NR\_key\_name: SendTo: CopyTo: DisplayBlindCopyTo: BlindCopyTo: From: DisplayFromDomain: DisplayDate: DisplayDate\_Time: ComposedDate: ComposedDate\_Time: Subject: 67C50C76CC3CBFBA862563B700251EC2 Eileen\_Sullivan @ jfk-arrb.gov @ internet

CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB DWMANTIK @ aol.com

10/02/1996 2:11:15 AM

Viewing FBI and Secret Service Copies of Z Film

Deal Wis. Sumvanti and Senuting this letter by overhight main to winnineapoils. The originalmessage norm the National Archives is in a separate e-mail message being sentat the same time as this. David W Mantik DAVID W MANTIK, MD, PhD Peter A Lake Oncology Center69-780 Stellar Drive Rancho Mirage, CA 92270 619-324-4591 FAX619-324-7931 e-mail: dwmantik@aol.com September 30, 1996The Honorable John R. TunheimUS District Court of Minnesota669 US Court110 South Fourth St.Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401 Re: Viewing FBI and Secret Service Copies of the Zapruder Film at the National Archives-- Request for AssistanceDear Judge Tunheim: During this year, for the first time, I have intensely examined the Zapruderfilm. This has led to original--and significant--results. In November 1996, aconference on the film will be held in Dallas, Texas, at which time I willpresent my findings, along with those of others who have been studying thefilm To strengthen my results, I have asked the National Archives forpermission to view the FBI and Secret Service copies of the film. To mysurprise, I have just heard from the National Archives by e-mail that I willnot be allowed to do this (copy enclosed). Their decision appears unjustifiable to me and I would be grateful for your assistance inoverturning this decision. The arguments that can be advanced against their position are various. 1. At least one other researcher (Anna Marie Kuhns-Walko) has already examined these films, without apparently obtaining any special permission. 2. These films purport to be copies of the original Zapruder film. I canunderstand that the original film cannot be examined, except under the mostunusual circumstances, but what possible reason can be advanced for notpermitting a simple inspection of copies as is the case for these FBI andSecret Service holdings? 3. I neither need nor want an 8 mm projector for this study. All I need isto view selected frames by means of a low power loupe (magnifying lens). Ican wear gloves while doing this--or take any other appropriate measures soas not to affect the film in any manner. 4. I have little or no interest in examining later generation copies that the Archives might make available -- as they suggest they may do in theirmessage. The whole purpose of my study is to search for critical features that may appear in early generations of the film but which either disappearor become more difficult to see in later copies. 5. My research is a highly focused, specific review of the film. It is notsome ill-defined fishing expedition with a vague hope of discovering an oddfeature or two. On the contrary, I have quite explicit questions in mind, allof which now demand an answer. If these questions cannot be addressed now, while the ARRB is still active, then when can this work be done? And if notby me (I have reviewed the autopsy photographs and X-rays on at least sevenoccasions), then by whom? With a conference pending, the ARRB alive and well, and numerous questions about this film newly emerging, the public interestwould be served by permitting this review now.

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

Ν

В