

QUESTIONS FOR ART SIMON

A. Professional Background-- Establish Mr. Simon's professional background, including training in history and/or archival preservation (*i.e.*, establish what makes him an "expert" on the issue of the intangible historical value in preserving the original Zapruder film).

1. What is Mr. Simon's educational background (college and graduate)?
2. What is Mr. Simon's current job?
3. What have been Mr. Simon's past jobs?
4. Does Mr. Simon have experience as an archivist? experience with museums?
5. What, if any, projects has Mr. Simon worked on involving the preservation of historical artifacts? Has he worked on any such projects involving photographs or films?
7. Has Mr. Simon written anything on the issue of preserving historical artifacts, such as photographs or films, that might be helpful for the Review Board to consider?

B. Substantive Opinion of Mr. Simon Being Offered to the Review Board-- Establish what Mr. Simon's opinion is and what the basis for the opinion is.

1. Mr. Simon, in his statement, says "there is little evidentiary value left in the Zapruder footage" and that the notion that "some future optical technology might" permit the "original to yield new important information" is an "enabling fiction" and a "fantasy."

Thus, Mr. Simon is of the opinion that the original cannot yield any new information in the future? And that the original will never yield any information other than what can be elicited from a copy? Thus, Mr. Simon assumes that there is no evidentiary value to the original?

2. In opining on the lack of possibilities for "future optical technology," Mr Simon does not purport to be an expert in this technical area?
3. Mr. Simon, in his statement, posits that the original Zapruder film could be considered a "secular relic, a material piece of the past" and that there may be an inherent value in preserving the original "as part of some ongoing archeology project" and as "the

[G]overnment's way of saying historical consciousness is important."

Thus, Mr. Simon is of the opinion that, even if there is no additional evidentiary value in the Government's preserving the original, there is an inherent value in preserving the original film simply as an historical artifact?

4. Mr. Simon, in his statement, says that if the Government decides to procure the original, then it should provide "some mechanism for public access" so that the film is not limited to "a select few." Mr. Simon proposes that the Government "entrust the film . . . to a museum, university or research institution."

What specifically would Mr. Simon recommend with respect to the future preservation and/or display of the original Zapruder film? Should the film (and perhaps the camera) be put on permanent display as an artifact? Should the original be played for viewing?

5. In assisting the Review Board in evaluating whether the Government should procure the original Zapruder film, can Mr. Simon point to any examples where the Government purchased or obtained an historical artifact, particularly films or photographs?

6. Can Mr. Simon point to any examples of how the originals of other famous films or photographs have been handled from an archival perspective? [For example, what ever happened to the original of the film of the Hindenburg accident? The originals of Matthew Brady's photographs? Films taken from the Apollo spaceships?]

7. Can Mr. Simon provide the Review Board with any other precedents or examples for the handling of the original Zapruder film?