

THE FOURTH DECADE

1963

1973

1983

1993

2003

VOLUME 7, NUMBER 1

NOVEMBER, 1999

Contents

GIFTS FROM RUSSIA: YELTSIN AND MITROKHIN	3
By Jerry D. Rose	
JOSE RIVERA: THE STORY THAT WILL NOT DIE	9
By William E. Kelly, Jr.	
THE ZAPRUDER FILM: A STUDY IN DECEPTION, PART IV	17
By Harrison Edward Livingstone	
WITH MALICE: A REVIEW	29
By William Weston	
AN APOLOGY AND A PRAYER FOR VICTORY	35
By Daniel Marvin	

A JOURNAL OF RESEARCH
ON THE
JOHN F. KENNEDY ASSASSINATION

ISSN 0888-5230

THE FOURTH DECADE (formerly **THE THIRD DECADE**) is published bimonthly at State University College, Fredonia, NY 14063. Editor and publisher: Jerry D. Rose. Subscription rates: \$30 for one year; \$55 for two years; \$75 for three years. Single issues \$6.

Notice to contributors: **THE FOURTH DECADE** encourages submission of articles and Letters to the Editor from all interested parties. Articles should be confined to no more than 5,000 words, letters to no more than 1,000 words. Manuscripts should be submitted in hard copy and, if possible, a 3.5" disk in Word Perfect 6.0 or other compatible format. Any author wishing copyright of his/her material should arrange that copyright upon submitting that material. All publication is at the discretion of the editor and subject to editorial revision.

Back cover illustration: the Hunt letter.

Shown are two letters, one written by Oswald in 1961, and one of which may have been written by Oswald in 1963. For a discussion of the issue of the authenticity of the 1963 letter, see the article this issue, "Gifts from Russia: Yeltsin and Mitrokhin."

GIFTS FROM RUSSIA: YELTSIN AND MITROKHIN

by
Jerry D. Rose

It has been a busy last several months on the issue of Soviet connection to the Kennedy assassination. During a meeting between President Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin in June, 1999, Yeltsin unexpectedly and without explanation gave Clinton 80 documents from KGB archives concerning the assassination. These documents became available at the National Archives for public examination on August 5, 1999. [1]

The most interesting, perhaps, of these documents was the indication that Soviet intelligence doubted the authenticity of Oswald's supposed letter of November 9, 1963 to the Soviet Embassy in Washington D.C.—a letter that spoke in ominous ways of his disgruntlement with the FBI and of his possibly conspiratorial activity in Mexico City. As reported in the news media, the Soviet suspicion of this letter was based on its observation that it differed in "tone" from other Oswald correspondence; and that, unlike all other correspondence, it was typed rather than handwritten. [2] The significance of this is that it suggests that the Soviets were somehow being "framed" for the crime that Oswald was supposedly shortly to commit.

The Soviet suspicion is well taken, I think, and for reasons beyond the tone or the typed format of the letter. There is, of course, a handwritten version of the letter in the public record. The House Select Committee on Assassinations published this, along with the typed version, in 1979; and duly authenticated the handwriting (and the signature on the typed copy) as that of Oswald. [3] Both the handwritten and typed versions are shown at right and on the next page.

Jerry D. Rose
State University College
Fredonia, NY 14063

Dear Sirs.

This is to inform you of ~~my~~ ^{my} interviews with ~~conside~~ ^{consider} Khatin in the Embassy of the Soviet Union Mexico City, Mexico.

I was unable to remain in Mexico City ~~because~~ ^{indefinitely} because of my ~~visa~~ ^{Mexican visa} restrictions which was for 15 days only, ~~plus~~ ^{plus} I could not ~~apply~~ ^{apply} for an extension ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ D.C. ~~and~~ ^{and} my ~~real~~ ^{real} name as I ~~return~~ ^{return} to the U.S. I ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~my~~ ^{my} ~~name~~ ^{name} ~~Micholeff~~ ^{Micholeff} are now living in Dallas, Texas, ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~attending~~ ^{attending} school.

The FBI is not now interested in my activities in the progressive organization, F.P.C.C. of which I was secretary in ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~U.S.~~ ^{U.S.} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~now~~ ^{now} ~~living~~ ^{living} in Louisiana and I ~~am~~ ^{am} no longer ~~connected~~ ^{connected} ~~to~~ ^{to} that State.

~~From~~ ^{From} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~FBI~~ ^{FBI} ~~has~~ ^{has} ~~visited~~ ^{visited} me ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~Texas~~ ^{Texas} on Nov. 1st. ~~a~~ ^a ~~agent~~ ^{agent} of the FBI James P. Healy warned me that if I attempt to ~~engage~~ ^{engage} in F.P.C.C. activities in Texas the FBI will appear ~~to~~ ^{to} have an "interest" in me. ~~Micholeff~~ ^{Micholeff} ~~also~~ ^{also} "suggested" that my wife could remain in the U.S. under FBI protection, ~~that~~ ^{that} is, she could ~~depart~~ ^{depart} from ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~Soviet~~ ^{Soviet} ~~Union~~ ^{Union}. Of course I and my wife strongly ~~opposed~~ ^{opposed} these tactics by the notorious F.B.I.

~~Micholeff~~ ^{Micholeff} ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~unable~~ ^{unable} ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~aid~~ ^{aid} ~~me~~ ^{me} ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~Mexico~~ ^{Mexico} ~~City~~ ^{City} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~had~~ ^{had} ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~planned~~ ^{planned} ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~contact~~ ^{contact} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~Soviet~~ ^{Soviet} ~~Embassy~~ ^{Embassy} ~~at~~ ^{at} ~~all~~ ^{all} ~~so~~ ^{so} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~course~~ ^{course} ~~they~~ ^{they} ~~were~~ ^{were} ~~unprepared~~ ^{unprepared} ~~for~~ ^{for} me ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~had~~ ^{had} ~~I~~ ^I ~~been~~ ^{been} ~~able~~ ^{able} ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~reach~~ ^{reach} ~~anyone~~ ^{anyone} ~~as~~ ^{as} ~~planned~~ ^{planned} I could ~~have~~ ^{have} ~~contacted~~ ^{contacted} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~Soviet~~ ^{Soviet} ~~Embassy~~ ^{Embassy} ~~there~~ ^{there} ~~for~~ ^{for} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~completion~~ ^{completion} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~which~~ ^{which} ~~would~~ ^{would} ~~have~~ ^{have} ~~been~~ ^{been} ~~able~~ ^{able} ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~get~~ ^{get} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~necessary~~ ^{necessary} ~~documents~~ ^{documents} ~~I~~ ^I ~~required~~ ^{required} ~~at~~ ^{at} ~~that~~ ^{that} ~~time~~ ^{time} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~would~~ ^{would} ~~have~~ ^{have} ~~had~~ ^{had} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~time~~ ^{time} ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~assist~~ ^{assist} ~~me~~ ^{me}. ~~But~~ ^{But} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~course~~ ^{course} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~strip~~ ^{strip} ~~carbon~~ ^{carbon} ~~consul~~ ^{consul} ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~at~~ ^{at} ~~fault~~ ^{fault} ~~here~~ ^{here}, ~~don't~~ ^{don't} ~~glad~~ ^{glad} ~~he~~ ^{he} ~~never~~ ^{never} ~~came~~ ^{came} ~~back~~ ^{back} ~~replaced~~ ^{replaced} ~~by~~ ^{by} ~~another~~ ^{another}.

(48) November 9, 1963. Photomechanical (halftone) reproduction of a type-written letter to the Consular Division, Embassy, U.S.S.R., Washington, D.C.

FROM: LEE H. OSWALD, P.O. BOX 6225, DALLAS, TEXAS
MARINA NICHILAYEVA OSWALD, SOVIET CIPHER

TO: CONSULAR DIVISION:
EMBASSY U.S.S.R.
WASHINGTON, D.C.
NOV. 9, 1963

Handwritten:
S. [unclear]
off
1963

Handwritten:
42515
20 X 1.5

Dear sir;

This is to inform you of recent events since my meetings with comrade Kozlin in the Embassy Of the Soviet Union, Mexico City, Mexico.

I was unable to remain in Mexico indefinitely because of my Mexican visa restrictions which was for 15 days only. I could not take a chance on requesting a new visa unless I used my real name, so I returned to the United States.

I had not planned to contact the Soviet embassy in Mexico so they were unprepared, had I been able to reach the Soviet Embassy in Havana as planned, the embassy there would have had time to complete our business.

Of course the Soviet embassy was not at fault, they were, as I say unprepared, the Cuban consulate was guilty of a gross breach of regulations, I am glad he has since been replaced.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is not now interested in my activities in the progressive organization "Fair Play For Cuba Committee", of which I was secretary in New Orleans (state Louisiana) since I no longer reside in that state. However, the F.B.I. has visited us here in Dallas, Texas, on November 1st. Agent James P. Hasty warned me that if I engaged in F.P.C.C. activities in Texas the F.B.I. will again take an "interest" in me.

This agent also "suggested" to Marina Nichilayeva that she could remain in the United States under F.B.I. "protection", that is, she could defect from the Soviet Union, of course, I and my wife strongly protested these tactics by the notorious F.B.I.

Please inform us of the arrival of our Soviet entrance visa's as soon as they come.

Also, this is to inform you of the birth, on October 20, 1963 of a DAUGHTER, AUCREY MARINA OSWALD in DALLAS, TEXAS, to my wife.

Respectfully,

Handwritten signature: L.H. Oswald

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Apparently, he either dropped it at an Irving mail collection point before he left for work at about 7 AM on Tuesday; or somebody mailed it for him later that day. [5] Either alternative is a little dissonant: why would a letter mailed before 7 AM not be post-marked before 5 PM?; or, alternatively, would the secretive Oswald have allowed anyone else to mail it for him? Logically (but who really expects logic in official accounts of Oswald's behavior?) he would have carried it to Dallas with him and maybe would have even taken the few steps necessary to mail it at the Terminal Annex post office, checking meantime to see if he had any mail in his box, #6225.

Secondly, the whole circumstance of Oswald's handwriting the letter and then typing it speaks if it does not scream of deception in the matter. For a description of these circumstances, we have only the testimony of Ruth Paine. [6] Her version, in brief, is that Oswald asked to borrow her typewriter and acted suspiciously by covering the material he was copy-

I have several suspicions of my own about the letter's authenticity. As I have previously noted [4], the date of the letter's posting is a little strange, as the postmark is at Irving, Texas at 5 PM on Tuesday, November 12. The letter was supposedly written in Irving on Saturday, November 9. Apparently it wasn't mailed—or at least picked up—on the following Sunday or Monday (Monday was Armistice Day, a work holiday for Oswald).

ing when she came into the room. Inconsistently with that behavior, he left the handwritten draft laying in plain sight after he finished the typing, and it stayed there until at least the next morning, when the ever-curious Paine read it. Incensed at what she regarded as blatant untruths in the letter, she decided to make her own copy of it, which she would give to the FBI when they returned for another visit (which, of course, they never

did). However, "not used to subterfuge in any way" as she claimed to be, she made a longhand copy of the letter while "the shower was running." [7] The copy of this letter in Paine's handwriting has never surfaced, [8] leaving her supposed corroboration that Oswald himself did write the letter subject to the gravest possible doubt.

Finally, and this is a game the reader can play with me by comparing the handwritten and typewritten copies shown above, I am very doubtful that the typed version is a copy of the handwritten one; it seems altogether more likely that the typed version was generated before the handwritten one—with a rather obvious motive: to create proof that Oswald had written the letter by a generating a "draft" in his handwriting. Perhaps Warren Commission Chief Counsel Rankin was aware of something like this when he showed the draft to Marina Oswald, mentioned the typewritten copy of same, and commented that "the comparison is most illuminating," without proceeding to say how the comparison could illuminate our understanding of the situation. [9]

My dubious-sounding hypothesis is based on noting an almost-consistent pattern of differences in word spelling in the two documents. The typewritten version is rife with the "mistakes" so characteristic of Oswald's writing, while the draft is almost clear of these errors. Using the marginal numbers I have furnished, note the incorrect spelling of course on lines 11 and 22 of the typewritten version, its correct spelling on lines 24 and 38 of the handwritten; similarly compare replaced at line 13 of the typewritten and line 40 of the handwritten; Union at line 23 of the typewritten, line 23 of the handwritten; indefinitely at line 4 of the typewritten, line 6 of the handwritten; interest at line 19 of the typewritten, line 21 of the handwritten. While there are a few "mistakes" in the handwritten version as well, there are none that are "corrected" in the typewritten version; all the "corrections" go the other way. Since Marina Oswald says he retyped the envelope about 10 times (she didn't see him type the letter) [10], one might have thought he would have gone to some pains to counter his dyslectic tendencies. Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin may have hit the nail on the head when he wrote, among the documents released to President Clinton, that "It is possible that Oswald himself wrote the letter as it was dictated to him, in return for some promises and then, as we know, he was simply bumped off after his useful-

ness had ended." [11] On the other hand, there is every possibility that the whole letter-writing episode is a contrivance concocted with the connivance of the Paines [12] and Marina Oswald; and that the handwritten version, along with the typed one, was fabricated by clever forgers after Oswald had been "bumped off." [13] If the Soviet Embassy actually received the letter before the assassination—or if a credible version of Ruth Paine's handwritten copy of the draft ever shows up—then this suggestion will obviously be in error.

In September of this year there arrived a far more sensational pile of "information" from KGB files. This time in the form of a book based on the notes of a former KGB archivist, Vasili Mitrokhin. [14] It seems that, for years, Mitrokhin had secretly copied notes from files on KGB operations and operatives, and carried them home in his shoes, his pants, etc. As a would-be defector, he offered his "information" to the Central Intelligence Agency. For some reason, perhaps distant memories of its embarrassing dealings with another "defector," Yuri Nosenko, the CIA turned him down and he took his material to a Cambridge University historian, Christopher Andrew, described on the dust cover of his book as "the world's leading authority on intelligence history."

Among the many startling pre-publication reports on Mitrokhin's file, they supposedly show that the KGB fabricated the "Dear Mr. Hunt" letter [reproduced here]

Nov. 8, 1963

Dear Mr Hunt,

I would like information concerning my position.

I am asking only for information I am suggesting that we discuss the matter fully before any steps are taken by me or anyone else

Thank you,
Lee Harvey Oswald

from Oswald dated November 8, 1963 (the day before he supposedly wrote that letter to the Soviet Embassy). The purpose of this operation was to blame the assassination on the CIA and a "right wing conspiracy," mean-

ing that the Mr. Hunt from whom Oswald was asking "instructions" was E. Howard Hunt of Watergate notoriety, certainly "CIA" and certainly "right wing." A secondary but also interesting revelation of the File is that the KGB "bankrolled" in 1964 a book by Joachim Joesten, Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy, through its subsidiaries to the book's publisher, Marzani and Munsell.

Like just about everyone else, I read about this book in newspapers before I was able to see it in print. The New York Times, in its September 12, 1999 issue (p. 3), featured the Hunt allegation in an article by James Risen. It headlined the article "KGB Told Tall Tales About Dallas, Book Says," even though the body of the article contains a very terse account of the "Hunt" part of the Mitrokhin revelations. Risen's article was distributed to other newspapers through the New York Times News Service and other papers, of course, furnished their own headlines: the New Orleans Times-Picayune, for example, in its September 12 issue, headlined the story "KGB Tied to Bogus Kennedy Conspiracy-Archivist's Book Shows Oswald Letter Faked." News coverage in Britain was understandably quite different. The London Times of September 11 came forth with the screaming headline, "Revealed: the Quiet Woman Who Betrayed Britain for 40 Years," concerning the now-87 year old grandmother, Melita Norwood, who admitted to passing atomic secrets to the Soviets; and the Times devoted a huge amount of space for a number of days to the File, especially to Norwood and to efforts in Parliament to blame the Government for insensitivity to the significance of these revelations. Only briefly, so far as I have seen, in the September 13 edition, p. 8, does the Times refer to the assassination, with the statement that the "KGB found an Italian-born American Communist [Carl Marzani] who received KGB payments" for a book on the assassination.

With all this pre-publication hype, I started haunting local bookstores for a copy of this book, which I finally was able to find at a local Waldenbooks outlet at the end of September. I had hoped, of course, that the book would live up to the promise of the headlines, and there would be extensive documentation of both the "Dear Mr. Hunt" and the Joesten allegations. I found, in fact, that there is much, much less here than meets the eye in this book.

To begin with, there is not a single reproduction of any document dealing with the assassination allegations, not even copies of any of Mitrokhin's notes on the mat-

ter. Equally as seriously, the author gives us no indication of how the independent researcher could access the File. Most assassination-related claims are referenced to vol 6 ch 14, part 3 of the Mitrokhin file but, other than to describe the file as located "in Britain," there is no clue how the File might be consulted—a far cry from the housing of Yeltsin's "gift" at the National Archives.

The other disappointing aspect of Sword and Shield is that there is actually so little detail to these allegations. In a book of 700 pages, the Hunt letter gets two pages (228, 229) and the Marzani/Joesten one also two pages (226, 227). Nor is the quality of the Mitrokhin evidence much more impressive than its quantity.

Where the Hunt letter is concerned we are told, without any documentation that can be checked, that the KGB forged the letter and checked its "authenticity" twice, then in 1975 distributed it anonymously to three "conspiracy theorists," not identified, in the Dallas area. Finally, in 1977, Penn Jones Jr. published the letter and the story behind it [15] and handwriting experts supposedly identified the handwriting as being that of Oswald. The KGB was disappointed, however, that the public reaction in the U.S. tended to identify the "Mr. Hunt" as the oil magnate H.L. Hunt of Dallas, whom Joesten, among others, had fingered as a suspect in accord with the Communist "line" in 1964. The suspicion was that the CIA was engaged in a "plot" to divert attention from their man, E. Howard Hunt, to that other Hunt. Actually, a better suspect for such diversionary activity would be the FBI. As detailed in an article by John Johnson in this Journal, [16] the Bureau investigated at some length in 1977 the possible assassination connections of H.L. Hunt, as well as those of his sons. The KGB should certainly have been aware of this investigative activity, as one its own agents code-named MARAT (Jack Childs) was in fact a double agent who was reporting to the FBI as well (under the Bureau code-name SOLO). [17]

Mitrokhin rather inaccurately reports that the handwriting experts of the HSCA "prudently" concluded that "they were unable to reach a 'firm conclusion' because of the absence of the original document." [18] Actually, the HSCA panel was composed of three handwriting "experts"—Joseph P. McNally, David J. Purtell and Charles C. Scott—each of whom gave his own, somewhat different assessment, of the document's authenticity. McNally (HSCA VIII, pp. 235, 236) was the most skeptical, terming the note as "highly suspicious," not-

ing numerous discrepancies with other Oswald writings and the fact that the lines were quite straight, as though written on ruled paper, while Oswald's writings characteristically involved a "crooked writing line."

Purtell (HSCA VIII pp. 238, 239) gave no basis for his conclusion that the note was not among the long list of examined documents written by the same person; but he does offer the enigmatic comment (p. 239) that the examined copy "gives the appearance that it might have been made for a purpose." (Precisely, Mr. Purtell, but whose purpose and what was the purpose?) Scott (HSCA VIII p. 246) comes closest to the Andrew characterization of the panel's conclusion: "it is impossible to determine positively whether the letter is or is not in the handwriting of the same person as the other writings purported to be Oswald's...If not genuine [it is] certainly a clever imitation." All these examiners agree that they needed the original and not the poor photographic copies they were offered for examination. (19)

Mary Ferrell of Dallas is not a handwriting expert, but she published in 1978 an article that challenged the HSCA panel's findings and reached a more definitive conclusion. (20) She compared the Hunt letter (reproduced on the back cover of this issue with the marginal numbers she furnished) alongside another Oswald document (also with marginal numbers, shown on the back cover) his 1961 letter to the American Embassy in Moscow. Among other things, she asks us to compare the notorious misspelling of concerning (rendered as concerding) in both documents, line 3 of the Hunt letter, line 16 of the other, the my on line 4 of the Hunt letter and on line 22 of the Embassy one, the at line 6 of the Hunt letter, line 23 of the Embassy one; any at line 7 of Hunt, line 11 of Embassy, and several others. She notes that these are similar not identical, precluding that the forgers simply "patched" words from an extant document onto one they were fabricating. Her conclusion, with which I cannot argue, is that "all these words appear to be written by the same person." That is not quite, however, to say that Oswald wrote both documents: especially if you suspect, as I do based on a great deal of my own research, that there was massive forgery in all the Oswald identity documents.

Briefly, now, on the allegation that the KGB financed Joesten's book. Once again, the evidence as presented is quite thin. It is based, really, on alleged documentation that the publisher, Carl Marzani, was a valued KGB asset whose publications generally parroted the Com-

munist party line, and who was given generous subsidies for his publishing activities. Assuming this to be the case, this is a bit short of saying that the KGB "bankrolled" Joesten's book. The KGB subsidies supposedly began in 1960, long before Joesten's 1964 publication, and it is not even clear that Marzani and Munsell were receiving the subsidies at the latter time. Even if they were, this falls rather short of asserting, as the media coverage at least suggests, that Joesten's book was "paid for" by the KGB. The rather obvious purpose of these allegations is to discredit a book that "blamed" CIA/right wing elements for the assassination. Whether such elements were or were not responsible for the assassination, the ideological proclivities of the publisher aren't really definitive for determining the responsibility of those parties.

To conclude, the whole problem of the Mitrokhin allegations is that we are left with no real basis for assessing their validity. On the general reliability of Mitrokhin and/or Andrew as sources, these are matters for other authorities than Andrew on "intelligence history," and I am certainly no such authority. I suspect that, on many dozens of "revelations" involving the "secret history" of the KGB, these matters will be argued for many years. My comments have focused on one part of the File, a minor matter in the totality of the book, but of course a major focus for the readers of this Journal (and a preoccupation of media coverage). Until the File becomes available for general public examination, I think my judgment of the total inadequacy of the treatment of these topics will stand.

Notes

1. George Lardner, Jr., "Papers Shed New Light on Soviets, Oswald," Washington Post August 6, 1999, p. 2 A.
2. Deb Reichmann (Associated Press), "Soviet Memo Calls Oswald Letter a Fake," Buffalo News August 6, 1999.
3. House Select Committee on Assassinations, Appendix to Hearings, vol. VIII, pp. 351,352, 358, 234, 238.
4. Jerry D. Rose, "What's In a Postmark?" The Third Decade vol. 2 #5, July 1986, pp.15-17.
5. Marina Oswald (Warren Commission Hearings and Exhibits, vol. 1 p. 45—hereafter cited in format 1H45) denied that she had anything to do with the mailing of the letter. Priscilla McMillan, (Marina and Lee New York: Bantam Books, 1977, p. 544) sug-

- gests he may have left it with Ruth Paine's letters, which she mailed on November 12.
6. 3H15.
 7. In Ruth Paine's Commission testimony, she says she was the "first one up" on the Sunday morning when she read the letter and the implication is that she went into the bathroom and made the copy using the sound of the shower as a pretext for being there. McMillan (Marina and Lee, p. 541) cleans up Mrs. Paine's act a bit on this one, saying that the shower was running and she "hoped" Oswald was in it while she made the copy.
 8. Mrs. Paine said (3H315) that her copy "should be among your [Warren Commission's] papers" but Counsel Jenner never indicated whether it was among his papers.
 9. 1H-45
 10. 1H110. She told Priscilla McMillan (Marina and Lee, p. 543) a slightly different story, according to McMillan's account: that he typed the letter twice and the envelope four times, not the ten times that she told the Warren Commission.
 11. Reichmann, "Soviet Memo." One circumstance suggestive of the likelihood that the letter was "dictated" to Oswald is the strange addition to the very end of the letter, "announcing" the birth of his second daughter. The interesting thing here is the name given, Audrey Marina Oswald, referring to the daughter who became known as Rachel Oswald. According to Priscilla McMillan (Marina and Lee, pp. 512-513), the birth certificate was originally filled out as Audrey Rachel Oswald. Lee "objected" to Rachel because it "sounded Jewish" and insisted he wanted the baby named after Marina, who then added Marina to the three names; the Rachel is dropped in Oswald's letter. The only reason I bring this up is the circumstance (Marina and Lee, p. 187) that Lee had also tried to have his first daughter named June Marina while they were living in the Soviet Union but was frustrated by a "Beaurecrat" at the birth registry office who insisted that Russian custom requires a middle name taken from the father's name, hence she became June Lee Oswald. (This episode is recorded in Oswald's Russian diary at p. 12, 16H105.) Knowing as he did Soviet "custom" in child-naming, why did he flaunt the naming of his second child in a way not permitted in the Soviet Union? Was he thumbing his nose at Russian custom—at the same time he was applying for Soviet entrance visas and writing an obsequious letter exonerating the Soviets of blame for his problems in Mexico? It was certainly not in his interest to confront the Soviet Embassy in this way, though it may somehow have served the interest of whoever "dictated" the letter.
 12. Michael Paine is the only person who claims to have seen the letter before the assassination—he was shown it by Ruth but mis-read the salutation as "Dear Lisa" rather than "Dear Sirs," presumed it was a personal letter and paid little attention to its contents. (2H406)
 13. There is nothing I know of in the record to authenticate that the handwritten draft was found among Oswald's personal effects. From where, then, did it come?
 14. Christopher Andrew and Vasili Mitrokhin, The Sword and the Shield: The Mitrokhin Archive and the Secret History of the KGB (New York: Basic Books, 1999)
 15. Penn Jones, Jr. The Continuing Inquiry February, 1977.
 16. John J. Johnson, "Oswald's Hunt Note" The Fourth Decade 5#3 March, 1998, pp. 23-29.
 17. Andrew, Sword and Shield, p. 226.
 18. Andrew, Sword and Shield, p. 229.
 19. I don't know why the panel was not presented with the original of the document but I have a suggestion, cynical though it may sound. Suppose they did get the original; would it not have been possible for "handwriting experts" to determine the approximate age of a piece of paper, at least whether it was at least fifteen years old if Oswald wrote it; perhaps only two years old if fabricated in 1975 and examined in 1977 (assuming the KGB forgers might have been imprudent enough not to have used 1963-vintage paper for their forgery)? A photocopy of the document would not allow such a comparison. Was that the reason they got a photocopy and not the original from the "researcher in Dallas Tex" from whom the committee said they got the document? (HSCA VIII 231)
 20. Mary Ferrell, "'Concerding' the Oswald Letter," The Continuing Inquiry vol III #3 October 22, 1978, pp. 7,8,13.

JOSE RIVERA: THE STORY THAT WILL NOT DIE

by
William E. Kelly, Jr.

The literature of the JFK assassination is littered with interesting lines of inquiry, but few are as detailed as the circumstances presented by Adele Edisen, who first made her story public in *The Third Decade*. The article, titled "From April to November and Back Again," was written by Edisen. To protect her identity, it was published under the byline of K. S. Turner in the November, 1991 edition (Vol.8, No.1) of *The Fourth Decade*.

Edisen claimed that in April of 1963 she met a person who apparently had foreknowledge of the assassination of President Kennedy, Dr. Jose Rivera. He gave her a phone number through which she contacted and talked with Lee Harvey Oswald in New Orleans in May, 1963. She called the Secret Service to warn them of the assassination and was interviewed by the Secret Service and FBI after the assassination.

There are, however, few official documented reports on the matter, although some are forthcoming in response to the JFK Assassination Records Review Act. But Adele Edisen's story can be independently confirmed in many respects without official documentation, and subsequent inquiries by Dick Russell, Larry Haapanen, John Gooch and myself have confirmed much of what she has to say. At this point, the lack of documentation seems to make what she has to say even more significant. It is a story that provides numerous leads that should be pursued.

Edisen's article in *The Third Decade* describes how she came to meet Dr. Jose Rivera at a medical conference in Atlantic City, New Jersey in April, 1963. She and Rivera were both medical professionals. Edisen was in her third year of a post-doctoral fellowship of the National Institute of Health's Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness (NINDB) at the Louisiana University School of Medicine. She had

also worked on the faculty of Tulane University, Rockefeller University, the University of Texas at San Antonio, and St. Mary's Dominican College and Delgado Community College in New Orleans. When she met him Dr. Rivera was manning a booth at the Atlantic City medical convention.

Upon learning that Edisen was with Louisiana State University School of Medicine in New Orleans, Rivera said he had been on the faculty of the biochemistry department at Loyola University, which is also in New Orleans, and that he was then living in Washington D.C. At the time of their meeting Edisen described Rivera as "approximately 45 or 50 years of age, about 5 feet, 3 or 4 inches in height, and obese. His hair was dark brown, almost black, with some grey; he was balding at the forehead and crown. His eyes were brown, and he wore corrective glasses with very thick lenses which greatly magnified the size of his eyes. His complexion was quite dark. He spoke English with a distinct Hispanic accent."

The Atlantic City Convention Authority records reflect that the National Institute of Health (NIH) sponsored a "High Blood Pressure Symposium" at the Atlantic City Convention Hall in April, 1963. Edisen testified before the Assassination Records Review Board (ARRB) in Dallas, Texas on November 18, 1994 that the meetings in Atlantic City were organized by the Federation of American Societies of Experimental Biology, an umbrella group of six major biological societies, including the American Physiological Society, for which Edisen gave a report on her research.

The strictly professional conversation between Edisen and Rivera became friendly, or as Edisen explained it, "I befriended him or he befriended me." The NIH was their first common tie, with their mutual professional acquaintances in New Orleans providing additional associations. "It turned out he had taught at Loyola University in New Orleans, and we knew some people in common who were, for example, Dr. Fred Brazda who was chairman of biochemistry at LSU Medical School, and a few other people."

"I was planning to go to Bethesda in Washington and visit with colleagues and friends at the NIH and also see the NIH," Edisen later testified, "and so he

William E. Kelly, Jr.
820 Shore Rd.
Somers Point, NJ 08244

had, in the course of our conversations and so on, invited me to his home to have dinner with him and his wife and daughter, and also to help me obtain hotel or motel space for my visit in Bethesda after these meetings, and to give me a sight-seeing tour, and so on."

Edisen arrived in Washington D.C. on Monday, April 22, 1963. As Rivera had requested, she telephoned him at his office, and his secretary arranged for her accommodations at a Bethesda, Maryland motel. Rivera picked Edisen up in his car and explained that his wife, who was a nurse, had been called into duty at a hospital. So the two of them had dinner at a Washington restaurant, Blackie's House of Beef. It was while standing in line waiting to be seated, Edisen recalled, when Dr. Rivera "began to talk of his travels in conjunction with his work. He spoke of Dallas, Texas."

Edisen quoted Rivera as saying, "When you go to Dallas, you should go to the Carousel Club because it's a very nice nightclub." Edisen made a mental note of a merry-go-round, while Rivera asked her if she knew Lee Harvey Oswald. He told her that Oswald had lived in the Soviet Union, was married to a Russian, had a child, and they were planning on moving to New Orleans, where Edisen was then living. She distinctly made a mental impression of the name, "I vaguely wondered if he was related to a boy I had gone to high school with, whose name was Fred Oswald." Rivera encouraged Edisen to meet the Oswalds, saying that "you should get to know them." She assumed that Oswald was a fellow medical research scientist.

Edisen and Rivera then made plans to meet the next night, when she would get a sight-seeing tour and could have dinner with Rivera at his home with his wife and daughter. After spending the day with friends, Edisen was picked up by Rivera at her motel, where "a tall, sharp-faced man hailed Rivera, addressing him as 'Colonel.' They spoke for quite a long while about their times together at an Army base. His friend spoke of his current work in the army on telemetry and some work with cameras and telephoto lenses."

Rivera later told Edisen that, "We're photographing demonstrators with telephoto cameras from rooftops.

We'll identify individual demonstrators and put their names in computer files. We've started this on the West Coast." Edisen wondered how that could be related to his work as a science administrator at NINDB until Rivera told her of his "other office, on the hill," and ties with "Foggy Bottom," which Edisen thought to be a residential section of the city.

According to Edisen: "After a lengthy drive to view the cherry trees, the National Library of Congress, Walter Reed Army Institute and Hospital, the Capitol Building, Georgetown and other sites, we started to approach the White House." While they passed the White House a number of times, the first time they went by Rivera asked Edisen, "I wonder what Jackie will do when her husband dies?" After a pause and Edisen's incredulous, "What?", Rivera said, "Oh, oh, I meant the baby. She might lose the baby." Edisen didn't know Jackie was pregnant.

That was "the first inkling I had that Rivera might be implying something sinister concerning President Kennedy." Then, "every time we toured around the White House he asked me if I saw Caroline on her pony Macaroni, and all kinds of crazy nonsense, and I was beginning to think I was with an absolute madman.... Rivera's part of the conversation at times was difficult to follow, but many of his statements, such as the reference to 'Jackie,' seemed deliberately placed. When he spoke of President Kennedy, Rivera was extremely critical of Kennedy's position on civil rights. Rivera made many disparaging remarks about black people and the civil rights movement."

Rivera also mentioned the NIH, Edisen remembers. "Several times during the course of this evening and the previous one, Rivera referred to the NIH being called 'The Reservation' because there were so many 'chiefs' and no 'Indians.' I wondered why he had to repeat this so many times." Edisen, as a professional research scientist, suspected Rivera was using hypnotic suggestion techniques on her, and possibly even drugs. "He spoke of hypnosis. He had knowledge of hypnotic techniques and of the uses of LSD, a psychomimetic and hypnagogic drug which increases susceptibility to suggestions without causing amnesia."

Since his wife, again, was called in to work at the

hospital, Rivera and Edisen had dinner at the Twin Bridges at the Marriott Motor Hotel across the Potomac River. While the dinner was relatively uneventful, Rivera did ask Edisen some strange questions, like if she knew a lawyer named John Abt.

"After we finished eating, he asked me to do a favor for him when I arrived home," recalls Edisen. Rivera wanted Edisen to contact Winston DeMonsabert, a Loyola faculty member who was leaving New Orleans. Edisen wrote a note to herself: "Winston DeMonsabert call Dr. Rivera when leaving N. O." Then Rivera said to also call Lee Harvey Oswald at 899-4244. "Write down this name: Lee Harvey Oswald. Tell him to kill the chief." Rivera then contradicted himself, saying, "No, no, don't write that down. You will remember it when you get to New Orleans. We're just playing a little joke on him."

Edisen said that she still assumed "the joke" would be on Oswald, whom she thought was a scientist and friend of Rivera's. She thought "the chief" was a reference to Elizabeth Hartman, "the chief" of the grants and awards section of the NIH, whom Rivera had earlier joked about as being like the chief of a reservation "with too many chiefs and not enough Indians."

Edisen remembers Rivera then being "agitated and excited. He began talking strangely about 'it' happening" and drew a diagram on a notepad, almost incoherent and very agitated. "It will be on the fifth floor, there'll be some men up there," he said. Edisen quoted Rivera as saying nonsensical things like, "Oswald was not what he seems. We're going to send him to the library to read about great assassinations in history. After it's over, he'll call Abt to defend him. After it happens, the President's best friend will commit suicide. He'll jump out of a window because of his grief.... It will happen after the Shriners' Circus comes to New Orleans. After it's over, the men will be out of the country. Remember, the first time it happens won't be real."

Edisen recalls, "He did not respond to any of my questions about what was to happen, and I became even more concerned and suspicious about his odd behavior and statements. As I entered his car, he asked me to destroy the note I had made and to forget what

had just happened. It did not dawn on me that he could have been referring to an assassination of the President — the Chief."

Rivera threatened Edisen about going to the FBI saying, "They'll want that note. Don't give it to them. I don't want to have to hurt you. We'll be watching you." Edisen said, "I became very frightened. I didn't understand what he was talking about, even though he had made references to the assassination of the President."

About a week after Adele Edisen returned home to New Orleans from Washington D.C. (around May 1-3, 1963), she called the 899-4244 number Rivera had given her for Lee Harvey Oswald, whom she believed was a research-scientist colleague of Dr. Rivera's, who had returned from Russia with a Russian wife and recently moved to New Orleans. A man who answered the phone said there was no one there by that name.

"A week later (approximately May 9-12, 1963) I dialed again, thinking I might have misdialed the first time," recalls Edisen. The same man answered, and seemed surprised when she asked for Oswald, as he said, "They've just arrived." Although Oswald wasn't there, Edisen spoke with his wife briefly, and although she spoke with a Slavic-Russian accent, Marina seemed to understand the conversation, didn't know Dr. Rivera, and said it was okay for Edisen to call back when her husband was there.

The third time she called, the phone was answered by the same man, whom Edisen believes was the landlord. Oswald came to the phone, but denied knowing Dr. Jose Rivera of Washington D.C. "That's strange, because he apparently knows you and your wife," Edisen told him. "I then asked Oswald for the location of the telephone, and he courteously gave me an address on Magazine Street, which I placed to be near the 5000 block.... I thanked him and apologized for bothering him. Still thinking that Oswald was a scientist, I wondered why a scientist would be living in a rather run-down part of the city. Needless to say, I did not deliver Rivera's message ('to kill the chief') to Oswald."

What is really strange is that Dr. (Col.) Jose Rivera, in Washington D.C., knew Oswald's New Orleans phone number on Tuesday, April 23, before Oswald

himself knew where he was moving to in New Orleans. It was the following day, Wednesday, April 24, when Ruth Paine drove from Irving to the Oswald's Neeley Street apartment in Dallas to find the Oswalds all packed and ready to move to New Orleans. They had quite suddenly (Marina later said it was because of the Walker shooting incident) decided to move to New Orleans, where Oswald was born. They asked Ruth Paine for a ride to the bus station and she was startled by the sudden decision.

Ruth Paine discussed the matter with them in the car on the way to the bus station, and convinced them that because they didn't know where Oswald would work or where they would stay in New Orleans, Marina and their daughter should stay with her in Irving, Texas while Oswald went on alone to New Orleans to find a job and locate an apartment. Oswald arrived in New Orleans by bus and called his aunt Lillian Murret to announce that he had returned home, and to ask if he could stay with them at 757 French Street while he searched for employment. Mrs. Murret was surprised, but agreed to take Oswald on as a guest until he obtained a job and apartment.

After filing for unemployment compensation extensions for his work in Dallas at Jaggars-Chiles-Stoval (which required cross-state approvals), Oswald applied for work at a number of locations, including the William B. Reily coffee company at 640 Magazine Street, where he listed three references — his uncle John Murret, Sgt. Robert Hidell and Lt. J. Evans, the last two of which the Warren Report claimed are "apparently fictitious names."

But they're not fictitious. Oswald did know a Hidell in the Marines, who was living in New Orleans at the time, and there was indeed a "J. Evans," because as the Report notes on the same page, "Also on May 9, Oswald obtained an apartment at 4905-07 Magazine Street with the help of Myrtle Evans, who had known him when he was a child." And Myrtle had a husband named Julian. When he was young, Oswald's mother had rented an apartment from Myrtle and Julian Evans. After the assassination Myrtle Evans characterized Oswald as a spoiled brat to the Warren Commission and Marina's biographer Priscilla Johnson McMillan. Myrtle also helped Oswald find

the Magazine Street apartment in the same "coincidental" way that Ruth Paine found Oswald a job at the Texas School Book Depository.

Recreating Oswald's reintroduction into his old neighborhood, Priscilla Johnson McMillan wrote: "Lee went to their building and Julian Evans, who was seated at breakfast drinking his last cup of coffee, recognized him right away. He had known Lee both as a child and as a teenager, and there was something about him that neither he nor Myrtle liked. Julian finished his coffee, shook hands with the caller, and left for work. His wife Myrtle, a heavy-set women in her fifties, who wore glasses, and had reddish hair in a bun, peered at Lee closely, 'I know you, don't I?'"

"Sure, I am Lee Oswald. I was just waiting to see when you were going to recognize me." McMillan: "Myrtle and Julian thought Oswald was in Russia. Even though there was something she didn't like about Oswald, Myrtle took Oswald to lunch and helped him find the apartment on Magazine Street." According to McMillan however, she drove Oswald around in her car looking for "FOR RENT" signs until they found one on Magazine Street."

"Lee spotted one and they went in," McMillan writes (*Marina and Lee*, p. 313). "There were two apartments for rent at 4907 Magazine Street, and the bigger one looked as if it might do. It was on the ground floor. It had a long living room, a screened-in front porch, a yard, and the kind of iron fence children can't crawl through. The rent was \$65 a month. Myrtle advised Lee that it was the best value for his money and he'd better take it."

The landlady was Mrs. Jesse Garner, who lived with her husband in an apartment next door in the same building complex. Oswald told Mrs. Garner he worked for the Leon Israel Company at 300 Magazine Street when he actually had obtained a job that morning at the William Reily Coffee Company on the same street. It was Jesse Garner who most likely answered the telephone the three times that Adele Edisen called at the request of Dr. Jose Rivera. The key question is: How did Dr. Jose Rivera in Washington D.C. know Lee Harvey Oswald's New Orleans phone number at Jesse Garner's 4905-7 Magazine Street apartment house on April 23, when Oswald himself

didn't know where he would be living until May 9? If true, it indicates that at least some of Oswald's movements were being directed by someone in Washington D.C. On May 9 Oswald called Marina at Ruth Paine's house in Irving, Texas with the news that he had obtained a job and apartment. Marina told Mrs. Paine and the children "Papa loves us," and was very happy. Mrs. Paine, Marina and the children left Irving the next day in Mrs. Paine's station wagon, staying overnight *en route* and arriving in New Orleans on May 11th. Mrs. Paine then stayed with the Oswalds at their new Magazine Street apartment for three days.

Ed Haslam, who wrote a book called, *Mary, Ferrie and the Monkey Virus*, and Adele Edisen suspect that the corner 4905-07 Magazine Street apartment building complex was owned by Mr. and Mrs. William McLaney until 1974, when it was sold to Isabella Dawson, who (according to Mary Ferrell) had previously signed a rent receipt for Oswald, indicating she had something to do with the building before she bought it.

Shortly after she returned to New Orleans, Edisen called Winston DeMonsabert, the Loyola faculty member whose name Rivera had given her, but he denied knowing Dr. Rivera. [This is contrary to what DeMonsabert told John Gooch and Dick Russell when they interviewed DeMonsabert, who admitted to being in communication with Rivera up to the time of his death.] When Edisen checked with the chairman of Loyola's biochemistry department, Dr. Anthony DiMaggio, he said he knew Rivera but told Edisen that Rivera "had left the university under very peculiar circumstances" and warned her not to have anything to do with him.

Suspicious of what she knew then, Edisen called the New Orleans office of the U.S. Secret Service and spoke with Special Agent Rice. According to Edisen, "After giving my name, address and telephone number to him, I told him I had met a man in Washington in April who said some strange things about the President which I thought they should know. It was my intention to go there and tell them about Rivera and his statements, but I began to think they might not believe me, so I called back and cancelled. Agent Rice told me they would be there any time I

would care to come in."

Four months later, in early August 1963, Edisen received an envelope in the mail with no return address and her name and address printed in a very crude scrawl. Enclosed, in a wadded up form, was the box-like drawing made by Jose Rivera on April 23, 1963 at the Marriott Hotel restaurant in Washington D.C., when Rivera made mention of men on the "fifth floor." Also in August, Edisen saw Oswald on television, handing out Fair Play for Cuba leaflets in front of the International Trade Mart in New Orleans. She recalled the announcer referring to him as "Leon" Oswald, noticed the similarity in names, and wondered if it was a coincidence.

In September 1963, sometime after Labor Day, Edisen was speaking with Dr. Greg Ferris in the hallway at LSU, when Rivera got off an elevator. "Of course I watched him," Edisen recalls, "and he didn't see me at first. He had very thick glasses. He may not have seen at long distance. But when he was about eight or ten feet away, he noticed me and halted and he almost stumbled stepping backwards. He looked as if he had seen a ghost, and then he walked on. He recovered by saying he had to go see Fred Brazda, his friend in the biochemistry." That was the last time Adele Edisen saw Dr. Jose Rivera.

For Edisen it all came to a head on the day of the assassination. "[On] November 22, my fears became reality. I spent much of the day listening to the news from Dallas and sorting out my memories of April, 1963. I felt I was involved, however innocently, and I thought it important the Secret Service and FBI be told of Rivera. Rivera was, to me, no longer a delusional psychotic, but an assassination conspirator. It also occurred to me that Oswald might be innocent despite the emphasis on his guilt by the news media, and that he might have been somehow manipulated by Rivera and his 'we' who were 'playing a little joke' on Oswald."

Two days later, on Sunday, November 24, Edisen, for the third time, called U.S. Secret Service office in New Orleans and spoke with Special Agent Rice. She was asked to go to the Federal Building at 600 South Street, where SA Rice met her in the lobby. She was told not to sign the entry-exit register with the secu-

rity guard. They went to an office on the fifth floor, where they were informed that Oswald had been shot in Dallas.

Edisen, at first, believed she met with Special Agent J. Calvin Rice, who has been identified as an agent of the FBI. Rather, she met with John W. Rice, the Special Agent In Charge of the New Orleans office of the Secret Service. She described Rice as being thin and short, not much taller than she was, while J. Calvin Rice has been described as over six feet tall and husky. In addition, it would have been the Secret Service, not the FBI, who were responsible for the safety of the President and investigation of threats against his life.

In the office, Rice introduced Edisen to "a tall, heavy-set bald man with wire-rimmed eyeglasses, a Special Agent of the FBI," who she recalls was named Orrin Bartlett. Orrin Bartlett has been identified as the FBI liaison with the Secret Service. Rice said they were working closely on the case. There was no one else in the office. Edisen believes the three-to-four hour long interview was tape-recorded. "Mr. Rice was seated at his desk, and I was seated to his right, and the FBI agent remained standing most of the time. I believe he may have taped it because every time Mr. Rice got up from his desk, there was a partition over there, for example, and there was a phone there which they used even though there was a phone on the desk, which I didn't understand, but apparently there was some reason for that. So every time Mr. Rice got up to answer the phone or to use the phone, I noticed his hand would do this, and I would either hear a whirring, a mechanical sound like a tape recorder or something. It may have been audiotaped."

Edisen told them the story of how she met Dr. Jose Rivera in Atlantic City in April and visited with him for two days in Washington D.C., and showed them the airline ticket, hotel receipts and the notes she kept. "At this point," Edisen recalls, "the agents' questioning became more intense. I was asked to further identify Rivera, his position at the NIH, and his physical description. I also gave them Rivera's office telephone number and his home phone number (301-654-7348) in Chevy Chase, Maryland. The FBI agent quickly went behind the partition and called some-

one, giving this information. I thought Rivera was to be apprehended."

"When the FBI agent returned from behind the partition, he asked if they could have the note, and I agreed," Edisen later wrote. As the interview came to an end, Agent Rice asked the FBI agent if he "had the film," and if he was ready to leave for Dallas, as "the plane was ready." "Before he showed me the door," wrote Edisen, "Agent Rice asked me to call them if I remembered anything else, and requested that I not tell anyone I had been there to speak with them. I understood this to be for my own protection as well as for their investigation. Both agents thanked me for speaking with them."

After she recalled a few more details, Edisen called Agent Rice a few days later, and repeated her fears of Rivera and his threats, but Rice counseled her, "Don't worry. That man can't hurt you." Edisen thought Rivera was in custody, and she expected to be called as a witness before the Warren Commission. "When the Warren Report was published, I was mystified and dismayed by the conclusion that Oswald acted alone, and that Jack Ruby acted alone, for my experiences told me otherwise."

Rivera's voice would come back to haunt her many times over the years, beginning shortly after the assassination, when she learned of the death of Edward Grant Stockdale, a former Ambassador to Ireland. When she heard Stockdale had jumped out of a window in Miami a few weeks after the assassination, she thought of what Rivera said: "After it happens the President's best friend will jump out a window because of his grief."

After maintaining her silence about the whole affair for many years, Edisen consulted an attorney to see if there was any record of her pre-assassination phone calls to the Secret Service or her post assassination interview. After perusing the 26 volumes of Warren Commission testimony and exhibits and finding nothing about Dr. Jose Rivera or reports from FBI Agent J. Calvin Rice or SAIC John Rice, she had New Orleans attorney Jack Peebles file a request under the Freedom of Information Act, but no documentation was discovered.

When the Church Committee convened she con-

tacted Sen. Frank Church, Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and when Sen. Daniel Inouye and his staff seemed interested she sent a copy of all documentation she had as well as a narrative of her experiences, but later received the response that the matter was "outside the purview of the Special Committee's work." A copy of the three-page summary of her experiences was also personally given to a Special Agent of the FBI in San Antonio, Texas, in 1984, which he sent to Headquarters.

A year later she again made an FOIA request to the FBI for anything they had in their files, and the FBI again replied that it had nothing. More recently, Adele Edisen asked, in writing and at a public hearing, that the Assassination Records Review Board examine any records pertaining to Dr. (Col.) Jose Rivera, "and what his role was in all of this. I know something about him, that he spent some time in Japan, for example, he told me that, and it may have been there at that time Oswald was there. He knew Oswald somehow."

As she concluded her *Third Decade* article, Edisen wrote, "History should record that some investigative work was conducted relevant to the information I had furnished to the U.S. Secret Service and the FBI following the assassination of President John F. Kennedy; however, there is no official record that this conversation ever took place. Why? If the information was not considered to be relevant and pertinent, there should be some record of the fact that the interview took place. If the information was considered to be relevant and pertinent, there certainly should have been a record of it."

"Whatever forces were operating to assassinate President Kennedy may never be revealed, but this should not deter anyone from seeking the truth. If our system of government, its laws, and our civil rights are to survive, we need to know the truth, no matter how convoluted and strange it may be. We deserve to know this long before the next century."

In 1989, Maryland newspapers published the obituary of "Dr. Jose Albert Rivera, pathologist, analyst, 78," which read:

Dr. Jose Albert Rivera, 78, a retired Army pathologist and research analyst at NIH, died of pancreatic cancer, Wednesday, Aug. 16, at the Naval Medical

Center in Bethesda. He lived in Kensington, Maryland [at 3913 Dannel Lane]. Dr. Rivera retired in 1973 from a second career as a medical research analyst at the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, of the NIH, where he worked after retiring from the Army in 1965.

Born in Lima, Peru, Dr. Rivera studied medicine at the University of San Marcos. He moved to the United States to study at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, earning his undergraduate degree there. He earned his doctoral degree from Georgetown University in 1939 and interned at Providence Hospital.

In 1942, he volunteered for the Army and was commissioned a first lieutenant in the medical corps. He was stationed at Walter Reed Army Hospital and later assigned to Halloran General Army Hospital in New York.

In 1944, while acting as chief of pathology at Halloran, he was promoted to captain and went on a series of assignments in Italy and France and at the 198th General Army Hospital in Berlin.

During the Korean War he served in the 1273rd Medical Field Unit of the 406th Medical General Laboratory and received a battlefield promotion to major. After the war, he was chief of laboratory service and pathology at the U.S. Army Hospital in Tokyo.

In 1958, he was assigned to the Reserve Training Center in Washington D.C., where he remained until his retirement in 1965.

Dr. Rivera was active in many civic organizations and charities. His favorites were the Epilepsy Foundation of America, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States and the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States....

Dr. Rivera is survived by two daughters, Linda Rivera-King of Abington, Pennsylvania, and Natalie Rivera Frederick of San Ramon, California, and three grandchildren. His wife, Anne J. Rivera, to whom he was married for 52 years, died in 1988. Services were held at Fort Myer Chapel, with burial at Arlington National Cemetery."

Research Notes

[A] Larry Haapanen notes that a review of medical literature indicates Dr. Rivera wrote a number of books

that were published, including one entitled *Cilia, Ciliated Epithelium and Ciliary Activity*, published by Pergamon Press in 1962, which mentions Col. Rivera's affiliation with the Naval Biological Laboratory of the School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley.

Haapanen writes: "So there was, indeed, a Lt. Col. Jose A. Rivera at the same phone number (654-7348) in Chevy Chase given in the article (*Third Decade*). Since Lt. Col. Rivera is not in the Regular Army's Active Duty list for 1961, I assume that he was a reservist. This is borne out by the listing of a Colonel Jose A. Rivera in the Army of the United States (i.e. Army Reserve) Retired List for 1969. His serial number was 0-0513618, and his date of retirement was given as March 1965 (see U.S. ARMY REGISTER, 1 January, 1969, Vol. III: Retired Lists, p. 304).

[B] Special thanks to Vincent Palamara, and Walt Brown and *Global JFK Index*: Bartlett, Orrin (FBI S/A - liaison with Secret Service), is mentioned in Carlos Brunguier's book *Red Friday*, p. 85; Livingstone's *High Treason II*, p.101; Weisberg's *Whitewash II*, pp. 200, 351, 599 and *Post Mortem*, p. 603; as well as WC Vol. III, p. 67-460; Vol. VI, p. 435 (concerning bullet fragments).

Rice, John W., Secret Service, Special Agent In Charge (SAIC) of the New Orleans SS office in 1963-1964, is referred to for his post-assassination interview with Jack Martin. SAIC John Rice is also indexed in John Davis, *Mafia Kingfish*, p. 200; Flammonde, *Kennedy Conspiracy*, pp. 125-6, 128; *American Grotesque*, p. 134; Newman, *Oswald and CIA*, p. 327.

[C] New Orleans researcher John Gooch III reported (in May, 1992) that he spoke with Loyola biochemistry professor Anthony DiMaggio III, who confirmed that Dr. Jose Rivera worked at Loyola as a biochemistry professor for a year and a half, until June, 1960. Gooch also spoke with Winston DeMonsabert, who maintained his contact with Dr. Rivera until 1989. In addition, Gooch has identified Dr. Cyril Bowers, whom he believes is the "C. Bowers" who signed the three Office of Naval Intelligence teletype orders of Sept. 1963 - Dec. 1964, that were found among the effects of Roscoe White.

Who's Who - Directory of Medical Specialists (17th

Edition, 1975-76). Internal Medicine Section: Dr. Cyril Yarling Bowers, Born in Dayton, Ohio in 1924; M.D. from Univ. of Oregon (Portland), intern at King County Hospital, Seattle, medical resident at Cornell Univ., N.Y.C.; Lt. in Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy Reserve from 1950-52; graduate study at Univ. of Penn (Philadelphia) 52-53; clinical trainee for NIH, Metabolic and Arthritic Division; fellowship for American Cancer Research at Tulane Univ.; assistant visiting physician (Charity Hospital, N.O.) and staff physician for the Alton Ochsner Medical Foundation; assistant professor of medicine at Tulane Medical School; 1959-60 asst. prof. of medicine at LSU (N.O.); associate professor for the Dept. of Medicine and director of Endocrine Unit at Tulane Medical School. In 1960 Dr. Bowers lived at 1705 Jefferson Ave, New Orleans and maintained an office at 3513 Prytania St. Since 1964 he has lived at 484 Audubon Street, New Orleans.

[D] The *Assassination Records Review Board Final Report* (Chapter 6, Part 1, p. 109) reports: "**8. Adele Edisen, Winston de Monsabert, Jose Rivera** Dr. Adele Edisen has written several letters to the Review Board and has also provided public testimony to the Review Board. In her letters and testimony, Dr. Edisen stated that, in New Orleans on November 24, 1963, she recounted to an FBI agent and a Secret Service agent her knowledge of apparent dealings between Dr. Jose Rivera, Mr. Winston de Monsabert, and Lee Harvey Oswald in 1963. The Review Board requested FBI records on these individuals from FBI Headquarters and field offices in Baltimore, Dallas, Denver, New Orleans and Washington D.C. The FBI retrieved only a few records relating to the individuals referenced above, all of which the Review Board designated as assassination records."

[E] On May 12, 1999 Special Access and FOIA Staff Archivist at the NARA, Martha Wagner Murphy, contacted Adele Edisen and informed her that the FBI had located the narrative she gave to the SA of the FBI in San Antonio, Texas, but that was all they could locate among their files other than two FBI documents relating to "Elvira Uskali Edisen." Because the ARRB asked for documents that referred to Adele Edisen rather than Elvira Uskali Edisen, they were

not included among the requested documents. According to Ms. Murphy, "Although I hesitate to interpret the records for you, it appears from the documentation that although the ARRB had requested to view files relating to these three names (Jose Rivera, Winston de Monsabert and Adele E.U. Edisen), and two documents had been located by the FBI relating to Elvira Uskali Edisen, the ARRB never officially designated either of these documents as assassination related. It appears the ARRB Report is therefore inaccurate.... Since the ARRB never officially designated either of the documents as assassination related, the NARA will not be receiving copies of these documents as part of the Kennedy Assassination Records Collection. However, you may request the copies from the FBI under the Freedom of Information Act. If you choose to do so, you will need to request the specific files listed in the 2/18/98 memorandum: 100-3-76-276, p 13 and 100-361391-29, p 51."

[F] While it appears the FBI is stonewalling, not admitting the two documents into the JFK Assassination Records Collection because of a technicality, the files of the Assassination Records Review Board lists relevant files among those of ARRB staff member Douglas P. Horne, specifically Box #18, which is labeled: "Adele Edisen - Investigation Reports on Jose A. Rivera." When Adele Edisen requested copies of these documents, she was informed that there were a total of over 700 pages of documents that would cost hundreds of dollars to copy. She is currently waiting for these papers to be sent to her. While I was going to wait for these new documents to be released before I updated this report, I have decided to release this analysis now, since the total number of additional documents indicates that there may be a lot of new information, this is what we now know, before the new documents are evaluated.

[G] In October, 1999, the National Institute of Health decided to name their library after Sen. Arlen Specter (R.Pa.).

[H] Adele Edisen will be a guest of Mary Ferrell at the JFK Lancer Conference in Dallas.

THE ZAPRUDER FILM: A STUDY IN DECEPTION, PART IV

by

Harrison Edward Livingstone

The evidence of alteration of the Zapruder film continues to grow stronger, but a great many false claims are now being put forward. Much needs to be done to prove it one way or the other. There are times when I feel that I have given birth to a monster, as the Warren Commission did when they issued their Report in 1964, and the fact that my writing has motivated much of what we are now seeing with regard to the Zapruder film. Jack White, a kind man, has said some kind things about me (James Fetzer, *Assassination Science*, p. 218). Sometimes I worry about him since an intruder in his home stabbed him in the head, nearly killing him, and he has sometimes gotten off the track. So I regret criticizing some of his statements in my report in this paper. I hope that he doesn't take it personally.

This is written before the time in a few months when I will be allowed to look at the alleged original Zapruder film in the National Archives. I question that the slides on public view in the Archives were actually made from the original by Time-Life. One can see a vague dividing line separating the intersprocket hole area, though sometimes faint, from the central image area normally projected on a screen. In addition, the entire intersprocket area adjacent to each frame is divided horizontally in half, each of a different density. This may be explainable as an optical phenomenon related to the design of the camera, but it differs too greatly from other films and the "home movie" shot on the same reel. We don't have slides of the home movie to make careful comparisons with, they were never made, to my knowledge. We can't find the home movie and the Zapruders aren't helping us.

Perhaps the major disinformation about the Zapruder film is the claim that it is a "time clock of the assassination." This was an overwhelming mes-

Harrison Edward Livingstone
3025 Abell
Baltimore, MD 21218

sage put out by the film's defenders who never questioned its authenticity, or if they knew it might be fake, certainly had no intention of revealing the truth. Let the truth be known!

In addition, it was long claimed by believers that the film showed evidence of a shot from in front, and perhaps showed that Connally was hit with a separate bullet. Neither of these points is solidly based in science and are subjective judgments. Nevertheless, both are true, but the film doesn't easily prove much on these issues. It's clear as a bell to me, however, that Connally is not hit for some time after Kennedy has first been hit, but our attention was long distracted from this in the film by the backwards movement of Kennedy's head and what that might mean. That is not clear evidence of a shot from in front.

Another point that needs dealing with is the idea that the technology to alter such a film was not present in 1963. This is simply wrong. The alteration of photographs was perfected before the Civil War, and was applied to motion pictures when they appeared. There are many examples of altered films, special effects, and combining animation and real pictures perfected before the Second World War. The Great Train Robbery is one example.

The basis for concluding that the key films in the case—autopsy photographs and X-rays, and some of the assassination films including the Zapruder film—were altered is the clear evidence that none of the films in any way show what was described by perhaps every witness who saw the body. Some of the problem may be explained away by the confusion over terms and anatomy. That is, they confuse "posterior" or occipital with parietal and right side. They visualize a human head as square and cannot see that the hole described was both. The large defect was certainly in the back right side of the head, extending low into the occipital area. Hal Verb and his mentor, Harold Weisberg, are the chief defenders of the position that the photos must be correct, as opposed to the actual reactions of the medical witnesses to the alleged autopsy photographs. The autopsy doctors insisted that the photographs do not show the wounds properly. I have outlined the massive evidence to support this in four books. Not only do their anatomical

descriptions and placement of the large wound as written or testified to by them differ with the photographs, but they were all shown the films and either ridiculed them or flatly stated that they were wrong. This simply cannot be overlooked or side-stepped and we don't see it in the film. What we see is a huge wound on the face that did not exist.

Martin Shackelford suggests that such sprocket hole images only show up when the camera is at certain angles to the sun where light can enter at odd angles all the way into the sprocket areas. If the camera is faced the wrong way, there will be little if any sprocket hole image. This seems reasonable considering the absence of the ghosts at other angles or with different lighting.

Perhaps Mizzer's most important observation with regard to these films is the fact that when the camera was stopped, the scene fades out for 2-3 frames while the film slowed to a stop. Each time the camera was started, the scene is over-exposed and takes 2-3 frames to fade in. This, of course, is not what we see in the transitions in the Zapruder film, when there is an abrupt change of scene between 132 and 133 when the limo appears. His observation was confirmed by Roland Zavada for the ARRB, but Zavada saw this phenomena only in one frame, when we saw it in three. He did confirm it several times in the home movie. I believe from other facts that his eyes are not as good as ours.

Claiming that there is normally only one over-exposed frame when the scene changes serves the cover-up of missing frames between 132-133, because we found that there were *always* about three frames over-exposed and none at all at 133. One missing over-exposed frame at that scene change might more easily be dismissed, but not three missing over-exposed frames.

This means that there was a sequence showing the uninterrupted motorcade or at least part of it, which was excised from the film. Zapruder indicated that he never stopped the camera, as we now see that it was stopped in the film. That is where I believe the limo first stopped and shots were fired. From this, discounting camera differences, one would think that the film was heavily edited and assembled from dif-

ferent pieces. But we do not yet know how different the various camera actions were.

David Mantik has also found that the darker intersprocket area of the Zapruder film's assassination sequence was not seen in his father's 8mm films of that era. The only way for most people to see this is to go to the National Archives and look at the slides made from the film.

A key difference in the motorcade films, easily seen on the slides in the Archives, is that the intersprocket area of the motorcade sequences (as seen in Vol. 18 and in the slides available to the public in the National Archives) is quite different from that of the home movie segment. Both sets of sequences were shot on the same roll of 16 mm film, which was later split length-wise and spliced together. As yet there is no good explanation for why the intersprocket areas would appear so markedly different (Zavada says it is a *shadow of the claw*)—darker and for the most part separated from the main image in the frame by a slight line. Mantik has noticed this also, before I verified it in the Archives.[1] The problem was that the home movie segment is only available, as far as we know, at the Archives, and they were not showing this until recently. But Mantik failed to comment on the fact that much of the home movie intersprocket areas are black and have no image at all, as is true of portions of the motorcade sequence toward the end, which he noticed.

There appear to be no "ghost images" such as the motorcycle seen floating in the air just beneath the sprocket hole in many frames of the film, and another entire "home movie" of the picket fence in the same spot much later in the film. I first pointed these images out to Mantik during one of our joint visits to the Archives years ago, and he has written extensively about the motorcycle, but not about the second set of images.

We don't know if there are ghost images in the home movie because extensive study would have to be done under a microscope, or slides made from the film which are easier to study.

Proof of Alteration:

The problems outlined here tell us that the Zapruder film was created just as films are edited in Hollywood,

using an optical printer which shoots a picture of each frame with no evidence of splicing. It is a reframed version, with massive deletions and outright alteration of frames.

1) Doug Mizzer and I made a startling discovery in the Archives on 21 April, 1998, looking at one of the two copies of the Zapruder film. Working on a light table in the labs of the National Archives, we lined up identical frames in terms of the Stemmons sign and compared it with the re-enactment. *One of the films, which we were told was shot with Zapruder's camera in a re-enactment of the assassination* (N.A. item title: Re-enactment, 65 JFK 14, 16 mm) *had a considerably higher vertical picture showing much more of the street scene and the County Records Building in the background than in any copy of the Zapruder film that we could recall* or the one we compared it to on the spot at the N.A. (87.38, marked as having come from Time/Life). Presumably, the camera had the full zoom lens on.

We also could see the entire side and rear wheel of the limo in the Re-enactment film (the Zapruder film shows the entire side of the car disappearing from view—there is no background other than grass (also true in the re-enactment film), so no way to locate the car in time and space). If I am correct, this means that the present Zapruder film as we know it was in fact *reframed* in a magnified format, losing detail on the margins of the picture, including landmarks that would have permitted an exact location in space for the head shot. The other was a copy of the Zapruder film made by Time/Life. The only way to test all this is to shoot the scene all over again, which would also offer the opportunity to test the copying process and the intersprocket areas. It's clear in the film that as the limousine draws close to Zapruder, the close-up lens is on.

We arrived at the conclusion that the film had been reframed long before due to our other observations and for other reasons (Doug Mizzer, who is extremely observant, is assisting me and has made some of these discoveries).

2) The numbers punched in the film or photographically printed seem to be in the wrong place. "0183" was placed at the end of the home movie. It is impos-

sible for it to be there, and by the same token, it is impossible for the punched through "0186" we see in the middle of SS No. 2 to be where it is, followed by a print through of a photographic splice.

3) There is no over-exposed series of frames, as there are on every scene change in the film, when the camera was stopped and started, at frame 133 when the limousine suddenly appears. It is a certainty from all that is known about the camera that this could not have happened. The over-exposed frames are a result of the camera's "inertial effect" as the motor starts, and this is a well documented problem with such cameras. It means that frames were removed, and as I argue elsewhere in this paper, probably very many frames encompassing enough for the three blocks or so of motorcade between the three lead motorcycles which we see, and the limousine which comes into view at frame 133.

4) The film is too long, as the maximum amount of footage on the 25 foot roll sold to customers was 33 feet and in most cases was 32 feet. Both single sides are too long and the entire length of one of the Jamieson films comes to more than seventy feet, rather than the maximum possible 66 feet.

5) In addition, Doug Mizzer notes that it is impossible for Jamieson's copy machines to copy more film than they received from Kodak, and even if Kodak in fact added spliced on leaders, as appears with the spliced on "0186" segment, it is impossible to record this on the new copy and still have less than 33 feet of film. Doug wrote me (16 May 1999) that "The out of camera original Zapruder film, after being processed by Kodak, was approximately 33 feet long, since Kodak did not remove any of the integral thread up from either side of the film. 33 feet is the maximum length for a 25 foot roll of film. the same rule applies to the length of the 25 foot roll of copy film sent to Jamieson. It could not copy anymore than its maximum length of 33 feet. Once Kodak added leader to the original film to run it through their processor, it would make the length more than 33 feet because of the leader. Therefore when Jamieson copied the original, the copy could only be as long as 33 feet and would not have enough film to copy a print through of Kodak's leader."

The keys to keep in mind are that normally Kodak cut off the excess film beyond 25 feet and added their own leaders which had printed on them: "processed by Kodak." The punch through numbers were made on the actual film, as we see at the end of the home movie, and not on a leader. All the actual punch through numbers are missing except one: "0186" on SS Copy No. 1 and this is not only not punched through the actual film, but seems clearly in the wrong place as it is not at the end of the home movie where we had the original number placed.

In this case, the film was not cut off and leaders were added. The punch through "0186" on SS No. 1 is on a spliced leader, according to Zavada.

6) As explicated in great detail in my third book, *Killing Kennedy and the Hoax of the Century*, there is a conflict in vector analysis in some of the frames, with the action going one way and the blurs from panning going the wrong way. There are frames where the camera has been panning and there are no blurs in the background when the camera is panning with the car, and vice versa, and other frames which show both blurred, or not blurred at all. The implication is that the car was simply stopped and the camera was not panning. Either the background or the limousine must be out of focus at any one time if the camera is still or panning, but there are frames where both are in focus at the same time.

7) As for the strange quality of the intersprocket area of the original motorcade film, as best studied on the slides on the Archives, Doug Horne suspects that this too may be evidence. "The quality of the recorded image between the sprocket holes is of a markedly different optical character than the remainder of the image in each frame. The author observed on 8/02/96 that the image content between the sprocket holes, although contiguous (he means *continuous*, I believe) with the image in the remainder of each frame, has a different optical texture than the remainder of the image in the rest of each frame outside the sprocket holes: namely, that it exhibits a 'silvery' tint overlaid onto the color image, and that the intensity of the portion of the color image between the sprocket holes is markedly subdued, when compared to the extremely bright color intensity in the

remainder of each frame. This difference in color balance gives the lay person viewing individual frames of the film the subjective impression of a 'boundary layer' between the sprocket-hole portion of each frame. The author could not help but wonder whether this observed phenomenon was evidence of an altered, duplicated and 'reconstructed' new 8 mm film, represented to be the 'camera original,' but which bears traces of reconstruction along the border normally masked out by duplicate copies by most optical printers." Horne speculates that someone might come up with an innocent explanation based on the design of the camera shutter, or the relationship of the lens with the extreme edge of the film plane, with further study. [2]

8) Witnesses (Zapruder's partner Irwin Schwartz among them who saw the film some 15 times that weekend, plus Beverly Oliver who also was shooting film, and Chester Breneman who saw large blow-ups from the frames) said that they saw globs of matter actually come out of the back of JFK's head, which is blacked out in the film. One version I saw long ago had what looked like the squiggles of a pen blacking out that area, where all are agreed there was a lack of both scalp and bone. If this was so, then the blob frames had to be removed from the film, according to some researchers, and this accounted for the speeded up backward head snap. The forgers did not want the head to be going back, as though from a shot from in front, but it was worse to have the blobs coming out very noticeably from the back of the head, far better proof of a shot from in front, so they removed those frames and this speeded up the backward head snap. Dan Rather of CBS stated that the head moved forward with great force when Kennedy was shot there, as the FBI's Cartha DeLoach also wrote. It is not reasonable that he made a mistake about that—an event now removed from the film except for one frame evidently left in by mistake. "Rather did not describe the violent head-snap to the rear which is on the film today, that a more gradual motion of the President's head to the rear after a second shot must have been artificially accelerated by the removal of exit debris frames, and that the resulting creation of a new movie inadvertently created the artifact of the violent head-

snap. In other words, a 'politically correct' violent forward motion may have been removed because a timing problem, in relation to other shots, may have constituted proof of conspiracy; however, the accompanying footage inadvertently created the dramatic—and unacceptable—impression of a shot from the front, causing the film to be 'placed under wraps' and not shown as a motion picture for years. This scenario is one possible explanation for why Time-Life paid an extra \$100,000 for motion picture rights to the Zapruder film, but never exploited it as a motion picture." [3]

"Researchers believe that intermittent, alternating frames showing a greatly slowed, or stopped limousine may have been removed from the film, thus creating the impression that the motorcade kept moving at all times. The result would have been a photographically created 'new' original." [4]

Some think that the double images of some objects and lack of them in the same frames in frames 294, 308, 311, 313, 314 are evidence of manipulation of the film.

9) Daryll Weatherly and I worked with CD 298 which was the FBI memo to the Warren Commission on their reconstruction of the crime, and they measured the distance from where the shot hit JFK in the head to the assassin's window as 307 feet. The survey plat map, CE 585, lists it as 294 feet. The Warren Report lists it as 265. Horne tells us what we researchers think when he says that some of us "feel that the reason for the discrepancy is that the measurements . . . were obtained by study of an unaltered film prior to removal of frames, and that the changed distance to the sniper's nest in the published Warren Report reflects study of an altered version of the Zapruder film—a version with many frames removed." [5] My chapter on the trajectory analysis in *Killing Kennedy* went into this in great detail, but we knew from the FBI's CD 298 that they used another film, that of Beverly Oliver (they called her Orville Nix, but he was a block away), and placed the camera person precisely where we see her in surviving photos of the bystanders. You can see her placed on the inside cover of Trask's book, *Pictures of the Pain*, and you can work out the FBI's measurements on the six foot plat of

Dealey Plaza obtainable from Robert Cutler. The facts are that there were two head shots, one about where we see it now, and one much closer to the bridge. The difference in the two widest separated figures above is 42 feet, and that is exactly the length farther down the street where the final shot to the head from in front actually happened. The two head shots were composited into one. We now see the fatal shot directly opposite Zapruder when the roll bar of the car is perpendicular.

10) The Nix film not only shows an entirely different event with Clint Hill putting Jackie back in her seat, his arms around her, but it shows a rearward motion of Kennedy's head much slower and less violent.

11) Doug Horne's interview with Frank Sloan formerly of the Jamieson Lab elicited this: He "suggested that one way to check whether the films in the Archives represented to be first-generation copies really are first-generation, would be as follows: since the Jamieson Film Co. ran off contact prints, he said a first-generation contact print should be read "correctly" (i.e., not backwards) on the *base side* (i.e., the shiny side), not the *emulsion side* (i.e., the dull side)." This is the *opposite* of what we've been told. *According to this, we don't have and can't have first generation copies, because the only way to read the films in the National Archives correctly is emulsion side up.*

Not enough work has been done on this question. In fact no work was done on it. If Sloan is right, the basic assumption about the copies has been wrong all the time.

Doug Horne, the government military documents analyst, brought his mind to bear on these problems and was listening to me when I wrote my books saying the film was false. He writes, "If wounds were altered, (i.e., a rear head wound blacked out, and a large wound painted onto the right side of the head) on the Zapruder film (the President's head wound), then one possible explanation is that use of selected frames from that film could be used, when necessary, to impugn the Parkland and Dallas eyewitness observations of the President's head wound. Without a Zapruder film showing a massive wound to the right side of the President's head, and no clearly visible

wound to the back of his head, 'all medical witnesses are equal,' and Parkland eyewitness observations would theoretically carry equal weight with Bethesda eyewitness observations; however, an altered Zapruder film, this explanation posits, would discredit Parkland and Dealey Plaza observations, support the Bethesda autopsy conclusions (regardless of the head-snap), and defuse the Parkland vs. Bethesda dichotomy in wounds observed by relegating the Parkland observations to 'error typical of Trauma room observers—made cursorily and in haste.'" [6]

David Mantik compiled a list of 20 reasons showing that the Zapruder film was altered, and these may be seen at the end of the 1998 edition of my *High Treason*, on page 545.

Allen Lewis, a supervisor who works for Les Waffin, has closely observed all of our work on the film since early January, 1998. During our April visit in 1999, Lewis, Waffin, and Charley Mayn worked with us for the entire four hours, all of us standing on our feet. It was tough.

The use of *reductio ad absurdum* arguments to discount film alteration is not a correct method of examining the issue. We have to examine the empirical evidence, *a posteriori* tested with the scientific method to come to a conclusion.

The Copying of the Zapruder Film, November 22, 1963

Bruce Jamieson, the man who owned the lab that copied the film the day of the assassination, wrote me that, "Thus in Zapruder's original film, the area between the sprocket holes will include parts of the scene and *with no dividing line to separate it*. This will be true of *all* scenes whether shot on the first half or the second half of the roll. Note that this area between sprocket holes will not show on the screen when projected because it will be masked off by the projector aperture." [7]

I had two long interviews and several short talks with Bruce Jamieson, the man who owned the lab where Zapruder took his film after it was processed the day of the assassination in order to make copies. Jamieson explained to me the technology involved in copying the film. Officially, and according to Jamieson, three copies were made. He was not present

in the darkroom, and at present, I was unable to locate the technician, Marshal Collier, who actually did the work, but I did talk to his close friend, Robert Colley, who worked in the adjoining darkroom. Colley was familiar with the facts.

It is essential to impart some understanding of the processes that were used on the day of the assassination to copy and process the film. There is a lot of confusion, and it is not easy to sort through, let alone grasp the technology itself.

The first possible major misconception or misunderstanding is the surmise of Kodak's Roland Zavada and Dr. David Mantik [8] that the intersprocket area of only one side of the film (the motorcade sequence) was copied at the Jamieson film lab. Intersprocket images are on the home movie segment that were perfect continuations of the images in the central frame, and from what Jamieson told me, the intersprocket areas of the motorcade sequence also had to have been copied. I have more about this later. *Some* of the home movie segments do not have such intersprocket images, and therefore, the film strips we have seen so far were manufactured, in some cases, having physical splices or copies of same which are visible. But have we yet seen the actual copies made in Dallas? We know that ninety frames were removed from one Secret Service copy of the home movie.

It makes no sense to me that Jamieson Lab, knowing how important the film was, with a SS man standing there, would copy the intersprocket area on the home movie section of the film, which meant nothing, and not on the assassination sequence, and by the same token, Kodak would have a processing machine that did not place the date and lab identification on only the home movie side of the film when their own film had the manufacturer's code edge printed on both sides. One could put this down to technological failures or incompetence, but it has to be considered with the over all picture of too many doors closed to us when trying to authenticate the film or show the lack thereof.

In a (second) long interview with Bruce Jamieson on January 22, 1998, he told me that both printers which he had, the Bell & Howell Model "J" and his custom made model, were contact printers. The Bell

& Howell was used for simple 16 mm pix film printing and that was what Jamieson Lab used the day of the assassination. His custom made model had three heads and was for making professional pix and sound release prints, and was intended to allow modifications of individual scenes where it was under-exposed, over-exposed, or a stretch of film needed filtering. Since no modifications of the Zapruder film were required, the custom printer was not used, we are now told. Jamieson was not in the lab during the printing, but he said that what he took to be Secret Service agents were inside the lab with Abraham Zapruder, though not inside the darkroom. Jamieson tells me that Zapruder was actually in the dark room and not just the lab.

The film was camera original and needed only one "pass" (of the film strip) through the printer to make what was called a "daily print" or "work print." This Bell & Howell Model "J" had no scene to scene color changing capability. He said that the Zapruder film would be what they called a "one light print."

The Bell & Howell Model "J" was a "continuous printer" with a sixteen tooth Bell & Howell sprocket, rather than a "step printer." A step printer is a projector looking at a camera—also known as an optical printer.

I asked Jamieson how many copies were made and he promptly responded "three!" I asked him about imperfections: "Unthinkable!" he said. It was unthinkable for any scratch or imperfection to come from the printer's sprocket, such as what we call "The Condor" in the upper sprocket area of this film. The printer has no freeze frame capability, and runs constantly once it is started. Any such imperfection has to be placed there by the camera, other than by such step by step operation.

As I understand it, the grain structure of each film is going to be copied and added to the grain structure of the copy film. A comparison of the grain will reveal this, except for the possibility that the copy receives less or more light and becomes, therefore, darker or lighter, depending. One lab technician urged me to examine the grain of the original for this reason. Doing so, if we indeed have the original film in the National Archives, poses major difficulties, in my

view. A scientific study by outsiders of the films in the Archives, even if skilled and well planned, poses very major difficulties.

Grain in the film may not at all reveal a composite film, but the claim is being made that it can be observed beneath retouching, a theory put forward by Tom Wilson.

Walt Brown, formerly of the Department of Justice, insisted to me that a researcher, who might have had access, has the original Zapruder film.

When Dr. Mantik interviewed Jamieson in July, 1997, Jamieson, who is 72, was not sure what process his technician, Marshal Collier, had used. Collier actually did the printing, and no one has found him to interview (he was last living a few miles north of Enid, Oklahoma). Jamieson had thought that his custom built printer was used for the 16mm film (there is no known printer for an 8 mm film, so when the original 16 mm film came over from Kodak, who had processed it in Dallas, it had not been split into the two 8 mm film strips and spliced together).

After Mantik called, Jamieson called Robert Colley (he could not locate Marshal Collier. Colley and Collier were close friends and later worked together in Houston) and asked him what printer was used and was told that it was his Model "J" Bell & Howell (the same manufacturer who made Zapruder's camera). Meanwhile, Kodak's Roland Zavada, was working closely with the National Archives' engineer Charles Mayn, Archivists Les Waffin and Alan Lewis, and Jeremy Gunn and Doug Horn of the Assassination Records Review Board on a crash study of the authenticity or lack of it of the various films in the Archives. Some of the other films (Muchmore and Nix), as explained below, were found not to be the originals they thought they had. Zavada sent some still pictures of 3"-4" lengths of the home movie film to Jamieson to examine.

The next issue was which of two methods were employed by Collier when he printed Zapruder's Double 8 film with the Bell and Howell. Since the original film was unsplit, it therefore had sprocket holes on *both* sides of the film and thus could be run through the printer in either direction. Normally the original film would be re-wound after each pass through the printer,

so all three prints would have been printed in the same direction. However, since it was in effect a "double proof" original, the film could have been simply re-positioned on the supply flange without reversing and the printing pass therefore going in the opposite direction. Using the same procedure, the third print would be made in the same direction as the first print. The only difference between the second print and the other two (Nos. 1 & 3) would be the position of the *septum* formed on the sprocket edge. As stated above, there would be no "septum," or dividing black line to separate that area from the main picture area. "This 'septum' can only be generated in a printing operation where the segment of film between the sprocket holes is exposed to the duplicating stock by an exposure separate from the picture printing aperture. This is a capability of the Bell & Howell Model J 16 mm printer as described in their operating manual. This printer has a separate aperture along the drive sprocket side intended to print edge number identifications in 16 mm films. This is the source of printing picture between sprocket holes in the Zapruder film and thus creating the septum between it and the main picture area. This septum, however, will only be on one side of the double 8mm film print, the side where the sprocket drives the film. The other row of pictures will not have this septum and may or may not have the image area between sprocket holes. This will depend on whether the print was made with the printing aperture in the 'pix only' position, or 'full frame' position. If the printer operator used the 'pix only' aperture, it would print both rows of images but not the area between sprocket holes on the row opposite the drive sprocket. This area would be black. If he used a "full frame" aperture, it would include printing the sprocket hole area of the opposite picture row, but there would be no septum (black line) on that side. This section of picture would be undivided just like the original film. I believe the 'full frame' aperture was used to print Zapruder's film, which was standard operating procedure," as Jamieson wrote me.[9]

The Model "J" is a contact printer, which meant that an unexposed raw-stock film was placed face to face against the original, processed film with the developed images, and both were exposed to a lamp in-

side the printer to expose the film to the images against it. Zapruder went into the dark room, "and would not let the film out of his sight at any time!" Jamieson told me. The fact that Zapruder maintained the chain of evidence at all times was repeatedly impressed upon me. We were told that it would have been impossible for additional copies to have been struck off at Jamieson, at least, if he was actually in the dark room. Kodak did not have such a printer and evidently did not have the capacity to make copies.

But the Secret Service was given two of the three copies Jamieson and Kodak made late in the day and one of those copies was given to the FBI and flown to Washington that night and the next day was duplicated in the FBI lab. Life Magazine obtained the original and one copy. The origin of the additional copies made that day (see statements of Paul Rothermel in *The Man Who Knew Too Much* by Dick Russell, and in *Killing The Truth*, by the author) for which there is evidence, is still not clear.

Optical printing is a common practice in 16 mm and 35 mm professional film work, but optical printing for 8 mm was unknown. If such a printer did exist and was used, it could print intersprocket areas.[10] An 8 mm printer was never marketed, so it would have to be custom manufactured. One wonders, then, how millions of 8 mm blue movies shot on 8 mm film were copied and distributed.

The giveaway on a film is which side is the "base" or slick, shiny side, and which side has the emulsion and is dull in appearance. This tells us if the film was reversed in the duplication process, the shiny side should show the action as it happened and not a mirror image, as on the flip side. Jamieson asked me pointedly if I could be certain "that the home movie segment is part of the motorcade segment?" By this I take it he meant that it might not have been from the same copy or even on the same roll as the original, and there was certainly evidence that the home movie segment had been manufactured from different films due to damage to some segments.

"When Kodak processed our prints, they slit the film, reversing one so it's all continuous." Jamieson told me that Kodak's Roland Zavada recently reported to him that he had seen both good prints in the Archives

and one was over-exposed. "It can't be mine because we used the same exposure on all three prints." He added that his process added nothing to the film. All edge printing, symbols, and the final registration number punched through the film, and the date were added by the Kodak lab were either on the film or added at Kodak during the processing. An edge number printer also prints over the sprocket area.

Jamieson had a further comment in the letter cited above about the edge printing seen in the Archives copies: "*The NOV 63 markings were placed on the films by Kodak processing lab in Dallas. Whether these are placed on both edges of the Double 8 mm film in processing, I don't know for sure, but I strongly suspect they were.* I seriously doubt that this edge marking would be printed through to subsequent generations because of the complexity of the equipment required. I therefore suspect that all prints made after the film left Dallas will have black inter-sprocket hole areas all the way to the outer edge, and would contain only those markings that Kodak applies to the print film in manufacture or in processing." We only have the NOV 63 date on the home movie side.

Later Jamieson suggests that "Any information you could develop to identify the name, or design, or characteristics of printers used by the FBI, Secret Service, or Life Magazine, etc. in making additional 8 mm copies would be very helpful in suggesting the source of these prints. I am not aware of any professional made printing machine for 8 mm film strips. However, I feel very strongly that any such printing equipment would print only the picture area to be projected, not the inter-sprocket area or edge information outside the sprocket holes. All prints made subsequent to November 22, 1963 on 8 mm film should have only BLACK inside of the sprocket hole area.

"I cannot envision any technique or printing method for 8 mm films that would transfer the NOV 63 identification markings that are on the Zapruder original film and the three Jamieson prints. When you see that symbol on a strip of film, it has to be one of the above, and the quick 'read correctly through the base or emulsion' test will readily identify it as original or print. *Because it was applied at some constant interval, any sudden discontinuance of that marking would be a*

clue that a film change or substitution had occurred (emphasis added)." I'm sure there was customized equipment around that would do most of what the forgers needed to make the film and its copies look relatively authentic. But mistakes were made.

The interior of the printing machine used by Jamieson had a lamp whose light was divided so that part of it could be directed into the sprocket area as far as the edge printing on the drive sprocket side of the film to expose it to the light and therefore be sure it is copied. "The original home movie and the motorcade segments will have the intersprocket area images but will not have the septum line," Jamieson told me. But with the copies, "We now have a septum on prints made by Jamieson. The Bell & Howell would have created a septum line on one side of the film only, not both sides." Jamieson himself saw the edge printing on one sample of the home movie segment only.

During the duplication process in printing film, the intersprocket area does not get the light by exactly the same route in the printer as the central image, and that results in the septum (formed by non-exposure from either the "picture" printing aperture or the "edge" printing aperture).

Some slight anomalies might be expected in the intersprocket area from the somewhat re-directed light. What we have not explained yet is the fact that the intersprocket areas, on those copies where we have it in the motorcade sequence, is divided into a lighter top half and a darker bottom half. The major problems which show up in the intersprocket are will be discussed later in this paper.

The septum creates a thin dark line showing on the film dividing the central image from the intersprocket area images. This is a clue to look for when examining copies. The septum is a shadow, as I understand it, caused by light from both sides of the flange carrying the printer's sprocket teeth.

The Bell & Howell Model J printer's aperture could be adjusted to do three things: to make film frames only, or make pictures and sound, or have sound only. The printing aperture was adjustable. The sprocket wheel was on one side only because the sound track was on the other side for 16mm film.

The Archives's own documentation states that the Secret Service copies were made by Time-Life. If so, they could not have been made in Dallas that day by Jamieson. Mantik wrote that Jamieson "recalled that for 16 mm film only one intersprocket image was copied. The other side was masked out—so that a sound track could be installed there. He also recalled that their contact printer was custom built and was of very high quality, perhaps even superior to Bell and Howell's version. But if Jamieson's memory is correct. . . then the absence of intersprocket images in the first generation copies of the motorcade made by him should not have been a surprise to me." [11]

Jamieson's Bell & Howell, which he tells me did in fact copy the film, also copied the intersprocket areas from the original. The fact that the Archives copies allegedly from the Secret Service (like the FBI copy of one of those films) do not have intersprocket areas in the motorcade sequences, means to many researchers that they are later generation copies and not those which the agencies worked with. Where are they?

Original camera film travels through the camera heads down with emulsion towards the light. The image formed by the lens on the film for exposure is inverted to heads down and also reversed left to right. Therefore, to correctly view this scene (as thus photographed), you would have to hold it heads up and view through the base. If you view it through the emulsion, it will be reversed left to right.

If you hold a print up to the light and look through the emulsion, you will read it correctly through the emulsion and have a correct left to right image. If you make a contact print emulsion to emulsion of an A Wind print—the result will be a B-Wind second generation print.

Robert Colley, one of the technicians at Jamieson has again patiently explained to me the sequence of making copies. The printer may only copy the edge printing and sprocket hole images on one side of the 16 mm roll. "The aperture may not have been wide open, but it would have been the most natural thing in the world to have it open, and this would have printed the edge printing on at least one side. My guess is that he turned it around, tails to heads." The camera film had sprocket holes on each side of the film,

which was turned over after one pass was made.

There were sprocket hole images, of course, on both the home movie (one side of the camera 16 mm film before it was turned over) and the motorcade sequence on the original. The slides made by *Life* have sprocket hole information, as does part of the home movie. What we don't know is whether or not the copies made at Jamieson copied sprocket hole information onto the copies of the motorcade sequence on the third copy.

Doug Horne of the ARRB writes that he looked at it in 1997. I don't find answers to the questions we want to know, as he says it is badly damaged. He writes that it has "poor quality images" between the sprocket holes of the home movie, the colors are "unusually vivid." He could not see the punched through number, either 0185 or 0187, but he explained to Dr. David Mantik that he did not completely unroll the film, thus blowing a priceless opportunity. In addition, we still don't know if this film would tell us if the original film was not rewound during copying (fed tails first into the printer) or if there are intersprocket images on the assassination sequence.

The printer prints sprocket hole information and edge printing only on one side by means of the "edge aperture" of the printer, as Jamieson noted for me on this manuscript.

If printed "full frame," intersprocket picture images will appear on both sides, but the septum will appear on only one side. The septum will alternate sides if multiple printing of Jamieson was done without re-winding between each pass. Jamieson comments that "this statement applies only to the Jamieson prints."

A 16 mm camera and printer is considered "professional," and an 8 mm is not. Zapruder's camera was a "Double 8," and not professional.

There are at this time 21 copies of the Zapruder film in the National Archives. All would have to be studied in order to catalog more precisely what they actually are. The FBI evidently collected a few more copies as the years passed.

An additional question arises when we consider the fact that none of the present Secret Service, FBI and other copies of the motorcade sequences have sprocket hole information and are simply black in that

area, even though the original certainly had a more or less complete photographic image extended through the camera aperture from the central image on the frame to the left hand edge of the intersprocket area. One of the strange things is that Secret Service Copy 1 was made from the original film and not a copy, yet has no sprocket hole information. Since the home movie film spliced to its end (mislabeled: the "Head") has intersprocket images, this is very strange.

Jamieson thinks that Zapruder might have stopped the camera after the lead motorcycles passed, and waited for the rest of the motorcade. Sometimes, he says, an amateur camera operator does not know when he has the camera on or off. A giveaway, he said, sometimes is that the last frame of the motorcycle sequence, Z-132, would be lighter than the preceding frames because the lens was still open when the camera stopped, but we found this was not so.

Additional Copies of the Zapruder Film Observed at the National Archives

Doug Mizzer and I undertook to examine all of the copies of the Zapruder film, along with some others in the Archives. This is a long term project and will be ongoing when time permits. On January 27-28, we studied, as best we could, seven more films. At the end of the day, we were allowed to begin unrolling the films on a long light table and we put two films side by side. By lining up the first appearance of the limousine (frame 133) in two films, we made an almost startling discovery. ***There are more frames in some sequences in one film than in others.***

We did this with a Zapruder copy inventoried as "Citizen Kirk Miller" film, putting this alongside Item No. 200.436

I would like to comment on the great difficulty of examining these films. I have undoubtedly made mistakes in reporting detail, or made omissions. It would take repeated journeys to the Archives, which is not easy for most, and it takes a great deal of their time and money to provide a fairly high level staff member to baby sit the researcher, monitor everything for security purposes, and offer suggestions. Doug Mizzer, David Mantik and I were treated with unfailing courtesy and assistance. It is going to take a major amount of time and money to check what the Archives has

and assist them to a certain extent with corrections in their records and identification of the materials. This is a big job, no matter how you cut it.

In addition, it takes very good eyes and a lot of care.

My Own Observations

Originally, I felt, as have many researchers, that the line of some fourteen bystanders to the East of the Stemmons sign were a little too inert, and appeared to be inserted as a set piece in composite frames. I think I detected one person applauding slightly in a couple of frames upon another examination of the film. The observation of possible hand movement must be made over the woman's shoulder, since we cannot see her front, so if she is in fact clapping her hands once, it is very difficult to see and then only a tiny part of her hand. Nevertheless, I think it more than odd that this particular line of people is so emotionless, and I think therefore it is suspicious.

Long ago I was concerned about what might be called the "frozen tableau" in the car before the head shot for many frames and mentioned this in my book. Nobody moves in the back seats until Connally turns. This was also referred to by *Time Magazine* and *Newsweek* long before in those terms (being frozen in place).

One of the strangest things on the slides in the Archives is the appearance of a large narrow banded red ring all the way around John Connally's head in frame 344.

In my second book, *High Treason 2*, I pointed out both the "blob," as I called it on Kennedy's face, and the apparent disappearance of his face and the front of his head (the "Stump"). I stick by The Blob, in spite of the furious assault on it at the time, but am keeping an open mind on the disappearance of Kennedy's face, until better prints are available. It is more than obvious that the huge wound on the front of the head ("The Blob") is a painted special effect.

David Lifton mentions it, but gives us no inkling whatsoever as to what the wound might mean, other than mentioning that there was no evidence for it at Parkland.[12] Some maintain that it is merely scalp and perhaps bone laid back and falling down, glistening in the sunlight, except that there was no evidence for such a wound, either, and it seems improbable. It appears very three dimensional, and it also appears as an obvious special effect that was painted and then matted onto

a new copy of the film.

I first wrote that it was a painted special effect.[13] Noel Twyman speaks of Dr. Roderick Ryan, an expert on film, trying to explain "The Blob" on Kennedy's face after the fatal head shot. Twyman quotes doctor Ryan as saying "it looked as if the blobs had been painted in." [14]

JFK's extraordinarily mottled and puffy face is so pronounced prior to the head shot, it is very unnatural, and I urge every student of this case to study it on the film, because it is not real. There are a series of very large, round bumps on his face. Extraordinarily puffy, it seems to me.

Notes

1. David Mantik, M.D., *Assassination Science*, 1996, p. 327.
2. Doug Horne, ARRB memo "Rationale for Having an Independent Third Party Examine the Authenticity of the Zapruder Film," p.3.
3. Horne, ARRB, *Reasons Why Some Researchers Doubt the Authenticity of What Is Purported to be the Original Zapruder Film*, 28 March, 1997, p. 3-4.
4. Horne, ARRB, *Reasons Why Some Researchers Doubt the Authenticity of What Is Purported to be the Original Zapruder Film*, 28 March, 1997, p. 1.
5. Horne, *Ibid*, p. 5.
6. Horne, ARRB, *Reasons Why Some Researchers Doubt the Authenticity of What Is Purported to be the Original Zapruder Film*, 28 March, 1997, p.6.
7. Letter of Bruce Jamieson to H. Livingstone, February 4, 1998.
8. *Assassination Science* (Catfeet Press, Chicago, 1997, assembled by James Fetzer, p. 325 of David Mantik's article.)
9. Jamieson to author, January 17, 1998.
10. *Assassination Science* edited by Fetzer, p.325.
11. Doug Horne, ARRB memo, "Examination of LMH Company Zapruder films in the Office of Jamie Silverberg on April 10, 1997," p. 2. This memo is dated 11 April with corrections 15 April, 1997.
12. David Lifton, *Best Evidence*, MacMillan, 1980, p. fn. 555-7.
13. Livingstone, *High Treason 2*, Carroll & Graf, 1992, p. 366, top.
14. Noel Twyman, *Bloody Treason*, 1997, Laurel Publishing, p. 160.

WITH MALICE: A REVIEW

by
William Weston

Dale K. Myers, **With Malice: Lee Harvey Oswald and the Murder of Officer J. D. Tippit** (Dallas: Oak Cliff Press, 1998).

In Noel Twyman's massive and eminently superb **Bloody Treason** the reader may turn to the section on the shooting of Officer J.D. Tippit with the hope of discovering something new. What he finds instead is a short rehash of what has been written a hundred times before, followed by an admission of an inability to do a better treatment. "I decided at this point," he writes, "not to pursue the murder of Tippit further, however fascinating the mystery."

This is not meant to be a criticism of Twyman. He is a brilliant writer who has gone to an immense amount of trouble and expense to find new witnesses and new documents to broaden our understanding of the JFK assassination. Yet for some reason he could not bring himself to look deeper into the Tippit case, even though he had a great interest in it.

There are certainly a lot of tantalizing loose ends which indicate that an in-depth analysis of this case would be highly worthwhile. Some of these loose ends are: a) the double tap on a police car horn when Oswald was in his rooming house; b) the absence of the initials "JMP" indicating a shell game with the shells; c) a voice in a darkened theater crying out as the suspect was being subdued "Kill the President, will you?" - an indication of foreknowledge of the patsy's role in both crimes; d) Harry Olsen, a patrolman and husband of a Carousel Club girl, guarding an unknown "estate" near the intersection of Eighth and Lancaster, the last location where Tippit contacted the dispatcher; e) a license plate number - PP4537 - yielding connections to Oswald, a friend of Tippit's, a company involved in covert activities, and Vice President Johnson. These disconnected bits of data are enough to demonstrate that a proper understand-

ing of what happened to Tippit would be essential in finding out what happened to JFK.

There have certainly been no lack of in-depth analyses of the Dealey Plaza shooting. Hundreds, if not thousands, of articles and books have been printed in the last thirty-five years. Yet the circumstances surrounding the Tippit murder remain largely untouched. It is rare to find a book or article that offers new information. The reason for this discrepancy is that the shooting at Tenth and Patton occurred within a local setting, where secrets could be more easily guarded. What happened to the President occurred within the realm of national politics and thus more prone to leaks.

Finding people who know something about the Tippit case and willing to answer questions is by no means an easy endeavor. When Mark Lane tried to interview eyewitness Domingo Benavides, the police got wind of this contact and scared Benavides away. Lane managed to get a phone interview with Helen Markham only by deceiving her with a ruse. Henry Hurt found Warren Reynolds and asked him if he would be willing to do an interview. Reynolds only smiled and refused to answer any questions about any aspect of the matter. Eyewitnesses, family members, and fellow police officers have consistently avoided talking about the case with outsiders, or if they do talk about it, they rarely, if ever, go beyond the boundary that encloses the official story. This impenetrable wall of reticence seems to suggest that some of these people are harboring some dark and guilty secret. What sort of secret could they be hiding? The betrayal of a friend and fellow citizen, perhaps?

Considering the immense difficulty of finding new information, any article or book that advances our knowledge of the Tippit shooting gets my vote as being a valuable contribution to the JFK assassination literature. And if I find an entire book devoted to the subject, I would regard it as nothing short of a miracle.

Such a book has been published. Dale Myers' hefty tome **With Malice: Oswald and the Murder of Officer J.D. Tippit** is the fruit of some twenty years of research. He has located some of the participants, gained their trust, and got some important questions answered. Furthermore, he has put all this great research into a book of exceptional quality. From the

William Weston
10291 D'Este Dr.
Anaheim, CA 92804

dust jacket, to the binding, to the crispness of the paper, to the clarity of the pictures, to the visual appeal of the text, this is the work of someone who knows and values the craftsmanship of fine books.

Just turning the pages and looking at the pictures is enough to convince the reader that he got his money's worth. Myers has collected some never-before-seen photographs and has given them generous amounts of space in his book. In one picture we see eyewitness William Smith and his brother Carl watching police activity around Tippit's car. In another picture we see Bernard Haire in front of a furniture store, watching police cars as they were pulling up in front of the theater. In still another picture we see William Scoggins, William Whaley, and Roger Craig in a hallway at the police station.

These fascinating pictures, as well as the book's outstanding design qualities, are unfortunately marred by a text that is often irritating to read. Myers has a condescending attitude towards the so-called "conspiracy buffs" - the same ones who compose the 99.99% of the people who actually buy and read his book. Also aggravating are some ludicrous statements, which he parades before the reader as if they are jewels of academic insight. For instance, he disputes Helen Markham's assertion that she left her home at 1:04 in order to catch the bus that was due to arrive at Jefferson and Patton at 1:12. Instead he has her leaving the apartment at 1:12. According to this chronology, Markham would have missed her bus before she even had a chance to get out the door. Obviously this is absurd.

In spite of these drawbacks, Myers' book is worth reading. It provides new and detailed perspectives on many different aspects of the case. Let us start with the erratic travels of Ron Nelson, the patrolman who was ordered to report to Oak Cliff along with J.D. Tippit. Three minutes after receiving this order Nelson contacted the dispatcher at 12:49 and said, "I'm on the south end of the Houston Street viaduct." This was the location of the GLOCO gas station, where Tippit was to appear shortly before 1:00. Did Nelson and Tippit have some sort of clandestine meeting together? Or was Nelson keeping Tippit under surveillance? Myers seems to recognize that something

strange was going on, for he says that Nelson's subsequent move toward the assassination site without a specific instruction from the dispatcher remains a mystery.

The suspicious activities of Nelson do not end with his unexplained appearance in Dealey Plaza. At 1:22 the dispatcher orders Nelson to go to a service station at 4340 West Davis to investigate a report of a suspicious car that was possibly connected to the assassination of the President. When Nelson got there, he spoke with a service station attendant who saw a late model white station wagon with a luggage rack on top bearing a license plate number that started with the letters PK. In the car were two white males. A shotgun or a rifle was seen in the back seat. After stopping at the gas station to get gas, the two men proceeded east on Davis Street - toward the location of Tenth and Patton. The car was last seen in the vicinity of the 500 block of West Jefferson. Apparently a citizen was following the station wagon as it was heading towards this area.

Was this car the mysterious Nash Rambler station wagon seen by Deputy Roger Craig in Dealey Plaza? At 12:45 Craig saw the driver of the Rambler stop on Elm Street and pick up a man who looked like Oswald. Thirty minutes later, according to Myers, the police dispatcher was linking this car to both the Kennedy assassination and the Tippit shooting. He also notes that the road on which the Rambler was traveling turned into a toll-road that met West Davis in the 4300 block. "Curiously," Myers writes, "Davis Street passes within 5 blocks of where Oswald was last seen at a bus stop [near his rooming house], and only two blocks from where Tippit was shot. In fact the station wagon was last reported in the area of West Jefferson shortly after the Tippit slaying."

Lest anyone think that Myers is turning into a conspiracy nut, he ends this analysis with a negative remark about Craig's ability to remember things accurately. This polemical tactic - the faulty memory allegation - is frequently used by Myers to close off discussions of controversial topics. Another tactic he favors is ridiculing the intelligence of the reporting observer, as in the case of his examination of Gerald Hill's statement over the radio, "The shells at the scene

indicate that the suspect is armed with an automatic 38." This statement has been the source of endless controversy, for if the shells at the scene came from an automatic, then Oswald could not have been the one who shot Tippit. He was armed with a revolver when he was arrested at the theater. Obviously Myers had to confront this issue head on, or else lose the debate entirely.

Hill was certainly not a novice when it came to identifying shells and ammunition, for he had been on the police force since 1958. Yet it is possible that he might have made an innocent mistake. Myers arranged to have an interview with him, hoping that a candid conversation would elicit a response that would finally vanquish those vexatious critics of the Warren Commission.

The conversation immediately began to get interesting when Myers had to break the news that Hill's original claim that someone else made the erroneous identification was simply not true. Myers checked the voice pattern on the audio recording, and the voice was unmistakably Hill's. Having been caught in a lie, Hill tried a different tack. He said that when he first saw the shells, he casually observed the scatter pattern they made on the ground and wrongly assumed that they had been ejected from an automatic pistol. Myers was perfectly willing to accept this explanation and moved on to the next question. How did Hill determine that the caliber of these shells were thirty-eights? Hill said, "You can tell that from the shell. Thirty-eight's stamped on the bottom of it. I looked at the bottom."

Once again the hapless detective had stuck his foot in his mouth. Anyone looking at the bottom of a shell to determine its caliber could not avoid seeing that it came from either an automatic or a revolver. Automatic shells are stamped "38 AUTO." The shells from Oswald's revolver are stamped "38 SPL," which meant that they were made for a Special revolver. At this point, Hill's credibility had sunk so low that Myers could do nothing more to help him. Instead he finishes him off with this quote from James Leavelle: "There were no automatic hulls there. I looked at them and they were revolver hulls. Captain Westbrook later commented to me that an officer right out of recruit

school could have seen the difference in those two kinds of hulls."

Notwithstanding Leavelle's assertion to the contrary, Hill's statement on the radio should be regarded as the correct one. Corroborating this statement is a 1996 interview Myers had with eyewitness Ted Callaway. If any one knows what weapons look like, this witness should. He was a captain in the Marine Corps during World War II and he himself carried an automatic. He happened to be the witness who reported to the police that the suspect was carrying a thirty-two automatic with a dark finish. Callaway told Myers that the way the gunman was carrying the weapon indicated right away that it was an automatic. He was holding it high and pointing it up, which was the correct way of carrying it. The correct way of carrying a revolver is to point it toward the ground. Although a slight error was made about the caliber, Callaway's expertise on the subject cannot be easily dismissed.

Although detrimental to the official version, Myers' presentation of Callaway's views is a credit to his integrity as a scholar. His willingness to present a balanced discussion of the facts before reaching his own conclusion is a positive attribute that redeems his habit of using sarcasm and specious arguments. Occasionally, his presentation of the evidence supporting the case for conspiracy is so thorough that he gets himself into trouble. For instance, Myers agrees with the official version that Tippit was shot once in the head, through the right temple. Yet there is strong evidence to believe that Tippit was also shot in the forehead - an indication that he was killed by a professional rather than by a panicky patsy on the run. In support of the existence of the forehead shot, Myers cites the following: (1) Captain Glen D. King in 1964 referred to two wounds in the head in a presentation of the facts of the case. He said that "three shots struck Tippit - in the temple, the forehead, and the chest." (2) Helen Markham told Mark Lane that Tippit was shot twice in the head. (3) In Jim Bishop's book **The Day Kennedy Was Shot** a reference was made to a wound in the middle of Tippit's forehead. (4) In James Hosty's 1996 book **Assignment: Oswald**, he wrote that Tippit was shot in the forehead and in the temple. (5) Gerald Hill told a news reporter on November 22, 1963 that

Tippit was shot twice in the head. (Hill actually stated that both wounds were in the forehead, yet it is possible that he might have misunderstood what his source really said.)

At this point Myers had a built up a case for the opposing viewpoint that was so formidable, that I became rather curious to see what he had to say in response.

The strongest piece of evidence that there was only one head wound was the autopsy report itself. Yet as Myers fully realizes, autopsy reports related to the JFK assassination are not as reputable as they used to be. He needed something more. What does he find? To make a long argument short, Myers singles out a Polaroid snapshot taken during the autopsy which shows the upper half of Tippit's body. Plainly the forehead shows no bullet hole, and Myers is triumphant. Of course the mere mention of the possibility that the snapshot might have been . . . ahem, retouched perhaps? . . . would be fatal to his argument, and obviously he does not address this.

Another fascinating section in Myers' book is the one dealing with the possible discovery of Oswald's wallet at the scene of the crime. This was first raised in Hosty's book **Assignment: Oswald**. According to Hosty, fellow FBI agent Bob Barrett was standing near Tippit's squad car, as the police were looking for clues. Near the blood stain where Tippit's body had been, Captain Westbrook found a man's leather wallet. Contained within it were identification cards for two names: Lee Oswald and Alek J. Hidell. Westbrook asked Barrett if these names were familiar to him, and Barrett said no.

To find out more about this wallet, Myers interviewed Barrett in 1996 (who by the way is not the mystery FBI man picking up a stray bullet in Dealey Plaza, as pictures of Barrett amply make clear). Barrett clearly recalled the circumstances of that day and confirmed the accuracy of the statements in Hosty's book. Backing up Barrett's claim is some news footage of three policemen examining the wallet - Captain Westbrook, Captain Doughty, and Sergeant Owens. Myers reproduces two pictures from this film in his book. The wallet being examined by the three policemen was distinctly different from the arrest

wallet that is now in the National Archives. It is also different from the brown wallet, the red wallet, and the black wallet - the three wallets found at Ruth Paine's house. (Oswald must have had a passion for collecting wallets.) Additional corroboration of Barrett's story came from Detective Paul Bentley, one of the arresting officers who was sitting next to Oswald as he was being driven to the police department. Of that ride in the car, Bentley recalled that "We were not aware that we had anybody connected with the assassination. When the dispatcher asked the name of our suspect, that's when we had the wallet and went through the wallet getting the names that Oswald had in his wallet and gave them to the dispatcher. We were told then to bring him directly to Captain Fritz's office, that he was a prime suspect in the assassination of the president and the wounding of Governor Connally."

Bentley's recollections raise the question of how the radio dispatcher happened to have prior knowledge of the two names the suspect had in his wallet. Where else could he have gotten this information other than from Westbrook, the man who found a second wallet at the scene of the crime?

As elsewhere in his book, Myers' love for details has once again weakened the foundation of the official version. To shore it back up, he tries asking Barrett a leading question. Perhaps the retired FBI agent had made a mistake regarding the time and location of where the wallet was seen. Is it possible, Myers asked, that he might have heard Westbrook speaking about the wallet at the police station sometime later in the afternoon rather than at the scene of the crime? If that were the case, then no doubt Barrett must have been hearing about Oswald's arrest wallet, the one taken out of his back pocket on the way to the police station. Unfortunately for Myers, Barrett was not willing to go along with this blatant attempt to manipulate his memory. He said, "The only time I spoke to Westbrook at any time was at the murder scene. And I'm adamant that there was a wallet in somebody's hand and [Westbrook] asked me if I knew who 'Lee Harvey Oswald' was and who 'Hidell' was."

Getting nowhere with Barrett, Myers tried another approach with a different witness. Perhaps the wallet

seen in the news film belonged to one of the eyewitnesses. Probably it was Ted Callaway's, for he might have aroused the suspicions of police officers, when he returned Tippit's gun after a futile vigilante chase. Of course this hypothesis ignores what Barrett had to say, but Myers was beginning to write him off anyway. He went to Callaway and asked him if he ever showed his wallet to the police. Callaway adamantly said no. Once again Myers ran into a dead end.

After these setbacks, the only option remaining was to fall back on the usual imputation of a faulty memory. In Barrett's case, this argument is particularly lame, for in all other respects, Myers deemed him an excellent witness with an excellent memory.

Another messy issue that Myers had trouble explaining away was the whole matter regarding Tippit's presence at Tenth and Patton. Myers, like all Warren Commission apologists, believes that Tippit was simply cruising the neighborhood and stopped at the curb when he saw a suspicious pedestrian. But an alternative explanation holds that Tippit had stopped there to see a girlfriend living in a nearby apartment. The truth about Tippit's girlfriend first became known through an anonymous letter written to District Attorney Jim Garrison on Feb. 5, 1968. According to the letter, Tippit had gotten a married woman pregnant. She was a small, blonde waitress who worked at Austin's Barbecue. Both the waitress and Tippit were seriously considering divorcing their spouses and getting remarried. The very morning he came home for lunch on November 22, he told his wife Marie that he was going to divorce her.

In 1983 Myers discussed this matter with Tom Tilson, a patrolman who had a locker next to Tippit's at the Oak Cliff substation. According to Tilson, "J.D. had this girlfriend that lived in that house, in front of where he was shot and J.D. was bad about going by there." Tilson's revelation goes far in illuminating a cryptic statement made by taxi driver William Scoggins, who said in his testimony to the Warren Commission, "I noticed he stopped down there, and I wasn't paying attention to the man, just used to see him every day." If anyone was in position to know, Scoggins was, for he himself stopped at that corner every day to eat his lunch.

Another cryptic statement regarding Tippit's frequent appearance at Tenth and Patton was made by Virginia Davis. In 1964, during her testimony to the Warren Commission, she was asked to describe where Tippit's car was parked. She said, "It was parked between the hedge that marks the apartment house where he lived next door." It can be assumed from this statement that Tippit was such a frequent visitor to the neighborhood that Davis actually thought he lived there. To settle this matter, Myers managed to locate her in 1997. Davis denied knowing where Tippit lived and said that the first time she saw him was after he was shot and lying in the street.

But what about her statement to the Warren Commission? Davis explained that she was nervous the day she testified and what she really meant to say was "It was parked between the hedge that marks the apartment house where we lived next door." That settles it for Myers, and as for Tilson, well, he was the kind of guy who would make up fictional stories at the drop of a hat.

Since Myers was able to find both Virginia and her sister-in-law Barbara, I would have been more interested in what they had to say about their connection to Jack Ruby. In the March 1985 issue of **The Third Decade**, Jerry Rose wrote an excellent article called "Jack Ruby and J.D. Tippit: Coincidence or Conspiracy," in which he revealed his discovery of a telephone number linking both these witnesses to Ruby. According to Dallas police records, Barbara and Virginia Davis used the number WH 3-8120. This number also appears in Ruby's notebook under the name Leona Miller. As revealed in Commission Exhibits 2282 and 2283, Leona Miller was the maiden name of Leona Lane, a professional photographer at Van Gogh Studios. Both she and her mother, Esther Miller, were natives of Chicago. In 1956, when Esther and Leona decided to move to Dallas, an aunt of Mrs. Phyllis Ruby, the wife of Sam Ruby, suggested that they look Phyllis up when they arrived. They did so and immediately became friends of Phyllis and her husband. Three years later they met Jack Ruby, Sam's brother, at a Passover dinner that was being held in Sam's home.

On the night of November 22, Leona, Esther, and

Leona's two teenage sons went to the Shearith Israel Synagogue to attend a special memorial service that was being held in honor of the late President. When the service was over at 11:00 pm, coffee and refreshments were served in the reception room. Leona, her mother and two sons had been in this room for about five minutes when Leona noticed Jack Ruby standing by himself. Leona had seen Jack about ten or twelve times in the past, but this was the only time she saw him at the synagogue. He was well dressed, and he looked very nervous, upset and depressed. Leona went up to Ruby and greeted him. She introduced him to her mother and sons, reminding him that he had met them once before at Sam's house. After the introductions, Mrs. Lane said how terrible the assassination of President Kennedy had been, and Ruby said, "It is worse than that." Leona and Jack talked about mutual friends for about five minutes, and then they parted. The encounter seems innocent, yet the telephone link is certainly real. Were the "mutual friends" spoken of in their conversation Barbara and Virginia Davis?

Since another Tippit shooting witness, Jack Tatum, was also a photographer, who did freelance work for burlesque clubs and even did one assignment for the Carousel Club, could it be that Leona also did such work? Perhaps that was how she came into contact with the Davis women. The telephone number may be the solution to a whole series of complex conundrums, and since both Davis women are currently alive and willing to answer questions, Myers might have taken the opportunity to probe a little deeper. But perhaps that might be going too far. He might have seen the sign "Do Not Trespass" and chose not to open the door.

There are other opportunities for further research that Myers chose not to pursue. Some are as important as the Miller-Davis phone number and some are trivial. For instance, Myers asked Wayne Tippit about his brother's name J.D. Contrary to what has been maintained in previous books, it does not mean Jefferson Davis. In fact, it does not stand for anything. "It was just an initial name," Wayne said. To satisfy our curiosity, Myers might have gone further and asked Wayne how his parents happened to decide on such

an unusual way of naming their son. Myers also might have asked Wayne if Gayle M. Tippit, a police officer and friend of Jack Ruby, was a family relative.

Still another example of a missed opportunity was a conversation Myers had with Charles Burnley. His name was mentioned by Oswald's landlady Earlene Roberts. She said that two men in a police car named Burnley and Alexander often stopped by the rooming house to see her. On November 22, when Oswald had gone into his room, a car horn from a police car was heard outside, and Roberts thought that the two men inside were her two friends. Since they were not, Roberts paid no further attention to them.

Burnley in his conversation with Myers denied knowing Roberts, and he denied having a partner named Alexander. That does not necessarily settle the matter. Myers should have asked him what the number of his car was, since Roberts had said that "Burnley and Alexander" drove a car marked 170, and the unknown police car had a similar number. Secondly, Myers should have asked Burnley what he was doing around 1:00 pm on November 22, 1963.

These examples of unpursued leads amply demonstrate that Myers' book is by no means the last word on the subject. Despite the size and scope of the book, it is curious that Myers has little to say about Tippit's movements before his death. For that particular subject, the reader should go to Bill Drenas' excellent article "Car #10 Where Are You?"

Whatever may be the truth regarding the Tippit shooting, we know by now that it bears little relation to what we find in the Warren Report. The official version can only hold water by an intricate network of lies and half-truths. Any new facts produced in the course of researching this case are like hammer blows upon the fragile structure of the retaining wall. It would be ironic if the discoveries made by such a dedicated advocate of the Warren Commission version became the means by which the critics of that same version eventually achieve a breakthrough that would bring about its total collapse. Such a downfall would be a good thing for all of us, for then, at last, we shall know the truth and the truth shall make us free.



AN APOLOGY AND A PRAYER FOR VICTORY

by
Daniel Marvin

The truth is what really matters and yet I know only too well that events and circumstances often times hold truth as hostage to fear. I've been through some hard times and dangerous moments, but when faced with potential harm coming to others who I dearly love, I became a victim of the system which had once propelled me as an agent of fear and intimidations against others who I thought at the time to be "enemies of the State".

It was when I first learned that one such target of our Central Intelligence Agency, a Lieutenant Commander William Bruce Pitzer (who the CIA represented to me to be a "traitor") was in fact an honorable Naval officer caught up in the web of deceit that used subterfuge and intimidation to cover-up the facts of the John F. Kennedy assassination, that I decided to do what I could to help surface the truth about Pitzer and the crucial role he played in the overall scheme of things.

Conversations with Pitzer's widow, his two sons, and a nephew who held him up as a hero and mentor, convinced me that Pitzer had valuable evidence and that he had suffered the consequences of his refusal to be a part of the cover up conspiracy.

You, as readers of the FOURTH DECADE, know the rest of the story of my efforts and how I suddenly strayed from the path of those who struggled to carry through to victory over those who engineered and participated in the assassination and its cover up. Once David Vanek denied any recollection of our involvement in a class together at the Special Warfare Center shortly after the Kennedy assassination, the entire Special Forces Association gathered its legal and member resources to go against me. I know what they are capable of as I once shared their philosophy that each must protect the other for the sake

of the organization itself.

When I later, inspired by Robin Palmer, read Dr. William Pepper's revelations surrounding the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., I provided Dr. Pepper with information I felt was relevant to that terrible crime. It was then that the safety of my grandchildren became an issue of great importance to me. I then attempted to extricate myself from the battle to prove that David Vanek or any other former Green Beret had taken the same assassination training as I had, even with me in early 1964 at Fort Bragg, NC. That was one terrible mistake. Instead of confessing my inability to deal with the fear that eroded my confidence in my own ability to protect each and every one of my children and grandchildren, I succumbed to that fear.

Thus I wrote and voiced statements to two men whose loyalty and selfless - indeed courageous support - had given me the encouragement I needed over a long haul to continue in the pursuit of truth. It was I who let them down and I apologize publicly for not staying the course.

I pray that Robin Palmer and Allan Eaglesham, who were those brave supporters, continue to wage the war of truth through to victory. I doubt that I will be of any more help than I have been in the past to reach that goal, but I can assure you readers that I will do nothing further to detract or discourage others from that awesome struggle.

I do believe in my heart that truth will prevail. I am sorry for any roadblock I may have put in any others' path which caused him or her to waiver.

Keep up the good fight!



Lt. Col. Daniel Marvin (USASF-ret'd)
PO Box 538
Cazenovia, NY 13035-0538

EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

MAY 25, 1961

MOSCOW

My
PSS

Dear Sir -

In regard to your letter of
March 24, I understand the reasons
for the necessity of a personal visit
will at the Embassy, however, I would
to make it clear that I am asking
not only for the right to return
to the United States, but also for
full guarantee that I shall
not, under any circumstances, be
prevented for any act pertaining
to this case. I made that clear
from my first letter, although
nothing has been said, even
inquiry, concerning this in my
correspondence with the Embassy.
Unless you honestly think that
this condition can be met, I see
no reason for a continuance of
our correspondence, instead, I shall
endeavour to see my relatives in
the United States, to see about getting

Commission Exhibit No. 252

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Nov. 8, 1953

Dear Mr. Hunt,
I would like information
concerning my position.
I am asking only for information
I am suggesting that we discuss the
matters fully before any steps are
taken by me or anyone else

Thank you,
F. Lee Oswald

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10