

NR_key_name: DF7E1F96EB786B76862565E200675E99
SendTo: MilicentCranor @ compuserve.com

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-arrrb.gov;74063.3405 @ compuserve.com;jwjfk @ flash.net

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB
From: palamara@telerama.com

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 04/10/1998

DisplayDate_Time: 2:48:36 PM

ComposedDate:

ComposedDate_Time:

Subject: Re: NEWSREEL EDITED
Kudos to mimi---great job of analysis! :-).VINCE/MILICENT L. CRANOR WROTE: > TO JOHN MCADAMS. SEE IF MARTIN OR I
posting this where all the> cybergraffitti 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 jumpseat -- 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 Shaneyfelt's own words: "...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

Body:

recstat:

DeliveryPriority:

DeliveryReport:

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: