

**NR\_key\_name:** 50346319A631FD7D862565DF00174891**SendTo:** Blind.Copy.Receiver @ compuserve.com**CopyTo:****DisplayBlindCopyTo:****BlindCopyTo:** CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB**From:** MillicentCranor@compuserve.com**DisplayFromDomain:****DisplayDate:** 04/07/1998**DisplayDate\_Time:** 12:12:35 AM**ComposedDate:****ComposedDate\_Time:**

**Subject:** Z-FILM, MARTIN v. WITNESSES

[REDACTED] to avoid being, long list. jvialon, your comment that the evidence for film editing when examined closely, is like ice on a hot stove" was appropriate insofar as many of us consider the evidence COOKED! On the other hand, it was hardly conducive to reconciliation. It reveals the following: (1) A highly inflated opinion of the arguments on your side of the question, none of which has come close to overcoming the most difficult obstacle to believing in the authenticity of the films -- the radical discrepancies between what the witnesses observed and what the films show. (2) Zero respect for the observations of a large number of witnesses. (3) Zero respect for the work of those researchers who have documented these discrepancies. (4) Zero respect for the scientific studies proving eye witnesses are actually reliable when it comes to accurately remembering important details. (5) Zero respect for the government agencies specializing in editing film evidence. You dealing with the issue of film tampering include the following: (1) You boast that you would know if a frame were missing. (2) You invoke the pseudoscience of Dale Myers. (3) Whether talking about researchers or witnesses -- you lump the loony with the lucid. (4) You abuse the expression "the unreliability of eye witnesses." Like Alvarez and many others, you bandy this concept about without explaining the unreliability relates to mostly IDENTIFYING FACES. You invoke the image of Jean Hill, as if she represented all witnesses. According to the witnesses, the following events occurred that do not show on the films (I saw #1 below on a different version of the Z film back in 1975 and once again more recently, but can't prove it): (Partial list) (1) Before moving backward (the "headsnap"), JFK moved dramatically downward and leftward. This action was so impressive that the backward motion didn't even register in my mind the first time I saw it. This maybe what Dan Rather experienced. Zapruder, who made several references to action he did not see on his film, said he DID NOT REMEMBER the BACKWARD motion. That's how anticlimactic it was compared with what happened just before: JFK went flat across Jackie's lap. (2) Connally, his wife, at least one Secret Serviceman, and one or two other witnesses said he turned around to his left before he was hit. Connally was more specific, saying he turned around, and Kennedy had "slumped." After this, he said, he himself was hit. Julian Reid, his assistant, said JBC was hit "two seconds" after JFK, but it was unclear whether he was quoting one of the Connally's or witnessed it himself (probably the former). The CBS newsreel in which he describes this was artfully edited to remove the mention of the left turn. It was broadcast uncut at first but, later, the cut version was broadcast, most recently on NOVA. But the uncut version is available. As far as I know, this is the first time anyone has documented -- using both versions of a film, the before and after -- an instance of film tampering in the case of the assassination. The purpose: to preserve the single bullet theory. Later

**Body:****recstat:****DeliveryPriority:****DeliveryReport:****ReturnReceipt:****Categories:**