments of the film as seen in the slides and in Vol. 18 of the Hearings of the WC. In the first appearance, we see the image of a motorcycle that

must have been on the right rear fender of the car (because we see the entire front wheel and windshield) but which never appears in the central frame itself. The second instance appears much later in the film, and occurs between frames 437 and ends at 458, if I'm not mistaken. The strange thing about this phenomena toward the end of the slides (is this the end of the film? We have slides through Z-483) is that all the intersprocket areas are black and without images from Z-413, except for the small window of pictures in the 21 frames or so above described in the upper right corner of the intersprocket area beneath the sprocket hole.

Without the technical experience to comment on this, I will state that it appears that this is evidence of tampering of some kind and Life should be asked if they have an explanation. It is suspicious or sinister in that gunmen may have been in the storm drains on the bridge facing the approaching car and this is the area that may be blacked out in the film, if they would have been photographed as the camera panned to the bridge. If the film was blown up and reframed, it might have eliminated activity on top of the bridge near the shooters.

How could the intersprocket area be black and yet have an image in that one area for 21 frames, and throughout the rest of the film have a full image taking up all of the area in the motorcade sequence, and only in the right half in the home movie?

It is our belief that the "original film," if it corresponds to the slides in the Archives, is a blown up version of the film which accounts for the complete filling up of the intersprocket area with a continuation of the central image, and that the film has been reframed. The purpose of this hard to fathom, except to eliminate peripheral data. Of course, it is my personal belief that scenes have been removed and the film altered with retouching and composited frames, as vector analysis, conducted by Daryll Weatherly, indicates. Enlarging the frames and reframing them might be a method of better concealing such alterations.

Apparent reframing is particularly evident as the limousine emerges from behind the Stemmons Freeway sign and the car and occupants all but disappear in the film.

There is no doubt that additional copies were made on November 22, 1963. Furthermore, it is inconceivable that the Secret Service, which had constructive possession or a chain of evidence on this film throughout most of November 22, 1963, would have ever given possession of the original to Abraham Zapruder. I can-

not imagine any law enforcement agency doing that, and in fact, they demonstrated throughout that day and succeeding days that they would seize any and all photographic evidence and keep it for a period of time, perhaps copying much of it, before returning it—if at all. The most important film of the assassination, described in (CD) 298 as the "Nix" film but in fact that of Beverly Oliver, was never returned.

THE MAN-IN-THE-DOORWAY: THE PLOT THICKENS

by
John J. Johnson

In the last issue, I offered a reward for previously unpublished photographs which would help identify the man-in-the-doorway. Although I haven't received any new photographs yet, one researcher in Australia has spotted something very interesting about the Lovelady plaid shirt. Jim Baker, 133 Ocean Drive, Evans Head, 2473 writes:

On page 187 of Groden's book The Killing of a President, there is a black and white photograph ostensibly of Lovelady. The plaid shirt Lovelady is wearing has a pocket flap on the left breast, yet the coloured picture on the right side of the page which Lovelady said he was wearing at the time of the shooting has no pocket flap!

Billy Lovelady never produced his long sleeve shirt for the Warren Commission investigators. The first recorded instance of Lovelady showing the plaid shirt to anyone is when Bob Jackson photographed him on the steps of the Depository in November of 1971. Robert Groden was sent to Denver to photograph Lovelady in that shirt for the HSCA in 1976.

Robert Groden attributes the black-and-white photograph to a film taken by F. M. Bell, although it may be from John Martin's 8mm film. I don't know; I am not familiar with F. M. Bell's film, although I do know it was used by the HSCA for study of a spectator who may have been Joseph Milteer as well as to study Lovelady. (HSCA 180—10091-10495) The color photo on the top

John J. Johnson
573 Hillsborough Rd.
Belle Mead NJ 08502