

**NR\_key\_name:** A1D8D251CC782BFE85256611006F80A2**SendTo:** CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB @ ARRB**CopyTo:****DisplayBlindCopyTo:****BlindCopyTo:** CN=R ecord/O=ARRB**From:** CN=Douglas Horne/O=ARRB**DisplayFromDomain:****DisplayDate:** 05/27/1998**DisplayDate\_Time:** 4:41:10 PM**ComposedDate:** 05/27/1998**ComposedDate\_Time:** 4:17:54 PM

**Subject:** Re: Zavada and Zapruder  
 Rollie would definitely need the entire frame for frames 133 (first innocuous frame), 303, and 305. I am sure it would be highly desirable (although not essential) for frame 312, since without showing the entire frame, there is no context for what one would be showing between the sprocket holes. Many frames show the "double motorcycle fender" between the sprocket holes, namely, frames 310 through 332. Frame 312 is one frame PRIOR TO the head explosion (which is 313), so I do not understand why you think he would be "extremely reluctant" to allow this. I suggested frame 312 to Rollie because it simply shows the President slumping over, and no wound whatsoever on his head, and is a frame of reference quite familiar to many researchers. Frames 310 and 311 look the same, except that the fender is less evident. The fender is more evident in successive frames where, unfortunately, there is a gory head wound evident (e.g., frames 320-323 and 326-330), which is why I chose the rather innocuous 312 to propose to Rollie. So, to recap, Rollie would not need to show the entire frame, perhaps just the intersprocket area, and one half of the projected frame...but if he doesn't show the entire frame, there is no way to verify independently that the frame is the number he says it is. This frame (312) seems quite innocuous to me, and has been published in many books, and used in many T.V. documentaries, with the permission of LMH Co. If you would like, I can cite them for you. To: Douglas Horne/ARRBcc: From: Jeremy Gunn/ARRBDate: 05/27/98 04:15:20 PM Subject: Re: Zavada and Zapruder Am I correct in assuming that, for the Second Shoot, he needs to shoot the entire frame (and inter-sprocket images) rather than the portions of the images that you identified. Is this correct? Based upon my conversation with Jamie, I presume that he will be extremely reluctant to allow re-publication of a detailed copy of 312 -- and perhaps the others as well. To: Jeremy Gunn/ARRBcc: Tracy Shycoff/ARRB From: Douglas Horne/ARRBDate: 05/27/98 02:52:53 PM Subject: Re: Zavada and Zapruder I just spoke with Rollie about the questions you raised in the attached e-mail. He confirmed that he is not a government consultant or employee, but is doing this work for Eastman Kodak, his previous employer. Kodak will not be profiting on the results of his work; all of Rollie's work is being done for research purposes only. He has approached questions raised over the years by researchers out of objective scientific curiosity, and was selected by Kodak because he was (and still is) their pre-eminent expert in 8 mm films.-----

-----I proposed to him, and he accepted, the following tentative travel schedule: Depart Rochester by Air July 8th in the afternoon, enroute Washington/Reagan National; Stay overnight in a Crystal City hotel P.M. July 8th; Conduct examinations at NARA on July 9th (a Thursday, and the day after a two-day Board meeting). I told him he Record

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