

equally dishonest. He characterizes Shaneyfelt's observation of the full left turn (now missing) as something "described in a complicated exchange." In fact, it appears in a long, uninterrupted paragraph, detailing Connally's movements from frame to frame. Why the misrepresentation? Promoters of the lone assassin theory often discredit eye witness testimony by asserting that the witnesses, usually untrained observers exposed to a shocking event for only a few seconds, cannot be relied upon. But Shaneyfelt was an FBI film analyst, a trained observer, who had hours to study the Zapruder film.

Ford "proves" frames from the Zapruder film have not been removed by citing Richard Burgess' article. He acknowledges "Burgess doesn't address Connally's turn, but we are dealing with a more complicated scenario than adding or deleting blobs of blood." How does Ford know? Removing frames may be a less complicated form of doctoring than the blob therapy described by Burgess.

Burgess' proof that no process existed in 1963 that would allow for the removal of frames without leaving any (or much) evidence: If he doesn't know about it, it didn't exist. His proof that no traces of tampering exist: If he can't see them, they aren't there. Burgess' film expertise is undocumented, and his assertions are not backed by any references from the scientific literature.

Burgess' statement, "First of all, arguments of fakery should arise from peculiarities within the film itself, not from comparison with other evidence," raises interesting questions: Why hasn't he addressed Chuck Marler's documentation regarding the impossibility of Will Greer's head turns in too short a time? What if two films of the same event, neither showing peculiarities visible to Burgess, contradict each other? If strong evidence from a variety of sources contradicts the Zapruder film, would Burgess just dismiss the evidence, or would he ever question his "expertise"?

Also undocumented is Burgess' knowledge of the film expertise of the intelligence agency accused of doctoring the assassination films. Might an agency whose business is deception and spying—often with cameras from great distances—know a bit more about film deception than Burgess and other members of the general public?

—Milicent Cranor, 630 W. 246th St., #921,
Riverdale, NY 10471

To the editor: May I offer a few comments about your March 1995 TFD?

1. Milicent Cranor's analysis of Connally's first account of the assassination (TFD July 1994, March 1995) is correct. Broadcast live from Parkland on November 27, 1963, Connally offered a different version of the shooting and NOVA in 1988 changed his words, perhaps to match his later explanation. Complete recordings do exist.

2. As for Jerry Organ's belief that Robert MacNeil, not Pierce Allman, asked Oswald for a phone, there is proof that MacNeil and William Manchester, who started it all, are incorrect. Oswald said the man had a crew cut, but pictures of MacNeil that weekend show his hair style longer than it is today and not a crew cut. Pierce Allman did wear a crew cut as confirmed by similar photos.

Organ also takes issue with the train story, addressed in previous issues, in which a Dallas policeman claimed to see the assassination while a freight train crossed the Trip Underpass. Both uncropped Mel McIntire photos show the end of one passenger car just north of the underpass barely 10 seconds after the assassination. The original, uncropped Volkland photo, shot from Stemmons 30 seconds later and showing the entire area behind the TSBD, reveals just one passenger car on the siding. Four freight cars (but no engine) are also visible a few hundred yards farther north. No trains are seen in these, or any other, films or photographs. As for Organ's reliance on aerial views made late that afternoon they are irrelevant to what happened just after the assassination. It's true that three passenger cars without an engine appear on the siding several minutes after the assassination but Organ's concern was MacNeil's claim that he saw trains back in the yards. If so, it happened later than the Volkland picture and NBC log suggest.

3. Now for Harry Livingstone's Who's Killing The Truth. His rebuttal to my review of his book demonstrates precisely why I have no respect for his work.

Contrary to his claim, my review never implied that he failed to measure the "scar" on the Elm Street sidewalk in the early 1970's; however, the decision to dig it up for analysis was made several years afterward by Earl Golz and the Dallas Morning News. Their commissioned study concluded that the piece of fabric caught in the wet cement when it was poured and made the mark as it dried and set. The results were conclusive that the News didn't even bother to print a story about it; instead, Earl relayed the findings to Penn Jones, who published them for the research community in January 1971. Livingstone should have known about that.

But notice that he claimed I removed the scar. I had nothing to do with it, didn't know Earl at that time and never knew he kept the cement core until he offered it to me about ten years ago before moving from Dallas. Using some common sense, if I were trying to keep the truth from coming out, as Livingstone suggests, I've had a decade to dispose of that "bullet scar" so no one would ever see it again; instead, I saved the "evidence," have shown it to researchers and wrote of its existence. Besides, why would the brilliant assassination plotters leave behind proof of their crime when anyone could have drilled out that "scar" in a matter of minutes? Even more ridiculous is Livingstone's recommendation that I place the core in the National Archives. It is proof of nothing but careless construction. Livingstone believes there has been a government coverup and now he wants me to turn over hard evidence of a second gunman to the very people who could make it vanish?!

To realize how absurd his theory really is, one need only diagram the trajectory. A bullet fired from the storm drain on the south end of the underpass would have passed over Kennedy at about Z-350, two seconds after the fatal head shot knocked him down, making another shot impossible and unnecessary.

As for the Bronson film and the acoustics evidence, I have written extensively about both in TFD for November 1993, March 1994 and July 1994. I own several film and tape copies of the Bronson film, but the original has always been either with Bronson's family or his attorney. I have continually pushed for the study and broadcast of the film since 1978, and well over a half million viewers in the Dallas and Boston areas have seen it.

Yes, there were antics at the 1992 JAMA conference. About an hour into the presentation, during the Q&A, JAMA's Rubin Mattel firmly admonished Livingstone by saying "You're here as a guest...this is a news conference. You do not have news credentials. We allowed you in. Now please behave yourself and you can stay."

When Livingstone needs an answer, but cannot find supporting evidence, he makes one up. For example, he links me and my acoustics theory with "close associate Robert Groden," even though we have not been friends or associates for several years. In fact, we never talked or met until the fall of 1978, long after the acoustics theory was brought to the HSCA's attention. It is both suspicious and disappointing to me that a select few in the critical community are so intent on destroying one of the

few pieces of hard evidence that can ever make a difference in this case. Every researcher ought to be pushing for further work until there is no doubt about the acoustics issue.

As for the veracity of Madeleine Brown, she was charged, tried by jury and convicted of forgery on November 6, 1992. The court of appeals reversed that conviction, apparently on a technicality in the original indictment, on January 19, 1995, months after my review had been submitted and days after the January 1995 TFD was mailed. Interested researchers can consult Criminal Case #F-9103481L in Dallas County. Despite what Livingstone wrote, Madeleine's longtime friend Jim Marrs tells me he has no plans to write an article defending her. Livingstone either made that up, or she did.

Finally, Livingstone suggests I am afraid "of the new scientific information about to be published in my new book." Quite the contrary. Livingstone's "new" information, that the Zapruder film has been altered, requires proof that the other three films of the head shot (Nix, Muchmore and Bronson) have likewise been changed yet still match each other. If that were possible, and it isn't, the perpetrators had to have all four original films in their possession that weekend before any copies were made. Yet Bronson didn't bring his film in for processing until Monday. Perhaps that's the real reason Livingstone wants you to think it doesn't show the head shot—it destroys his theory. When his book appears, the media will ask pro-conspiracy film maker Oliver Stone about the alteration theory and he'll just laugh. Maybe then Livingstone will behave himself.

-Gary Mack, 6646 E. Lovers Lane #604,
Dallas, TX 75214-1619