

NR_key_name: 10904B62EE1D0483862565E1002267EE
SendTo: MilicentCranor @ compuserve.com

jmcadams @ primenet.com;mam @ comteck.com;smyers @ connect.net;mparks @ cyberramp.net;pdscott @ socrates.berkeley.edu;peterson @ garlic.com;rredmon @ switzerland.k12.in.us;jnriley @ sprintmail.com;sixthfloor @ earthlink.net;mshack @ concentric.net;russ63 @ ix.netcom.com;jrsjfk @ idt.net;Eileen_Sullivan @ jfk-arrr.gov;74063.3405 @ compuserve.com;jwjfk @ flash.net

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB

From: robertg1@airmail.net

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 04/09/1998

DisplayDate_Time: 1:11:18 AM

ComposedDate:

ComposedDate_Time:

Subject: Re: NEWSREEL EDITED
MILICENT L. CRANOR WROTE: >> TO JOHN MICAADAMS. SEE IT MIAADAM OR S POSING THIS WHERE ALL THE CYBERGRINLU
goes.>> NEWSREEL EDITED TO SAVE THE SINGLE BULLET THEORY?>> This is the first of a series of messages to
Martin Shackelford who has> been most vocal in disparaging the notion of film editing. These> messages
concern what I think is the greatest obstacle to believing in the> authenticity of the Z film: the number of
credible witnesses who describe> events that do not occur on the film. Martin often claims the witnesses are>
wrong, or our interpretations of their words are wrong. But here, Martin> claims an event, alleged by me to be
missing, is actually not missing.>>> Martin, you contradict both Connally's, the witnesses, and the FBI film>
analyst. Your opinion seems to be that ANY left turn found on the Z film> -- even if it is clearly NOT the one
described -- disproves the claim that> a particular left turn is now missing from the Z film. You are entitled> to
your opinion that all these witnesses are wrong -- including the FBI> film analyst who could study his
apparently less-edited version of the film> at his leisure -- but it is misleading to not state up front that your>
descriptions (below) give a radically different impression from what the> witnesses actually said. Possibly you
thought that was understood, but> even so, you should make it very easy to see the dividing line between
what> they said -- and your very different interpretation which reads like it> might be a paraphrase. [Notes
and references are at the end.]>> Connally's own words: "We heard a shot. I turned to my left -- I was>
sitting in the jumpseat -- I turned to my left to look in the back seat.> The President had slumped. He had said
nothing. Almost simultaneously, as> I turned I was hit." FBI film analyst Shaneyfelt's own words:
"...as he comes out of the> signboard he is facing slightly to the right, comes around straight on and> then
he turns to his left straight on...">> Below, I respond to some comments posted earlier by Martin (MS):>>
MS: I have no doubt that Connally was turning back to his left when he> was hit; the film shows exactly that
happening...>> MLC: Your words are very different from Connally's. Connally said he> "turned to my left
to look in the back seat." You wrote "turning BACK to> his left.">> Turning BACK to his left -- from a
position in which Connally was turned> around to his right, his posture as he goes behind the Stemmons sign --
> would merely bring him back to the front, the way he appears in Z-222 and>
several frames thereafter.>> By
adding just one word -- and subtracting a few others -- you've changed>
the entire meaning of
Connally's statement. Looking "into the back seat" -- or even TRYING to look into the back seat --
would necessarily put him> in quite a different position than the one he's in at Z-222 and thereafter.>
Nowhere do we see Connally looking over his left shoulder into the back>
seat where Kennedy was
slumped.">> MS: Early in the film, Connally turns slightly to the right, then faces>
the front straight on,

Body:

recstat:

DeliveryPriority:

DeliveryReport:

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: