These pictures are, literally, an example of the official "photographic whitewash". The are made from the same negative but are not identical. Enlargement is slightly different in proportion and what the pictures show varies slightly. These are the minor flaws.

Both pictures are touched up to hide the intermittent white road-diving stripes on Elm Street, the one on the left, on which the assassination occurred. It would seem that this same touching up was extended to the other streets, with the exception of the north lane of Main, the ceter center street. The stripes are the most essential unmovable landmarks and are vital in photographic intelligence, especially in palce where people were, most of all with the photographers.

These pictures are of conspicuously poor quality. They need not be this indictinct and fuzzy. The road stripes are readily seen on pictures of normal competence (WHITEWASH II, 247-8) and are quite prominent in the original Alrgens picture (WHITEWASH II, 244-5). It is not byn by accident that a picture so far inferior to ordinary amateur snapshots was used by the Commission as evidence. Someone went to a lot of trouble to get such terrible pictures.

Moreover, someone went to maore trouble to distort and misrepresent. The places people were standing at specific times about which they testified. Arnold Louis Rowland marked where he was standing on what was identified in the Assistant Counsel Arlen Specter identified during his testimony as Exhibit 354. Those marks on Exhibit 354 are not Rowland's, but an artists. It would appear that the place Altgens was standing when he took his most important picture, "s "3" on Exhibit 354, is far from the similar hand-made mark on Exhibit 347. If these are the things the marking represent, on Exhibit 347 Altgens is farthur west on Elm Street and in the middle of the street. Exhibit 354, therefore, is both a misrepresentation and a distortion, making it impossible to use the Altgens picture for photographic intelligence. The pictures are made to lie.