

Mr. Firshein. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. I do.

Mr. Eisenberg. Could you state your full name, Mr. Shaneyfelt?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, Lyndal L. Shaneyfelt.

Mr. Eisenberg. And you have testified before the Commission in this proceeding before?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I have.

Mr. Eisenberg. We will not rehearse your qualifications again since you have already been accepted as an expert in the field in which you are going to be questioned today.

Mr. Shaneyfelt, I hand you a photograph marked Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 1 consisting of a photograph of Lee Harvey Oswald holding a rifle and I ask you whether you prepared that photograph.

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I did.

Mr. Eisenberg. Is this a photograph of an existing Commission exhibit?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, this is a copy of the small photograph that is a part of Commission Exhibit 133.

Mr. Eisenberg. That would be 133A?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. I don't recall whether it is A or B.

Mr. Eisenberg. I hand you photographs of Commission

Exhibits 133A and 133B and ask if this serves to refresh your recollection as to whether Shaneyfelt Exhibit 1 is a photograph of 133A or 133B?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 1 is a copy of the Commission Exhibit 133A.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, Mr. Shaneyfelt, I hand you the cover of Life Magazine, issue of February 21, 1964 which I have labeled Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 2, and I ask you if this is a photograph which you have previously examined in connection with earlier testimony given by you to the Commission?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Eisenberg. I hand you page 80 of the same issue of Life which is labeled Commission Exhibit No. 3, and I ask you the same question, that is, whether this is the photograph you have previously discussed in connection with earlier testimony.

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, it is.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, for the record, I am using duplicate originals rather than the actual exhibits because the actual exhibits are now being printed up by the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Shaneyfelt, I hand you the front page of the Detroit Free Press, issue of February 17, 1964, containing a picture similar to Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 1, and the other pictures thus far referred to and I am labeling this Detroit Free Press page Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 4 and ask you whether you have examined the picture of Lee Harvey Oswald and a rifle appearing on that exhibit.

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I have.

Mr. Eisenberg. Did you compare this picture with 133A and/or Shaneyfelt Exhibit 1, your ~~introduction of~~ reproduction of 133A?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I did.

Mr. Eisenberg. What was your conclusion on the basis of that comparison?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. I found that the reproduction of the photograph of Oswald holding the gun on Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 4 ~~is a reproduction~~, has insufficient detail to warrant positive identification as being the same photograph as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 1.

However, I did find that the photograph in the newspaper, Exhibit No. 4, is consistent in all respects with the photograph which is Exhibit No. 1, except for variations in retouching that are a normal part of the process of making half-tone reproductions from photographs for newspapers.

I further found that there was nothing in these photographs to indicate that they are other than the same photograph.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, when you say that the only variations appear to be variations in retouching, that would be based on the conclusion that they were the same photograph, is that correct?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes.

Mr. Eisenberg. Could you describe those variations which are apparently due to retouching, Mr. Shaneyfelt?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes.

There is an area to the right of Oswald's head and shoulder as I look at the photograph, to my left as I look at the photograph, ~~the left side of the head~~, that has been air-brushed or otherwise altered, to intensify the outline of the shoulder, which would be Oswald's right shoulder.

In addition there is retouching around the stock of the rifle, and along the other portions of the rifle where it crosses Oswald's body that ~~have~~<sup>has</sup> been added to intensify the detail in that portion of the photograph.

Mr. Eisenberg. When you say around the stock, could you specify as to whether you mean the top, bottom and/or all three or any two of those boundaries.

Mr. Shaneyfelt. In Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 4 there is retouching on both the top and bottom and butt of the stock, and also a highlight running along the top of the gun from the bolt forward toward the muzzle.

~~THERE IS~~  
An additional highlight along the bottom of the gun just forward of the trigger assembly between the trigger assembly and the hand.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, there is a highlight on Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 1 running near the top of the barrel or receiver, is that correct?—terminating at Oswald's left hand?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes.

Mr. Eisenberg. What is the relation between the highlight

at the top of the barrel or receiver in Shanoyfelt Exhibit 4 and the highlight referred to just this moment in Shanoyfelt Exhibit No. 1?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. In ~~the~~ Exhibit No. 1, that highlight along the bolt of the gun is in two parts, and the highlight in the photograph or the reproduction of the photograph, in Exhibit No. 4, is a continuous highlight.

Mr. Eisenberg. Is it your opinion that the highlight in Shanoyfelt Exhibit No. 4 is based upon the highlight in Shanoyfelt Exhibit No. 1?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. Yes.

Mr. Eisenberg. But it differs, at least, in that it makes a continuous highlight where none appears in Shanoyfelt Exhibit No. 1, is that your testimony?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, in Shanoyfelt Exhibit No. 1, a telescopic sight is apparent on the rifle, and no such sight is apparent in Shanoyfelt Exhibit No. 4.

Do you have any opinion as to the reason for the lack of a sight appearing on Shanoyfelt Exhibit No. 4?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. Yes.

Mr. Eisenberg. Could you give that opinion?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. I believe that the sight does not appear in the reproduction of the photograph on Shanoyfelt Exhibit No. 4 because it was not retouched to intensify the detail of the

sight, and, therefore, was lost in the engraving process.

I do not believe that there was any retouching over the sight in order to purposely obliterate it from the reproduction in Exhibit No. 4.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, is there generally a loss of detail in reproduction of illustrations appearing in newspapers, Mr. Shaneyfelt?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, there is. This is apparent in other areas of this photograph when compared with Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 1, in areas of Oswald's shirt where wrinkling appear in ~~the~~ Exhibit No. 1, and is lost in the reproduction.

Also the wrinkles in the dark areas of the trousers are not reproduced in the half-tone process, but this detail is lost by the process.

Mr. Eisenberg. What is this half-tone process which you mention?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. This is, the half-tone process ~~is the~~ process by which a continuous tone photograph such as Exhibit No. 1, is photographed through a screen so that it can be broken up into a dot pattern of black dots on a white background and white dots on a black background to give the appearance of a continuous tone in the printed newspaper reproduction.

And, this is the only means by which a continuous tone photograph can be reproduced.

Mr. Eisenberg. Why is it called a half-tone process?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. ~~I could only guess.~~ I don't really know the answer but I would assume that it is because it gives you the tones in between black and white or the halftones.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, a loss of detail is inherent in this process, is it?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is true, particularly in regard to newspaper reproductions where a relatively coarse screen is used in making the halftone.

In a magazine publication where a higher quality of printing is used, and a better quality of paper is used, it is possible to use a finer screen and thereby retain a greater amount of the detail.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, referring once more to the highlight running along the top of the weapon, and terminating at Oswald's left hand in ~~the exhibit~~, Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 4 when you compare this exhibit with Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 1, does it appear that that highlight <sup>actually</sup> runs along the top of the weapon?

*Wait* ~~Mr. Shaneyfelt. Would you read that question to me?~~  
~~Mr. Eisenberg. Make it actually runs along the top of the~~  
~~weapon.~~

Mr. Shaneyfelt. In the reproduction of the photograph on Exhibit No. 4, the impression is given that the highlight is along the top of the rifle, because you see no additional detail above that highlight along the top of the gun.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, if you compare that with Shaneyfelt

Exhibit No. 1 where a similar highlight appears, does that actually denote the top of the weapon or is there any detail above the highlight apparent in Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 1?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. On Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 1 the highlight does not denote the top of the weapon. There is detail present that shows other areas of the gun, the breech, above the highlight.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, would you say then that detail of the weapon itself, that is the upper part of the weapon, had been lost along with detail representing the telescopic sight?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Eisenberg. Bringing your attention back to Shaneyfelt Exhibits 2 and 3, which are the Life photographs, how did these photographs compare with Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 4, the Detroit Free Press photograph.

Mr. Shaneyfelt. The primary difference is in the retouching. In the area ~~above or behind~~, above and behind Oswald's right shoulder the background has been retouched out on Exhibit No. 4, in the Detroit Free Press.

In the Life Magazine reproduction, Exhibit No. 2, the background has been left in and the retouching has been added to the shirt area around the right shoulder to enhance the detail along in that area.

The Life Magazine reproduction, Exhibit No. 2, also has retouching around the scope of the rifle in order that it will not





blend into the dark shirt that Oswald was wearing and thus be lost in the reproduction process.

This has not been done in ~~any~~ Exhibit No. 4. The retouching along the top of the rifle stock is generally similar in that it is in a straight line from the butt of the stock to the bolt.

However, Exhibit No. 4 has a different type of retouching along the end or butt of the stock and the bottom of the stock or the lower edge of the stock ~~toward the~~ between the butt and the trigger guard.

Highlights along the top and bottom of the breech area are different in the Exhibit No. 4 than in the Exhibit No. 2. There is a dark shadow between the legs of Oswald that is about halfway between the knee and the crotch that has been left in the reproduction on Exhibit No. 4, but has been retouched out of the Life Magazine reproduction, Exhibit No. 2.

These are the primary variations in the retouching on the two exhibits.

Mr. Eisenberg. Does the highlight running at or near the top of the receiver or barrel in the bolt area show a continuous or an intermittent form in Commission Exhibit No. 2?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Commission Exhibit No. 2 shows a break in the highlight along the bolt, and is reproduced very close to the original photograph, which is Exhibit No. 1.

In fact, this area was probably not retouched or this high-

light was probably not retouched, for the Life Magazine reproduction.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, you also mentioned that the retouching along the stock was different when Shanoyfelt Exhibit 2 is compared with Shanoyfelt Exhibit No. 4.

Could you go into a little bit of detail in that difference?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. Yes, I mentioned that the highlight along the top from the butt to the bolt is generally similar in that it is in a straight line, although the rifle itself is actually curved along that area, they both have been retouched in a relatively straight line along the top edge of the stock.

There has been a white or light line added along the butt of the stock where it crosses Oswald's leg in Exhibit 4 and this has not been done in Exhibit No. 2.

In addition, ~~the same~~ a white outline has been drawn in along the bottom edge of the stock as it runs from the butt to the trigger guard in Exhibit No. 4.

This has not been done in Exhibit No. 2.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, Mr. Shanoyfelt, when this retouching or when retouching is effected, is it performed on a negative or on a print?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. Retouching for newspaper reproduction is almost always done on the print.

Mr. Eisenberg. And what about magazine reproductions?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. This would also be true of magazine

reproductions.

Mr. Eisenberg. And would that explain how Shaneyfelt Exhibit Nos. 2 and 4 could differ from each other even though they were apparently both taken from the same print, originally from the same print, of which Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 1 is a photograph?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, that would explain the difference.

Mr. Eisenberg. That is -- could you go into detail on that? Could you elaborate that answer, what process would be involved to end up with two different prints -- strike that.

By what process would the result of a reproduction of the same print differ as reproduced in two different media or two different magazines or newspapers?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Well, the primary variation would be in the retouching that has been added. Different publications and different retouch artists would handle a photograph differently, and add different retouching to them and, therefore, <sup>these</sup> would be the main variations which you would have between two different reproductions.

In addition there can also be differences in the quality of the engraving as there are differences in quality of many things.

A newspaper reproduction is <sup>made</sup> ~~handled~~ with a coarser screen and gives less detail than a magazine reproduction that uses a finer screen and, therefore, reproduces more detail. These are

come of the basic things that would affect these reproductions and make variations in the ~~resulting~~ reproductions.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, Mr. Shaneyfelt, I hand you page 80 of Newsweek Magazine, issue of March 2, 1964, also containing a photograph like those we have been examining, and this is marked Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 5 and I ask you whether you have examined that photograph.

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I have.

Mr. Eisenberg. Can you give us your conclusions, Please?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. I found that the photograph reproduced in the Newsweek magazine, issue of March 2, 1964, which has been marked as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 5, is the same in all general characteristics <sup>as</sup> the photograph that has been marked as Commission Exhibit No. 133A, and I found no differences to suggest that it is other than the same photograph.

Mr. Eisenberg. Yes.

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Except for variations in retouching.

Mr. Eisenberg. I take it that your testimony concerning Shaneyfelt No. 4 and 5 is that due to some loss of detail it is impossible to say that these photographs are identical to Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 1, or rather 133A on which Shaneyfelt Exhibit 1 is based, <sup>as</sup> ~~except~~ to say, that a fingerprint is identical to a given fingerprint impression, is that correct?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

I was not able to positively identify them because of this

loss of detail.

Mr. Eisenberg. What is your opinion as to the probability that they are identical, bearing in mind that it is impossible to make an absolute unqualified determination of identity.

Mr. Shaneyfelt. *They may very well be identical since I found no significant differences other than the retouching.*  
~~I feel that it is highly probable that they are identical.~~

Mr. Eisenberg. Is there much doubt in your mind?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Very little.

Mr. Eisenberg. Apart from the factors which have been mentioned so far as apparently due to retouching and those factors which you have not yet discussed but will, was there any difference between the reproductions and the original, between the apparent reproductions and the original?

That is, was lighting the same, position and so forth?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes.

I found them to be the same in all of these general characteristics as to lighting and position of hands and position of body, their relation to the background. I found no differences whatsoever.

Mr. Eisenberg. So that for the photograph to be a different photograph I take it you would have had to have had Oswald line up exactly in the same position with his elbows and torso in precisely the same relative position with the rifle at precisely the same relative height and in precisely the same relative position it had been previously with the lighting casting the

exact same shadows insofar as shadows are visible and so forth,  
is that correct?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Eisenberg. And you found no discrepancies in those items  
I have just mentioned?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. That is correct.

( Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Eisenberg. Back on the record.

To make the record complete, is there any other possibility,  
no matter how remote?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. Yes. Even though it would be extremely  
remote, it is conceivable that a person could actually make a  
drawing or painting of a picture exactly like this that when re-  
produced in a newspaper or publication with its loss of detail  
would resemble Commission Exhibit 133A, in the same manner that  
this picture or this reproduction resembles 133A.

Mr. Eisenberg. By "this reproduction" being which, Mr. Shanoy-  
felt?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. Either Exhibit 4 or Exhibit 5, Exhibit 2,  
any of the magazine or newspaper reproductions that we have  
discussed.

Mr. Eisenberg. You are not talking about Exhibit 133A  
itself which you testified to earlier?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. No, no.

Mr. Eisenberg. Do you see any evidence of this, Mr. Shanoy-

felt?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. No, I do not, and I think it is in the realm of unreasonable doubt and it is highly <sup>im</sup>unprobable.

Mr. Eisenberg. Returning to Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 5, could you describe the apparent retouching in that exhibit?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes.

There is airbrushing in the background area that shows beside the right shoulder of Oswald where the tree that shows in Exhibit 1 has been airbrushed out to a dark ~~area~~<sup>wood</sup> area. There have been highlights added to the rifle, a straight highlight along the top of the stock running from the butt of the stock to the bolt, a bright highlight along the butt of the stock.

There has been rather elaborate retouching around the bolt area or breech area of the rifle. The highlight that appears in Commission Exhibit 1 along the bolt of the gun which appears as a broken line or two segments of a line or highlight appears in the reproduction on Exhibit 5 as a broken line very much like the actual highlight in the photograph, which is Exhibit No. 1.

~~There~~ has been a highlight added parallel to that along the bottom ~~or~~ or just below that area in the reproduction on Exhibit 5 which does not appear in Exhibit No. 1.

The top of the rifle has been emphasized with a strong highlight and the highlight in the reproduction of No. 5 along the top of the rifle does not conform to the actual top of the

riflo as it can be seen in Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 1.

There are some other highlights added above that, that are rather unexplainable but may be highlights relative to the lower portion of the scope.

Also a highlight has been added along the top of the barrel between Oswald's left hand and where the barrel extends past his left shoulder.

There has been some retouching added around the pistol on the right hip of Oswald, <sup>around</sup> ~~on~~ the holster. These are the primary points that have been retouched.

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Shaneyfelt, does this photograph, Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 5, more closely resemble the Detroit Press photograph which is Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 4, or the Life photograph, Shaneyfelt Exhibits No. 2 and 3?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. It corresponds to the reproduction in the Detroit Free Press, Exhibit No. 4, and not as well to the reproduction on Exhibit No. 2 which is the Life Magazine.

In fact, the reproductions on Exhibit No. 4 and No. 5 both have two white specks along the right leg between the knee and the right foot, centrally located in that area, one above the other, that do not appear in the original photograph which is Commission Exhibit 133A, and do not appear in the Life Magazine reproduction on either Exhibit No. 2 or 3. This would indicate to me that these two photographs <sup>may have</sup> originated from the same basic source or basic print.



Mr. Eisenberg. Now, in fact, the credit under Shanoyfelt No. 5 says, "Copyright 1964, Detroit Free Press," is that correct?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Eisenberg. But is picture identical in all respects to the Detroit Free Press picture?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. No. The retouching particularly around the breech of the rifle in Exhibit No. 5, which is the Newsweek reproduction is different than the retouching on the reproduction in Exhibit No. 4, the Detroit Free Press.

Mr. Eisenberg. Does the reproduction around the breech that is just below Oswald's left hand, retouching, correspond to anything you have ever seen on a rifle, Mr. Shanoyfelt, that is the four or five roughly parallel lines?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. No, it doesn't correspond to anything that I recall having seen on a rifle.

Mr. Eisenberg. What do you think the genesis of all those lines would be?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. I believe that they are possibly the artists' interpretation of how the rifle may have looked in that area since the photograph being retouched was indistinct in that area.

Mr. Eisenberg. Would you say that would be likely to have been done by a person not familiar with rifles?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. That is a possibility, but ~~it would be~~

I wouldn't be able to state that with any degree of certainty.

That is one possibility.

Mr. Eisenberg. I also see that Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 4 has an arrow pointing to the revolver which is not present in Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 5, is that correct?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Eisenberg. Can you explain why Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 5 differs from Exhibit No. 4 although it seems to be substantially similar and in fact Newsweek credits its photo to the Detroit Free Press, which is Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 4 picture?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. Yes. I would attribute these differences to the differences in retouching. Since it would be normal procedure in publications of this type for each publication to do its own retouching for its own reproductions, they would normally receive the picture in an unretouched condition from whatever source is available such as the Associated Press or as in Exhibit No. 3, the credit to the Detroit Free Press, and after receiving the photograph, unretouched photograph, would then add the retouching that they desired to have on the photo before making the halftone reproduction.

Mr. Eisenberg. The arrow to the right of Oswald's shoulder and head, that is to the left of the shoulder and head as we look at the picture appear to be retouched or airbrushed out in the same way in both pictures.

Would that be your conclusion?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, with one exception that while the airbrushing is generally similar, it appears in the Detroit Free Press, which is Exhibit No. 4, as a light area against a black shirt.

While in the Newsweek Exhibit No. 5 it appears as a black area against a rather dark shirt with a light highlight added along the shoulder to make the area stand out against the background.

Mr. Eisenberg. Is it your conclusion then that two separate retouchings were done to accomplish that effect, one retouching by the Newsweek people and one retouching by the Detroit Free Press people.

Mr. Shaneyfelt. ~~That~~ I have no foundation on which to base a positive statement in that regard but this is suggested by the variations that are present.

Mr. Eisenberg. So that the presence of that same feature as a retouch in both photographs might be coincidental or at least might not have been done by the same person?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Eisenberg. And in your mind that similarity of feature does not preclude the possibility that a completely unretouched photo was submitted by the Detroit Free Press to Newsweek?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is right.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, Mr. Shaneyfelt, I hand you page 30 of the New York Times, issue of February 19, 1964, which again con-

tains a photograph similar to those you have been testifying as to -- and which page I have marked Shaneyfelt Exhibit No.6, and I ask you whether you have examined that photograph?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I have.

Mr. Eisenberg. And what is your conclusion concerning that photograph, Mr. Shaneyfelt?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. I found this to be generally similar in all ~~visual characteristics~~, visible characteristics, to the photograph which is Commission Exhibit 133A and found no differences to suggest that it is other than the same photograph as Exhibit 133A.

However, the lack of detail in the halftone reproduction on Exhibit 6 precludes a positive identification with Exhibit 133A

Mr. Eisenberg. Do you see any retouching in this photograph, Mr. Shaneyfelt?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I do.

Mr. Eisenberg. Can you describe that?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. In the photograph reproduced on Exhibit No. 6 this is retouched along the right shoulder and to the right side of the face of Oswald.

In this instance, that has been put in in a solid medium gray to make it appear as the extension of the building or the fence that appears in the background of the original photograph. There is retouching around the rifle stock. In fact, the stock itself seems to have been lightened all along the lower

portion near the butt. A highlight along the top has been retouched in, ~~going from~~, along the top from the butt to the breech. Some retouching along the butt of the stock and also along the bottom edge of the stock running upward <sup>TOWARD</sup> the trigger.

The highlight that appears in Exhibit No. 1 along the bolt as a two-section highlight or a broken highlight, appears in this same general area on the gun in the reproduction on Exhibit No. 6 as a solid highlight and one continuous line. There has been a highlight added along the bottom of the gun just forward of the trigger guard and just below Oswald's left hand.

<sup>has been</sup> Also a highlight added along the top of the gun above Oswald's left hand to show the gun as a part from the dark shirt so that the gun and shirt do not blend into one continuous tone at that point.

There appears to be some retouching of Oswald's shadow in that it has been <sup>to</sup> toned down to a medium gray shadow that it will not blend into <sup>the</sup> lower portion of his legs.

Mr. Eisenberg. Which of the reproductions which you have so far examined does this most resemble, Mr. Shaneyfelt, the Detroit Free Press, the Life or the Newsweek reproduction?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. This corresponds to both the Detroit Free Press and the Newsweek ~~photograph~~ reproductions of the photograph in that it contains the two white dots along the right leg centrally located between the ankle and the knee as they appear in these two reproductions, and <sup>maybe</sup> therefore derived from the same

basic print since this characteristic does not appear in Commission Exhibit 133A or in the Life Magazine reproductions on Exhibits 2 and 3.

Mr. Eisenberg. What about the retouching in the New York Times photograph, Mr. Shaneyfelt, how does that compare with the retouching in the Detroit Free Press and Newsweek photographs.

Mr. Shaneyfelt. The retouching is different from any of the other exhibits, 4 and 5.

Mr. Eisenberg. Would you conclude, therefore, that the New York Times like Newsweek <sup>may have</sup> ~~had~~ received from its source an unretouched photograph which it proceeded to retouch?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes.

Mr. Eisenberg. And that again the similarity in retouching to the upper right of Oswald's shoulder and head might be coincidental?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes. Actually there is considerable difference in the retouching in that area on the New York Times <sup>PHOTOGRAPH</sup> compared to the Newsweek and Detroit Free Press <sup>EXHIBITS.</sup> ~~They~~ have. The New York Times has attempted to make it appear as a wall whereas the other <sup>have</sup> ~~are~~ merely airbrushed out ~~the~~ the line and it looks like foliage.

Mr. Eisenberg. The stock in all three of these photographs, that is Detroit Free Press, Newsweek and New York Times has also been retouched in a similar manner, that is, so that the top of the stock appears straight whereas actually the top of



the stock is curved is the correct ~~form~~

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Eisenberg. What do you think accounts for the coincidence of the retouching in those three areas, the two areas, that is the top of the stock and the area to the upper right of Oswald's shoulder and given the differences you have noted in the details of retouching.

Mr. Shaneyfelt. I would attribute that to a lack of detail in the photographs that they had, and a lack of understanding of the formation of <sup>a</sup> ~~the~~ normal rifle stock on the part of the retoucher.

Mr. Eisenberg. Now, Mr. Shaneyfelt, I hand you the front page of the New York Journal American, issue of February 18, 1964, which again contains a photograph similar to those you have been discussing and which you have labeled Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 7 and ask you whether you have examined that photograph

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I have.

Mr. Eisenberg. What is your conclusion?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. It is my conclusion that this photograph is the same in all visible characteristics <sup>as</sup> ~~to~~ the photograph which is Commission's Exhibit 133A, and I found no differences that would suggest that it is other than the same photograph.

However, because of the lack of detail in the reproduction on Exhibit No. 7, it is not possible to positively identify it as the same photograph.

Mr. Eisenberg. Is retouching apparent in this photograph, Mr. Shanoyfelt?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. Yes, it is.

Mr. Eisenberg. Could you describe that in detail?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. Yes.

There has been retouching along the right shoulder of Oswald and to some degree around the head in order to have the head and shoulder not blend into the background.

This appears to have been done by increasing the highlight or lightening the highlight along the shoulder rather than darkening the background. There is a highlight added along the top of the rifle stock that runs quite straight toward the bolt.

But it is not as strong a highlight as in the other reproductions we have discussed. There is a highlight along the top of the rifle between Oswald's left hand and the point where the rifle passes his left shoulder. There is a suggestion of some retouching around the rifle scope which is almost lost in the detail or almost lost against the black shirt but it is barely visible.

There is a dark shadow that appears in Commission Exhibit 133A that has been retouched out of Exhibit No. 7 reproduction, that shadow being about halfway between the knee and the crotch of the trousers between the legs.

These are the primary points of retouching.

Mr. Eisenberg. Which of the various photographs which you



have examined does this Journal American photograph most resemble Mr. Shaneyfelt?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. The Journal American photograph reproduction on Exhibit No. 7 is ~~different in the Detroit~~ different than the Detroit Free Press, Exhibit No. 4, Newsweek, Exhibit No. 5, and New York Times, Exhibit No. 6, in that the white spots along the right leg between the ankle and the knee do not appear in the reproduction in the Journal American.

It very closely corresponds to the reproduction on the front of the Life Magazine which is Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 2. In fact, the retouching ~~is~~ appears to be, very nearly the same. The lack of detail in the Newspaper reproduction on 7 precludes positively saying that it is identical, but it ~~is~~ <sup>may very well</sup> ~~have been made from the Life Magazine cover.~~ *have been made from the Life Magazine cover.* ~~It is probably identical.~~

Mr. Eisenberg. Could you point out some of the similarities in retouching?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes.

The retouching along the top of the rifle stock, the retouching around the right shoulder and around the head, to the right ~~hand~~ <sup>head,</sup> of Oswald, retouching around the top of the rifle above the left hand, the elimination of the shadow between the legs just below the breech of the trousers are the same in both reproductions.

Mr. Eisenberg. Is there any notable difference between these reproductions, the Life and Journal American reproduction?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. No, no notable difference in the retouching.

Mr. Eisenberg. Do you have any opinion as to the source of the Journal American photograph?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes. It is not possible to positively state but I note in examining the Journal American reproduction which is Exhibit No. 7 that the face area in particular has a design in the light shadow areas which I recognized as being typical of a halftone reproduction made from another halftone reproduction. And because of the presence of this characteristic in the shadow area of the face, the manner in which the photograph is cropped or trimmed, ~~I think it is highly~~ I am of the opinion that it is highly possible that the reproduction in the Journal American, Exhibit No. 7, was made from a Life magazine cover issue of February 21, 1964, containing the reproduction of the photograph of Oswald.

Mr. Eisenberg. Could you elaborate on your statement that the cropping is a factor in leading to this conclusion?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes.

On Exhibit No. 2, which is the Life Magazine cover, if a straight line is drawn vertically past the right edge of the Life sign on the front of the magazine <sup>so</sup> that the sign is blocked out, and that straight line is continued through a <sup>shadow</sup> ~~shadow~~ area comparable to the shadow in the reproduction of Exhibit No. 7, the cropping along that edge of the photograph then becomes identical to the cropping on the Journal American photograph.

This would suggest that the picture was purposely cropped in that manner to eliminate the Life Magazine printing in the upper left-hand corner of the magazine cover.

Mr. Eisenberg. Does the Life magazine picture and also the Journal American picture show cropping as against the original?

*omit* ~~Mr. Shanoyfelt. I don't understand the question.~~

~~(Discussion off the record.)~~

~~Mr. Eisenberg. That is 133A?~~

Mr. Shanoyfelt. Yes.

The Life magazine photograph does not show all of the photograph that appears on Commission Exhibit 133A, the photograph having been cropped down closer to the head, cutting out some of the overhead area.

There has also been considerable cropping on both the right and left margins when you compare the Life magazine and Journal American reproductions with 133A.

Mr. Eisenberg. Is there any other feature on the Journal American photograph which leads you to conclude that it was taken from the Life photograph?

Mr. Shanoyfelt. Yes.

In the lower right-hand corner of the Life Magazine cover, Exhibit No. 2, there is a strip set in containing the printing February 21, 1964, 25 cents.

If the Journal American did, in fact, reproduce this picture from a Life cover it would have been necessary for them to re-

touch out this strip of printing in the lower right-hand corner of the Life magazine cover, and I find on examination of the reproduction on the Journal American that there is retouching in this area. The background ~~is~~ of the grass, is inconsistent in that it has been darkened around that area, and there is also darkening along the foot and leg and the shadow area has been altered in between the two feet in a manner to strongly suggest that this strip has been retouched out in order to make the reproduction on the Journal American Exhibit No.7.

Mr. Eisenberg. Mr. Shaneyfelt, do you have anything to add to your testimony?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. I believe not.

Mr. Eisenberg. Well, thank you very much then.

That will be all.

(Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m., the taking of the above-entitled deposition was concluded.)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Vol. -  
Copy 6 of 6

**PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION**  
**ON THE**  
**ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY**

---

**DEPOSITION OF LYNDA L. SHANEYFELT**  
Report of Proceedings

Held at

Washington, D. C.

Tuesday, September 1, 1964

---

PAGES I - 48

**WARD & PAUL**  
OFFICIAL REPORTERS  
917 G STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20001  
AREA CODE 202-628-4268

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

RSHEIN

10

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION

ON THE  
ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

---

Washington, D. C.

Tuesday, September 1, 1964.

DEPOSITION OF LYNDAL L. SHANEYFELT, taken, pursuant to  
notice, at 200 Maryland Avenue, Northeast, Washington, D. C.,  
commencing at 10:45 a.m.

PRESENT:

NORMAN REDLICH, Special Assistant to General Counsel

---

✓

Mr. Redlich. The purpose of today's deposition is to take the testimony of Lyndal L. Shaneyfelt, Special Agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Shaneyfelt, you have previously testified in connection with the Commission proceedings on April 23, 1964, and June 12, 1964, is that correct?

TESTIMONY OF LYNDAL L. SHANEYFELT

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Redlich. You still consider yourself under oath?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I do.

Mr. Redlich. You also appeared on one other occasion, is that correct, Mr. Shaneyfelt?

Mr. Redlich. That is correct.

Mr. Redlich. And that was the date when you testified in connection with the re-enactment that was conducted in Dallas?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Redlich. During your previous testimony, Mr. Shaneyfelt, you testified concerning the retouching which, according to your testimony, had been performed on the photograph which has heretofore been designated as Commission Exhibit No. 133A; is that correct?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes.

(Exhibits 10, 11, 12 and 13 (Shaneyfelt) were marked for identification.)

Mr. Redlich. I hand you now an exchange of correspondence

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

between the Commission and Life Magazine, which has been designated as Shaneyfelt Exhibits No. 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, together with a photograph furnished to the Commission by Life Magazine which has been designated as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13, and I ask you to review this correspondence.

For the record, Mr. Shaneyfelt, have you read this correspondence?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I have.

Mr. Redlich. This correspondence will show that the Commission advised Life Magazine of your prior testimony, and requested of Life Magazine the original photograph upon which the retouching was performed.

Does Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13 purport to be that original photograph, Mr. Shaneyfelt?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, it does.

Mr. Redlich. And Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13 was forwarded to you by the Commission for examination, was it not?

Mr. Redlich. That is correct.

Mr. Redlich. The Commission asked you to examine that photograph in order to describe in greater detail the actual retouching which was performed on that photograph preparatory to examination, is that correct?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is right.

(Exhibit 14 (Shaneyfelt) was marked for identification.

Mr. Redlich. I now hand you another exhibit which is

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



designated as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14, and ask you to describe how it was made, and what it purports to demonstrate?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14 is a chart that I prepared to illustrate the retouching that I found in my examination of the Life Magazine photograph which is Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13.

This chart consists of three different photographs. Photograph A is a normal print of Commission Exhibit 133A. Photograph B and C are photographs of the Life Magazine picture, which is Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13, made using special lighting technique in order to portray the retouching that has been added to the Life Magazine photograph, Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13.

Mr. Redlich. On each of these three photographs there appear a series of numbers starting with No. 1, and running consecutively through No. 11, is that correct?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Redlich. Can you describe the significance of these numbers?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. The numbers with red arrows were placed on the photographs to point to specific areas of retouching, and relate them to these same areas of the photograph which is Commission Exhibit 133A.

Mr. Redlich. And as I understand it, just using as an example before I ask you to go through all of the numbers, using No. 1 as an example, the arrow next to No. 1 in photograph A of

Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14, points to the stock of the rifle as it appeared in the picture which has heretofore been designated as Exhibit No. 133A.

The arrow next to No. 1 in photograph B of Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14 points to the same spot on the stock of the rifle and points to a specific indication of retouching which you will subsequently describe?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Redlich. And the arrow next to No. 1 in photograph No. C of Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14 points to the same spot on the rifle; namely, the stock, and is placed here in order to indicate in more specific detail the type and manner of retouching which was done at this particular location?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Redlich. Now, starting with No. 1 and going through No. 11, would you describe the points on the picture and the type of retouching which was performed?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes.

Point No. 1 on all photograph A, B and C, points to the stock of the rifle, particularly the top area of the stock running from the butt of the rifle to the breech.

On photograph A this No. 1 area is rather indistinct but shows that the rifle stock runs in a straight line from the butt up about two-thirds of the way to the breech, where it curves down around a highlight that is clearly visible on the photograph

A of Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14. It curves around that highlight and then recurves up to the breech.

In this same general area of No. 1 of photograph B, there is a dark area which is an area of retouching that is on the photograph which is Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13, that runs from the butt of the rifle all the way to the breech without any curve or recurve around the highlight.

The highlight is still present on this photograph. However, the retouching line runs straight past and is a straight line of retouching and does not follow the actual configuration of the rifle stock in that area.

Mr. Redlich. Just so the record is completely clear on this, Mr. Shaneyfelt, the retouching marks which appear in pictures B and C of Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14, are the retouching marks which appear on the photograph furnished to the Commission by Life Magazine and which has been designated as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct. The retouching does not appear as prominent in the Life Magazine photograph, which is Commission Exhibit No. 13, as ~~it does~~ <sup>it does</sup> in the photographs B and C of Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14, because photographs B and C were made with special lighting to bring out this retouching, but they are nevertheless, the points of retouching are nevertheless, there on the Life Magazine photograph.

Mr. Redlich. And photographs B and C of Shaneyfelt Exhibit

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

7

No. 14 were actually made from the photograph which is Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Redlich. Will you continue?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Photograph C of Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14 shows at point 1, which is the area of the upper edge of the stock of the rifle, ~~is~~ this straight line retouching going directly from the butt to the breech without a recurve, and not in conformity with the actual contour of the stock of the rifle in that area.

Points No. 2 in all photographs A, B and C, point to the telescopic sight of the rifle. In photograph B retouching is shown around this point No. 2 where retouching has been added to enhance the detail around the rifle scope. This is also shown clearly as retouching at point 2 in photograph C.

Point No. 3 in photographs A, B and C, in Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14, refers to the area along the top of the rifle beyond the breech just above Oswald's left hand. There is a retouching line that runs from Oswald's hand to the point where the gun protrudes past his shoulder. This is clear in photograph B and C at point No. 3.

Photograph A at point 3 shows how the photograph appears in that area on Commission Exhibit 133A.

Point No. 4 refers to the retouching along the lower edge of the right arm of Oswald, and that area No. 4 of photographs

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

E and C clearly show this retouching along the edge of the elbow and a large spot just below the elbow where a shadow between two fence posts has been removed in order to show the contour of the elbow in better detail.

Point No. 5 refers to the shoulder area of the photographs A, B and C in Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14. The photograph A, point 5, shows the shoulder as it is in Commission Exhibit 133A, and point 5 in photographs B and C shows the retouching along Oswald's right shoulder.

Point No. 6 in photographs A, B and C refers to the right side of Oswald's neck and chin area, and point 6 in photographs E and C clearly shows the retouching along ~~the~~ the right side of Oswald's neck, and around his chin and some slight retouching into, slightly into, his cheeks.

Point No. 7 in photographs A, B and C, shows the area of the left side of Oswald's head where retouching has been added to the Life Magazine photograph, Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13 --

Mr. Redlich. May I interrupt you there. You said where retouching has been added to the Life photograph. Did you mean where it -- did you mean that or did you mean that the Life photograph as published contained this retouching?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. I mean that the Life photograph as published contains the retouching. That the retouching has been added ~~to the photograph~~ prior to publication.

Point 7 refers to the retouching along the left side of

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Oswald's hair in the hair area, and is clearly visible as retouching in the photographs B and C at point 7.

Point 3 refers to an area of background to the right of Oswald's head, to the left ~~of his head~~ of his head as the viewer looks at the picture. This is an area that has been air brushed in order to lighten the background so that the detail of the photograph in that area will be better.

Point No. 9 in photographs A, B and C of Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14, shows an area directly below the rifle butt to the side of Oswald's right thigh where retouching has been added to decrease the darkness of the shadow between two fence posts in that area.

This is evident in area 9 of photographs B and C. It is more clearly shown in 9C.

Point No. 10 in the three photographs on Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 14 shows the retouching between the thighs of Oswald. Photograph A shows quite a dark area between the thighs, and this has been eliminated by retouching <sup>as shown in</sup> 10B and 10C, and the retouching clearly shows in 10C.

Likewise, there is a dark shadow along the ~~side of Oswald's left knee~~ side of Oswald's left knee which has been eliminated by retouching or softened by retouching, and this retouching shows in Exhibit B and C at point ~~4~~ <sup>11</sup>.

This represents the primary or outstanding areas of retouching that I found from an examination of the Life Magazine

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

photograph, which is Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13.

Mr. Redlich. Mr. Shaneyfelt, when you discussed this photograph in your prior testimony, you expressed your opinion to the effect that the retouching which was done preparatory to the publication of the photograph on the cover of Life Magazine was normal and customary.

On the basis of your detailed examination of the retouching made from the photograph as submitted to the Commission by Life Magazine, would you now care to state your opinion as to whether this is customary and normal retouching in connection with the publication of a photograph?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes. It is my opinion, based on my examination of the photograph, Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13, that all of the retouching that I found on this photograph I would consider to be normal, routine retouching that is a normal part of the reproduction process.

Mr. Redlich. In your prior testimony, you stated that on the basis of your examination of the photograph which had been published in Life Magazine, it was your opinion that this photograph published in Life Magazine was the same photograph which has heretofore been designated as Commission Exhibit No. 133A, with the retouching that you have described.

Now, today, on the basis of your detailed examination of this retouching, is it still your opinion that the photograph which appeared on the cover of Life Magazine is a retouched

photograph (i the photograph which has heretofore been designated as Commission Exhibit No. 133A?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes.

(Exhibits 15 and 16 (Shaneyfelt) were marked for identification.)

Mr. Redlich. Mr. Shaneyfelt, I now hand you an exchange of correspondence between the Commission and Newsweek, Incorporated, the publishers of Newsweek Magazine, which is marked Shaneyfelt Exhibits 15 and 16, and ask you if you have had an opportunity to review this exchange of correspondence?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I have.

Mr. Redlich. The record will show that in prior testimony appearing on page 414 of Volume 7 of the hearings of the Commission, you testified concerning the retouching which had been performed on this photograph prior to its publication in Newsweek Magazine.

I may add that during the course of that prior testimony *page from containing a reproduction of that* the Newsweek photograph was introduced into evidence as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 5.

Having reviewed the correspondence between the Commission and Newsweek, Incorporated, I ask you whether you have anything to add to or any testimony which you would like to correct having compared the Newsweek correspondence and your prior testimony?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. No, I have nothing to add or nothing to



correct. I find the correspondence from Newsweek to be consistent with my prior testimony.

(Exhibits 17, 18 and 19 (Shaneyfelt) were marked for identification.)

Mr. Redlich. Mr. Shaneyfelt. I now hand you a letter from the New York Times addressed to Mr. J. Lee Rankin, which has been marked as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 17, and also hand you a photograph furnished by the New York Times which has been designated as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 13, and some printed material designated as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 19, also furnished by the New York Times, which is a caption and other descriptive material concerning this photograph as used by the New York Times when the photograph was published.

I also wish to point out for the record that the <sup>reproduction of the</sup> New York Times photograph has previously been designated as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 6 and was discussed by you on pages 416 and 417 of Volume 7 of the hearings of this Commission.

Have you had an opportunity to review this letter from the New York Times to Mr. Rankin?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I have.

Mr. Redlich. Do you find that the letter from the New York Times is consistent with the testimony you have previously given concerning the retouching which was performed by the New York Times preparatory to the publication of this photograph?

*Shaneyfelt*  
Mr. ~~Redlich~~. Yes, I do.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Mr. Redlich. Is there anything that you would like to add to or correct in your previous testimony in connection with this photograph?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. No, I have nothing to add or correct. I find the correspondence and photograph to be entirely consistent with my previous testimony.

Mr. Redlich. And through all of your examination of the retouching that was performed on Commission Exhibit, on the photograph which has been designated as Commission Exhibit No. 133A, you are still of the opinion that all of the pictures which have been published and which you have identified, were copies of Commission Exhibit No. 133A, with the retouching performed as you have heretofore described?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

Mr. Redlich. Mr. Shaneyfelt, the record of the testimony before this Commission will show that in Commission Exhibit No. 133A Lee Harvey Oswald appears to be holding two newspapers..

The Commission asked the FBI, did it not, to examine Commission Exhibit No. 133A in order to determine the exact issues of the publications which appear in the right hand of Lee Harvey Oswald in Commission Exhibit No. 133A, is that correct?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is right.

Mr. Redlich. Did you perform the examination of Commission Exhibit No. 133A in connection with this request of the Commission?

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I did.

(Exhibits 20, 21 and 22 (Shaneyfelt) were marked for identification.)

Mr. Redlich. At this time, I would like to introduce into the record a copy of The Militant, which has been designated as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 20, and a copy of The Worker, which has been designated as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 21, a copy of a letter dated June 29, 1964 from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, to Mr. J. Lee Rankin, which is a discussion of the results of your investigation in connection with these two publications; and Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 22.

I ask you to describe at this time by making reference to the exhibits which I have heretofore designated, the results of your investigation concerning the question of the specific issues of the two publications held by Lee Harvey Oswald in Commission Exhibit No. 133A?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 22 is a chart that I made ~~to~~ to better illustrate the results of my examination, and it consists of three photographs, lettered A, B and C. The center photograph, being photograph A, is an enlargement of the newspapers being held by Oswald in Commission Exhibit No. 133A. By an examination of this enlarged photograph, I find it is possible to see the headlines and certain portions of ~~the~~ ~~the~~ the two papers being held, one of them being The Militant, and one of them The Worker.

I obtained copies of both of these papers for an extended period of time, and went through them and found that The Militant for Monday, March 11, 1963, which is Volume 27, No. 10, and has been marked as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 20, conforms to the copy of The Militant being held by Oswald in picture A of Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 22.

Picture C of Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 22 is a photograph of the headlines of that issue of that paper.

In examining this material I found that The Militant portion, printed on the upper right hand portion of the page, is in the same location as in the photograph A of Oswald holding the papers, as it is in the copy of The Militant which is Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 20.

In addition, the general configuration of the headlines in the center column which read "Miss.", abbreviation for Mississippi, "Racists Shoot Down a Rights Worker", those headlines are not readable in the photograph of the newspaper being held by Oswald, but the general configuration of the type is the same.

There is a photograph of Bertram Powers reproduced in the second column near the top of The Militant for Monday, March 11, 1963, which is Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 20.

The top of this photograph is visible in the same location and has the same characteristics in the newspaper being held by Oswald in photograph A of Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 22.

Mr. Redlich. Before passing to the other publication, did you find that in your examination of the ~~issues of~~ the prior issues of, The Militant, that there was considerable variation in the typography of the publication?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, I found the name block for The Militant did not always appear in the upper right hand corner. It was sometimes in the left. Sometimes the headlines ran across the top of the name block and there was great variety in the typography of the headlines of the papers.

Mr. Redlich. Do you recall the period of time of the issues that you examined?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Approximately one year.

Mr. Redlich. One year prior to what date?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Prior to November.

Mr. Redlich. Would you say it was a period --

Mr. Shaneyfelt. End of November.

Mr. Redlich. --approximately November 1962 to November 1963?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. Yes, ~~approximately~~ <sup>approximately</sup> through November, 1963.

Mr. Redlich. And it is your opinion that based upon an examination of those issues and these photographs that the issue which appears in Commission Exhibit No. 133A is the issue of March 11, 1963?

Mr. Shaneyfelt. That is correct.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

In the examination of the other newspaper held by Oswald in Commission Exhibit 133A, I reviewed issues of The Worker for approximately one year from November issues of 1962 through all of the November issues for 1963, and found that the March 24, 1963 issue of The Worker, which is Volume 28, No. 124, matches the newspaper being held by Oswald in Commission Exhibit No. 133A.

Again, the enlarged photograph of this newspaper in photograph A of Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 22, shows some of the type of the headlines and the block of the title "The Worker".

B photograph of Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 22 shows this same area of the headline of the March 24, 1963 issue of The Worker.

The headline of that newspaper, ~~which is~~, which has been designated as, Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 22 is "War Hogs Fight <sup>At</sup> TFX Plane Profit Trough".

In the photograph A of Oswald holding the paper on Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 22, you can clearly see The Worker and you can clearly see the "At TFX" which is a part of the headline, and the bottom of the "W" of the word "War", and based on these characteristics, it is my opinion that <sup>one of the</sup> ~~this~~ newspaper, being held by Oswald in Commission Exhibit 133A is the March 24, 1963 issue of The Worker ~~which is in exhibit~~ which is the same issue as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 21.

Mr Rodlich. Referring now, Mr. Shaneyfelt, to the letter which has been designated as Shaneyfelt Exhibit No. 22, this

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~