

copy to HOWARD

JFK Deep Politics Quarterly

Vol. 4, #III April, 1999

JFK/ Deep Politics Quarterly

WHY THE ZAPRUDER FILM IS AUTHENTIC

by Josiah Thompson

Editor:

WALT BROWN, Ph.D.

Associate Editor:
VINCE PALAMARA

JFK / Deep Politics Quarterly is published four times a year: January, April, July, and October, and is dedicated to the ongoing study of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and related topics of Intelligence operations, other assassinations, and other issues of "deep politics". We invite responsible articles, commentaries, reviews, and Letters to the Editors. These should not exceed 3,000 words for articles and 1,000 for letters. All materials published will be at the discretion of the editors and are subject to editorial revision. Material derogatory to, or divisive in the spirit of what JFK/DPQ represents will not be accepted.

The opinions and/or conclusions expressed herein are not necessarily those of the editors.

E-mail: jfkdpq2@aol.com

On the World Wide Web:

<http://www.crafti.com.au/~gerlach/jfk.dpq.htm>
webmaster, Steve Gerlach--with deepest thanks!!

Subscription rates are \$26 (USA) for one year (four issues). European countries add \$8.00 (\$14 for 1st class) Please address all inquiries, Letters to the Editors, or subscriptions to:

JFK/ DEEP POLITICS QUARTERLY
PO BOX 174
HILLSDALE, NJ 07642 USA

[ed. note: a brief commentary is necessary to understand the genesis and background of both this article and the nature of the debate. In the previous issue of the *JFK/Deep Politics Quarterly*, a commentary by Greg Jaynes was published which reflected the Thompson-Fetzer "debate" held in November, 1998, in Dallas; in his internet post, titled something like "Thompson kicks Fetzer's a**", Greg Jaynes vented *his* spleen on the Zapruder alteration debate. I then heard immediately from Dr. Fetzer, who demanded I print his commentary, and told me, among other things, that I was under a "moral obligation" to do so, particularly since I had refused to print his rebuttal to a review of his book which appeared in the *JFK/DPQ*. I responded that I had published not one, but two letters of his which addressed points in the review (July, 1998 issue), so he ought to get his story straight, and that I felt no "moral obligation" to clean his laundry, particularly since the promoters of the Thompson-Fetzer debate had turned off the microphone during Fetzer's angry rebuttal. If they felt themselves under no moral obligation, I asked, why should I? He wrote back, in a tone which Josiah Thompson mentions toward the end of the article, to say that since I was hesitant to deal with "the truth," I was really the enemy in disguise. Frankly, I have worked too long and too hard to hear that kind of drivel. From there, Dr. Fetzer went all over the net in a

JFK Deep Politics Quarterly

campaign to force me to publish his rebuttal, even contacting Greg Jaynes. Greg indicated he had not given me the piece, [internet posting makes it "public"], but went on to say that he stood by the content of it and that he perceived Thompson to be the clear winner. That event, too, has a genesis. At COPA 1996, a regional meeting in Dallas, Robert Groden began to introduce a video presentation. Two rows in front of me, Dr. James Fetzer stood and excoriated Groden in front of a sizable crowd, as Groden's video presentation included the Zapruder film, which, according to Fetzer, had been proven to be false during the course of that weekend. "What is your proof?" many yelled, although Dr. Fetzer offered none. I remember turning to watch the crowd and the person yelling to/at Dr. Fetzer the loudest, for proof, was Greg Jaynes. He got no answer from Fetzer, although David Mantik took the microphone [while Fetzer and Groden retreated to the rear of the hall to settle their differences] to explain that the Moorman Polaroid photo shows the background--the knoll--and the foreground--the car--in the same perspective, so they must be traveling at the identical speed. Since the knoll is not moving, then the car cannot be moving, and since the Z film does not show the car to stop, there is a proof of alteration. The rest would wind up in Dr. Fetzer's book. As a subscriber, he will receive this, and he is more than welcome to rebut, line by line, paragraph by paragraph, what Josiah Thompson has to say. I would ask him to please leave my lineage out of it].

DR. THOMPSON: Before turning to the Zapruder film in particular, I want to situate it under a more general horizon. If altered, the Zapruder film would be an

example of a more general phenomenon: the alteration of physical evidence by the authorities in a criminal case. Yes, it does happen. Not often. In fact, it's almost unique.

In over twenty years of experience as a criminal investigator, I've seen it happen only once or twice. But it does happen. In fact, right now I have a death penalty case where I think it happened. Let me tell you about it.

[HERE FOLLOWS A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE POSSIBLE SUBSTITUTION OF A CARTRIDGE CASE BY THE INVESTIGATING OFFICER IN A MURDER CASE.]

Whether or not a substitution was made in this case is not the point. What is the point is the considerations that would make such a substitution plausible, that would make someone even try it: Note first that the crime scene cartridge case was in the custody of the person carrying out the substitution. Note second that, since the cartridge case was linked to no other evidence in the case, once the substitution was made there was no way for it to be discovered. Note third that the person who substituted the cartridge case knew exactly what he had to prove by the substitution.

Now let's try on another hypothetical example for size. Let's say that a particular letter is found at a crime scene. Let's say that that letter was the output of a computer at a remote location. Let's also say that the investigating officer had some incentive to change the wording in the letter.

If you were that investigating officer, what questions would you ask yourself? Wouldn't you first ask whether there were other copies of the letter? Had the writer kept a copy in a safe place or given it to someone else? Was the text of the letter kept on the computer? Even if it

had been deleted from the hard drive of the computer, was there a backup somewhere? The alteration of evidence in a criminal case is a desperate act. Would you take that chance if you knew that irrefutable evidence of the alteration might turn up somewhere else? And how could you ever be sure?

Now let's take a photograph of a crime. First, you'd have to know exactly how you wanted to alter it. Secondly, you'd have to be sure no other copies no negative hidden away, no second copy residing in someone else's possession existed. Thirdly, you'd have to be sure that no other photographs taken by anyone else later would surface to expose the alteration.

With these considerations in mind, consider whether you would undertake to alter the Zapruder film. First, you'd have to know exactly what you wanted to show in your alteration. Second, since the film in question was a movie, you might very well have to alter not just one frame, not just one sequence of frames, but many. Thirdly, what about the other films? At least thirty-eight people were taking pictures that day in Dealey Plaza.

At the very least, the Muchmore and Nix films also would have to be altered.

The Muchmore film was purchased by UPI on Monday, November 25th, and shown the following day on WNEW TV in New York City. On Friday, November 29th, the Nix film was also purchased by UPI and shown the next week in theater newsreels.

But the critical problem for anyone thinking of altering the Zapruder film is not the Muchmore and Nix films. It is all the other films you don't know about--films developed outside Dallas by people from out of state who just happened by...or by foreign tourists who would get their films developed in their home

countries. Any one of these unknown films could expose your alteration.

If one sat down for a long, long time it would be difficult to come up with a situation where alteration was more unlikely than in a film of the assassination of President Kennedy, a murder occurring at noon in a public square in front of hundreds of witnesses, an unknown number of whom were taking photographs of it.

Unlikely? Yes. Foolhardy? Yes. Impossible? No.

What makes it impossible is the actual provenance of the film itself. Recall above the example which showed the foolhardiness of faking a letter if you were not in possession of all the copies. This situation is repeated with respect to the Zapruder film. For a minute, come along with me as we plot Zapruder and his film's movements over that crucial weekend thirty-five years ago...

NOVEMBER 22, 1963

8:00 am Abraham Zapruder arrives at the offices of Jennifer Juniors. Marilyn Sitzman and Lillian Rogers persuade him to retrieve his 8 mm. movie camera from his home.

11:30 am Zapruder returns to his office after retrieving his camera.

12:30 pm Zapruder films the assassination from a pedestal in Dealey Plaza.

12:45 pm Zapruder returns to his office and locks the camera in his safe.

1:30 pm Reporter Harry McCormick takes Secret Service Agent Forrest Sorrels to Zapruder's office. Emotionally upset, Zapruder agrees to furnish Sorrels with a copy of his film if Sorrels will agree that the copy is only for use by the Secret Service and that it would not be shown or given to any media. Sorrels agrees.

1:45 pm Together with Zapruder's partner, Irwin Schwartz, Sorrels, McCormick and Zapruder drive to *Dallas Morning News*. Since they can't process the film, they walk to WFAA TV. Zapruder is interviewed live; Schwartz is photographed with the camera.

2:15 pm A police car takes Sorrels, Schwartz, Zapruder and McCormick to the Kodak plant. Zapruder makes arrangements for the processing of the film. Phil Willis meets Sorrels at the Kodak plant and also agrees to furnish the Secret Service with copies of his 35 mm. slides. Sorrels gets a phone call and leaves for Dallas Police Headquarters.

3:15 pm (est.) The processed film is shown to fifteen to eighteen people. To have copies made, Zapruder must take camera original to Jamieson Company.

4:00 pm (est.) Zapruder has three (3) copies made by the Jamieson Company. He requests affidavit that no more copies were made.

4:30 pm (est.) Zapruder returns to Kodak plant with the original and three (3) copies. He has the three (3) copies processed and requests affidavits from Kodak personnel that only three (3) copies were processed.

Afternoon: Richard Stolley and Tommy Thompson of *LIFE* fly in from Los Angeles. *LIFE* stringers Patsy Swank and Holland McCombs learn that Zapruder has film of the assassination. Forrest Sorrels receives two of the three first generation copies and assures Zapruder they will be used only for official purposes by the Secret Service.

Evening: Stolley sets up offices in the Adolphus Hotel and begins calling Zapruder's home at fifteen minute intervals. Zapruder, shaken by the day's events, drives aimlessly around Dallas.

9:55 pm Secret Service Agent Max Phillips sends one of the two copies to

Secret Service Chief Rowley in Washington, D.C. In an accompanying note, Phillips says that "Mr. Zapruder is in custody of the 'master' film."

11:00 pm Stolley reaches Zapruder at home and asks to come out and view the film. Zapruder declines. They agree to meet the next morning at 9:00am at Zapruder's office.

NOVEMBER 23

8:00 am Stolley is waiting at Zapruder's office when Zapruder arrives. The film is screened for Stolley. Stolley agrees that *LIFE* will pay Zapruder \$50,000 in two installments for print rights to the film. Stolley leaves with the original and perhaps the remaining copy. The original is sent to Chicago where the *LIFE* editorial staff has assembled to prepare the new issue to be on the newsstands the following Tuesday, November 26th. During the preparation of black and white copies, the original is broken in several places by photo technicians. Splices are made.

At some time this weekend, a copy of the film is sent to New York where it is viewed by C.D. Jackson, publisher of *LIFE*. Jackson decides to acquire all rights to the film and so instructs Stolley.

Evening: Since copies cannot be made in Dallas, Gordon Shanklin, FBI SAIC in Dallas, is instructed to send the copy the FBI obtained from Sorrels by commercial flight to Washington, D.C. Shanklin does so, at the same time requesting that the FBI Lab make three, second generation copies, one for Washington and two for the Dallas Field Office.

NOVEMBER 24

Zapruder may have screened the film for Forrest Sorrels and other law

enforcement agents.

NOVEMBER 25

Morning: Stolley meets with Zapruder in the offices of Zapruder's lawyer. The negotiations end with *LIFE* purchasing worldwide rights to the film for \$150,000. During these negotiations, Dan Rather is shown the film. He neglects to make an immediate bid but elects to check with New York first. During a radio broadcast with Richard C. Hottelet and Hughes Rudd, Rather describes the film which he has "just returned from seeing." Later that day, Rather describes his viewing of the film on the CBS Evening News. Rather could only have seen this film at this time if Zapruder had retained one copy and provided Stolley with only the original the previous Saturday.

NOVEMBER 26

Morning: *LIFE* begins newsstand distribution of the November 29th issue. At the same time, various *LIFE* editors order up prints of the film for viewing in their offices. I was shown one of these in October 1966. Since control was lax, bootleg copies began to circulate.

What emerges from this chronology is a single important fact:

At no time during the hectic weekend did the original of the film ever leave the custody and control of Abraham Zapruder and *LIFE* magazine.

Two first generation copies were provided to Forrest Sorrels of the Secret Service in the late afternoon of November 22nd. One of these copies was shipped to Washington that night. The other was turned over to the FBI and sent by commercial air to Washington the next day. But the original stayed with Zapruder until the

morning of November 23rd when Dick Stolley walked out of Zapruder's office with it under his arm.

That original remained under *LIFE*'s custody and control until it was given back to Zapruder's family in the 1970s.

But how do we know that *LIFE* did not conspire in the alteration of the film? As it is impossible to prove any negative, so it is impossible to prove this negative.

But there is no shred of evidence that it happened.

On Monday, November 25th, many millions of *LIFE* magazine copies went into the mails to subscribers with black and white frames from the film, and, about the same time, copies of the film began appearing in editors' offices. Had the conspiratorial alteration of the film by *LIFE* and the government already taken place? If not, it would have been too late. With unknown copies floating around, the toothpaste could no longer have been put back in the tube.

Recently, another thread in the fabric has become visible. On Saturday morning, November 23rd, 1963, Zapruder sold just print rights to *LIFE* for \$50,000. Other media were clamoring at Zapruder's heels, and two days later he sold additional rights to *LIFE* for \$100,000 more. Are we to believe that Zapruder, always a shrewd businessman, had let Stolley walk out of his office with both the original and the last first generation copy? How would Zapruder be able to negotiate with the media for the remaining rights to his film? Had he given up his last copy of the film, then Dan Rather could not have viewed the film in the offices of Zapruder's lawyer on the morning of November 25th. Had he given up the last copy of his film, he could not have shown the film numerous times to Forrest Sorrels and others over that weekend. Recently, a new fact has come

to light via the inquiries of the AARB. Their report disclosed that "...the Zapruder family's company possessed a third, first generation copy of the Zapruder film."

If Zapruder retained a first generation copy of the film, then there was no time ever when the toothpaste could have been put back in the tube. You say that Zapruder and *LIFE* could both have cooperated with the government in the alteration of the film? You can say this if you will. You can believe it, I suppose...

But I can't. I think it's silly.

At this conference two years ago, Professor James Fetzer declared that a "historical turning point" had been reached: The alteration of the Zapruder film had been proven!

When my colleague here, Hal Verb, had the temerity to disagree, the Professor told him he was "irrational."

When earlier this year, I had the temerity to disagree, I was told by the Professor that "...you have thereby discredited yourself as a commentator on these matters."

Well, Professor Fetzer is a commentator here today and you will be able to judge his commentary. But since he is here, I want to close by taking up two of his contentions.

First, that the original of the Zapruder film was sent to the National Photographic Interpretation Center on the evening of November 22nd.

Second, that famed eyewitness identification expert Elizabeth Loftus has produced findings showing that salient details of events are remembered with 98% accuracy and completeness.

In a recent email to me, Professor Fetzer wrote: "A study that appears in *ASSASSINATION SCIENCE* [states that] the film appears to have been in the hands of the National Photographic

Interpretation Center run by the CIA already Friday night, where an original and three copies were struck and then returned to Dallas in time for a small group of reporters, including Dan Rather, to view the film in a preliminarily edited version."

The study referred to is by Mike Pincher and Roy L. Schaeffer. These writers manufacture out of whole cloth a flight of "at least the original and one copy" from Dallas to Andrews Air Force Base on the night of the 22nd and a return flight of the altered film to Dallas in the early morning hours of November 23rd. They do this without a single fact to support their fancy.

They even cite the Max Phillips note (quoted above), but never tell the reader that Phillips also pointed out that "Mr. Zapruder is in custody of the 'master' [read 'original'] film." They, and apparently Professor Fetzer, have simply misinterpreted the so-called "CIA 450 Documents" discovered by Paul Hoch in the early 1980s. These documents recount the preparation of four photo briefing boards for government officials based upon NPIC's analysis of the film. The question at issue is the timing of the shots. The selection of frames for the briefing boards makes clear that NPIC is looking at the same film we see today. Telltale information is found on page six of the documents which refer to the December 6, 1963 issue of *LIFE*. Hence, the examination was carried out not on November 22nd but sometime in December 1963. The copy of the film analyzed was the Secret Service copy, whose agents stayed with the film while the briefing boards were prepared. AARB located and interviewed two former employees of NPIC who stated that internegatives were made of only single frames to be mounted on briefing boards

and that they never "reproduced the film as a motion picture."

Professor Fetzer makes his second claim in his own recognizable style. He wrote to me: "On Table 3.1 of Elizabeth Loftus, *EYEWITNESS TESTIMONY*, appears a summary of research with 151 subjects which reports that, when a group of subjects considered what they were observing to be salient or significant, they were 98% accurate and 98% complete with respect to their observations, which reinforces their importance as evidence. Even though you appear to accept the widely-held belief that eyewitness testimony is unreliable, Loftus' findings provide one more striking indication that opinions that are popular are not always true.

"Indeed, to think that a view must be true because it is widespread is to commit the FALLACY OF POPULAR SENTIMENTS... While you have cited an appropriate expert in Elizabeth Loftus, you have misrepresented her findings concerning eyewitness testimony in relation to the assassination of JFK... Indeed, David [Mantik] offers a calculation that, whenever dozens of witnesses all recall an event...in the same way then they are almost certainly correct.

If a single witness has a 2% chance of being wrong, then if all ten witnesses report the same event, the probability they are all wrong is 02 to the 10th power or 10 to the minus 17th, which equals .000000000000000001!"

There are so many errors in these few lines that it is difficult to know where to begin.

First of all, these are not Elizabeth Loftus' findings, but the account of an experiment published in the *Harvard Law Review* by Marshall, et al., "Effects of Kind of Question and Atmosphere of

Interrogation on Accuracy and Completeness of Testimony." The focus of the study is not "salience" or "accuracy" or "completeness" but, rather, methods of interrogation.

Elizabeth Loftus cited the study in her book but these are not "her findings." Had Professor Fetzer taken the trouble to look at the article he cites, he would have recognized that the "salient items" were not picked out by the people tested in the experiment, but by staff members and high school students. Hence, he misspeaks in saying, "...when a group of subjects considered what they were observing to be salient or significant, they were 98% accurate and 98% complete with respect to their observations."

It is Professor Fetzer's practice to ascribe nonsensical views to people and then criticize them for holding them. Likewise here. The Professor ascribes to me the silly idea that "...a view must be true because it is widespread." Then he exposes me as having committed "the fallacy of popular sentiments" for holding such a silly idea.

This isn't argument. It's just silliness! Then there is Professor Fetzer's claim that I have "misrepresented" Elizabeth Loftus' findings with respect to the Kennedy assassination. It is not only I who "accepts the widely-held belief that eyewitness testimony is unreliable," it is also Elizabeth Loftus. In fact, it is precisely her work which brought about this "widely-held belief." The cover of *Eyewitness Testimony* states that the book "...makes the psychological case against the reliability of the eyewitness." This is the book's single, unifying theme. Eyewitness testimony is both unreliable at its inception and subject to corruption by later acquired information and questioning.

Since I'd worked with Elizabeth Loftus on two cases (most recently the Oklahoma City bombing case), I asked her what she thought of the use the Harvard Law article had been put to by David Mantik and Professor Fetzer. She wrote back:

"It is fair to say that salient details are remembered better than peripheral ones. Also, it is easier to mislead people about peripheral details.

"It is WRONG [her emphasis], however, to say anything like 98% of salient details are accurately remembered. If that was shown in the Marshall case, it is only with those subjects, with that stimulus material, in that study. We virtually never make claims about absolute percentages because the real percentages in any situation depend on so many other factors."

So much for my "alleged" misinterpretation of her views.

Next is Professor Fetzer's quotation of a statistical error by David Mantik. Here, as in so many other things, he wraps himself in David Mantik's skirts. But David Mantik is mistaken when he writes: "If a single witness has a 2% chance of being wrong, then if all ten witnesses report the same event, the probability they are all wrong is .02 to the 10th power or 10 to the minus 17th, which equals .00000000000000001!"

They both got it wrong. As Art Snyder will be able to explain to you, they confused a Type I Probability (false negative) with a Type II Probability (false positive). I am sure Professor Fetzer will go on for hours in argument with Art Snyder about this. As for me, I know zip about probability theory and find the important point to be Elizabeth Loftus' "...it's wrong to say anything like 98% of salient details are accurately remembered."

You may wonder why I've taken the time to attack Professor Fetzer here. It is because he expresses a trend in assassination research which I find odious. His emphasis on credentials and the cult of expertise (or alleged expertise) is demeaning to the tradition of inquiry we all share as a community. When the final history of this case is written it will be based on the canons of acute historical research. These canons have nothing to do with how many initials you can hang after your name or how often you're called "distinguished."

They have to do with the evidence you put forward for your view and the reasonableness of the interpretations you hang on that evidence. That's what Sylvia Meagher and I believed when we started working together in the 60s. It was a long time ago in virtually another country. It was 1965... 66... 67, and here and there people were beginning to distrust what they'd been told.

There was Mary Ferrell in Dallas, Penn Jones just outside Dallas, Sylvia Meagher in New York City, Paul Hoch in Berkeley, Cyril Wecht in Pittsburgh, Vince Salandria in Philadelphia, Harold Weisberg in Maryland, Ray Marcus and David Lifton in Los Angeles... and many, many more. A housewife, a lawyer for the school board, the editor of a small paper, a graduate student, a young professor, a WHO official. We were little people. People who had only a few things in common: inquiring minds, an unwillingness to be intimidated by public attitudes, more than a little tenacity, a bit of modesty and a willingness to laugh at oneself. None of us had any money or hoped to make any money out of this. We were doing it for its own sake. We formed a community... the closest thing to a true community of inquiry that I've ever known.

We shared information on a trans-continental basis. I still remember the excitement with which Vince Salandria and I received our copy of the Sibert/O'Neill Report from Paul Hoch! None of us gave a damn for credentials because as we put it "There are no Ph.D.s in assassination research."

Back then, with the might and majesty of the federal government aligned with the news media in defense of the Warren Report, performing assassination research was somewhat like doing research on UFOs. It was not respectable.

And so we formed our own community and helped with each others' research and critiqued each others' drafts. It's that community which still stands in my mind's eye as the ideal and it's that community to which I owe my loyalty. That community lies at the farthest remove from "Assassination Science" and its promoter.

**The Sibert-O'Neill Report:
Data, Disinformation, or
Deceit?**

by Walt Brown

If an academician were to read and evaluate the famous Sibert-O'Neill Report, based on the observations of the two named FBI Special Agents from the Hyattsville Residency Agency of the Baltimore Field Office of the FBI, the document would receive at best a C for syntax and grammar, a C- for clarity of expression, and clearly, an F for spelling.

But what does the grade become

when you evaluate that same report in the light of existing FBI standards for gathering evidence in criminal proceedings? Then overlay the fact that the Sibert-O'Neill Report, on the autopsy of the late President John F. Kennedy and materials gleaned from that autopsy, could have, had the "accused assassin" survived being in police custody, been one of the most important criminal investigative reports in history.

What does it tell us?

Let us rephrase that: what is in that report besides the phrase "as well as surgery of the head area, namely in the top of the skull," an ambiguous 15-word phrase which nevertheless earned the work *Best Evidence* a place on the best seller list and countless reprintings?

The most generous answer would be "not much," but a closer look suggests the final two possibilities cited above--"disinformation" or downright deceit."

The "S-O" document begins in poor expression and never really gets a whole lot better: "At approximately 3 p.m. [no time zone noted] on November 22, 1963, following the President's announced assassination, it was ascertained that *Air Force One*,..." The way in which "President's announced assassination" is expressed, one gets the feeling that there were news bulletins saying the president would be killed at 12:30, later today, and please stay tuned to this channel for details. What the reader has to realize amidst the sarcasm here is that FBI agents were trained to convey clear, accurate, and concise data in all FD-302 forms, the standard reporting vehicle. The FBI group leader, who read every such document, would routinely walk into

the squad room, approach an agent's desk, find a corner to park his butt on [and the butts all belonged to men in those days...], and say, for instance, "Couldn't this have said, 'At approximately 3 pm, Eastern Standard Time, which was 2 pm Central Standard Time at the crime scene, and some 30 minutes after the announcement that John F. Kennedy had died as a result of an assassination attempt on his life,...'." Particularly in light of the crime that was being reported.

But if you read that whole first paragraph of S/O, you will not find one mention of the name "John Kennedy." It was the President's assassination, which at 3 pm technically and constitutionally meant Lyndon Johnson; it was *Air Force One*, noted as "the President's jet," [also LBJ], and that the plane was flying "the body back." In that sense, you had to know what crime was being discussed to understand whose body was aboard *Air Force One*, and that again flies into the clarity standards that existed at that time (as well as before and since). And they existed for good reason, because FBI documents were frequently, almost routinely, introduced in criminal proceedings* and they had to be, for that reason, clear and concise enough to withstand the most enfilading cross-examination. They had to be... [note: because the "report" was the evidence, it was common practice to destroy notes when a report was submitted, ie. S/A Quigley in New Orleans--readers should NOT be too shocked by that]; But why no mention of the name of the fallen President? Let's see... the Report would go up the FBI food chain until it reached... J. Edgar Hoover, no large fan of JFK, nor was his boss and neighbor, Lyndon Johnson. How quickly those two scoundrels tore JFK from the American

collective memory--faster even than Russia de-Stalinized after Khrushchev's bellicose outburst at the time of the XXII Congress.

Now, why, of all the law enforcement officers on earth, was it Francis X. O'Neill, Jr., and James W. Sibert? Why not just let the Secret Service, sworn to protect the President, monitor the autopsy? After all, Roy Kellerman--Secret Service ASAIC Roy Kellerman--was given the undeveloped photographs of the President, which are as probative as evidentiary items as a couple of minute bullet fragments received by Sibert and O'Neill. And, of course, one has to add, and why was nobody from Dallas present to maintain the chain of custody of any such evidence that became available at the autopsy? Because this was not then a federal crime, and Sibert and O'Neill had no real jurisdiction, and evidence that went to the feds tended *to stay with the feds*. Here is what the report says as to the need for these two officers: "...and handle any matters which would fall within the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation [at that moment, NONE], inasmuch as it was anticipated that a large group of both military and civilian personnel assigned to the [Andrews Air Force] Base would congregate at Base operations to witness the landing of this flight." That is the justification for the presence of two FBI agents, and a lawyer defending Lee Oswald would have had a field day with that line, which closes paragraph one of the S/O report. I considered using that near the beginning of *People v. Lee Harvey Oswald* seven years ago, but realized that if I had, less people would have kept reading.

The third paragraph of the S/O

report tells us that the agents were ordered to "accompany the body [again, no mention of whose it was] to the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland, to stay with the body and to obtain bullets reportedly in the President's body." *Bullets?* Who "reported" that? While it might have been a reasonable *assumption*, that which one assumes and that which one reports diverge at right angles.

After a paragraph detailing how Secret Service Director Rowley had given permission for the FBI presence, like he had a choice, the fifth paragraph gives more *Best Evidence* clues, telling how the ambulance, [presumably with something in it] stopped in front of the Medical Center, where Jacqueline and Robert Kennedy got out and entered the facility. "the ambulance was thereafter driven around to the rear entrance..." Thereafter? When? Immediately upon the Kennedys' exit, or half an hour later? There is no clarity there, and that is unacceptable. "...the President's body was removed [from the ambulance] and taken into an autopsy room. Bureau agents (a euphemism for Sibert and O'Neill) assisted in the moving of the casket to the autopsy room." No time is noted either for the arrival of the ambulance at the front, nor for the unloading at the back. It is then noted that Secret Service Agents Kellerman, Greer and William O'Leary "were the only personnel other than medical personnel present during the autopsy." It might have been more accurate to say "medical personnel and those who were giving them the orders to do and not do what was accomplished over the next few hours."

"The following individuals attended the autopsy:" and fourteen names follow.

Six of the fourteen are misspelled, with eight correct, giving Sibert and O'Neill a spelling grade of 57%, and that is **unthinkable** --not to mention **unacceptable** --in an FBI document of this import. The following are wrong: Admiral Holloway (actually, Calvin Galloway--and it is hard to imagine how you get from Galloway to Holloway), Admiral Berkeley (Burkley), Captain Stoner (Stover), Lloyd E. Raihe (there's a stretch--actually Floyd Reibe), J.T. Bozwell (Boswell, an understandable phonetic confusion, but any FBI agent is trained to get the spelling right, also), and Jerrol F. Crester (Custer); there is just no accepting such literary license. Had there been a trial, one can imagine the defense attorney destroying key autopsy evidence against the accused by asking, "This, uh, Admiral Holloway, could you have meant 'Galloway'? And this uh, Lloyd, fellow... tell us who he is. And while you are at it, please tell us why this court should accept one word of what is in this error-filled document?"

And the jury would have been listening intently.

There are no mentions of William Bruce Pitzer, one of the most controversial individuals "present" at the autopsy [see continuing data supplied by Allan Eaglesham in this issue], nor of Robert Canada, one of Humes's superiors who was also present. With respect to the fourteen who are listed, only five are labeled....Holloway, Berkley, Humes, Stoner, and John Stringer, photographer. The other nine are just names....

When the morticians arrived, the thoroughness of the FBI report does not increase, as one of the four morticians is simply listed as "Mr. Hagen." One might

suspect, given the curiosities of JFK's medical history prior to November 22, that some personal considerations be given, but how do you do that when you don't even know the names of individuals whose discretions in non-criminal areas you would be relying on? Just makes no sense whatsoever.

Then comes the punch line that gave author David Lifton his inspiration, as it is noted that after "the President's" casket was opened, and his body was removed, "it was also apparent that a tracheotomy had been performed, as well as surgery of the head area, namely, in the top of the skull." The commentary then switches gears to note that all personnel excepting those needed in the taking of photos were "requested to leave the autopsy room and remain in an adjacent room." Several questions arise here, and they are not necessarily new to this inquiry, having been raised by authors who have studied the medical evidence closely.

Where did Sibert and O'Neill get the data that there had been surgery in the head area? Who said it, and what was the context? How, in fact, was that surgery "apparent"? The paragraph raises a second question: since Sibert and O'Neill were charged to remain with the body, and needed to do so in an evidentiary sense, did they follow their charge and remain in the autopsy room with John Kennedy's remains or did they leave, as ordered, since they were non-medical personnel. The report does not say and thereby becomes another gray area in the legal sense. If a bullet were obviously visible--and removed from the President and Sibert and O'Neill were not present, what of its evidentiary value? A third concern noted in that statement will

be referenced later.

Precision enters the report, if for no other purpose than to demonstrate that it is attainable: "Upon completion of X-Rays and photographs, the first incision was made at 8:15 p.m." This becomes significant in Lifton's time lines, but is noteworthy here, as it is the first time reference since 5:55, when it was noted that Sibert and O'Neill were to stay with "the body" and "to obtain bullets." Many other time references were vital in a report this important.

A verbal glitch then occurs which, to me, is more important than Lifton's discovery, and I'm not intending to throw down any gauntlets here, as Lifton noted this also, but with less intensity than the surgery reference: "During the latter stages of this autopsy, Dr. HUMES located an opening which appeared to be a bullet hole which was below the shoulders and two inches to the right of the middle line of the spinal column." To return to the third question earlier, how could everyone have been removed from the autopsy room so that photos and x-rays could be taken by the medical personnel, [after 'certain preliminary investigations' even earlier] and only then was a bullet wound in the back discovered? *They photographed and measured, with a ruler in the photo, that bullet wound hours earlier!!*

As always, quality material is available through
Last Hurrah Bookshop
 849 W. Third, #1
 Williamsport, PA 17701
 717 321 1150

Beyond that, we have two choices in our thinking on this subject. We can go on saying that the S/O report is the product of ignorance, as they are telling us that the back wound, and as photographed, was "below the shoulders and two inches to the right of the middle line of the spinal column," yet we can resist the temptation to accept that, as neither Sibert nor O'Neill were doctors, yet they saw the wounds and were trained to make observations. Weeks and months later, forensic specialists Doctor Arlen Specter and Dr. Gerald Ford would tell us that the bullet hole seen by Sibert and O'Neill was a "neck wound." For my dime, it is a back wound, and destroyed the single bullet theory before Specter ever birthed it. Perhaps that is why the Sibert-O'Neill Report was not published by the Warren Commission.

Other, lesser problems are noted. The report noted, "...no complete bullet of any size could be located in the brain and likewise no bullet could be located in the back" [emphasis added]. What is wrong with the clarity there is that there is only one such item as a "complete" bullet. You cannot have a complete bullet "of any size"; you can only have them complete... that is why they are called "complete bullets."

Sibert and O'Neill conclude with two further items that demand attention. One is that Humes, et al concluded that since there was no bullet(s) found, that a bullet had worked its way out of the back wound [this overlooks commentary by Jerrol Custer, who told Walt Brown that Humes was on the phone to Texas often on Friday night, and knew there was a possible tracheostomy passage, which is not mentioned in any way in Sibert-O'Neill, except in the surgery passage],

and that a 10 x 6.5 centimeters piece of skull bone was delivered to the autopsy room, and no questions were asked.

What can be concluded about the Sibert-O'Neill Report? It seems obvious that these two agents did not get the job done. The question is, did they try to do their jobs and get stonewalled into reporting a flimsy collection of paragraphs that said nothing but kept J. Edgar Hoover's official "Oswald did it" line alive, did they intentionally keep to Hoover's party line, or was their purpose to disinform and confuse? It seems that all three answers are possible. It should be added in closing that if any of the JFK researchers who have written about the medical aspects of the case had been assigned instead of Sibert and O'Neill, we might have gotten far greater and far more accurate reportage.

The Lifton-Mantik Report? The Livingstone-Aguilar Report?

Would make interesting reading.....

**YOU KNOW ABOUT
ALBERT GUY BOGARD:
WHAT ABOUT 'ED BRAND'?**

by Walt Brown

Albert Guy Bogard. Just the mention of the name sends believers in an assassination conspiracy into a frenzy, and well it should. Bogard was an auto salesman at a Lincoln Mercury dealership on November 9, 1963, when an individual who identified himself as "Lee Oswald" test drove a red Comet,