

NR_key_name: 4189B228DDB270A58525646E007AFC94

SendTo: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Thom Wilborn/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 04/03/1997

DisplayDate_Time: 5:23:29 PM

ComposedDate: 04/03/1997

ComposedDate_Time: 5:23:21 PM

Subject: Re: Zapruder Hearing
 TO: David Marwell/ARRBCC. FROM: Jeremy Gunn/ARRB Date: 04/03/97 11:41:20 AMSubject: Re: Zapruder HearingFYI.To: Jeremy_Gunn @ jfk-arrr.gov ("Jeremy Gunn") @ internetcc: (bcc: Jeremy Gunn/ARRB)From: DLifton @ COMPUSERVE.COM (David Lifton) @ INTERNET @ WORLDCOM Date: 04/03/97 10:28:02 AM CSTSubject: Re: Zapruder HearingJeremy:I watched the hearing and really enjoyed it. I guess its because I'minterested in the subject, but I found some of it very high brow daytime tv. I especially enjoyed Braunweiss, from GWU. I don't know much aboutthe technicalities of JFK Records Act, and thought his exposition, layingout all the possibilities, was very good, and that it provided the boardwith a wide range of actions.During the hearing, Marina called, and I shushed her off the phone; but itshowed me (again) that maybe now is the time to bend her ear about signingthose releases.I thought Jim Lesar's idea that the JFK Act, because it came after thecopyright, might be interpreted as permitting the board to do a taking ofthe copyright interesting, but I doubt they'll want to go that far.I thought Josiah Thompson exhibited just what I expected---swipes at mymedical alteration hypothesis and swipes the idea that the film could beinauthentic (a "quibble", he called it.) One thin he said I do agree with:that if the Government keeps it, the procedures for authentication mustfollow, but he followed that up with some statement to the effect that ofcourse that would establish authenticity. Au contraire! I believe that ifa group of optical people convened and examined the film, its highlyprobably that they are going to find serious problems with the film, andthen we are in a whole new ball park.Moses Weitzman made a great witness, but he failed to state (as I know fromRichter personally) that there were about 6 internegatives---not one---inthe box. And of course, he behaved as if somehow, unknown to him, the filmhad been copied. Well, that's ok; but of course, he knows all about it,since it was at the very center of his relationship with Groden (andinvolved all the other films, as well.)One ironic thought: that all of us---me, Weitzman, Groden, andThompson---all of us, each in our own way, had to "steal" the film!My impression of Trask was that he is still at the stage I was at back inL.A., thinking that exhorting the Zapruder family to do the right thing isgoing to work. Unfortunately, it won't.Finally, that last guy, Art Simon---sure he was interesting, and hislanguage was colorful but I kept wondering, Where did this guy come from? Who found him? Why is he here? Is he a Posner relative or what? All this,because he seemed an attempt to marginalize the significance of theoriginal. The one new idea that really impressed me (aside from Brauneis' pointingout that the Z film may already be an assassination record) was MoeWeitzman's idea that the Goverment should retain the original as a recordcopy of what it showed, a standard against future digital mischief. That is an excellent point.FWIW: I had a sense of real participation as the event unfolded, becuae

Body:
recstat: Record

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: