

# **BREAKTHROUGH--*THE* *JOHN F. KENNEDY* *ASSASSINATION***

**THE STORY BEHIND THE F.B.I.'S  
SUPPRESSION OF ITS OWN INTERVIEW  
REPORT OF CAROLYN ARNOLD,  
SUPPRESSION OF THE 8MM BRONSON  
MOTORCADE FILM AND  
PERPETUATION OF THE ALTGENS  
PHOTO CONTROVERSY**

**By Frank A. Cellura**

**June, 1999**

Copyright-protected

A witness statement which Federal Bureau of Investigation never gave to the Warren Commission is described by a leading author as the "most damning indictment of the (Warren) commission's version (of Oswald as the lone assassin of President Kennedy)."<sup>1</sup> The 1963 F.B.I. statement was the report of F.B.I. agent Richard E. Harrison of an interview of Texas School Book Depository employee Carolyn Arnold. Accused Kennedy assassin Lee Harvey Oswald was an employee of the Depository. The report had been suppressed but was first chronicled

---

<sup>1</sup>*Reasonable Doubt*, Henry Hurt, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1985, p.90.

by researcher Harold Weisberg in 1967 in his Photographic Whitewash publication after he found identical copies of the report in two different F.B.I. archival files.<sup>2</sup> Prior to Weisberg's unearthing of the document, it had not been disclosed to the Warren Commission to whom the F.B.I. was reporting nor was the public made aware of its existence.

The "damning" impact of the Arnold statement may be much greater than heretofore conceived even by assassination theorists. Actions by the F.B.I., with regard to this statement, will be shown to reflect an "ulterior" motive of the agency with regard to the investigation until now never explored or exposed.

Carolyn Arnold<sup>3</sup>, at the time of the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963, was secretary to the Vice-President of the Texas School Book Depository, the location from which at the sixth floor sniper's nest that the Warren Commission and later House Select Committee on Assassinations concluded was the location from which Lee Harvey Oswald fired upon the Presidential limousine as it passed down Elm Street in a park area of Dallas known as Dealey Plaza. Oswald himself murdered within forty-eight hours of the assassination by Dallas night-club owner Jack Ruby. Unlike many, if not most, of the other seventy-two employees housed in the building, Ms. Arnold was thoroughly familiar with Oswald because he would come to her for change for the vending machines. She noticed he kept mostly to himself.

Just four days after the assassination, on *November 26, 1963*, F.B.I. agent Richard E. Harrison issued a report of his interview of Ms. Arnold as part of the investigation of the assassination.<sup>4</sup> This report was not recorded as a verbatim statement of Ms. Arnold. She would

---

<sup>2</sup>*Photographic Whitewash*, Harold Weisberg, published by author, Hyattstown, Maryland, 1967, p. 74.

<sup>3</sup>More recently known as Carolyn Johnston of Stephenville, Texas

<sup>4</sup>File #DL 89-43 as reported by Weisberg in File Folder 3 and one other.

not be able to review her recorded statement as she was not asked to sign it.

In this summary report, Ms. Arnold supposedly indicated she left her second floor office in the Depository with co-workers "between 12:00 and 12:15 PM," to go downstairs and stand in to view the Presidential Motorcade." It was further reported that Ms. Arnold indicated "As she was standing in front of the building, she stated she thought she caught a fleeting glimpse of LEE HARVEY OSWALD standing in the hallway between the front door and the double doors leading to the warehouse, located on the first floor." According to the agent, Ms. Arnold indicated she wasn't absolutely sure it was Oswald in fact, and that it would have been about 12:15 p.m. when she exited the building.

*not so*

Accepting the information related by the F.B.I. agent was truly related to him by Ms. Arnold, keeping in mind it will later be submitted that the statement was not accurate, the F.B.I. document was an incredible lead for the F.B.I. that warranted immediate action to confirm or disaffirm. The conception of Oswald being on the first floor, or even on the second floor as Ms. Arnold would later report, around 12:15 p.m. was remarkable and needed to be pursued in light of other conflicting evidence that the gunman or gunmen had already reached the vicinity of the sixth floor by that time, a scant fifteen minutes before arrival of the motorcade.<sup>5</sup> *she actually said 12:30!*

The Arnold testimony warranted the undertaking of a concerted effort to be reconciled with the observations of Arnold Rowland. Rowland, from his vantage point at street level among the throngs awaiting the

---

<sup>5</sup>If there was an assembling of the rifle, the F.B.I. reported that activity would consume at least six minutes.

*of an expert, which Oswald was not*



arrival of the motorcade, indicated that he had seen at 12:15 p.m. a man in the Depository's sixth floor window, the one at the southwest corner where the sniper's nest was supposedly constructed of packing boxes.

From his street level vantage, at about fifteen minutes before the motorcade turned from Houston to Main Street on its approach to Dealey Plaza, Rowland said he noticed a person standing poised at the sixth floor southwest corner window of the Depository with a rifle in cradled across his chest.<sup>6</sup> He thought the man was security for the event. Given the conflict with the Arnold testimony, there is raised the specter that someone or some others beside Oswald were involved in the assassination. *First in WWII*

Arnold Rowland was certain as to the timing of his sighting of the man in the window as he recollected overhearing a detailed police radio *in west* announcement from his position on the street of the location of the approaching motorcade on Cedar Springs Road as when he glanced up at the Depository.<sup>7</sup> This correlated with the 12:15 p.m. time Oswald was seen downstairs as related by Ms. Arnold. Ms. Arnold's own departure from her second floor office and timing of the citing is also corroborated as being at least 12:15 p.m. *if not later*. Four other *was* ladies that joined her to watch from the sidewalk indicated times of

---

<sup>6</sup>*Conspiracy*, Anthony Summers, Paragon House, New York, N.Y., 1989, p. 78 citing Commission testimony of Arnold Rowland, WC II 169/11.183 and his wife, Barbara Rowland WC vi 185 and 181. *WWII confirmed his testimony*

<sup>7</sup>Warren Report, Vol. 2, pp. 172-3 Rowland said "there was a motorcycle parked just On the street, not in front of us, and the radio was on it giving details of the motorcade, where it was positioned, and right after the time I noticed him (the man on the sixth floor) and when my wife was pointing this other thing to me...the dispatcher came on and gave the position of the motorcade on Cedar Springs. This would be in the area of Turtle Creek, down in that area...And that was the position of the motorcade and it was about 15 or 16 after 12."

through my  
ch 28-0322

5

12:15 p.m. to 12:20 p.m. in concert with Ms. Arnold's recollection.<sup>8</sup>

Rowland's story of a man near the sixth floor window received further corroboration in 1978 when an 8mm film of the assassination scene taken by Dallas resident Charles R. Bronson was obtained from Bronson by investigators and reports were given to the public of what it contained. The film was reported as showing what seemed to be animated images of a person in the corner sixth floor window of the Depository, the sniper's perch, and another man in an adjacent window.<sup>9</sup> It was not until 1978 that The Dallas Morning News finally tracked down this important evidence and reviewed it<sup>10</sup> after researcher Weisberg located a formerly classified F.B.I. report revealing that the film may still exist in the owner's possession.<sup>11</sup> Bronson had furnished the film and still photos to the F.B.I. at the time of the assassination, but the F.B.I. remitted the items to him after supposedly reviewing them and concluding they did not furnish evidence material to their investigation.

not this  
way

"could not be used for identification" but did show JFK being killed!

The amazing thing about the Bronson film was that the F.B.I. in the early phase of its investigation indicated the footage was mistakenly discarded four days after the assassination, the same day of the interview of Ms. Arnold, and erroneously reported that the footage did

FBI did not annul

<sup>8</sup>Mrs. Donald Baker - 12:15 p.m. Warren Commission Vol. 22 Page 635; Ms. Judy Johnson - 12:15 p.m. WC Vol. 22 Page 656; Ms. Bonnie Rachee WC Vol. 22 Page 671; Mrs. Betty Dragoo - 12:20 Warren Commission Vol. 22 page 645

<sup>9</sup>Dallas Morning News, Nov. 27, 1978, Depository Chief Disputes Dvidence of Filmed Images, by Earl Golz, pp. 1A-3A

<sup>10</sup>Ibid

<sup>11</sup>Bronson had an 8mm motion picture film taken with a Keystone camera and a Number of 35mm still pictures taken with a Leica camera of high quality.

not show the Depository Building.<sup>12</sup> In actuality, the film was of inordinate quality and contained ninety-two frames showing the sniper's nest window as the motorcade advanced from Houston Street on past the Depository and down Elm Street.<sup>13</sup> This is another instance where critical evidence was covertly subverted from the public on a false pretense it was not worthy of detailed analysis. The reality was that the F.B.I. knew the evidence could be recalled and re-casted if it became necessary that it was physically impossible for Oswald to be one of the men in position to participate in the shooting. ?

*Groden cannot be trusted & no men there*  
Robert J. Groden, a staff consultant on photographic evidence for the House Assassination Committee of the 1970's studied the film with enhancement techniques and found it to show images of two human figures on the sixth floor of the Depository building which prominently stood out in the photographs as plain as day.<sup>14</sup> The F.B.I. did not want to pursue any meaningful analysis of the Bronson film because such inquiry would suggest whether the sixth floor had been the location or one of the locations of the assassins and whether more than one person was involved. It was too convenient and deemed a political mistake to follow this lead because of the potential consequences of discovering the truth. *Did it not suggest NTS? which said nothing there?*

*It presented nothing to public*  
The F.B.I., chose to present a public tact diminishing the value of the Bronson film by falsely reporting that it had been mistakenly destroyed. *Source?*  
The film, once thought to be lost, was then supposedly inadvertently and suddenly, albeit belatedly, discovered fifteen years later still in existence. The fact is that it had not been lost or destroyed but intentionally suppressed by the government who wanted to have it

<sup>12</sup>Ibid

<sup>13</sup>*Never Again*, Harold Weisberg, Carroll & Graf Publishers, New York, N.Y., 1995, pp. 29-31.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid



in case it needed to recall it, whereupon it could analyze it, and use it even for what it showed, the two images at the sixth floor windows five minutes before the motorcade arrived.

The F.B.I.'s suppression of this critical evidence accomplished both the substantiation of the official story that there was a lone assassin and that he was Oswald while creating a compelling contradictory array of evidence that could be recalled and re-cast in the event that the theory of Oswald as the exclusive suspect had to be abandoned.

The 1963 statement of Ms. Arnold never reached the Warren Commission. She was never called to give testimony, and there was no follow-up regarding the Oswald siting to which she had supposedly notified the F.B.I. Researcher Weisberg believed the F.B.I. purposely suppressed the statement and evidence that Oswald may have been on the first floor because the Commission and the public realm needed to be shielded from significant evidence that contradicted Oswald being the lone assassin.

My tact advances the concept proposed by these original theories. It is my view that the F.B.I. went forward in building the public case against Oswald, but simultaneously did purposely nurture or create false evidence advancing the innocence of Oswald, did receive and harbor other evidence then proceeded to suppress this and other evidence to support this case that could immediately be called upon to exculpate Oswald. In secreting particular items, the F.B.I. either gave false disclosures of the existence, kept silent as to their existence, or diminished the significance of such evidence.

Abandonment of the official case was foreseen and feared by the F.B.I. as a real possibility as it lacked control of all sources of information and evidence. Primary of these concerns, were threats to national security or domestic tranquility, such as where the belief Oswald was directly commissioned in this acts by Russia or Cuba had overtaken the nation during the course of the investigation. Another, secondary

*Reasonable but baseless false conjecture*

8

was the need to abandon the Oswald case to "save face" institutionally in the event irrefutable evidence destroying of the official case came out and into the hands of the public.

The use of the descriptive words "fleeting glimpse" in Ms. Arnold's recorded statement, in my opinion, demonstrates a meticulous crafting or words or rephrasing of what Ms. Arnold stated particularly in light of Ms. Arnold's shocking belated disclosure in 1978, at about the same time the Bronson film was discovered, that the F.B.I. report failed miserably in recording what she said.

*We should talk about this, Summers is tricky & she did say 1st floor*  
Author and researcher Anthony Summers interviewed Arnold in 1978, and found her recollection to be clear and convincing. She disclosed to him in an interview that she had not seen her 1963 statement until the Dallas Morning News presented it to her in 1978 for the first time and she found it to be significantly at variance from what she had said.<sup>15</sup> She says she was surprised to see anything about her having seen Oswald on the first floor, but recollected and said she had told the agent in 1963 she had seen him on the second floor lunchroom at 12:15 p.m. or later.<sup>16</sup>

According to Summers, Arnold told her that Oswald often came to her desk for change so she readily recognized him. She stated at 12:15 on November 22<sup>nd</sup> she went to the lunchroom momentarily and saw him in one of the booth seats on the right-hand side sitting alone and appearing to be eating lunch. She times her entrance to the lunchroom as "about 12:15" or slightly later because she went for water, something she craved due to her pregnancy. So while this version of Ms. Arnold's story, the one to which she attests as a credible witness, still puts Oswald in a precarious position relative to timing to reach the sixth floor in time to assemble his rifle and assume a firing position, it

---

<sup>15</sup>Conspiracy, Anthony Summers, Paragon House, New York, 1989, pp. 77-80.

<sup>16</sup>Dallas Daily News, Earl Golz, pp. 1A-3A, 11/27/78



baseless! as his signed statement proves

9

raises the specter that her very original statement about Oswald on the first floor was not her statement and was an F.B.I. creation to build a case exonerating Oswald that meshed with other evidence particularly *near* that introduced by the famous Altgens photograph that Oswald was on the doorstep of the Depository at the time of the shooting. *which actually confirms almost if I what she had in FBI that it had about in Annex I*

The famous Altgens photo was taken by Associated Press photographer James W. Altgens of the Presidential limousine from his position on the sidewalk. The wounded President is seen through the front windshield clutching his throat while Secret Service men on the follow-up car turn back toward the Depository in reaction to the disturbance. Unlike the Bronson footage, the Altgens photograph was widely published and became the most famous assassination picture. *More than Zapruder's* *most important still picture by any news photographer?*

Within a day or two of the assassination, millions viewed this remarkable photo in their local newspapers and assassination journals, most of the time with credits being given to Mr. Altgens and the Associated Press as the source. The significance of the photo was twofold: (1) The front steps and doorway to the depository building are shown in the distant background directly aligned behind the Presidential limousine and at the top of these steps peering around the brick wall, in an apparent attempt to see the passing motorcade, is a man bearing resemblance to both Oswald and Billy Nolan Lovelady, another employee in the building [Because of the apparent facial likeness to Oswald and the incredible match of the clothing to that shirt he had on when arrested only hours later, blow-ups of the photo submitted by *in WWT* publications only served to heighten the identity crisis] and 2) The photo was highly valuable for use in determining reference points along Elm Street vis-a-vis points clarified in the Zapruder film taken from an opposing angle to enable the location of the vehicles to be pinpointed relative to the reactions of the President and Governor Connally to being shot. This was part of a broader analysis of the timing of the gaps between shots, necessary to determine the number of shots fired and resulting in a basis to identify the location and numbers of shooters.

Despite these two critical areas of inquiry opened up by the Altgens photo, the F.B.I. and Warren Commission did not question Altgens until May 25, 1964, more than six months after the assassination,<sup>17</sup> and a month after the Commission planned to bring its investigation to a conclusion. The F.B.I. made an effort to re-enact the Altgens photo during this time period, but Researcher Weisberg contends this reconstruction was "reckless" because the Bureau chose to use a different camera and then altered several other material conditions resulting in a rendering that was a false duplicate.<sup>18</sup>

*just issue its Report*

The Warren Commission, in its twenty-six volume publication of testimony and exhibits, never publishes the entire original photo, but rather presented cropped, altered versions produced by a photoengraving process that reproduced that diminished the photo's clarity and usefulness.<sup>19</sup> Weisberg calls it a deliberate corruption of the photo.<sup>20</sup>

The F.B.I.'s apparently inexplicable "assorted flummery" and "tricks" in perpetuating the Altgens photo controversy, rather than decisively resolving it, are well documented in an entire chapter of Weisberg's *Whitewash II*,<sup>21</sup> and is further explored in his *Photographic Whitewash*.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>*Photographic Whitewash*, P.65

<sup>18</sup>*Photographic Whitewash*, p.

<sup>19</sup>As an example of this, the F.B.I. cut off the head and concealed the hairline features of a background subject who resembled and could have been Oswald when the hairline was a distinguishing characteristic between Oswald and another person of very similar resemblance, Billy Nolan Lovelady. See *Whitewash II*, Weisberg.

<sup>20</sup>*Photographic Whitewash*, p. 66

<sup>21</sup>*Whitewash II*, Harold Weisberg published by Harold Weisberg, Chapter entitled The Lovelady Diversion, pp. 150-163, 1966

<sup>22</sup>*Photographic Whitewash*, pp. 65-77.

"The F.B.I. knew about and was interested in the Altgens ... picture<sup>23</sup> immediately, meaning the day of the assassination" according to Weisberg. The picture which showed the man who bore resemblances to both Oswald and Lovelady was shown to Lovelady within a couple of days of the assassination, and Weisberg says the F.B.I. was pleased to learn that Lovelady was willing to attest that it was his opinion that it was him in the photo.<sup>24</sup> While this seems to have simply resolved the issue as to who is to know better who the subject was than the subject himself, the controversy continued primarily because the shirt on the man in the photo was nearly identical to the one Oswald was wearing when arrested that day and other similarities.<sup>25</sup>

The agency began within days to receive reports regarding the man in the doorway. The F.B.I. feigned intrigue and surprise as the contacts

---

<sup>23</sup>The famous Altgens picture being described is the second one of a series of three taken by him.

<sup>24</sup>Weisberg indicates that F.B.I. questioned Lovelady about the photo on November 23, one day after the assassination, and again on November 25 and that the F.B.I. in another falsification of facts designed to conceal its concerns with the Altgens photo indicated in an investigate summary (File 457a) the F.B.I. indicated it learned of the photograph on November 25. Altgens name was not mentioned in the report even though widely disseminated and available. Weisberg indicates this was done to "avoid drawing attention to its omission in not interviewing him." *Photographic Whitewash*, P. 66

<sup>25</sup>a Oswald may have changed shirts at his roominghouse that afternoon before being arrested in the movie theatre, but if the change occurred it was from a dark red long-sleeve shirt to dark brown or rust shirt both of which may have had characteristics similar to that in the Altgens photo on the man in the doorway.  
b Other similar characteristics of the man in the doorway to Oswald were:  
(1) The hairline; (2) Buttons missing on the shirt in which Oswald was arrested left the shirt open in an unusual way exposing a white undershirt just like the figure in the Altgens photo was dressed; (3) Furls in the shirt amazingly alike. See, *Whitewash II*, Harold Weisberg, inside back cover with photo comparison.



and inquiries were received perpetuating a myth that it would be handled as a matter of vital importance and with the utmost diligence. As it assembled these reports and criticisms, the agency never proceeded to seriously resolve the controversy choosing in a myriad of ways to obfuscate it.

It did not pursue Lovelady to have him photographed, and when it did get around to doing so on *February 29, 1964*, it failed to insure that the clothing he was wearing was that he wore when the assassination occurred. In fact, in its recorded statement coinciding with the photo session,<sup>26</sup> it is reported that Lovelady informed the agency that the shirt he was wearing that day, a red and white vertical-striped shirt was the one he wore on the day of the assassination, when the agency knew that was impossible because the subject wore a long-sleeve shirt with none of the characteristics of the one Lovelady wore that day. This is clear evidence that the F.B.I. had desire and design not to resolve this critical aspect of the case but perpetuate the controversy. *for under stated*  
*on to frame LHO*

The agency did not seek to interview material witnesses who were with Lovelady on the steps. Weisberg suggests the F.B.I. failed miserably in pursuing a complete photographic analysis of the Altgens picture. It says it never sought to have Lovelady produce the actual shirt he was wearing for a reenactment that might resolve the issue once and forever. F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover reported three pictures were taken of Lovelady as a "composite"<sup>27</sup> but makes no mention that the photos reflect a man in a short-sleeve shirt and that this was a different shirt than the man in the Altgens photo was wearing. However, the F.B.I. burdened the Warren Commission and its own records with a number of reports and inquiries posted to it so as to make it appear that it was being vigilant with respect to this evidentiary

<sup>26</sup>*Photographic Whitewash*, p. 194; F.B.I. File No. DL100-10401

<sup>27</sup>Letter from Hoover to Warren Commission Chief Counsel J. Lee Rankin 3/9/64

controversy. With respect to the Oswald shirt in controversy, the F.B.I. exhibited the utmost in flim-flammy by conducting an examination whether a shirt in its custody which Oswald was wearing when arrested was in fact the shirt he was wearing when arrested.

According to author and researcher Josiah Thompson, an effort to resolve this discrepancy came from Lovelady himself, not the F.B.I., when he reported to C.B.S. that the shirt he was photographed in was not the one he was wearing the day of the assassination as the F.B.I. had reported.<sup>28</sup> The shirt Lovelady himself to have actually been wearing was long-sleeved and patterned in large squares.

When F.B.I. agent were instructed by Hoover to develop summary interviews of all seventy-three employees of the Depository early in 1964, the agents were so limited in the scope of the interview having been restricted to ask and only ask six identical questions of each witness that they could not and did not develop anything one way or another relevant to the Altgens photo controversy.<sup>29</sup> All of those questioned, including those to have been with Lovelady on the steps, indicated they had not seen Oswald at the moment of the assassination. Even if Oswald had been the figure on the steps, he would have been behind the groupings of co-employees that were on the steps or spread along the sidewalk in front of the Depository and the attention of all the crowd was on the passing motorcade. Consequently, no employee would be expected to acknowledge any siting of Oswald at that moment and none did. This offered nothing to indicate Oswald was in the doorway on the first floor or to refute it.

<sup>28</sup>*Six Seconds in Dallas*, Josiah Thompson, Berkley Medallion Edition, Nov. 1976, P. 287.

<sup>29</sup>The immateriality of the *March, 1964* interviews of the 73 Depository employees is well-explained in the 1975 book of Howard Roffman, *Presumed Guilty*, A.S. Barnes & Co., South Brunswick, 1976, pp. 184-88.

The Warren Commission did conduct an interview of William Shelley<sup>30</sup> who was the supervisor for both Oswald and Lovelady, and who indicated he stood on the steps near Lovelady, but indicated Oswald was sitting not standing as he had taken a position to eat his lunch. Shelley was apparently blocked out in the Altgens photo which was strange because of his proximity to Lovelady if the subject peering around the wall as photographed was Lovelady because no one is standing next to the figure but someone appears to be sitting to the forward of the figure in question.

Warren Commission proponent Gerald Posner in his false epic entitled *Case Closed*<sup>31</sup> examined Ms. Arnold's own March, 1964, F.B.I. affidavit which was prepared as one of the summary interviews described. Arnold, as did everyone else, indicated she had not seen Oswald at the time of the assassination (meaning at the exact moment of the shooting). Posner does falsely appraise Ms. Arnold's recorded interview as negating her earlier statement given on November 26, 1963, to agent Harrison that she caught a glimpse of Oswald in leaving the building. The narrow focus of the summary interview did not warrant Posner's attack on Ms. Arnold's credibility.

Knowing it had possession of the Arnold statement, and knowing it had suppressed it from public access, and knowing as long as the Altgens photo controversy was perpetuated, the F.B.I. held strong evidence that was complimentary and consistent which it could recall to radically change its posture that Oswald was the lone assassin. This leads to the next development that kept the Arnold matter alive--the discovery that her original 1963 statement was altered and fabricated.

The fictional account of Gerald Posner attempts to close out the Altgens

<sup>30</sup>Photographic Whitewash, p 67

<sup>31</sup>Case Closed, Random House, Inc., New York, N Y., 1993.PP. 227-228

Is this  
represent  
file of my  
committee  
with in  
given at  
shows of  
is appropriate  
are hyp  
on it  
files



photo question once and for all, but actually resurrects it with dubious journalistic references. Posner cites author Jim Marrs in reporting that even though it had all along been implausible the subject in the Altgens photo was Oswald, that the "issue survived until the House Select Committee finally undertook an anthropological photo study and concluded the man in the doorway was indeed Lovelady."<sup>32</sup> Evidently, Posner chose not to critique the Committee's study in any way and apparently never read the report because he did not cite it, but relied indirectly on Marrs then attacked Marrs for only conceding that the man in the doorway "may have been Lovelady" in the face of the Committee's findings.

Actually, at least Marrs read the Committee report and correctly noted that their conclusions as to the subject being Lovelady were not conclusive but 'highly probable.' Further, Marrs added the following observation: "....since Lovelady said he was sitting on the steps and the man in the photo is standing, peering around the edge of the alcove--- and since the F.B.I. did such a dismal job of proving it was Lovelady, some suspicion still lingers about the identity of the man in the doorway. Most researchers today are ready to concede that the man may have been Lovelady," Marrs indicates that regardless, no hard evidence indicates Oswald was on the sixth floor.

Findings: *But not as you say*

- The F.B.I. altered or falsified the 1963 statement of Carolyn Arnold without her knowledge.
- The agency then suppressed the report subject to recall if the official case needed to be abandoned. *fiction*
- The F.B.I. falsely indicated the Bronson film contained no material footage and that the Depository building was not within it. *not this*
- The agency indicated the Bronson film was destroyed but it had *Wanted*

<sup>32</sup>Ibid, p 261; *Crossfire*, Jim Marrs, Carroll & Graf, New York, N.Y., 1989

*It never possessed the film  
to return it*

16

in actuality had been returned to Bronson with the F.B.I.'s persuasive suggestion it contained no material evidence.

- *delusional  
a false* The Bronson film was then discovered and resurrected. It was found to disclose images of a man at the sniper's nest window at the time Arnold saw Oswald on a lower floor.
- The F.B.I. perpetuated the Altgens film controversy when it could have taken definitive steps to resolve it, holding a public line that the Altgens photo did not show Oswald on the street level, but inexplicably failed to pursue evidence to explain the clothing dissimilarity triggered by the F.B.I.'s Lovelady photo thereby extending the controversy that Oswald, not Lovelady, was the man in the Altgens photo on the Depository steps.
- The agency distorted information of the Altgens photo controversy when reporting to the Warren Commission thereby masking the critical importance of the evidence and protracting a resolution.

The F.B.I. developed a hidden case antithetical to its official case founded on evidence it had harbored but which was publicly dismissed or suppressed. Meanwhile, it promoted with steadfast earnest and singular resolve the official version of events that Oswald was guilty as a lone assassin. */?*

The agency evidently acted as it did to protect against significant internal or international discord or damage to its own institutional reputation should evidence be discovered that Oswald was commissioned by a foreign enemy, such as Russia or Cuba, that he acted in some way upon directive of our own intelligence agencies or government or that he was promoting a political cause likely to engender widespread reaction such as that represented by the right-wing anti-Castro movement. The case targeting Oswald could easily and quickly be abandoned by the recall and re-casting of this suppressed information. The F.B.I.'s corruption of purpose exposes the undeniable fact the entire investigation was compromised and engenders continuing doubt that Oswald was a lone assassin and no conspiracy took place. *false*