

July 5, 2017

David W. Mantik, M.D., Ph.D.
69780 Stellar Drive
Rancho Mirage, CA 92270

Dear Dr. Mantik:

This letter is in response to your two letters of February 22, 1997 (on the Zapruder Film), and March 7, 1997 (on issues related to autopsy photographs and x-rays). To the extent that I am able, I will attempt to address several of the concerns raised in your two letters.

First, regarding your February 22, 1997 letter regarding Zapruder film issues, let me assure you that the Review Board and the ARRB staff have been, and remain, interested in issues related to the Zapruder film. As you may be aware, the Review Board held a Public Hearing on Wednesday, April 2, 1997 on the future disposition of the original Zapruder film. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Review Board stated its intention to make a decision about the film at its next Board Meeting, which is scheduled for April 23-24, 1997. The Board's forthcoming determination regarding the film may have a material effect upon your desire to examine the film; namely, the result of the Board's determination may clarify to whom you should address your request.

Additional comments are provided below on selected Zapruder film issues raised in your letter:

-During the Review Board's recent Public Hearing on April 2, 1997, film expert Moses Weitzman stated that one way to gauge the authenticity of a camera-original film is that in every case, when viewed correctly (on top of a light box, for example), the base (shiny) side of any camera-original film should be "up" toward the eyes of the observer. Recent examination by ARRB staff of the film labeled as the original Zapruder film by the National Archives revealed that when the frames are viewed correctly on top of a light box, the base ("shiny") side is in fact "up" toward the eyes of the observer. While this is not in-and-of itself conclusive proof that this film is the camera original, this finding is certainly *consistent with* what one would expect to observe when viewing a camera-original film.

-Regarding your desire to compare the quality of the intersprocket images on the "home

Dr. David W. Mantik

July 5, 2017

Page 2

movie" portion of Zapruder's film with the quality of the intersprocket images on the assassination portion of his film, we find your suggestion eminently reasonable and we share your curiosity in this area. However, recent ARRB staff examinations of the original Zapruder film, and of the various copies in the Archives, has revealed that the *original* of the "home movie" portion of the film is presently unlocated--while what appear to be copies of it are present on Secret Service copies 1 and 2, the original "home movie" is not on the same reel as what is labeled as the original assassination film, and its whereabouts are presently unknown.

- We have also examined Secret Service copies 1 and 2, which are reputed to be two of the three first-generation copies made at the Jamieson film lab. When the frames are viewed correctly, the emulsion ("dull") side is "up," which seems consistent with the reversal that one would expect from any first generation copies made in a contact printer, such as was the case at the Jamieson film lab.

- The ARRB staff believes that neither of the two Time-Life copies at the Archives are first-generation--this means that for the time being, the third of three first-generation copies made on November 22, 1963 is unlocated; the ARRB will continue to try to locate the third first-generation copy of the Zapruder film.

Second, in response to your letter of March 7, 1997, the following comments are offered:

- We have thus far been unable to substantiate the allegations contained in the Joseph Scovitch letter that you passed to Mr. Marwell at the 1996 COPA conference. One lead that has been pursued turned out not to substantiate his allegations; we are still in the midst of pursuing other leads he provided.

-The ARRB staff has examined all of the original autopsy photographs and x-rays and cross-checked them against the index prepared for the transfer to NARA on October 31, 1966, when the Deed-of-Gift was executed. It appears to us that NARA currently possesses all of the material that it originally received. With regard to your suggestion that we depose NARA people under oath, we are somewhat perplexed. Do you have any evidence that anyone currently at NARA has any involvement with the autopsy materials *before* the transfer and would thereby have knowledge about missing materials? If you can recommend to us the name of anyone in the National Archives who has information pertaining to missing photographic and x-ray records of President Kennedy's autopsy, please provide us with a firm lead so that we can pursue it. The question of whether there are missing photographs or

Dr. David W. Mantik
July 5, 2017
Page 3

x-rays from the period between the President's autopsy, and the execution of the Kennedy family Deed-of-Gift, is one that the ARRB is still attempting to clarify.

-Regarding the individuals you have suggested that we contact, you should understand that our priorities are necessarily connected to records or to personnel directly connected to the creation of records (*e.g.*, in this case autopsy x-rays and photographs). Do you have any evidence that Dr. Dickson prepared any records related to the autopsy? ARRB staff has interviewed Dr. Karnei on two occasions; two other individuals, both connected with the creation of the autopsy x-ray record, have not as yet chosen to cooperate with the ARRB in our attempts to clarify the record in this area. Our attempts to enlist their assistance are continuing.

I hope that this addresses some of your concerns.

Sincerely,

T. Jeremy Gunn
General Counsel and
Associate Director for Research and Analysis