deweld "Iterature distribution; WEU, AND factage, Dirty ork and and by the EXT

By preservencement, I bed an archives showing of their copies of the WHE case of Whit caseld- ITM footage at 11 e'clock this morning. It least in the case of Whit, this is not the footage initially supplied deferal agencies. There are indications (but not positive proof) that it is not identical with the footage I obtained from WHMU and that supplied the Carrison of fice by Johann Rush, who took this footage for WDSU.

The film begins with the standard "academy" leader, the SECTE timing mambering, beginning with 11. If the examining it several time, with the projection-ist I made an inspection for machanisal evidence of solicing. There is none. However, between the various segments, there is blank film, perhaps 6-8 frames in length, that is visible in projection. Frinted in longhand at the beginning of the NOSU footage is the word "BUPPERSOUT". It also is on my copy.

There are five different scases in this film. They are the familiar ones. Forhams because the equipment was of better quality the film seems clearer. The first scene shows a large "Gorden" track slong the Semp St. side of the 17%, near the Common St. Segner. This same truck appears in the same footage, leading to to believe that either the truck remained thore a long time of both photographers began shooting about the same time, or one di much editing.

This film beers as fell identification on the real, in ink, end on the bag, rather claps envelope. It has no box of the sort pen imerican customerity supplies. In fact, it has no Pan American marking of any kind (theoret, film had a yellow Scotch-taps piece for keepint the film from unwinding on the real). The identification is new risens 89-69. Sefore the date, which is a surprising date, is the further identification "ROB". There is also the number "lis". The Wal film has the same identification except for the number 117. It is labelled "oswald passing out leaflets."

Now both films are dated 12/3/63. Both agencies were given the film well before this date.

There are seven sequences in the WML film. They show detaild mearing dark, possibly black slacks and a tie that seems to be of the same color. The court sequence in the MDSD film shows him wearing light-colored, pleated elecks.

exemination of the FSI and Secret Service reports show that as least still from the film were in the hands of federal agents not later than 11/23/65. Information from Turner on the Rush film is deficient in this regard, saying nothing about the time the film was given federal ments. However, Hoch overceme this deficiency in his interview of Rush (of 11/24/68, reportedate: 11/25/88). He says "on 11/23 or 11/24 Such received permission from his base, John Woperen, to take the eriginal film to Tan 'merican Films to get copies made". He is not certain that the two other sequences, the court scene and the waveld studie interview, were added at this time. westions about the See at Service use of the mords "film clip". Rush says they got all the station had. Rush recells that." a faw days after the essessination, while he was working in the derkroom, he talke to some federal agents who obtained stills and a film from him and took notes." Thile be seemed to believe they were FBI, Mach cites the FMI Copares interview, CD 6:421-2) to indicate the FEI got the film 12/3/68. I suggest it is entirely inconceivable the FBI weited Il days to get the film, that what they got then was an extra copy, garhaps a version with all requences combined. The Secret 'ervice descriptions of the film it got asks no references to the court and studio sequences (Controls 199,703).

Secret Service Control 703 leaves little doubt that it was in touch with of Oswald and Steels In San Intonio for Mrs. John Tersikes to exemine. If the exect time the FBI obtained access to the footage is in doubt, there is no available reports show they had gotten copies of pictures to witnesses before their

It just is not conceivable that with Oswald the accused escassin, there were way pictures of him that all of the federal investigative exercise ded not obtain as soon as it was humanly possible.

when I noted the date on this film I asket marion Johnson for the copies made available to the federal government earlier. He said these were all made from the footage. I had three, two post-card size, similar to the prints bringular exhibits, and one great enlargement of Charles Hall Steels, Jr., so large it is quite Grainy, about 8x10 in size. These are in File CD 87, which is pictures (the Secret Service reports establishing that John Mash gave a total of pictures (the Secret Service reports establishing that John Mash gave a total of and very carteinly the FBI had and used prints, the remains reports indicating a total of six different scenes. He says they have none. He did show me Carner Mahibit No. 1, their written permission, even though the picture is printed and is commercially made available, as evidence should be, with the restriction stemped on it.

Johnson also teld me they had written me about the Tarvikes matter right after Christmas. I have not yet received that letter. I saked him to send me a copy. He says they have found staff documents he thinks may explain the month discrepancy in the Garner picture, it having been shown to Mrs. Garner as Exhibit was deposed.

Dear Mon.

Tried to phone you several places earlier tonight, without I saw the TV footage at the archives today, got the Julia and Mercer which say nothing, as I told you (enclosed), and wrote the enclosed m

In connection with it, I urge you to ask Fen american Film Rumpert) for a check of their billings for the period 11/22-12/3/65 to when they dubbed copies of the FDSU and SEL footage. They might have to bills under a grovernment agency, as they might that of SDSU of course stations might have had other footage dubbed there during this period. It might be possible to isolate this. One of the things to look for is short length of film, for if the ITM footage was done first, it is brill'd estimate no more than two minutes, perhaps less.

Sincerely,

Harold deisberg