

PLAYBOY interview

Zapruder

Having never understood the real significances of the Zapruder film, having done none of the considerable important work on it, having missed the most glaring destruction of essential parts of it, Mark never ceases misrepresenting who did.

Knowing full well that it was brought to light in WHITEWASH, he alleges in his Playboy interview exactly the contrary. Here there is a virtuoso display of both his integrity and his knowledge - of the fact, the testimony and the Commission personnel: (p.46)

"The question of these missing frames was brought before one of the Commission's lawyers last year by David Lifton, a graduate engineering student and an associate of the Citizens' Committee of Inquiry. The lawyer was so concerned he wrote (the former head of the Commission). This Commission lawyer commented: 'I have no recollection that anybody considered what happened to the sign or that anybody was aware of the fact that the frames were omitted.'"

"Omitted" as a replacement for "destroyed: is a considerable understatement for Omniscient Mark to be quoting. The lawyer is Wesley Liebeler, from whom Mark, for a long time, was running. He had often promised to file a suit against Liebeler for calling him a liar but apparently never did.

Now, if there is anyone who did have knowledge and did have "recollection" about these two things, it is Wesley Liebeler, who took the testimony on the same day from the two people who gave just that information. With the sign, it was Goundskeeper Emmett Hudson, as I published in WHITEWASH. With the missing frames of the Zapruder film, it was his own "testimony" in Vol. 7, (attached), also revealed in my writing alone.

Now, a year before this alleged interest by Lifton and lapse of memory by Liebeler, all of this was brought to light in WHITEWASH, But Mark, consistent with his pose of having done everything that was done and all that has never been done - and alone and unassisted - pretends no other books exist. This is consistent with the failure of his own book to bring forth any major new information about the assassination or its investigation and consistent with his own high concepts of personal integrity and legal and literary ethics.

There is a different version of the same general character added in the reprint of Rush to Judgment (p.387), heralded on that cover as "important new information".

Mr. ZARVUDEN. That's right.

Mr. LITWACKER. And the motorcade comes behind it. Now, what about picture No. 210—however—there is no No. 210 in here.

Mr. ZARVUDEN. No.

Mr. LITWACKER. How about No. 222? Now, in No. 222 you can see the Presidential car coming out from behind the sign.

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Yes.

Mr. LITWACKER. And you can see Governor Connally right there in that center seat, I believe?

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Yes; Governor Connally—yes—these are all the same pictures—I remember the car was kind of buried and I was kind of low and I don't know how I got that view—I didn't get just the full view of the shot.

Mr. LITWACKER. Let's turn to 228 and there the car is coming further out from behind the sign.

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Yes.

Mr. LITWACKER. Is that still the same part of the sequence?

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Yes.

Mr. LITWACKER. You can now see the President for the first time.

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Yes; that's the President.

Mr. LITWACKER. The President appears to have his hand up by his throat as he is just coming from behind the sign.

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Yes; it looks like he was hit—it seems—there—somewhere behind the sign. You see, he is still sitting upright.

Mr. LITWACKER. Yes; he's sitting up and holding his hand up.

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Do we have the sequence—the next frames?

Mr. LITWACKER. Yes; it will be No. 227 and his hand comes up even more and he starts to move a little to his left.

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Apparently. And they started speeding the car then to—but he is still sitting up here. Is that still the President here?

Mr. LITWACKER. Yes; in picture No. 228—he still appears to have his hand up and in No. 229 it's even more pronounced.

Mr. LITWACKER. Five frames?

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Five frames is nothing—I believe.

Mr. LITWACKER. How about 249?

Mr. ZARVUDEN. No. 249—I just wonder if it was with that I don't remember—it looks like he has don't remember seeing that. Of course, the picture

Mr. LITWACKER. Yes; when you pick one of them and pick them out.

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Yes; it's hard. <sup>We run them</sup> the night shot—it's hard.

Mr. LITWACKER. Now, let's turn over to picture 253 are from your film?

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Yes; they are—I know this—I in fact, I used to have nightmares. The thing would up and see this.

Mr. LITWACKER. What about 255—that about that

Mr. ZARVUDEN. That's still the same series.

Mr. LITWACKER. That's still the same series—they

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Yes.

Mr. LITWACKER. And let's look at No. 219—as we start moving sharply to the left.

Mr. ZARVUDEN. Yes; when you take it frame by frame 2 or 3 seconds, but the impression was that he was sitting there and looking over that and grabbing his

Mr. LITWACKER. Yes; moving toward Mrs. Kennedy

Mr. ZARVUDEN. That's what impressed me. Now,

Mr. LITWACKER. 313—you remember that one?

Mr. ZARVUDEN. That was—that was the horrible one

Mr. LITWACKER. It appears to you then, that this I look through it

## A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

108, "Examination of the Zapruder camera established that it ran  
221 at a speed of 18.3 frames per second."

This footnote is in error. Examination of the camera cannot establish the speed at which it ran. In the case of this camera, it could not even establish the speed or speeds at which it could have run. The fact is that there was no test of any kind to show the rate at which film was actually exposed.

The basis of this chapter comes from my work, what I first brought to light in WHITEWASH, not with CBS or Alvarex or any of the other quoted sources. Here Lane's criticism, which is based upon the invalid work of the Commission for attack on invalidity by CBS, is less honest than CBS, which at least referred to the work of "one critic", as Lane knew. He knows so little about this aspect that he does not acknowledge the variable speed of the camera - or the 30% error in the reenactment. This is in no way relieved by the guarded acknowledgment on 111, where he evades what I first began to bring to light in WWII this way, "...in my opinion, no evidence has been produced which would tend to invalidate the correctness of that figure." The question is not at all "if the film did, in fact, run slower", but did it run faster, which is quite possible.

112 Reference to NYTimes review of the basic work he here refuses to credit. Show NYTimes he quotes and comment on the quotation he uses.

113, Quotation from Rush to Judgment that the Zapruder film shows  
197 the President "was thrown to the left and toward the rear". Here Mark tries to eliminate his error and take credit for the work of others by inaccurate quotation from his own book by eliminating the word "directly" (RTJ55). And there is source cited is not even the movie, which he could have seen and studied and didn't prior to the publication of RTJ, but the printed stills in Vol. 18, which show no such things as he represents - and cannot. The motion is backward. After a pause the body spins, back to camera, then falls to the left, slowly.

## A CITIZEN'S DISSENT - Notes

173           What is lacking in this reference to the Zapruder film is that I brought it to light - the missing frames, the editing of those at each of the missing sequences, of the copies - even the bringing to light of what allegedly happened to the film flowed from me through a newspaper reporter, and all is presented by Mark as though it is his work, for this passage is introduced by the statements that Roberts made "reference to me or my work sixty-seven times" in nine pages.