

THESE PHOTOGRAPHS - WHERE WAS THE PRESIDENT WHEN STRUCK BY THE FIRST
BULLET?

"Hudson Exhibit No. 1" is not really a Hudson exhibit. It is a photograph identified as having been taken by Philip L. Willis. His deposition appears in Vol. VII, p.492-7, followed by that of his daughter taking up another page and a half. The date was July 22, 1964, with the questioning by Liebeler. He is a disabled World War II Air Force Major and an independent real estate broker. He was a color picture. He is an amateur photographer. He was at the corner of Houston and Main and took pictures before the Presidential motorcade turned into Houston Street. (p.492) After getting a similar picture of the then Vice President, a personal friend, "I immediately ran across the Plaza, raced over to Elm Street and stationed myself on the curb in front of the Texas School Book Depository." He can be identified by a picture that appeared in the Memorial edition of LIFE. He got some pictures as close as 10 feet to the Presidential car. He moved down the street as the motorcade proceeded and says the LIFE shows him "in about three different pictures going down the street". He declares, "... in fact, a shot caused me to squeeze the camera shutter, and I got a picture of the President as he was hit with the first shot. So simultaneous, in fact, that the crowd hadn't had time to react." He declared, "I am the only one, I am told, who has a complete set of prints covering the last 25 seconds of the President's life and the assassination and the tragedy following." Shown "Hudson Exhibit No. 1", he says, "that picture was made at the very instant that the first shot was fired." He points out Zapruder's position in the background of his picture (p.493). Willis also points out that a previous picture he took, the one immediately preceding this one, the President "is facing the outside of the street and smiling

2 - Photos

and waving." Liebeler said he didn't follow it and asked Willis to repeat it, which Willis did. "Hudson Exhibit No. 1" is the fifth in Willis's series. He then describes No. 4, "which you see doesn't include the front or the rear of the President's car, but ^{the} ~~is~~ centered. That is proving how close it was." (p.494)

He cites the shadow of the tree, as I have in my previous commentary, as showing a position below which on the street he had not yet reached.

Asked again about the coincidence of the shot and his snapping the shutter, he says, "Absolutely. I, having been in World War II, and being a deer hunter hobbyist, I would recognize a high-powered rifle immediately." And he repeats that he heard the shot prior to the time ^{he} ~~of~~ took the picture. He heard three shots.

He didn't take any other pictures instantly because he was concerned about his little daughters who "were running along behind the Presidential car, and I was immediately concerned about them, and I was screaming for them to come back, and they didn't hear me. But I was concerned about them immediately, because I knew something tragic had happened, and the shots didn't ring out long like a rifle shot that is fired into midair in a distance. I knew it hit something, and it couldn't have been a firecracker or anything like that ..." (Compare this with the testimony of all the Secret Service agents who talked about "firecrackers" in a self-serving context.) He identifies the point at which his wife was waiting as not "more than 40 feet from where the President was hit." She was "back in the crowd looking through this concrete structure." (p.495)

He is certain the shots came from the building and "I screamed, hoping the policeman would hear me, to ring that building ..." He said

3 - photos - Willis

"I wven looked for smoke, and I knew it came from high up/" When asked how, he replied, "I even observed the clock on top of the build^ging, it was 12:33 when I looked up there." This is shown on his slide No. 12 (p.496)

Linda Kay Willis's testimony follows on pp.498-9. She is 15 years old. She saw the first shot hit the President but "couldn't tell where the second shot went." She heard only 3 shots and was certain, after initially thinking it was fireworks, that it "was too loud and too close to be fireworks".

The Willis slides are on pp.767-773, Vol. XXI. On Slide No. 3, p.769, note that none of the Secret Service men are looking up, with one possible but remote exception. Note also the Presidential and followup cars are a lot closer together than the 20-25 feet Secret Service men testified to. Note on slide No. 5, p.770 (Hudson Exhibit No. 1), that of all of the heads visible in the followup car, only one is not looking toward the area on the knoll where several witnesses said they thought the shots had come from.

In his deposition of September 1, 1964, in Vol. XV, Shanefelt is asked about these pictures beginning at the bottom of p.695. He prepared an exhibit called "Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 25", p.471, Vol. XXI. It deals with slide No. 5, or Hudson Exhibit No. 1. It shows the position of Zapruder, point No. 2 is the President, point No. ³ is the Stemmons Freeway sign, point No. 4 is never identified. It may presume to be Shaneyfelt's reconstruction of where Willis was standing. This whole business is typical of the flimflamery in which the FBI and the Commission collude. First of all, the position shown for the President in No. 2 is incorrect. It shows the President after he was known to have been hit. The position ~~in~~ No. 4 presumed to be that

4 - photos - Shanefelt

of Willis, an unnecessary presumption as Shanefelt himself makes clear. And the whole thing is almost entirely illegible. Not one of the crucial letterings on this chart is legible with a magnifying glass. It seems as though down the center of the road a series of marks are made which I would presume are the frame numbers from the Zapruder film. But I am just guessing. If this is the case, position No. 2 is arbitrarily and entirely inaccurately determined as the position of the President at frame No. 225 ~~at~~ ^{of} the Zapruder film. The picture in question was taken by Willis and it clearly shows that it was taken before the President passed behind the Stemmons Freeway sign as viewed from Zapruder's position; yet this line is a projection from Zapruder's position in the general direction of Willis's presumed position.

If, on the other hand, as with the aid of a magnifying glass seems possible, Shanefelt projected one line through the center of the Stemmons Freeway sign, then position No. 2 could be halfway between frame No. 205 and 225. But again he is using Zapruder to locate Willis, and if he were to do this, he has to recognize the fact that Zapruder is not hidden by the sign from Willis's lens. Thereafter, Shanefelt concluded the Willis photograph was taken "in the vicinity of the time that frame 210 of the Zapruder picture was taken." This is not an accurate determination because the exact location of the photograph (Hudson Exhibit No. 1 - HW), as related to the Zapruder film, would be generally during the period that the President was behind the signboard in the Zapruder film, which covers a range from about frame 205 to frame 225."

205 is the frame at which most of the President is obliterated. I want to point out that he is not going behind the sign as the inter-

5 - photos

pretations of Mr. Redlich indicate from side to side, that is, disappearing entirely behind the sign. There was a downhill grade and the car gradually disappeared behind the sign from upper left to lower right. At frame 205 the President's head is still visible. His right arm, raised up, is still visible. Yet he is about a quarter of the way past the left-hand edge of the sign as seen in the frame from the Zapruder film. (Without intending to confuse this - and I hope I don't - I want to point out that it is only a presumption that in these last frames before his head was obliterated by the sign the President is waving. It would seem to be just as fair a presumption that he is reacting to the shot. The gesture from Zapruder's position could very well be identical. Examination of frames 203-5 on pp.17-8 of Vol. XVIII can lead to a conclusion consistent with the President having been shot by that time and to have begun his reaction. The Commission's films are deplorably and unjustifiably unclear in view of the clarity of other pictures made from this film. But it would seem from frame 205 that the President may very well have his right hand up against his neck.)

Frame 210 is crucial to the Commission's reconstruction because this is the earliest frame to represent a situation that would have provided a shot from the sixth floor window. Hence ~~therefore~~ they cannot conclude that the President was shot by an earlier frame.

On p.697 Mr. Redlich then, as a basis for further conclusions to be drawn by Mr. Shaneyfelt, misrepresents Willis's testimony in saying/ Willis stated "that he took this photograph almost at the instant that the President was hit ... " What Willis actually said (Vol. VII, p.493) was that he took this picture after the shot was fired. He repeated this in several different ways, and in its most dramatic form on p.493

6 - photos

when he says, "in fact, the shot caused me to squeeze the camera shutter, and I got a picture off the President as he was hit with the first shot. So instantaneous, in fact, that the crowd hadn't had time to react." This is a specific and graphic description of the time at which he took the picture, and it is distorted by ~~Mr.~~ Mr. Redlich on p.697, Vol. XV, in the conditions he is posing for Shaneyfelt's evaluation. It is also something with which almost everyone who has ever taken a picture must certainly be familiar. It is the kind of thing one just doesn't forget.

On p.696, Shaneyfelt said he determined approximately where Mr. Willis was standing by correspondence. This after Willis had testified under oath. Also, in the picture No. 1 in the October 2, 1964, printing by LIFE of the Zapruder films, a photographer who seems to be just advancing his film after taking a picture is clearly visible in almost the middle of the background. It is the only photographer I can see in this picture. Projection of the original Zapruder films on the screen would have been much more distinct and would have allowed Willis to identify himself, if others couldn't. This being Willis, then Willis and Zapruder were approximately on a line with the left-hand edge of the sign as viewed in the Zapruder films. And this being the case, there would be no need for all of this conjecture, which serves only to let the Commission try to evade the clear probability that the President was shot at a time when it said he could not have been shot from the Depository Building.

In an effort to wrap it up, Mr. Redlich on pp.697 says, "Returning for just a moment to Mr. Willis's location, would it not have been possible for you to fix his exact location by reference to two fixed points in the background at different points in this picture?"

7 - photos

Shaneyfelt readily agrees, saying, "Yes; it would be possible having Mr. Willis' camera, to fix his location with some degree of accuracy by using it at the specific location in Dallas, and relating various objects in the photograph to their location as they appear" in the picture, to which Mr. Redlich says, "You are reasonably satisfied, however, that the technique that you have used to fix his location is a reasonably accurate one upon which you can base the conclusions which you have stated today?" and Shaneyfelt's response was, "Yes, yes. I feel that the exact establishing of the position of Mr. Willis would not add a great deal of additional accuracy to my present conclusions."

Here is a clear admission that Shaneyfelt estimated and approximated unnecessarily. He could have used the camera - and at no point is the camera that was used by Willis identified, either here or in Willis's deposition - and he elected not to. The only conclusion that can be drawn from this is that he wanted or the Commission wanted the flexibility that permitted them again to evade the clear probability that was against its reconstruction.

Even then note the language used by Redlich, "reasonably accurate". Is this a sufficient basis for such a report in the presence of a clearly more accurate and readily available method? Especially one that was known to be available?

The Commission's reconstruction here is so tight on time that a fraction of a second in its own reconstruction destroys the possibility of the bullet having been fired from the sixth floor window.

And note Shaneyfelt's appraisal of what he could have done but didn't. He described it as an "exact establishing of the position of Mr. Willis."

This is why I called it flimflamery. We have a combination of

8 - photos

presumption, inaccurate and illegible charts, a selection of presumption and estimate instead of exact measurement, misrepresentation and distortion of ^{the}/conditions/ and ^{the} ~~of~~ testimony, and deceptive language.

I believe this proves what I had earlier forecast as soon as I had located the film identified as Hudson Exhibit No. 1.