"HOW DID ZAPRUDER KNOW?"

With the exception of Sylvia Meagher (1967), almost every historical version viewed in bookprint and Internet www.com form on the "Incident at Dealey Plaza" off-handedly skirts over the conflicted and unresolved factual issue of the precise final motorcade route for President Kennedy's motorcade entourage. The motorcade route of 11/22/63 in Dallas, Texas attempted to exit Dealey Plaza before going to a Trade Mart luncheon about 12:30 PM, Texas time (CST), when the President was suddenly ambushed and assassinated on Elm Street, SW Plaza area, by gunfire—possibly from several directions with up to seven volleys of gunfire. The President (and Governor Connally) were taken to Parkland Memorial Hospital in Dallas. The situation was critical: JFK expired at about 1:00 PM (CST). Of note here, is that the motorcade route in Dealey Plaza, heading South to Stemmons Freeway had been changed several times that week, as reflected in the Dallas newspapers. The final route used was the November 19 route, not the advertised one of November 22.

A more notable event took place in parallel juxtaposition to the motorcade: the simultaneous 8-mm color filming non-stop of the entire tragic event in SW Dealey Plaza, below the area of the Texas School Book Depository Building (TSBD), formerly the Sexton Building. This photographic record, among several similar ones that day, was accomplished by the "amateur" filmographer, Abraham Zapruder, Abe Z, or "Mr. Z." Zapruder was a dress manufacturer and wholesaler outlet representative for a company from New York, Jennifer Juniors or Jennifer of Dallas, although Livingstone, Frewin, and others dispute the legitimacy of this company as it existed at the Dal-Tex Building. Zapruder was an alleged pro-JFK partisan, and spoke favorably of Kennedy, according to accounts given in the Dallas Jewish Historical Society Journal, Fall 1995, and on JFK-Lancer's "A History of the Zapruder Film," by Martin Shackelford.

Zapruder took the car to the lower SW Plaza area accompanied by his secretary, Marilyn Sitzman (d. 1993). His wife, Lillian (d. 1993) stayed at home, listening to local radio broadcasts on the JFK visit to Dallas. Zapruder (d. 1970), once a Manhattan N. Y. businessman, was not an expert with the new Bell and Howell camera. He had Marilyn Sitzman and the Hesters, Charles and Beatrice, pose for him as he prepared to film scenes from the SW pergola platform overlooking the Elm Street hillside. Marilyn Sitzman was also assigned the task of assisting Zapruder by steadying him and bracing him against vertigo or dizziness, by holding his legs firmly onto the concrete decorative platform as he stood, nearly embracing him so that he would not fall to the grass below. She was also able to view the motorcade.

The DJHS Journal (1995) says that Zapruder parked his car near Elm Street to go film; ditto, William Manchester's 1967 version of the events of 11/22/63. However,
Zapruder’s WC testimony of 7/64 with attorney Wesley Liebeler, was contradictory on this point. Zapruder gave the distinct impression in his testimony that he merely walked to the Elm Street pergola platform directly from the Dal-Tex Building at 501 N. Elm. Perhaps his recollection was faulty. Marilyn Sitzman never really clarified this point in her 1966 Thompson interview. There is an unresolved conflict here in the story line. Only Mrs. Hester or Ms. Rogers (if still alive) could resolve this minor point. Marilyn Sitzman died 1993. All versions consulted do agree that the entourage with Zapruder in Dealey Plaza (Marilyn Sitzman, Beatrice Hester, Charles Hester) walked back to the Dal-Tex Building, passing the TSBD Building, after the filming and the assassination of JFK. Few versions consulted even touch upon the use of the Zapruder car to get the entourage from Dal-Tex to the filming location on the pergola platform, abutment, pedestal, or perch. If a car was indeed used, it would have likely been parked on the lot behind the pergola area. From this pergola platform, Zapruder captured the entire JFK death scenario on film, non-stop, without any interruptions. The famous (or infamous) film became known as the “Zapruder film,” or the “Z-film,” of the entire JFK assassination scenario in Dealey Plaza, 11/22/63.

The Zapruder film was mentioned several times in the Warren Commission Hearings (WC), and the Warren Report (WR) on the JFK assassination. The Z-film was likened to a crucial “timeclock” for the assassination. Trask (1994) as cited by JFK-Lancer Online Resources, (1/2000), claimed that Zapruder intended to film that day 11/22/63, but other sources dispute this claim, noting that Zapruder did not even bring the Bell and Howell camera to work that particular day. Sitzman seemed to have a major role in his final decision to film, although there could have been others: Lillian Rogers, Beatrice Hester, Erwin (Irwin) Schwartz, or maybe even Jack Ruby (via a proxy among the aforementioned). Lillian Zapruder’s role is unknown.

Zapruder, a garment district New York businessman, transplanted to Dallas, sometime in 1941-42, did the actual on-site filming of all of the assassination of JFK, then broke down in outrage, tears, hysteria, and a screaming fit, according to most sources consulted—including his own WC testimony. His car was parked near to the rear of the pergola platform, but most accounts (including his own) note that he walked back to his office at the Dal-Tex Building, accompanied by Marilyn Sitzman, and possibly Beatrice Hester and her husband. The Zapruder business company was Jennifer Juniors at 501 Elm St. N., Dal-Tex Building. The offices were situated on either the fourth or fifth floor—some accounts say part of both floors. Zapruder, in the DJHS Journal account from Fall 1995, (reprint), “A Man and His Camera,” led the way for Ms. Sitzman and Mrs. Hester, thus establishing definite foreknowledge concerning the best location for the Plaza filmography session on the JFK motorcade visit. They had positioned themselves in a sunny elevated location overlooking Elm Street, slightly East of the grassy knoll fence, along an abutment or perch, herein called the “pergola platform,” a concrete slab decoration. They were situated in the SW section of the plaza, from the aerial perspective. The time constraint was about 12:15-12:25 PM, CST (Texas time). Sitzman and the Hesters were there to help Zapruder and view the motorcade. Ms. Rogers and Mr. Schwartz, the co-partner, were not present or accounted for with the Plaza viewers. Thus, not all of the employees were in attendance with Zapruder.
H. Livingstone, in Killing Kennedy (1995), maintained that Zapruder was directed to go to the Plaza in order to film that day, but does not state by whom, other than possibly hinting at the co-partner, Erwin (Irwin) Schwartz. No firm proof on this point was furnished, beyond the delayed return of Schwartz to the Dal-Tex office of Zapruder at about 2:00 PM, CST (Texas time). This speculative point of departure must be further investigated and cogently outlined by Livingstone or others, in an evidentiary manner. Mob ties were also suggested herein.

In summary, we must note that Erwin (Irwin) Schwartz, the business co-partner of Zapruder, deeply involved in the dissemination of the Zapruder film, and in the negotiations on the sale of the Zapruder film, was absent AWOL from the motorcade viewing in the Plaza. He was not with Zapruder. Ms. Lillian Rogers, another employee, must have stayed behind at the Dal-Tex offices, possibly with Schwartz. However, Schwartz must have left at some point unknown, because he was not at the offices when Zapruder, Sitzman, and Hester returned. Schwartz did not, or pretended not to know what had happened in the Plaza, upon returning at about 2:00 PM, CST (Texas time). As Livingstone noted, the whereabouts of Schwartz, at the time period of the assassination is not fully known. One wonders if he went to meet with his friend, Jack Ruby, at the newspaper offices, or at Parkland Memorial Hospital. Ruby denied ever being at the Hospital that day, but Schwartz never commented on the situation. Schwartz never seemed to have claimed that he had directly viewed the assassination of JFK. However, he did view the Zapruder film at least a dozen times that weekend, 22-25 November, per his own statements. Since Schwartz was allegedly involved with mob connections and the underworld syndicates, it is essential that we scrutinize his role, movements, and possible motivations that particular day, 11/22/63. Schwartz attempted to act as an immediate custodian, advisor, and guardian angel type over the Zapruder film when Abe Z. revealed to him the contents of the JFK “trophy.” Livingstone (1993, 1995) furnishes numerous details on the evolution of the role of Schwartz in the Zapruder film dissemination and payoff imbroglio with Life magazine. Ditto, the outlines furnished online by Dr. Josiah Thompson (1998) and by the Sixth Floor Museum (2000). The role of Schwartz is also mentioned in other recent assassination books by J. Fetzer (1998) and by N. Twyman (1997). In many ways, Schwartz seemed to fulfill the assigned role of a “convenient go-between.” His alleged mob linkage had negative connotations.

Much of the aforementioned was taken, in research and redaction terms, from composite compilations of data found in the writings of: Sylvia Meagher (1967); S. Meagher and G. Owens (1980); James DiEugenio (1992); James Fetzer (1998); James Giglio (1995); D. Guth and D. Wrone (1980); Anthony Frewin (1993); Michael Benson (1993); Harrison Livingstone (1989, 1993, 1995, 1998); and N. Twyman (1997)—all of which are cited in the Bibliographic Notes Section, at the end. Also included here as source material, one must cite: The Journal of the Dallas Jewish Historical Society (1995); Dallas Jewish Historical Society Online, JFK-Lancer Online Resources, “A History of the Zapruder Film,” by Martin Shackelford (1997); and “Why the Zapruder Film is Authentic,” by Josiah Thompson (1998); and The Sixth Floor Museum at Dealey Plaza, “Abraham Zapruder Film Chronology,” Museum Staff (1999).
As mentioned, the JFK motorcade route in Dallas 1963 is a source of conflicting and conflicted information and misinformation. Also rather conflicted and unresolved is the current controversy over the issue of the 8-mm film on JFK’s assassination captured by filmmaker Abraham Zapruder. Many charges have now been made (5/2000) concerning the authenticity, cosmetic alteration, fraudulent forgery, selective deletions, photo imagery realignment, and composite blending of sections of the Zapruder film—all involving multiple copies, substitutions, switching, theft and deception, trickery and treachery, collusion and coverup. We cannot solve or resolve all the latter in this essay, but we can ask the salient question, so central to this present essay:

“How did Zapruder know?” And a subsequent corollary would be: “How did Zapruder know where to stand on 11/22/63?”

The recent sixteen million dollar U.S. Government compensation figure (1998) attached to the ARRB seizure of the 1963 Zapruder film of the JFK assassination, prompts the sixteen million dollar question about the “sixteen million dollar man”: How then did Abraham Zapruder, “Mr. Z.,” know exactly where to stand in Dealey Plaza 11/22/63 in order to film the entire JFK motorcade scene of the assassination to such perfect maximum effect in bright sunlight with his 8-mm Bell and Howell camera, a camera with which he was an unfamiliar and largely unskilled “amateur?” History does not furnish a clear-cut answer, since the written record on the location was in total error for 11/22/63. It was almost a case of planted misinformation. It would seem that only some verbal external source held this information, and then relayed it to Zapruder—or to those around him on 11/22/63. There is no clear answer to this situation. It is a perplexing anomaly and a curious sub-factoid of the JFK assassination drama, and remains largely unresolved.

Speculation thus abounds concerning the Zapruder filmography. Chance memory, chance guessing, insider-info prompting via proxies, or outright co-conspiracy remain some of the options in this involved situation. It is crucial to understand how the filmography was possible and probable—as opposed to highly unlikely or “totally suspect.” It is also becoming very necessary to try to authenticate all duplicate generations of the Z-film as “pristine,” and not “tainted,” or tampered with, or re-edited with “special effects,” or PWB mental re-programming optical techniques.

We return now to the basics of the Z-film scenario once more. We cannot help but remember the earlier asserted claim: He led the way (to the filming site), said of Zapruder. The women did not lead him; he led the women (Ms. Sitzman and Mrs. Hester). (See DJHS Journal, Fall 1995).

The timing of the noon JFK motorcade of 11/22/63 to the Dallas Trade Mart luncheon, via Dealey Plaza, was known and set (12:30 PM, CST), but not the final route, until about 9:00 AM, CST. The final operative route chosen was fluctuating, serpentine, zig-zag, right-left, too wide-angled, and not at all in keeping with general Secret Service policy on Presidential motorcades. The final route was on the West side of Dealey Plaza, meandering into the SW quadrant of the Plaza, with
quick access to the Stemmons Freeway. Route 77 bounded either side of the Plaza. The West side street was called Elm Street; the East side street was called Commerce Street. JFK was killed at or about 411 Elm Street, on the Western and SW side of the Plaza (from the aerial view). Zapruder stood filming along the Elm Street perch, the concrete pergola platform. The JFK motorcade route on the West side of the Plaza had just passed by the TSBD (Book Depository Building) when gunfire erupted, initially missing the limousine, by most accounts. The motorcade went down a slight incline on Elm Street as the Plaza began to descend, almost in front of the Zapruder filming area. The motorcade had avoided Main Street (in the middle of the Plaza) and veered right then left. The Elm Street route was an abrupt change in the published plans. The accountability and responsibility factors were unclear then, and are still debated and disputed today. This decision led to disaster. This was then, "The Incident at Dealey Plaza," the bloody motorcade route involving the filmed death of President Kennedy, allegedly killed by Oswald and possibly others.

The newspapers in Dallas, Texas had reported one basic Presidential motorcade route earlier, on November 18 (cf. Meagher, Livingstone); changed the route to Elm Street, November 19; then returned to the original route via Main Street only (November 22 version). But the original route, published again on November 22, was not used. The November 19 route was used on November 22. The route used involved the shift to Houston Street, then to Elm Street, near to Oswald's TSBD (Depository Building) location. Of such subtle and not-so-subtle nuances, are possible conspiracy theories rooted and developed. The Dallas morning newspapers published the wrong route for November 22 on November 22, then published the corrected route later that day. From this, one might suggest a sort of "shell game" was being played out on several levels.

The motorcade route via Main Street was obviously changed on the morning of 22 November, without newspaper consultations, thus superseding the previously published route of November 19 on Elm in the Dallas Morning News, as well as superseding the route via Main Street which was published for 22 November, but in reality, was finally returning to the November 19 route via Houston and Elm Streets. This motorcade route data is found in several pertinent source materials: The Dallas Morning News, 11/22/63, p. 1; The Warren Commission Hearings, 1964, Vol. 22, p. 617; Walt Brown, Treachery in Dallas, (1995), pp. 131-132; Sylvia Meagher, Accessories After the Fact, (1967, 1976), pp. 17-21 & pp. 36-39; Sylvia Meagher and Gary Owens, Master Index to the JFK Assassination Investigations, (1980), pp. 413-478 & pp. 523-535; Donald Gibson, The Kennedy Assassination Coverup, (2000), p. 19; James Fetzer, Assassination Science, (1998), p. 192; James DiEugenio, Destiny Betrayed, (1992), p. 38, and Harrison Livingstone, High Treason, (1998), pp. 127-135 & pp. 159-160. An interesting footnote is that Fetzer and also DiEugenio provide the Presidential motorcade route sketches from the original newspaper diagram material. The Dallas morning newspapers circulated this same Fetzer (and DiEugenio) sketch, showing the motorcade solely traveling the route on Main Street to the Stemmons Freeway. No Elm Street route was depicted.

However, as we now know, the Main Street route was altered and abandoned by noontime on 11/22/63. Several political and law enforcement people have been assigned "blame" or vague custodial responsibility for this dangerous itinerary—but to no avail. This crucial factoid remains a lingering and substantially ill-defined anomaly. The route was not in keeping with general protective service practices and standards. No one single individual has admitted to total responsibility. For example, the Secret Service limo driver of the JFK limo, William Greer, definitely knew of the Presidential route changes, as did co-rider in the limo, Agent Roy Kellerman. Some degree of blame has also been assigned to other Agents in Dallas: Puterbaugh, Lawson, Sorrels, and Boring. Elizabeth Harris, an LBJ advance person, was also closely linked to the route changes.
Meagher (1967, 1976, 1980) noted trenchantly (1967, p. 36) in several footnotes that even the WC, The Warren Commission Hearings & Exhibits Volumes, Volume 22 specifically, omitted the precise JFK motorcade route diagram. This item was omitted entirely, even though we can see a simultaneous reproduction of the exact front newspaper text on the motorcade from the Dallas Morning News of 11/22/63. The specific motorcade diagram was rendered as totally white space, blank space, excised space in white, in WC Hearings, Volume 22, CE 1365 (Exhibit), p. 617. How could such a crucial sleight of hand, significant omission, or subliminal PWB editing, go so unnoticed by such a large segment of the media? Or by historians, researchers, and investigators?

With the wrong JFK motorcade route given out for dissemination, the bulk of the spectators generally remained on Main Street in Dealey Plaza, not along Elm Street, although Houston Street was fairly filled with the viewing public. Those operating by the collective memory of the earlier published newspaper route obviously did indeed stay on Elm Street, or took a wild guess or a chance, and joined the others already positioned there. With fewer people on and along Elm Street, the assassination faced no major glitches. This paucity of viewers on Elm Street enabled an assassin to bypass a large crowd of co-witnesses or potential fatalities—and to make a quick getaway, with very few witnesses.

In summary, we must certainly note that the earlier pre-planned November 19 motorcade route for JFK and staff was discarded, but was not inoperative. In fact, it was suddenly reinstated on November 22, without warning. Not even the Dallas morning newspapers got the route diagram correct, (cf., Meagher, Livingstone, Fetzer, Twyman, Russo, Brown, and DiEugenio). The Dallas Police and the Secret Service obviously knew that morning which route would be used. On the Internet, Netscape Center site, viewed 5/2000, J. Locke (1995) blandly explained that, “... the straight through route (via Main Street in Dealey Plaza) did not allow access to the Freeway ...” But this assertion is not so accurate, if applied to 11/22/63. Livingstone and other researchers have disputed this claim by Locke and others as untrue for 11/22/63. Main Street could have been used (at that time) to get the motorcade to the Trade Mart Luncheon.

We now know enough about the involved nuances peculiar to the JFK motorcade route of 11/22/63. We are also somewhat aware that the route along Elm Street, from Houston to Elm, did not conform to usual Secret Service procedures for a Presidential motorcade. We must then return to the original essential question, which still goes begging: “How did Zapruder know where to stand?” Did he actually memorize the November 19 route via Dealey Plaza for the JFK motorcade? Did Zapruder then assume that the November 19 route was the operative route for November 22 on November 22? Did he clip the November 19 route from the newspaper as an internal reference and guide? But why then—after all of the above—did Zapruder forget to bring his camera to work that morning? If he was planning to film the President and the motorcade on Elm Street, on November 22, then he was certainly very unprepared, overcast or no overcast. In fact, by noontime, the Plaza area was extremely sunny. Marilyn Sitzman, Lillian Rogers, and Beatrice Hester may have indeed goaded Zapruder into going home to get the new camera, but there is no statement found anywhere by any of the participants, that the filming location had to be along Elm Street. We also have no indication that Zapruder’s wife,
Lillian S. Zapruder, ever told Zapruder where exactly to film the motorcade route—she had not even
told him to take the camera to work. In addition, we do not know the exact role of co-partner, Erwin
(Irwin) Schwartz in the original filming effort. Frewin noted (1993) that Hunt aide, Paul Rothermel, Jr.,
claimed that H. L. Hunt did indeed immediately obtain an early “trophy” copy of the Zapruder film,
possibly within 72 hours of the JFK assassination. One wonders if Schwartz was the prime conduit?
This too is unknown.

Who then told Zapruder? How did Zapruder know where to stand? Did someone tell the women
involved to tell Zapruder the “best” location? Or was it all just a “lucky guess” by Mr. Z.? There
seems to be no satisfactory historical answer to these questions. The Warren Commission itself never
probed this area; nor did Zapruder volunteer any specific information on these items. R. Trask (1994)
asserted that Zapruder was a big JFK “fan,” and planned to film the Dallas event on 11/22/63; but
Livingstone (1995) and others cite contrary information. William Manchester (1967) in Death of a
President, confirmed that Zapruder did not bring the Bell and Howell camera to work on 11/22/63.

Other insights on the specifics of the JFK motorcade are found in the film chronologies and anthol-
ogies cited above (cf., Josiah Thompson, “Why the Zapruder Film is Authentic,” (1998, pp. 1-8);
Martin Shackelford, “A History of the Zapruder Film,” (1997, pp. 1-6); Staff of the Sixth Floor Mus-

eum, “The Abraham Zapruder Film Chronology,” (2000, pp. 1-15); and Staff of the Dallas Jewish
Historical Society, DJHS Journal, “A Man and His Camera,” (Fall 1995, pp. 2-3, reprint). Also val-

uable along these lines, are the works by Harrison E. Livingstone (1993, 1995) cited in the Appendix).

With such confusion, contradiction, and duplicity over the exact JFK motorcade route for 11/22/63,
largely concerning the Dealey Plaza segment to the Stemmons Freeway, one wonders if there were
some “master planners” involved willing to assist Zapruder with the “best” location site for filming?
We do not know if a patrol officer in the Plaza conveyed to Zapruder and Sitzman the best place to
stand for filming. Sitzman made no mention of such external guidance when she was interviewed, after
the fact—although she never gave a legal deposition, she did talk with several researchers, writers, and
journalists. If a policeman or even a journalist or a fellow spectator assisted Zapruder and his entourage
with the proper filming location, there was never any word or acknowledgment of same. It is as if we
are to believe that it was all just divine guidance or chance. Certainly, Main Street for filming was
ruled out by Zapruder and Sitzman on 11/22/63. That left only Houston or Elm Streets. Although
the corner of Houston and Elm was closer, Zapruder chose lower Elm Street, below the Depository
Building. If his car was parked behind the pergola arcade, then it is clear that Zapruder knew this film-
ing location was possibly mandated or mandatory in advance. Sitzman was never entirely clear on this
point, but did not indicate that she knew where to stand nor did she seem to have advised Zapruder on
where to stand. Zapruder never gave his specific reasons or rationale (even in the face of “vertigo”)for standing on the lower Elm Street pedestal platform in the pergola area, during the filming of the
JFK motorcade. We also do not know if co-partner Erwin (Irwin) Schwartz advised Zapruder, in ad-

vance, to stand along Elm Street. The latter is entirely possible. Schwartz could have gotten such
data from his friend, Jack Ruby, or from the local Dallas police ( cf. R. Morningstar, 1999, asserted
that Officer J. D. Tippit held such data on the motorcade route).
Did Zapruder possibly make a “lucky guess” on the filming site? Hardly. The elevated sunlit location overlooking Elm Street was too ideal for filming such panoramic movement involving closeups. We must surely be aware that Marilyn Sitzman, Zapruder’s personal secretary and receptionist and confidante, stated that “Abe” did not even bring his camera to work that day, 11/22/63. Marilyn had to nag him like a fishwife to go and retrieve his camera. As in the account by William Manchester, Marilyn Sitzman insisted that she and Ms. Lillian Rogers, a co-worker, had to urge Zapruder to go home and get the camera to film the JFK motorcade (cf., Manchester, Livingstone, Russo, and the DJHS Journal reprint 1995). No one ever asked Zapruder if he was directed, ordered, induced, or bribed with payments to film that day in Dealey Plaza. Although unlikely, we must leave no stone unturned in this analysis.

Above all, herein, we must refer to Meagher’s perspective (1967) on this issue of the filming, the site, and the role of Marilyn Sitzman as helper. As noted by Sylvia Meagher (d. 1992), we must forcefully repeat that: Marilyn Sitzman (d. 1993) NEVER even testified before the Warren Commission nor before the Dallas City Police. Nor did Marilyn Sitzman ever give a legally sworn affidavit to the FBI or to the Secret Service or any duly constituted Federal agency or paralegal group concerning what she saw, what she knew, and what had happened. This was extremely irregular and inexplicable. An informal interview with Mark Lane or Josiah Thompson is generally not a legal instrument nor of much legal value. Marilyn Sitzman did allegedly talk briefly on 11/22/63 in front of the Depository Building with local Dallas reporters, H. McCormick and D. Payne—but this was only to alert them of Zapruder’s filming of the motorcade. She also allegedly used the phrase, “They killed him.” (See the 1966 interview with J. Thompson for similar statements). One wonders here, just who is “They?” Both Zapruder and Sitzman used this identical and never explained generic phrase. Did they both have someone or some group in mind?

After a vague unnamed reference in the WC Report, as “his secretary”, in linking Marilyn to Zapruder, without furnishing her name, we hear little of Marilyn Sitzman or her final role at the Dal-Tex Building. All we later have of Ms. Sitzman’s viewpoint and insider info, are the recollected interview statements which she furnished to writers and researchers: Mark Lane, Gus Russo, Josiah Thompson, and Harrison Livingstone. As noted by Meagher, Marilyn Sitzman never testified under any oath, and thus could be suspected of errors, re-arrangements, exaggerations, deletions, attenuations, as well as omission of salient details. Marilyn Sitzman was “conveniently” overlooked as a material witness to the Presidential assassination; and as a witness to the reality of Zapruder as the sole filmmaker on the SW pergola pedestal or platform in Dealey Plaza, 11/22/63. This situation of witness omission is inexplicable and utterly outrageous in a Federal forensic homicide case. Furthermore, we do not know, and possibly never will know, if Marilyn Sitzman was coached at any time or co-conspired at any time with the business co-partner of Zapruder, concerning answers or scenarios. Sitzman never commented along these lines; nor did Erwin (Irwin) Schwartz, the co-partner (who was interviewed by N. Twyman as recently as 1996-1997). H. Livingstone (1995) has consistently cited Schwartz’s extensive mob connections in 1963 as a significant problem, completely overlooked.

Finally, we must note that Marilyn Sitzman inexplicably and staunchly maintained, as late as 1992 (to Gus Russo, interviewer), that no shots, in her opinion, were fired from the grassy knoll or grassy knoll fence area, on 11/22/63. Yet even Zapruder himself (and others in the Plaza) maintained that a shot or shots were fired somewhere near to the rear of the pergola platform area, possibly from the grassy knoll.
Abe Zapruder was aware of gunfire from the rear as he filmed, and stated such to be the case. Marilyn Sitzman obviously disagreed. Some of the railway workers behind the knoll area claimed to see puffs of smoke rise from the knoll, possibly a sign of gunfire from that location. In fact, R. Morningstar (1999) has tentatively identified a shooter ("Badgeman") at the grassy knoll fence area at the time of the JFK motorcade. Morningstar maintains that the shooter was none other than Officer J. D. Tippit, based on extensive computer enhancements, and other data, taken from the Moorman and Muchmore polaroids and prints (1963). Hence, Marilyn Sitzman could, at the very least, be accused of inattention to detail, selective forgetfulness, mental confusion, or outright misinformation. Her credibility concerning gunfire from the grassy knoll area seems to be seriously compromised and possibly inaccurate for 11/22/63 in Dealey Plaza. Even in a near kneeling or semi-crouching position, below and behind Abe Zapruder, tangentially, Marilyn Sitzman could probably have recognized (by tinnitus) or felt the vibrations of nearby gunfire from the grassy knoll or grassy knoll fence area. Her contrarian viewpoint was puzzling, and was definitely a minority viewpoint. Even Josiah Thompson, in his interview with Sitzman, mentioned a Dallas source who claimed that Marilyn Sitzman was not telling the truth and had changed her story.

In her November 1966 interview with Josiah Thompson, the author of "Six Seconds in Dallas," Marilyn Sitzman, secretary and receptionist for Zapruder, provided an informal and nonchalant personal re-telling of the original Zapruder filming effort on 11/22/63 in Dealey Plaza, and of the parallel and subsequent very bloody assassination of President Kennedy. She was unable to find the proper synonym for: abutment, perch, platform, pedestal, or pergola. With Thompson's help, she settled on: "concrete slab." She also, as noted earlier elsewhere, said that Zapruder "led the way" to the filming location, asked her to assist him, agreed, joined him on the perch abutment, and held him from behind, while he was filming. (We see her head bob to our viewing left, left of Zapruder, on even the Moorman polaroid enlargement). Sitzman was unsure whether Mr. "Z." had definitely pre-picked the location, or just did it impulsively, on the "spur of the moment." Above all, Marilyn Sitzman maintained that she disagreed with all the theories about any gunfire from the knoll area. She maintained that no shots were fired from the grassy knoll or knoll fence area, to her immediate right, 11/22/63. How could she be so certain? Had someone coached her or instructed her? Sitzman said she heard no ringing in her ears from any knoll gunfire, yet she never mentioned the possible use of a gun silencer mechanism.

Marilyn Sitzman indicated that the gunfire came from her left, in the area around the Depository Building. She asserted repeatedly that the only loud noise near the knoll area was from a young black couple who had dropped their glass Coke bottles and ran away from the park bench at the sound of the gunfire. She described the bloody JFK shooting, agreeing with Zapruder that only one conclusion was possible: "They killed him."

Sitzman had to admit to Thompson that she and Zapruder (cf., McAdams online, 2000) both turned to the stockade knoll fence area after the shooting. They didn't really know where the shots came from, she then alleged, in contradistinction to her claim that all the shots had come from her left. They both saw the two young blacks ("colored couple") run away to the back of the knoll arcade, behind the pergola platform area. They were allegedly startled by the breaking glass.
Thompson also questioned Marilyn Sitzman on related matters of 11/22/63 in Dallas. Sitzman claimed that she knew nothing of the “trespasser” found in her building, the Dal-Tex Building about 1:00 PM CST on 11/22/63 by the Dallas Police. The man was questioned by police and released. Research has disclosed that the man was a mob “asset,” named Eugene Brading, using a false name. One wonders if the man was looking that day and hour for Zapruder’s co-partner, Erwin (Irwin) Schwartz. Schwartz was seemingly absent or unaccounted for at that time. In the Thompson interview (1966), there was no identification of the “trespasser” as Brading. Marilyn Sitzman said she simply did not know about it in all the confusion, or had not paid attention. No similar query was made of Lillian Rogers, who evidently remained at the Jennifer Juniors office in the Dal-Tex Building during the period of the Presidential motorcade. No other queries on the “trespasser” were made by Thompson during the 1966 interview. (Brading also appeared in the area of the 1968 shooting of Robert F. Kennedy, at the Ambassador Hotel, in Los Angeles).

After the interview, Thompson noted the peripheral imbroglio, the issue of the controversial claims by Mr. Jones Harris concerning the statements by Marilyn Sitzman. Harris claimed that Sitzman had told him that a shot came from the right, in the knoll area, close to her, and that she had heard ringing in her ears. Marilyn Sitzman was confronted by Thompson with these claims, before the formal interview. Marilyn Sitzman denied the entire Harris story as totally false, a fabrication. She felt that the shots definitely came from her left, not from the grassy knoll on the right. Josiah Thompson left the latter issue and conflicting versions of the story of Sitzman-versus-Harris up in the air and unresolved, but Thompson stressed his belief in the veracity of Marilyn’s statements. This November 1966 interview by Thompson was not connected with any formal legal inquiry, nor with any aspect of the Warren Commission (1964), nor with any inquest or civil litigation. As noted above, Marilyn Sitzman never testified before the Warren Commission, nor in any legal proceeding on the Zapruder film and the JFK death scenario. The entire Thompson interview with Sitzman can be found on Compuserve online, courtesy of M. Sylwester and McAdams website (2000). The reader should also be aware of recent charges that Josiah “Tink” Thompson may have been, at one time, a CIA asset. This issue is unresolved.

Let us return to our central question: “How did Zapruder know?” If the pre-set motorcade route of 11/22/63 to the Dallas Trade Mart was to be only via Main Street to the Stemmons Freeway, then we must certainly note the curious lacuna and disconnect in the Zapruder filming event of November 22. This discontinuity has never really been satisfactorily explained. If the route was to be via Main Street only, within Dealey Plaza, then the Zapruder film (if produced on Elm Street) would be almost worthless, not worth sixteen million dollars (and counting). Zapruder would not have captured the best close-ups of the assassination due to distance, glare, and the crowds along Main Street. No one has yet paid a dime for the Patsy Paschall 8-mm film of the 1963 JFK motorcade (as of 5/2000) mentioned in the ARRB files (1996). If Zapruder had tried to film Main Street to Stemmons from the SW concrete pergola platform or abutment, he would have obviously been imprecise, even with the zoom lens, may have been overexposed due to so much sunlight and glare at noon, and may have faced obstruction of view by the Main Street crowd. His filming location on lower Elm Street at high noon was almost too ideal for words as he stood on the elevated pedestal or perch. Must we assume that Zapruder assumed that the November 19 route for the Presidential motorcade was definitely still operative? Did someone unknown on Elm Street advise or alert Zapruder to film only along Elm Street on 11/22/63? We have yet to resolve the question. Marilyn Sitzman was not helpful or conclusive in her statements on this latter situation.
Harrison Livingstone (1995) reported some sinister implications regarding Zapruder's filming (see Killing Kennedy, pp. 116-123, pp. 170-172). Zapruder and co-partner Schwartz knew Ruby. Schwartz and Ruby also knew H. L. Hunt, the anti-JFK Texas oilman. Frewin (1993) indicated that Hunt obtained an almost immediate copy of the Zapruder film in 1963, per data supplied by P. Rothermel. Did Hunt get a copy of the film from Schwartz or Ruby, one wonders? Did someone "set up" Zapruder as the 11/22/63 filmographer? Did anyone possibly threaten Zapruder (in a hallway, in a car conversation) to film the motorcade for "the sake of his two young children?" Or did someone, such as Schwartz via Sitzman as proxy, assign Abe Zapruder to this "special film task"? In other words, was Zapruder really making, knowingly or unknowingly, a "trophy copy" of the JFK assassination film for the "mob" and the "syndicate" connections both in Dallas and Chicago? Was Zapruder duped? Was Zapruder threatened via the telephone? All the answers are unknown; all the questions must reside in the speculative realm. Zapruder himself never mentioned any threats, implicit or explicit.

Zapruder's exact position on his "position" in Dealey Plaza was never adequately explained or clarified before the Warren Commission. If, as noted, he "led" Marilyn Sitzman, without words or outside advice, to the pergola platform location in the SW Plaza, then Abraham Zapruder knew the EXACT, not probable motorcade route. He did not obviously operate by rumor or speculation in this endeavor. He thus had inside knowledge superior to the morning Dallas newspapers. There is no indication that Marilyn Sitzman (or Beatrice Hester) "led" Zapruder to the filming location in the Plaza. No one ever mentioned any patrol officer or pedestrian or tourist giving the Zapruder group any precise data for the correct film location in the Plaza on 11/22/63.

Visually, as they approached, the Zapruder group could see a paucity of spectators along Elm Street. If, as Sitzman noted, the Presidential motorcade was to be only a "block away" (DJHS Journal, 1995), this would indicate that 501 Elm Street (Dal-Tex Building) would have a VIP visitor coming by, at or about either 600 Elm or 400 Elm Street. (JFK was killed, legally and forensically, at or about 411 Elm Street). Since the Street numbering to the Stemmons Freeway South was descending, then Marilyn Sitzman had excluded both the 600 block of Elm North, North of Dal-Tex, and had also excluded the straight through route solely along Main Street for the JFK Presidential motorcade, and thus had inadvertently given the impression of a motorcade along the 400 block of Elm Street, or at the very least, near the Elm Street and Houston Street intersections. How did Marilyn Sitzman know all this beforehand? This point has never been adequately examined or explained. In such a situation, it would seem that Marilyn Sitzman did indeed know the "best" location for the filming effort, and was operating by the November 19 published motorcade route. She never indicated such in any interview.

Zapruder had allegedly parked his car on 11/22/63 behind the pergola area on an unattended parking lot. A "wrong" guess for filming would have meant a very substantial error—no sixteen million dollar payment (funded by the taxpayers) for the Zapruder film. Nor the interim payments totalling almost one million dollars (1963-1998). The women left the car and followed Zapruder to the filming location along the Elm Street perch or platform. Marilyn Sitzman never really explained the "position" anomaly, next to the grassy knoll. Nor did Zapruder. All we know is that the women had successfully persuaded Zapruder to film, and Marilyn Sitzman assisted him scrupulously and diligently. The Hesters (Charles and Beatrice) watched
the film event and the motorcade simultaneously. We are aware of the absence of Schwartz and Lillian Rogers (and Lillian Zapruder) from the filming in Dealey Plaza with Zapruder and Sitzman. We still wonder: Did Schwartz possibly prompt the women to prompt Zapruder to film on 11/22/63? Unknown at this point.

The Zapruder film is now worth sixteen million dollars or more (as of 5/2000), not counting the pending copyright disposition issue. As mentioned, the Z-film would have little value, if Zapruder had not filmed the JFK motorcade event from the Elm Street pergola pedestal, perch, or platform located in SW Dealey Plaza on 11/22/63 in Dallas, Texas. In fact, the film might have been considered of minimal worth or may have been confiscated and left in oblivion. If the women employees of Jennifer Juniors of Dallas company knew the “best” location for filming that day, and advised Zapruder on such, we simply do not know how the various women knew. No information has surfaced on this point of foreknowledge. We also do not know if Charles Hester, the husband of Beatrice Hester, having joined the group in the Zapruder entourage that day, was the source of any precise information on the “best” filming location. It would seem doubtful, yet we also must note that we do not know when Beatrice Hester alerted her husband to meet her—either at the office or in Dealey Plaza. How did they connect that day? Not even Marilyn Sitzman commented.

How then did Zapruder know what he “had to know” to perform so well under pressure? Did Zapruder operate the camera film that day based on gossip, wild lucky guess, memorization, misinformation, or informed insider information? Possibly the latter might prevail as the choice at this time. The data on the on-site filming location used by Zapruder on 11/22/63 in Dealey Plaza must remain suspect and in eternal conflict. No one source or multiple sources studied and consulted on the Elm Street filming ever explained conclusively, tangentially, or superficially how Zapruder knew what he knew. No one even admits that they advised Zapruder where to film in the Plaza on 11/22/63. Must we assume that Zapruder knew in advance? Knew, that is, where to film—but knew nothing else.

Does the “official” record show us clues as to how Zapruder knew? Not really. No one precisely or imprecisely was questioned on this point, nor testified on this obscure point before the WC hearings. Not even Zapruder furnished such key data in his testimony before the WC. Marilyn Sitzman hinted that Zapruder took them to the location, and chose his final filming spot on the elevated concrete abutment, not on the stairway leading up to the abutment. Sitzman (cf., Thompson interview, 11/66) was vague on the method or reasoning process which Zapruder had used to pick the spot, always trying to minimize her role in the final choice, citing an either/or selection mode used by Zapruder.

We cannot understand all the history of the Zapruder film, unless we understand the subtle nuances and sub-details of the crucial choice made by Zapruder, concerning the filming. These items of controversy on the “final position” for filming, must be resolved in the near future. We cannot give Zapruder a “blank check” in this matter. Sixteen million dollars is in the balance.

As outlined above, the Dallas newspapers of 11/22/63 were all inaccurate and/or erroneous on the data furnished diagramatically, and were evidently not the prime source used for the Dealey Plaza filmography
on Elm Street. As noted, the corrected or altered and re-altered route of the motorcade route did not appear in the Dallas newspapers until the noon editions that day. Kennedy had probably already died by then, so what good was the correction? It only served to underline the state of misinformation and confusion prevalent in Dallas that day.

We must note that Zapruder and his entourage were positioned in the SW Dealey Plaza area at or about 12:15 PM, CST (Texas time). They may not have known about the earlier ambulance incident in the Plaza, with the allegedly "epileptic" man, near the Depository. The man supposedly had a seizure before JFK and his group entered the Plaza area. The ambulance came to remove him, after calls were obviously made. Some researchers have felt that the ambulance was a staged "diversionary tactic" for the gunmen in the Plaza area to get ready unobtrusively—while everyone was distracted by the ambulance. The Zapruder group never mentioned the ambulance incident, nor did Zapruder.

We constantly keep asking: How then did Zapruder know where to stand, 11/22/63? History simply cannot gloss over this point. It is a key point which could link Zapruder both to Schwartz and to Ruby as the informants. Or perhaps, the link could lead to Officer J. D. Tippit, or to another Zapruder alleged acquaintance in Dallas: Georges de Mohrenschildt. (Zapruder's link to probable CIA "asset", de Mohrenschildt was reported by Bruce Campbell Adamson, in Vol. X, Oswald's Closest Friends, BCA Books, Aptos, California, 1998, fascicle anthology). We simply cannot take anything for granted about Zapruder at the pergola platform or pedestal. It is just too convenient to attribute Zapruder's filming site to divine inspiration or to faulty memory based on the November 19 motorcade route data version. We really should not give Zapruder a "blank check" for up to sixteen million taxpayer dollars until we have the entire truth of this Dealey Plaza scenario pinned down firmly.

The Marilyn Sitzman story on the filming request made to Zapruder seems to be rather opera bouffe, comedy of errors stuff. Did the women really have to coax Zapruder? Did Zapruder really and honestly forget the camera? Did Schwartz really disappear that day? Did Zapruder really guess at the final filming location? Can anyone really doubt the sincerity of Zapruder? Can anyone really doubt the veracity of Marilyn Sitzman? We cannot discern all the truth or the non-truthful shadings in the Sitzman story, since Zapruder never overtly critiqued or criticized or re-examined or verified Marilyn's statements in the 1966 interview with Josiah Thompson. Up until his death in August 1970, Abe Zapruder never gave his written or recorded opinions on the Sitzman-Thompson 1966 interview. Thompson gave Marilyn Sitzman a "blank check" on truthfulness, but that does not mean that all researchers, historians, and readers must agree.

If we refer to Livingstone's observations (1995), then we can recall that Zapruder probably attended the same synagogue as did Schwartz (co-partner) and Ruby (Oswald's assassin). Since Schwartz was a co-partner to Zapruder, it is very possible that Schwartz and Ruby were the "real" masterminds behind the JFK filmography request (on behalf of the mob, H. L. Hunt, or others). They could have easily served a proxy function. The women at Jennifer Juniors, Inc., likewise may have been duped as proxies to the proxies to conveniently enforce the film request in a benign manner, and thus activate Zapruder into the filming—for which, we know, he was not prepared on 11/22/63. This does not at all mean that Abe Zapruder knew what was going to happen ultimately to JFK that day. Like the women, Zapruder may have likewise been a con-
venient dupe—but realized much too late what a terrible mess he had stepped into in Dealey Plaza on 11/22/63.

Not to be totally redundant, but once more: How did Zapruder really know where to stand in order to film that day in Dealey Plaza? The answer seems to be mostly still up in the air, or for grabs. History has failed to tell us. No one has pinned it down firmly. Zapruder never told us directly or completely. Sitzman never told us directly or completely. Schwartz (still alive in 1997) never told us directly or completely. Earl Warren completely overlooked the matter, as did his staff. The Hesters never told us; ditto Lillian Rogers; ditto Lillian Zapruder; ditto Jack Ruby, and ultra-ditto, the Warren Commission Hearings, and the Warren Commission Report. Nor did the FBI closely examine the exact position of Zapruder in the Plaza on 11/22/63. This was totally overlooked, skimmed over, or taken for granted. It is not a non-essential or trivial factor or aspect in the evolution of the Z-film. In fact, in this writer’s opinion, it is a crucial unexplained sidebar, in the midst of the assassination scenario. All new details on the position of Zapruder and the Zapruder filmography of JFK should be elicited and outlined coherently for the historical record—even if this effort takes us to the very eve of the Jubilee of JFK’s death. Miracles may happen, but not this conveniently and carelessly, as they happened in the case of the Zapruder filmography.

Of course, speculation will continue on the genesis, evolution, replication, and authenticity of the Zapruder film into the near future—and it should. It is a healthy sign of critical thinking. It leads to other salient questions and answers in this area; it resolves points of conflict; it allows us to get a handle on the controversy; and it may help to reduce suspicions and tensions, left lingering so long, both on and off the record. Abraham Zapruder (“Mr. Z”) and his estate cannot be given a free ride worth approximately sixteen million dollars, taxpayer dollars, without answering the historical questions, conundrums, and concerns posed herein. We cannot so easily dismiss the role of Schwartz in possibly brokering a deal on the Zapruder film with the underworld syndicates.

We can wonder forever how Zapruder knew: knew where to stand, 11/22/63, Dealey Plaza. Was it all by default in judgment? Was it by insider info? Was it just the luck of the draw? It is very hard to believe that it was all by pure random chance. Must we resort to the old proverbial choice: If the nose of Cleopatra had only been (x) inches longer, the whole history of the world would have been changed? But that would seem to be an illogical choice. It appears that: Zapruder either relied on his (and Marilyn’s) memory of the earlier November 19 mapped route for JFK as published, or he was instructed or pressured (beyond the three women at the office) to film the entire motorcade event, non-stop, no excuses. That he (Zapruder) never stopped filming, amidst gunfire and echoes of gunfire, shows the extent of his determination to capture the entire event, to complete the “task,” when only hours earlier that morning, he nonchalantly acted or pretended to act as if he did not care about filming. Lillian Zapruder had not urged Abe Zapruder to film that day. He simply had no incentive to film that day. Yet Sitzman (and possibly Schwartz) roused Zapruder into action. Thus, he went home to get his camera.

Another interesting item, in addition to the non-stop filming in the midst of close gunfire, was that Zapruder even claimed that he may have heard gunfire from the nearby grassy knoll area, to his side and rear—yet he kept on filming. He seemed to approach the filming with the idea: one must film, non-stop, “no
matter what happens.” Others would have possibly (probably) stopped filming when they heard nearby gunfire—but not Mr. “Z.” He seemed to have no “fight or flight” complex to deal with that day. He seemed to feel either impervious to the bullets, or realized and/or knew that these projectiles were meant only for JFK. We cannot go further here, lest we be accused of total psycho-babble.

We wonder why there is such a paucity of concern and a paucity of articulate historical research on this locational minutia surrounding the genesis of the 1963 Zapruder film? Perhaps one does not wish to appear to be overly suspicious and paranoid, but the sum of sixteen million dollars has been paid and does rest in the balance. In addition, several writers have recently challenged the authenticity, provenance, possible editing, and chain of custody of the Zapruder film, charging that there are too many multiple copies, too many secret undisclosed copies, too many team-led edited and altered copies with deletion of frames (cf., Fetzer, Twyman, Morningstar, Mantik, White, Livingstone, etc.). This speculation on the Zapruder film will obviously continue. Sixteen million dollars from the taxpayers rests in the balance.

Too much data which has been given as a “given,” is just not a given, but is an assumption or an unwarranted assumption leading to a questionable conclusion. How did Zapruder know, and know what he knew, and know where to stand? He knew because he stood, and he stood because he knew—this is the essential circular problem we face. But if we look at the DJHS Journal article (Fall 1995, Vol. IX, no. 1), we see the statement, “Knowing that after the parade officially ended, it would turn right on Houston and left on Elm, …,” and thus we are perplexed and provoked by this data which is given as a “given.” How would Zapruder know this? How did Zapruder know this? Why is it assumed so nonchalantly that everyone knew? What is the exact source for this “knowing?” The Dallas newspapers supplied the wrong motorcade route data for 11/22/63. No answer is supplied for this questioning on the “given.”

We have already noted that it was a definite case of Zapruder leading Sitzman and the Hesters into the SW Dealey Plaza area near the grassy knoll fence, 11/22/63 at about high noon. No informant or “other” informational source is cited as the source for the “best” location to stand and film the JFK motorcade. The morning newspapers in Dallas were not the source on 11/22/63. No one overtly told Zapruder, as far as we can determine. Hence, Zapruder obviously must have known beforehand exactly where to stand. Sitzman never made any claim, for herself or for the women or for Zapruder, that they had the proper positional location information beforehand (or at any time) for the JFK filming, 11/22/63. We never actually learn how or when Zapruder knew where to stand—but he had this information readily at his command on 11/22/63.

Finally, if Zapruder feared a vertigo attack involving dizziness, and needed Marilyn Sitzman to brace and hold him and his legs from behind, during filming, then why did Zapruder not fear the bullets exploding and vibrating all about him? His fearless non-stop filming will always raise some questions and concerns. Few other humans would react that atypical way. Some might brand the whole stretch of behavior as “atypical.” Ms. Sitzman, of course, stayed with Zapruder during the dangers, but had less to fear in a crouching position behind Zapruder.

As mentioned, the culprits in the motorcade route which JFK took through Dealey Plaza on 11/22/63 re-
main: Puterbaugh, Greer, Lawson, Sorrels, Boring, Kellerman, all government employees. In addition, the names: Elizabeth Harris (LBJ aide), Jesse Curry (Dallas Police Chief), and Earl Cabell (Mayor of Dallas) have been mentioned. These men (and woman) allegedly all insisted on the changed JFK motorcade route in Dealey Plaza. The “best” route or “easiest” route to the Trade Mart luncheon turned out to be the “deadliest.” This changed route helped the assassin or assassins accomplish the very real, “Nightmare on Elm Street.” We should note here the autobiographical version of the JFK motorcade route of 11/22/63 by Elizabeth Harris in the November 1988 Washington Post Magazine, a supplement to the Washington Post.

Must we ponder: “How did Zapruder know where to stand on 11/22/63?” This is the sixteen million dollar question. This question is still largely unanswered some thirty-seven years later. The absent “facts” beg the question. The assertions given as “facts” also beg the question. History does not record the exact answer, and most historical research has overlooked the obvious question. Nobody cared much to ask the question to which there must be some sort of answer: hard, set, and firm—with no exceptions. It cannot be taken for granted, or minimized as a luck of the draw, because any answer on the Zapruder film position serves as a contextual clue to the assassination scenario. As such, we have no answer and no clue because the question was never posed, nor was the “crucial” question considered relevant, outside of the writings and observations of a few researchers, such as Sylvia Meagher (d. 1992).

Everyone assumed, it seems, that it was “legitimate” and neutral and harmless for Zapruder to have stood where he stood, on 11/22/63, on the concrete pergola platform overlooking the descent of Elm Street. But the number of variables and imponderables involved is too complicated to overlook. The true saga of Dealey Plaza and the alleged JFK conspiracy may prove to be likewise, and careful scrutiny of the “legitimate” may prove to be otherwise. (We have only recently, 5/2000, learned of the alleged role of Officer J. D. Tippit in computer enhanced comparison and magnification photos as a possible “Badgeman” figure, the man allegedly shooting at JFK from the shadows along the back of the stockade fence on the grassy knoll. This computer enhancement work was done by Professor Robert D. Morningstar, 1999, based on the 1963 Moorman polaroid.).

It is also important to look at the inept questioning of Zapruder by Warren Commission lawyer, Wes Liebeler (7/22/64). Liebeler had Zapruder under oath concerning the JFK film, but could have also asked other related, pertinent questions. Liebeler concentrated solely on the Z-film. We can readily note that Liebeler never touched upon Zapruder and Schwartz, Zapruder and Sitzman, the presence of the Hesters by the pergola area, the Jennifer Juniors, Inc. company linked to Zapruder, and so forth. No mention was made of Hunt or de Mohrenschildt either. Liebeler did not even readily establish how and why Zapruder was at the pergola perch that day, 11/22/63. The filming effort was an assumed well-established “given.” No data was established on Zapruder’s background, nor the reasons for his presence in the SW Dealey Plaza area near the grassy knoll and the stockade fence (cf., Lewis, 1964, pp. 46-47). No one ever asked Zapruder if he knew, had met, or conversed with either Ruby or Oswald. Livingstone (1995) did report that Zapruder had met Ruby via Schwartz. No mention of Oswald was made. Manchester (1967) did relay the attitude of Zapruder on the pergola platform filming (pp. 150-164), stating that it was necessary for Zapruder to stand on a concrete perch because he felt he was “too short to film.” Liebeler did not
even elicit this point from Zapruder. He also failed to verify or confirm Marilyn Sitzman’s claims that she had to assist Zapruder because he had a bad case of vertigo, and feared that he might fall down while filming the film sequences. Hence, she felt she had to assist him and hold him from behind during the filming. We must insist that Liebeler’s questioning left too much to be desired, did not explore lacuna issues, and did not clarify or dispel suspicions or controversies later noticed in the Z-filming event. On Liebeler, see: (WC, Vol. VII, pp. 569-576).

Just how, then, did Abraham Zapruder, the filmographer, know where to stand, 11/22/63? We are no more prescient now on this point than we were thirty-seven years ago. If Ms. Sitzman and the Hesters, and Ms. Rogers and Mr. Schwartz did not advise old Abe Zapruder on the precise motorcade route, then how did he know anything about where to stand in Dealey Plaza? Another source must have told him. No one was ever implicated in this at the street level (Manchester maintained that Mr. Z. drove the car to the pergola area anyway), therefore, perhaps another source at the office level (or via telephone to the office) must have told him or relayed the data via a proxy. It is unlikely, though possible, that Zapruder could have memorized only the November 19 published route, and likewise had not seen nor read the morning newspaper posting for November 22. This is the only way around all of this controversy and suspicion and speculation.

We can safely say that we have no indication or published statement that Lillian Zapruder told her husband, Abe Zapruder, about the exact route for the JFK motorcade. Who is then left as a prime suspect or candidate? Since Zapruder was not going to film that day, per the statements of Sitzman and per the written version by Manchester and others, then we can probably rule out Abe Zapruder making explicit telephonic calls concerning the precise route of the JFK motorcade. As mentioned, this sort of data was available in both of the Dallas newspapers that week, November 18-22, although the route itself did shift after November 20 to the Main Street route. It seemingly changed again on November 22, but the change was a bogus change camouflaging the real route for the JFK motorcade via the Plaza segment.

As for the source of the Elm Street route for the motorcade, we can possibly rule out Ms. Lillian Rogers of the office staff at Dal-Tex (Jennifer Juniors). She is only cited as one who urged Abe Zapruder to film; but nowhere does she mention a possible Presidential motorcade route. However, Marilyn Sitzman did indeed do such, and thus must remain a prime suspect. We must also note that perhaps Ms. Rogers was only a mild JFK supporter (if at all) because she obviously stayed behind at the office, and did not attend the filming event by Zapruder. We are also left with the issue of the co-partner of Zapruder, Erwin (Irwin) Schwartz. As noted, his exact whereabouts on 11/22/63 at the time of the JFK shooting, were not known; and Schwartz did not return to the office until about 2:00 PM (CST), after the return of Zapruder and the women. As aforementioned, H. Livingshorne (1995) cited suspicion of a strong linkage of Schwartz as a friend of Jack Ruby. Schwartz as a mob go-between figure and underworld operative is a problematic figure beyond all expectations, if he did indeed supply data to Zapruder on the JFK motorcade route. In addition, we find that no one ever clarified the issue of the Brading tresspassing incident at Dal-Tex on 11/22/63. Was Brading a close operative with Schwartz on 11/22/63? The direct linkage of Schwartz to Zapruder and to aspects of the filming (final handling and sales discussions) is bothersome, to say the least. It changes the entire historical perspective (cf., Fetzer, Assassination Science, pp. 297-298), if we link Schwartz, Ruby, Brading, and Zapruder to the Dal-Tex Building on the edge of Dealey Plaza.
Abraham Zapruder (d. 1970) outfoxed history and random chance guessing, outdistanced the staff of the Dallas Morning News and several other Dallas newspapers, outdid the motorcycle cops, the FBI, and the Secret Service agents, and outflanked the Warren Commission and its “single bullet theory.” Zapruder also provided his estate with almost one million dollars in payments, fees, assets, and related residuals, at the time of his cancer death in August 1970. Ultimately, beyond death, Zapruder has provided his estate with sixteen million dollars (taxpayer dollars) and many further fees for the copyright control. The U.S. taxpayers should have a right to know what we got for our investment money. Should we dare ask: Was the Z-film a legitimate and bona fide historical artifact, or a mob-directed trophy film of JFK’s assassination? Was the Z-film part of a larger conspiratorial and historical hoax? Is the current Z-film copy at the Sixth Floor Museum in Dallas an edited or unadulterated version? Is the Z-film at the U.S. National Archives an authentic part of historiographic research or part of a larger edited hoax? Was Zapruder’s role that of a conduit or “dupe” in a larger intelligence effort to record by filmography a criminal and forensic event? Was Abe Z. merely a co-conspirator in the hoax effort by default? These questions must remain largely unanswered. There are still no final satisfactory answers to these psycho-historical and motivational questions or assertions, some thirty-seven years later. However, there are still many suspicions and several unresolved issues still pending.


This article basically has adhered to the idea that: The Z-film original by Zapruder could not have been executed by a “random guess” or “random chance.” It required some sort of planning which placed Zapruder and the camera on Elm Street in the SW Plaza area and not on Main Street or Houston Street. It appears that it all involved some “insider info” comparable in quality to the foreknowledge of the mechanics of the route, demonstrated by Secret Service driver Will Greer. The women in Zapruder’s office at Dal-Tex did not seem to know where to stand—or pretended not to know. Zapruder, we know, led them to the specific site. But Marilyn Sitzman did seem to indicate that she did know the nature of the JFK motorcade route for that day when noting that the event would only be a “block away” from Dal-Tex, 501 N. Elm Street.

Is it so difficult to conclude that Zapruder, Sitzman, and possibly Schwartz all had a vague yet correct idea of where to stand (and when) in Dealey Plaza, 11/22/63? We do not know if anyone from the Dallas City Police, the Secret Service, or the FBI (or military intelligence contractees) told Zapruder (via Erwin Schwartz) exactly where to stand, 11/22/63. We do not know if, as alleged, Zapruder was a possible “in-

In a sidebar related issue, some anomalies have also been mentioned and alleged (Frewin, 1993, pp. 12-14), concerning the overall “clearinghouse” role assigned in a de facto manner to the offices of Jennifer Juniors, Inc., the Zapruder company at 501 Elm Street, near the edge of Dealey Plaza, in the Dal-Tex Building. This office of a textile outlet became a central focus for meetings with legal authorities and the media, as well as the viewing space for the Zapruder film. Schwartz literally held court there from 22-25 November, 1963. Was this clothing manufacturers’ business a “legitimate” business, or was it a mob-controlled “storefront” using Schwartz and the filmographer, Zapruder? It occupied several spaces on the fourth and fifth floors of the Dal-Tex Building, but its funding sources were unclear. A. Dingus (1995) maintained that Jennifer Juniors, Jennifer of Dallas, and Chalet were all legitimate clothing lines developed by Zapruder, possibly with help from Nardis Co., of Dallas. Did Jennifer Juniors of Dallas file for bankruptcy, as has been alleged, right after the JFK assassination? This point needs bankruptcy court clarification. No documents were readily available. We should also attempt to verify the assertions that Jennifer Juniors vacated its premises at Dal-Tex Building by the end of 1964. We have no clear records on its movement back to Manhattan, New York. We do know that Zapruder did not go back to New York, New York in any case. He remained in Dallas. This sidebar on Jennifer Juniors needs more intensive investigation because of the suspicions it arouses as a possible mob front proxy operation, (cf., H. Livingstone, 1995, 1998) utilizing Zapruder, and linked to Schwartz and Ruby, and maybe even to Brading.

How did Zapruder know what he knew, 11/22/63? This item seems unresolved. Of course, Zapruder may have been only too glad to oblige the “innocent” (almost patriotic) request to film JFK, when the women at Dal-Tex pressed the issue—never knowing what unexpected horror lay ahead in the visual and auditory realm. Perhaps Schwartz, the co-partner, counseled the women, in advance, to get Zapruder to film the motorcade with his new Bell and Howell camera. Perhaps Schwartz (and Ruby) may have wanted a “trophy” copy of Zapruder’s final original film. It is unclear whether Schwartz got a bootlegged copy of the Zapruder film from the Jamieson Labs in Dallas. But if Schwartz held a copy, a secret “fourth copy” of the original, then it is probable that this copy was passed to Ruby or to H. L. Hunt—and maybe to others. Frewin (1993) has been mentioned as the prime historical source for the basic outline of the Rothermel story on the early H. L. Hunt copy of the JFK assassination film at or about 25 November 1963.

There is no specific indication that Zapruder was ever threatened or coerced into filming the JFK sequences in the Z-film. There is also no contrarian proof to show that he was not induced to film as a proxy for Schwartz and Ruby and others unknown.
As we end, we finally must ask: If Zapruder did not know what was going to happen on Elm Street, 11/22/63, can we assume the same for co-partner, Erwin (Irwin) Schwartz? Not necessarily. If Ruby (and possibly Brading) had alerted Schwartz with such foreknowledge, then the need for the proper filming of a “trophy” copy of the JFK assassination became paramount and inescapable. Zapruder could function as the ideal proxy, tied to a legitimate “business,” assisted by Marilyn Sitzman, the go-between to Schwartz. Did Abe Zapruder know exactly what was involved in filming the assassination that day in Dealey Plaza? Probably not—due to his severe emotional grief reactions both on and off the television. Zapruder’s wife and children maintained that he was a great supporter of President Kennedy, but the mob was not pro-JFK, so what might this tell us about co-partner, Erwin Schwartz? On the other hand, Zapruder also made several emotional pro-JFK telephone calls, immediately after the JFK assassination. It would seem that Zapruder would never knowingly assist an attempt to harm JFK—only subliminal treachery and trickery could have misled him on 11/22/63.

In the final analysis, the question must remain open for general discussion: “How did Zapruder Know?” This is the sixteen million dollar question. It cannot be dismissed so easily in the matter of the Zapruder film on the JFK assassination. How did Zapruder know, based on the factual database of 11/22/63, where and when to stand in order to film the JFK motorcade exit from the Plaza, and the concurrent JFK death, non-stop, without any significant errors in the filmography? That is the essential crux of the sixteen million dollar question. We still seek a final answer for the question posed by November 22, 1963.
APPENDIX: BOOKS & ARTICLES

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTES:


ARTICLES (PRINT & ON-LINE)


(3) – Conway, Debra. JFK Lancer Online Resources, 1998-2000. Site hosted by Debra Conway and Tom

(4) — Dingus, Anne.

(5) — Harris, Elizabeth F.

(6) — Mack, Gary.

(7) — McAdams, P.

(8) — Morningstar, Robert.

(9) — Shackelford, Martin.

(10) — Shackelford, Martin.

(11) — Sylwester, Mike.
(12) – Thompson, Josiah.
From first 3 1/2 pages, this is ignorant, crazy, based on irresponsible sources. Not all conclusions are reasonable, that in turn are based on unclear, irresponsible conclusions.