

NR_key_name: B1B11208641D9D9E852565E600795322

SendTo: CN=Douglas Horne/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 04/14/1998

DisplayDate_Time: 6:05:29 PM

ComposedDate: 04/14/1998

ComposedDate_Time: 6:05:11 PM

Subject: Re: Resp to ROBERT HARRIS
 FROM: EILEEN SULLIVAN @ ARRB/ARRB/INTERLIANT @ COMPUSEIVE.COM @
 INTERNET @ INTERLIANT Date: 04/14/98 10:50:40 AM ASTSubject: Resp to ROBERT HARRIS
 John, would you kindly post my response? In my response to Robert Harris, I will not discuss his claims about what appears on the Zapruder film except to advise people to verify these claims for themselves. You will need a good copy of the film or video itself, and it helps to be able to see the frame numbers. For this, you might try to make a good xerox of CE 885 which has most of these frames. They are quite fuzzy, but at least they will help orient you.
 HARRIS: Let me suggest an experiment. Have someone who has never seen the Zapruder film sit down with you and watch it 2-3 times at full speed. Afterwards, ask them questions like, "Did JBC turn left or right after the Stemmons sign." or "Did you see the limo actually turn off of Houston?" Ask a dozen or so similar questions, and then count up the errors. If they are less than 50% then you have a pretty alert witness. But those kinds of mistakes are *predictable*, as they were in 1963. They don't necessarily prove forgery.
 CRANOR: You are mixing up three different kinds of witnesses: (1) Those who saw the ACTUAL EVENT in Dealey Plaza (2) An FBI film analyst with MONTHS TO STUDY THE FILM and FILM STILLS on superior equipment (3) Those given a brief viewing of the film. Did you think no one would notice these differences? Number 3 does NOT belong. Nothing said by people given a brief viewing of a film is remotely comparable to what is said by people who saw the actual event, or even to what was described after PROLONGED analysis of stills and the film itself.-----

HARRIS: Ms. Cranor - please excuse me for butting in, but as I understand it, you are suggesting that JBC actually turned far to his left, looked at the President and was then hit in the back.
 CRANOR: (1) CONNALLY said that is what happened after Kennedy was hit; (2) witnesses said that is what happened; (3) an FBI film analyst said that is what happened on the Z film.
 HARRIS: Are you suggesting that Connally was a primary target? If he was not, then do you believe the shooter was so inept that he missed Kennedy by 3-4 feet?
 CRANOR: WHERE DO I SUGGEST CONNALLY WAS THE PRIMARY TARGET?
 HARRIS: I can see how you might posit a bullet from the front causing his wounds as he is turned to the rear.
 CRANOR: We cannot use any of the testimony to make informed speculation because we do not know (1) how far to the left he turned, or (2) when exactly he was hit in relation to that turn. But the Connally's knew. The FBI knew since the left turn was on *their* copy of the film. They could have put the information together and come up with a conclusion that did not fit the Warren Commission scenario. In any case, this testimony already compromises the WC conclusion because it describes JBC and JFK being hit by separate bullets fired too close together.
 HARRIS:

Body:
recstat: Record

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: