

Dear Gary,

1/6/84

Thanks for your letter of 12/30 and enclosure. With regard to Enquirer people, it has been my consistent experience with many of them that one must distinguish between them and that ~~my~~ paper. All I've met have been decent people and none has ever abused me.

With regard to the car (you refer to it as a train) near the TSBd, I am now reminded that Fred Newcomby once had something like this, looking like that car, in perhaps a Willis shot. The picture I referred to in Curry's book (p. 31) also shows cars, but they are parked on the tracks and are not attached to engines so they could not move. Moreover, it appears to be impossible for any of the shooting to have been from any of them. I mean physically impossible.

The Marsh rebuttal of the WAS panel is, in parts, impressive. Other parts I also could not understand. However, where he said more than he had to be erred. One example is on 2, where he has Buddy Walthers in Dealey Plaza directing traffic at the time the motorcade passed... He wasn't. Either. He and the others were against the wall of their building. (On the same page Marsh refers to FBI and WC tapes of the DFD broadcasts. While I'm sure the FBI has and hides them, on the record they do not have any and the WC never did.) It also is questionable when he claims that there is "photographic evidence of a gun at that (grassy knoll) location..." (Page 12)


I wish he'd gone further with crosstalk (page 1), such as by making tests to establish that the words on each channel are identical. This would prove that the crosstalk was introduced when the dubbing was done.

When you see Barger's I'd be interested in going over it.

The time may come when I can be of help with this picture without the enhancement by getting it to someone. Think it over and if you decide this can be so and if you'd like it, let me know and have a sample, of which I'd make no other use.

I have no clear recollection of the prints but I do have of the slide. I suppose this is because of greater magnification. However, a print is easier to handle. And I have in mind not doing this in person but through another who had a very good and interested connection. I also think it would be good to have this up here and available for when they issue the report reflected in the record I sent you. It might get printed then, too, from up here, and that is something separate from what I refer to above, earlier. But it is your work and Jacks, so you decide.

Best wishes,



December 30, 1983

Dear Harold,

Good point on the Frazier/surveillance angle - I'll put it in the next Coverups.

The MIT mess - Schreiber, who is head of the Image Processing Dept, is the one who agreed to look at the picture after David begged and pleaded. Professor Lim and an associate did the actual work. Lim, whose first name I don't remember, is the one who backed out. Schreiber is merely going along with Lim's decision, but ~~mm~~ Schreiber is the one who said we could not have the digitized computer tape. The digitizing was done by the Scitex Corporation, which has facilities a few miles from MIT. Product Manager Eli Israeli oversaw the digitizing and had a copy of the computer tape made for Scitex files; as far as we know, Scitex still has the copy. Israeli is their Product Manager at the home office in Israel.

Just found a note - it's Dr. Bill Schreiber, Professor of Electrical Engineering for the Image Processing Group.

The initial meeting at MIT in Cambridge was with Schreiber, Lim, Israeli (acting as a consultant), David Wright, Jack White and myself. I sat between Lim and Israeli. We showed them exactly what you saw in Washington and the slide Groden had sent. They all saw the image immediately. Their change in expression and attitude was instantaneous. Let me clarify - we first showed them the 8x10 with the overlay.

Lim was so excited his hands were shaking as he held the pictures. His interest and enthusiasm were genuine.

After backgrounding on the picture and details, arrangements were made to transfer the slide image to computer tape. Israeli called his office and set up computer time for first thing the next morning.

David, Jack & I arrived, the image was scanned, and Israeli spent ~~x~~ almost an hour enhancing the image. Everyone in the room, 10-15 people in all, saw the image of a man and were stunned to learn where the picture came from. However, this enhancement session was only to alter brightness and contrast and did not involve computer work. The original image and enhanced versions were stored on tape and a copy was kept at Scitex. We took the original ~~tape~~ to MIT later that morning.

Schreiber took it because Lim was out of his office. Jack & I then flew back to Texas. Early that evening, Lim and an assistant started work on the image. They didn't finish till 8 or 9 the next morning.

In a phone conversation with David, Lim said he had no doubt it was a person. He worked only on the facial features except for a brief period when he concentrated on the "smoke". He was not able to find a gun either through or under that image. He found what he thought was a second man, but he wasn't clear about where (we did explain the Gordon Arnold possibility, which was not known when I wrote the first story for the October 1982 Coverups).

Lim said he would continue on the project and wanted to try out two or three new computer programs which he had developed. He felt they would bring out more detail without adding "noise" to the picture. He also wanted to "get the blessings" of the school before proceeding.

Later that afternoon, Lim "frantically" refused to continue. He did not say why the change in heart, nor did he say it was a school decision. He said if the Enquirer printed a word about any of this he would deny having seen any picture having to do with the assassination. He also refused to talk with any other scientists the Enquirer might contact.

Everything that happened after Jack and I flew home, of course, came from David Wright. I have no reason to doubt him and have, in fact, made the preliminary moves to get another scientist to duplicate the work; however, I won't know more until sometime in January.

Enclosed is a much clearer version of the McIntire photo showing the railroad car. Several of the early Wilma Bond photos also show a moving shape in back of the pergola. The McIntire photo is 15-20 seconds after the head shot. The Stemmons photo you mentioned is anywhere from 1-1½ minutes after the shooting, so the train could have gotten to a location ~~where~~ where it can't be seen. Remember, I've written many times about the "slowdown" or "stop" on the Stemmons access ramp.

I don't know if the train car has any connection, but it was there. I do know it was not crossing the overpass at the time of the shooting, ~~and~~ even though one of the cops said it was.

Barger's refutation is not yet finished - he told me months ago he would send me a copy. The AGC problem, which Barger first suspected, presumably will be part of his report.

Also enclosed is a copy of the rebuttal - both Blakey and Cutler sent me copies. I understand it's pretty good - wish I had the math expertise to understand it.

Thanks again for the introduction to the Enquirer people. I've been treated fairly, and well - hope it continues!

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to be 'C. W. Wright', is written in the lower-left quadrant of the page.