

NR_key_name: C1A7EB0E8130D5D6862565E1001909E4

SendTo: jmcadams @ primenet.com
mam @ comteck.com;smyers @ connect.net;mparks @ cyberramp.net;pdscott @ socrates.berkeley.edu;peterson @ garlic.com;rredmon @ switzerland.k12.in.us;jnriley @ sprintmail.com;sixthfloor @ earthlink.net;mshack @ concentric.net;russ63 @ ix.netcom.com;jrsjfk @ idt.net;Eileen_Sullivan @ jfk-arrr.gov;74063.3405 @ compuserve.com;jwjfk @ flash.net

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB

From: MilicentCranor@compuserve.com

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 04/09/1998

DisplayDate_Time: 12:02:58 AM

ComposedDate:

ComposedDate_Time:

Subject: NEWSREEL EDITED
TO JOHN M. CADAMS. See if Martin OK's posting this where all the cybergraming goes. NEWSREEL EDITED TO SAVE THE SINGLE BULLET THEORY? This is the first of a series of messages to Martin Shackelford who has been most vocal in disparaging the notion of film editing. These messages concern what I think is the greatest obstacle to believing in the authenticity of the Z film: the number of credible witnesses who describe events that do not occur on the film. Martin often claims the witnesses are wrong, or our interpretations of their words are wrong. But here, Martin claims an event, alleged by me to be missing, is actually not missing. Martin, you contradict both Connally's, the witnesses, and the FBI film analyst. Your opinion seems to be that ANY left turn found on the Z film -- even if it is clearly NOT the one described -- disproves the claim that a particular left turn is now missing from the Z film. You are entitled to your opinion that all these witnesses are wrong -- including the FBI film analyst who could study his apparently less-edited version of the film at his leisure -- but it is misleading to not state up front that your descriptions (below) give a radically different impression from what the witnesses actually said. Possibly you thought that was understood, but even so, you should make it very easy to see the dividing line between what they said -- and your very different interpretation which reads like it might be a paraphrase. [Notes and references are at the end.] Connally's own words: "We heard a shot. I turned to my left -- I was sitting in the jump seat -- I turned to my left to look in the back seat. The President had slumped. He had said nothing. Almost simultaneously, as I turned I was hit. " FBI film analyst Shaney felt "as he comes out of the signboard he is facing slightly to the right, comes around straight on and then he turns to his left straight on..." Below, I respond to some comments posted earlier by Martin (MS): MS: I have no doubt that Connally was turning back to his left when he was hit; the film shows exactly that happening... MLC: Your words are very different from Connally's. Connally said he "turned to my left to look in the back seat." You wrote "turning BACK to his left." Turning BACK to his left -- from a position in which Connally was turned around to his right, his posture as he goes behind the Stemmons sign -- would merely bring him back to the front, the way he appears in Z-222 and several frames thereafter. By adding just one word -- and subtracting a few others -- you've changed the entire meaning of Connally's statement. Looking "into the back seat" -- or even TRYING to look into the back seat -- would necessarily put him in quite a different position than the one he's in at Z-222 and thereafter. Nowhere do we see Connally looking over his left shoulder into the back seat where Kennedy was "slumped." MS: Early in the film, Connally turns slightly to the right, then faces the front straight on, then turns to the left straight on (early Z-160s). MLC: The FBI's film analyst said "as he COMES OUT OF THE SIGNBOARD, he is facing slightly

Body:

recstat:

DeliveryPriority:

DeliveryReport:

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: