

NR_key_name: 531A041EDA08B2BA8525634E00668CFE

SendTo: CN=Tim Wray/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=Douglas Horne/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 06/19/1996

DisplayDate_Time: 3:32:32 PM

ComposedDate: 06/19/1996

ComposedDate_Time: 2:40:08 PM

Subject: Draft Letter to Kodak
BEFORE YOU FORWARD MY DRAFT LETTER TO KODAK ON TO JEREMY, PLEASE CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING. MY DRAFT LETTER DOES NOT LIST SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FILM ANALYSIS MADE BY VARIOUS INDEPENDENT RESEARCHERS, AS MY INTERNAL MEMO DID, BECAUSE SENIOR STAFF WAS UNCOMFORTABLE WITH ITS TONE, SAYING IT WAS TOO "CONSPIRACY ORIENTED;" THEY THEREFORE DID NOT WANT KODAK TO SEE ANYTHING WITH THAT DEGREE OF SPECIFICITY. WE THEN HELD OUR FIRST, GENERALIZED, GET-ACQUAINTED MEETING WITH KODAK, AND TALKED ONLY IN GENERALITIES, ABOUT POSSIBILITIES. THIS WAS FINE, AND APPROPRIATE, FOR A FIRST MEETING. HOWEVER, AS I RECALL, MR. WILLIAMSON ASKED US TO PREPARE A DOCUMENT LAYING OUT THE SCOPE OF WHAT WE WANT CONSIDERED. AFTER ALL, THE WHOLE POINT OF THIS NEXT STEP IS FOR KODAK TO BOUNCE THE SCOPE OF WHAT WE MIGHT WANT DONE AGAINST WHAT HAS ALREADY BEEN DONE, SO THAT THEY CAN THEN PRESENT US WITH OPTIONS AS TO AS-YET UNTRIED PHOTOGRAPHIC PROCEDURES, AND WHAT THEY WOULD COST. THE ENCLOSURE TO THE DRAFT LETTER, AFTER LISTING FILM NAME AND FORMAT, TELLS KODAK WHETHER WE ARE INTERESTED ONLY IN "AUTHENTICITY" OR "ENHANCEMENT:" IN PREPARING THE DRAFT IN THIS SIMPLIFIED FORMAT, I AM FOLLOWING JEREMY'S SUGGESTION. DAVID MARWELL PERUSED MY DRAFT ON MY COMPUTER SCREEN AS IT WAS BEING WRITTEN, AND DIDN'T LIKE THIS AT ALL...HE THOUGHT WE SHOULD ONLY BE PROVIDING KODAK WITH THE NAME OF THE FILM AND THE FILM FORMAT. ALTHOUGH I HAVE TURNED IN THE PRODUCT IN THE FORMAT SUGGESTED BY OUR BOSS, I AM NOT COMFORTABLE WITH THE PRODUCT. I BELIEVE WE SHOULD BE SENDING KODAK A DOCUMENT WHICH NOT ONLY DEFINES THE UNIVERSE OF FILM, AND SPECIFIES "AUTHENTICITY" OR "ENHANCEMENT," BUT WHICH ALSO SHOULD ADDRESS IN DETAIL (IN THE REMARKS COLUMN) EXACTLY WHAT WE MIGHT WANT DONE WITH EACH FILM; I.E., IN THE CASE OF THE ZAPRUDER FILM, CHECK FRAMES 313-340 TO DETERMINE WHETHER BACK OF HEAD IS BLACKED OUT; CHECK FRAMES 313-340 TO SEE WHETHER THE WOUND DEPICTED ON THE TOP AND RIGHT SIDE OF THE HEAD (ESPECIALLY FRAMES 335 AND 337) REPRESENTS AN ARTIFACT (ARTWORK), OR REALITY; ETC., ETC. ONLY IF WE DO THIS WILL KODAK BE ABLE TO PRESENT US WITH REALISTIC AND MEANINGFUL ESTIMATES ON CAPABILITIES AND COSTS AT OUR NEXT MEETING. IF WE WAIT UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING (WHEN MR. MILCH COMES DOWN FROM THE LAB AT ROCHESTER) TO MAKE ONLY ORAL (VICE WRITTEN) PRESENTATIONS OF "SENSITIVE" SUBJECTS, WE ARE WASTING VALUABLE TIME, AND THEN WILL RISK THE POSSIBILITY THAT KODAK WILL MISUNDERSTAND OUR ORAL REMARKS. OUR COVER LETTER MAKES CLEAR THAT WE ARE DEFINING, FOR KODAK'S CONSIDERATION AND STUDY ONLY, THE WIDEST POSSIBLE DEFINITION OF WHAT WE MIGHT WANT LOOKED AT, WITHOUT REGARD YET TO FEASIBILITY OR COST. BECAUSE WE ARE NOT COMMITTING ARRB YET TO ANY COURSE OF ACTION, AND ARE ONLY "ASKING THE QUESTION," AS REQUESTED BY KODAK, IT SEEMS TO ME WE SHOULD ASK THE WHOLE QUESTION IN EACH CASE, NOT HALF THE QUESTION. WE CANNOT EXPECT KODAK TO READ OUR MINDS AND MIRACULOUSLY PROPOSE TESTS AND TECHNIQUES (AND COST ESTIMATES) FOR QUESTIONS WE HAVE NOT ASKED IN ANY DETAIL. I'M HOPING YOU WILL ASK JEREMY TO RECONSIDER WHAT WE PUT IN THIS LETTER; IT WOULD

Body:
recstat: Record

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: