

Dr. Mantik had obtained copies of the same slides from the National Archives that my challengers were examining, and he showed them to me. I noted that frame 317 was misnumbered. (Earlier I had noted this in the Zapruder family attorney's office in Washington, D.C.; frame 317 was misnumbered in their collection which they said they had obtained from the National Archives.) I determined that what is numbered as frame 317 in the National Archives is actually frame 308. Marler and I had carefully confirmed that the slides we were looking at were accurately numbered. We had confirmed that the slides agreed with what was shown in the Warren Commission Report. As noted previously, I also confirmed that the slides upon which our analysis was based were in proper sequence, comparing them to a copy of the original film strip provided to me by Zapruder's attorney. The fact that our challengers were looking at the wrong slide in frame 317 was relayed to them a few days later with the hope that this would explain their confusion.\*

In any event, we spent the day at Idyllwild brainstorming various aspects of the Kennedy assassination, looking at the slides and checking my work. We spiritedly disagreed on several aspects of the assassination evidence as to the plotters, but unanimously agreed that the angles and speeds that Marler and I had calculated for William Greer's head turn were correct.

As a point of irony, three weeks after the meeting in Idyllwild I received a letter from Marler relaying to me that Dr. Mantik had

\*The "challengers" I can now report were author Harrison Livingstone and two researchers working with him, Martin Shackelford and Darryll Weatherly. Harrison Livingstone published his new book, *Killing Kennedy: And the Heart of the Century*, in the spring of 1995. I was not happy with what he had written. Marler and I had both hoped that when we advised him that he and his group were looking at the wrong frames he would back off and leave the rapid head/body turn subject alone until I could publish. But he did not do so. He wrote about degrees of head turn in frames 302-303 and 316-317 with which Marler, Dr. Mantik, and I did not agree. Livingstone acknowledged that we may have been looking at different frames than he. Unfortunately, he did not include photos of the actual frames that he was looking at for his reader to study. Also, Livingstone apparently was not aware (I never talked with him) that my study was based on the maximum achievable rate of *angular velocity*, not on a missing frame count exhibited by Greer's head and body in 302, 303 and 316, 317 compared to our tests with athletes. This is unfortunate because both David Lifton and Marler had presented my work based on missing frame counts. Later I decided that the angular velocity was the only way to analyze it because frame counts are very deceiving—head and body turns start with minuscule frame counts and build up in degrees as the turn accelerates. I now regret that I agreed to let David Lifton present what we call the "rapid head turn" before I had finished my work and was ready to publish. This led to Marler's articles and now, finally, my book, which was published only after extensive study and consultation with experts. I wish that Livingstone had held off until I could finish my work and

*continued on next page*

sent him a copy of a page from Harold Weisberg's book *Photographic Whitewash*, in which Weisberg had noted that in 1966 he had discovered that frame 317 in the National Archive collection was misnumbered and was actually a frame taken about twenty frames earlier. This error, despite having been identified to the National Archives by Weisburg, remained in place in 1995, twenty-nine years later, and was still creating confusion among researchers.

I wondered why frame 317 was misnumbered in the collection available to the public in the National Archives. It demonstrated to me a possible reason why no one had discovered the rapid head turn between 316 and 317 over all these years. To my knowledge, these frames had never appeared in *Life* or any national publication. Thus when researchers went to the National Archives they would only end up confused. This would be true even for experienced researchers. I noted that it was indeed a peculiar coincidence that this critical frame would be misnumbered. It was when looking at frame 317 that I first noticed the extreme head turn from frame 316 <sup>to frame 317</sup> in the Warren Commission Report, the poor-quality black-and-white copies of the Zapruder film do not clearly show this head turn, although, on close scrutiny, one can see it, but only if looking for it.) I pondered if it were not more likely that frame 317 had been deliberately misnumbered by someone along the way because that person knew that it would be the one that would jump out most obviously to future researchers who would be looking, as I did, at the position of Greer's head during and after the fatal head shot. (When I found the rapid head turn at 317, I was not looking for it. I was examining the film to see if Greer's testimony—that he was not looking at Kennedy when he was shot—was true.) Only by accident did I make the discovery of the rapid head turn at 317. I also noted that Harold Weisberg had not noticed the rapid head turn at 317. I suspected that Weisberg did not notice it because he probably did not have 317 available to examine. All he had available to him was the poor reproduction of 317 in the Warren Commission Report.

*continued from previous page*

publish, but he was unwilling to do so. Perhaps after he reads this book he will agree with my work.

I also want to correct Harrison Livingstone in his statement on page 172 of his book *Killing Kennedy* that seems to imply that Dr. Mantik endorses his analysis. I talked with Dr. Mantik about this after I had seen that Livingstone had made that statement, and Dr. Mantik told me that he, indeed, agreed with the estimates of angles I am reporting here.

298-305

310

15-27

30

36

38

50

53-4

61-4

71

81-2

104

109

119

138-46

148-9

151-2

154

178

182

280

Zapruder actually told FBI Agent Robert M. Barrett on December 4, 1963, that he did take slow-motion pictures. I herewith reproduce that document. So the suppressed truth about the invalid, false reenactment is confirmed by the suppressed report, a document I got from the Commission's files but for which I found no space in its 27 large volumes, in the 900-page Report, the 15 volumes of testimony (Liebeler did not ask Zapruder about it), or in the 11 volumes of printed documents.

It was Liebeler's responsibility to get the record complete and straight. It was his responsibility to know the speed at which the Zapruder camera was set to run. He asked no such question - he asked not a single question about the camera and failed to get it properly identified in the testimony. Had Liebeler asked the necessary questions of Zapruder, the truth would have come out. His failure to do so is consistent with the failure of the Commission to call Zapruder until after it had planned to finish its work and eight months after the assassination, whereas he should have been one of the first Commission witnesses. It is futile to argue that Liebeler might not have known of the FBI report quoting Zapruder as saying that he took the pictures at slow motion, for it was his responsibility to know all about Zapruder and his pictures before taking his deposition.

Nor can it be argued that the Commission and the FBI were unaware of this report. Hoover alludes to it in his February 3 camera-speed letter to Rankin. In so doing he indicts himself, involving himself personally in the misrepresentation of the camera speed on which the entire fake reconstruction of the crime is based. In this letter Hoover says that Zapruder "stated that the camera was fully wound". The Barrett report says that Zapruder "stated his camera was fully wound". So, Hoover read the memo that said the camera was not taking pictures at normal speed but was "set to take" pictures at "24 frames per second". His February 3 letter is an elaborate contrary pretense.

This Barrett report was also the subject of staff discussion. In the appendix I print a January 28, 1964, memo from Assistant Counsel David Ballin to General Counsel Rankin. It comes from the Commission's "MP" file and reveals staff discussion of part of the Barrett report.

This memorandum also discloses Ballin's understanding of the nature of 8-mm. photography. Particularly because he and Assistant Counsel Joseph Ball "discussed the problem of determination of the speed of the car" can there be no excuse for ignoring what is the certainty, that the camera was taking 30 percent more pictures than presumed per second. This, of course, made the 30 percent error referred to in Shaneyfelt's testimony. At the time of this Ballin memo, January 28, 1964, the reenactment that established the 30 percent error had not been made. But the fact that the camera had exposed 24 frames per second, not the presumed 16, is recorded in the Barrett memo. At the very least, it was incumbent upon Ballin and Ball of the Commission staff and Shaneyfelt of the FBI to check this out. Had they, however, the entire fictitious case against Oswald would have been tossed out in January, before the first hearing was held. This the government, which had already decided to pin the rap on the dead and defenseless accused assassin, was not about to do. Nor was it willing to face the inevitable consequence, acknowledgment that the assassination was the result of a conspiracy.

The penultimate paragraph of Ballin's memorandum proves the invalidity of the claim later made, that the government could not use the original Zapruder film, the only version it should have used, because of the danger of damage. Shaneyfelt makes it clear

that the most important use "would be under microscopic examination", which requires neither heat nor motion, and that there should not be any impairment of the quality of the film through such a microscopic check".

The government - especially the FBI - is touchy about the Zapruder film. The fact that it was also altered, reproduced with the frames essential by the Commission's own concept missing, is exposed in WHITEWASH (206). (Life had made 35-mm. color slides, or individual pictures, from those frames designated by the government (WHITEWASH II, 173).) None of the other published books mention this. The sensitivity of the FBI is understandable because it supplied the Commission's photographic services and staged the reenactment in Dallas, made the pictures that the Commission printed and obtained from Life magazine the original slides from which it made these copies. I had had much to say about the alteration of the Zapruder film, in writing and in public appearances, and I alone was discussing it.

In September 1966 I finished WHITEWASH II. There existed but four copies out of my possession - so far as I know - one at a major newspaper and at a TV station, one at a potential publishing house, and one at a major magazine. I have no reason to believe that any one of these made a copy of what was my exclusive literary property. In addition, as my wife retyped the manuscript, I mailed it to Gordon Harbord, my agent in England. To this day, and I write this more than a half-year later, some of the chapters have not reached Gordon. All were properly addressed. None was returned by the post office. Each had a correct return address.

Prior to publication of WHITEWASH II in early December, I never said that the FBI was responsible for the alteration of the Zapruder film. However, on November 23, J. Edgar Hoover wrote a letter to a favored reporter that he released two days later. In this letter he said:

Recently the charge has been made that the FBI altered the film of the assassination taken by Abraham Zapruder. This is totally false. The FBI never had the original Zapruder film in its possession - it was purchased by a national magazine. The FBI obtained a copy of the original uncut film and reproduced this for the Commission which has since turned it over to the National Archives.

If Hoover chose to interpret my as yet unspoken and unpublished words to mean this, I shall not complain. What I actually said when the book was later published is that the responsibility was that of the FBI because the FBI numbered the frames and knew that four were entirely missing and others tampered with. It therefore knew of the destruction of evidence in the only form in which it could be considered closely by the Commission, the stills.

What interests me, with all the interferences with my mail and telephone service, is how Hoover knew the charge I was about to make and answered it in advance. The post office assures me the only trouble with my postal service comes from the absolute pinpoints of inefficiency it has achieved. So I am, naturally, interested in how the FBI, in advance of it, could undertake to answer my criticism.

As with every part of this fraud called an investigation, each official answer that answers nothing also raises new questions. It is true that "The FBI obtained a copy" of the Zapruder film. They borrowed what is described as a copy of the original

There are published references to black and white copies made by Life. Can you confirm this and, if so, the purpose? Life has not replied.

References to other pictures Life had that were not released were not speculation. I knew of specific film, never published. Nor was my request to know all the frames supplied the Commission, for the proof that Life supplied more than the Commission prints or acknowledges is in the Hoover letter of April 21, 1964.

Once the Commission got the slides, once it studied them and without being able to study the frames it had been led by the FBI and its own staff to decide were crucial, once it finished its deliberations, it printed these slides, not as prepared by Life but as black and white copies made from the Life slides by Shaneyfelt. Then it sent them to the Archives when it went out of business.

As late as the holiday season of 1966, when I took Michael J. Berlin of the New York Post to the Archives and to see the Zapruder film and slides so he could better understand the conditions under which researchers work (the better to slander them, was misnumbered. The one identified as 317 actually was one taken from his subsequent series of articles), at least one of the slides about twenty frames earlier. I had not noticed this before and apparently no one else had, either. The Government projectionist checked his slide and affirmed that it was numbered "317". I showed him and Berlin that Mary Moorman and Jean Lollis Hill are in this frame, but in fact they disappear entirely from Zapruder's lens before Frame 317.

Of greater significance, however, is the reversal in the printed exhibit of Frames 314 and 315. In 313 the President's head explodes, visibly and unforgettable. The reversal of the two immediately following frames has the effect of reversing the direction in which the President moved in response to the power of the bullet. Printed incorrectly, they show the President slumping forward, as he would in response to the power of a bullet hitting him in the back of the head, which is the official story. However, the President actually moved backward, an impossible reaction to the power of a bullet travelling in excess of 2,000 feet per second and hitting from the back. The President also thereafter falls to his left, indication that the shot had come from his right. The Zapruder picture actually shows that the so-called fatal shot represented in Frame 313 came from the President's right side or the general area of the "Grassy Knoll".

Close study of the motion picture and the stills, and I cannot say how many extremely unpleasant times I studied them, going forward and backward and in slow motion, convinced me more than a year before this writing that the President was actually struck from each direction almost simultaneously, the bullet before the one that explodes in Frame 313 coming from the rear.

Had not Frames 314 and 315 been reversed in the Commission's evidence and had not the Commission ignored the unmistakable evidence of the motion picture, it could never have falsely concluded that the fatal injury also was inflicted from the rear and was also fired by Oswald.

When a west-coast researcher wrote Shaneyfelt in the name of a lady friend, Hoover replied, acknowledging the error and seeking to explain it away, as nothing can. That Hoover letter, dated December 14, 1965, is herewith printed with the name of the address masked.

It is no answer to say, as Hoover does, "The National

24

Archives is aware of this printing error," for the Archives has no power, rendered no decision and can reverse none. Its "awareness" is meaningless. (Nor did anyone there ever call this "printing error" to my attention.) This statement is without honorable purpose. It is indecent to call this only a "printing error", for the Report and the official "solution" of the assassination rest on it. If it is wrong, they must be also, and they are. It is obscene to repeat this, as Hoover does, saying, "This is a printing error and does not exist in the actual Commission Exhibit."

How many such "printing errors" has the FBI discovered after the electrocution of innocent men? Does the acknowledgment of a "printing error" bring them back to life? For Hoover to assume this pious pose and straight-facedly pretend he has said anything in this monumental non sequitur is the equivalent of saying, "I killed the wrong man, but it is all right because I didn't do it on purpose." Or, in this case, "We issued a fraudulent explanation of the assassination of the President, but it makes no difference. The error was typographical."

It is immoral to pretend that the explanation this is just a "printing error" explains anything. However phrased, however disguised, whatever device is used to conceal it, this is an acknowledgment that the Report is wrong, that the crime is unsolved. It certainly requires something more than a non sequitur from the head of the FBI, the man who was in charge of the investigators and technical, including photographic, services.

The only honorable answer, even if this were but a "printing error", is the reopening of the investigation or a demand for it.

And how many more unadmitted "printing errors" do we have?

I wish it were possible here to end exposition of the dishonesty and deception by the Government in its treatment of this, the most important single bit of assassination evidence. There is much more, some of which I will allow the documents to say for themselves. I cannot, however, ignore an explanation of how the Government persistently refused to possess the actual Zapruder camera and how, by persistent ridicule, I seem to have forced an abrupt change of policy. The documentation on that is also printed in this book. Here I add but this brief illumination:

From early November 1966 on, whenever I made a public appearance and particularly on radio, unwaveringly when I was on clear-channel radio which blankets most of the country, I quoted the October 31, 1966, order of the Attorney General directing that everything in the possession of the Government and considered by the Commission be transferred to the National Archives. In every case I quoted from the official list of what had been transferred, from the Federal Register of November 1. It is, actually, an awful collection of trash, trivia and junk.

"Is it possible," I asked, "that Marina Oswald's mail file and sewing basket are essential to the national heritage but the camera that recorded the entire assassination is not?"

Then, on December 5, I gave Peter Kins of the New York Times a copy of WHITWASH II and pointed out to him that the Government had contorted itself to avoid possessing the camera. Following his own inquiries, his story appeared in the issue of December 6. On December 7, Bell & Howell, with seeming spontaneity, several days after printed copies of WHITWASH II were available and a press release with emphasis on it was distributed