

Rt 8, Frederick, Md. 21701

10/4/69

Dear Dave,

While I do not expect you to do anything to undo what could have served only harmful purposes, in fairness to you, as to myself, I report the following, discovered tonight in the course of going over some old files.

After reading WHITEWASH II, a total stranger phoned Zapruder and then reported the conversation to me.

They were discussing camera speed, the purpose the caller had in mind.

This is an excerpt (caller Q, Zapruder A):

Q. Is that 16, 24, or what?

A. Normal is not 24, 24 is slow motion. for

Q. I have an FBI report that says you had it set ~~at~~ 24.

A. I spoke to a man, Barrett. It's all wrong. He came in talking in general, how cameras could be set at different speeds and he misunderstood. I had Mr. Barrett on the phone and he corrected it, if you go back to the FBI you'll find the correction. The FBI has it so I can't (unintelligible).

This is a direct quotation from what this stranger sent me under date of 2/11/67. Obviously, the "correction" is after the attention the Barrett report received through WHITEWASH II.

However, in Zapruder's mind, there was no confusion about Barrett's purposes, "how cameras could be set at different speeds". Nothing at all to do with ASA numbers.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

3/2/67

Dear Mr. Mills,

Thanks for your letter and the interesting enclosure.

If you will check page 180 of WW II you will find, as I say in the text, that I discovered the 30% error in the reenactment before I ferreted out the Barrett report. That this error exists is Shaneyfelt's testimony, is unchallenged (really, ignored) and is independent of Zapruder's testimony or recollection.

It may be exactly as Zapruder says. But that does not change the irrefutable evidence of Shaneyfelt's testimony. Now as to what Zapruder now says, while I take publicly a dim view of the FBI reports and while it is clear that Barret knows nothing about taking movies, I find it difficult to believe he made this all up.

On infrequent occasions I have also flipped the camera onto wrong speed. Zapruder now has no way of knowing whether or not he did this by accident. If he did it purposefully he would, of course, know.

In my belief, and the way my book is written, what is significant and controlling is Shaneyfelt testimony. He is the properly qualified expert and he said that what in the original took 5 seconds in the reenactment with the same camera knowingly set at normal speed took but 3.5 seconds. The arithmetic of this almost exactly coincides with the difference in camera settings. It is a simple matter to slide the button the wrong way in normal handling of the camera.

Hurriedly,

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION with ABRAHAM ZAPRUDER
February 1, 1967

Q. Mr. Zapruder?

A. Yes.

Q. I'm calling long distances from Portland, Oregon. I wonder if you could answer a few questions about the movie camera you were using on Nov. 22.

A. I do not give any interviews as far as... what do you want to know about the camera?

Q. I wanted to know what speed you had it set for on the day...

A. I think you'll find it in the Warren Report, it tells you exactly what happened.

(mumbled) The trouble is everybody calling somebody else telling something different.

(stated firmly) I had it set at normal speed.

Q. Is that 16, 24, or what?

A. Normal is not 24, 24 is slow motion.

Q. I have in FBI report that says you had it set for 24.

A. (first part unintelligible) I spoke to a man, Barrett. It's all wrong.

He came talking in general, how cameras could be set at different speeds and he misunderstood. I had Mr. Barrett on the phone and he corrected it, if you go back to the FBI you'll find the correction. The FBI has it so I can't (unintelligible).

Q. A camera could be off 2.3 frames?

A. A little, but not 24 when normal is 16. They established it at 18.3, but not 24.

Thank you Mr. Zapruder

David Mills
2324 N. E. Knott
Portland, Oregon 97212

February 11, 1967

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I was very interested in FBI report File #DL 89-43 (Whitewash II, p.184). If the report was accurate, and the camera was taking pictures at the speed of 24 frames per second, then the shooting only lasted 4.2 seconds. This, of course, points to a second assassin according to the Commission's own findings.

The report states "The camera was set to take normal speed movie film or 24 frames per second". After some research, I found that normal speed is 16 fps, while 24 frames per second is slow motion. You can see from this blatant contradiction that it had to be one or the other. If the camera was set for 24 fps, then Zapruder was taking slow motion movies for reasons unexpressed in any testimony or findings that I have seen.

If Zapruder had had it set at 24 fps, then the FBI's finding that the camera took pictures at the rate of 18.3 fps would be highly unlikely since cameras of reputable make are rarely off to such a degree. However, the FBI might have assumed that the camera speed was set at normal and based its tests on that.

If the camera speed was inaccurate at the same rate that the FBI found it was, then

$$\frac{16 \text{ fps}}{18.3 \text{ fps}}$$

$$\frac{24 \text{ fps}}{27.5 \text{ fps}}$$

the camera was taking pictures at 27.3 fps; this would mean the shooting lasted only 3.7 seconds.

I could not see why Zapruder would take slow motion pictures of the President. In order to resolve this question and the contradiction in the FBI report, I called Abraham Zapruder long distance at his home and questioned him about the speed of the camera. A written copy of the conversation is enclosed with this letter. I have a tape recording of the conversation. However, since it was obtained illicitly I do not want it out of my possession.

According to Zapruder the FBI report is inaccurate. I am curious to know if you have found the correction of which Zapruder spoke. If there is no such correction it is highly suspicious that the FBI would assume the camera took 16 fps when a written report states that it was set to take 24 fps.

I would very much like to have a copy of the entire FBI report File #DL 89-43. If this is possible, I will gladly pay for it.

I really can not find the words to describe your last two books, nothing short of excellent or superb is adequate. I am eagerly awaiting Whitewash III, though I haven't even begun to delve into all the leads in Whitewash I.

With respect,



David Mills

DM/pc