

## CHAPTER 13

### THE AUTOPSY PHOTOGRAPHS AND EVIDENCE OF FORGERY

In my chapter on the Autopsy, I began with a rumination flowing from the great conflicts in each piece of evidence: Is this really President Kennedy's body? I'm not sure if I dare ask this too seriously, but here and there through the work of various persons sometimes more intimately exposed to the evidence than myself, one comes across statements like the following by Frank Scott--who prepared the report for the House Assassinations Committee on the authenticity of the color photographs of the body: "I conclude that these pictures are authentic photographs. In forming this conclusion, I assume that the object photographed is, indeed, the body of President Kennedy." (7 HSCA 70)

Some assumption, because there sure must have been a question in his mind. People looking at the photographs of the body would sometimes ask me: "Is this really President Kennedy?"

Is that really him in his grave?

There is a certain amount of horror attached to what is being called an object, above, that was once a person we loved. Even more horror to what an autopsy does to that person's body. We are fortunate that our culture believes that the spirit never dies and is indestructible. The terrible violation of the body--that which is the cathedral wherein resides the soul--for scientific purposes, is viewed without feeling as it is butchered beneath the investigating pathologist's knife.

Scott's report on the authentication of the color photographs is little more than one page long. He relies on stereo pairs and theory underlying that. What he does not account for is that stereo viewing is not very good if one does not have prints made from the original negatives. The value or accuracy of a stereoscopic exam is greatly diminished for each generation removed from the original. The House committee examined prints which were two generations removed. They did not have access to and were not allowed to study the original color slides in the National Archives.

We can add this to the growing list of dictatorial and authoritarian acts by government workers and bureaucrats at the Archives who have usurped key artifacts of our history and who are making it impossible for study and research of this material, not to speak of all that evidence which by rulings of the investigative bodies is sequestered in secret at the Archives until the next Century.

"If you had the original color slides, you could tell in a

heartbeat if they are fake or not," Mark Crouch told me on August 17, 1991. The House Committee had the slides from the Archives taken to a private firm that made prints from them, which is what was used for the study. The original film were 4 x 5 color positive (slides.) There was no color positive print film in 1963, I am told. Internegatives had to be made from the slides in order to produce color prints.

The pictures we have are clearly not first generation. The House Committee commented on the photographs as follows:

1. They are generally of rather poor photographic quality.
2. Some, particularly closeups, were taken in such a manner that it is nearly impossible to anatomically orient the direction of view.
3. In many, scalar references are entirely lacking, or when present, were positioned in such a manner to make it difficult or impossible to obtain accurate measurements of critical features (such as the wound in the upper back) from anatomical landmarks.
4. None of the photographs contain information identifying the victim; such as his name, the autopsy case number, the date and place of the examination. (7 HSCA 46)

There is much more that is wrong with them, but once again--as with the conspiracy itself which they found--our representatives in the government did not dare go any farther.

In the next paragraph, the House Committee comments that a defense would object to introducing "such poorly made and documented photographs as evidence in a murder trail.... Furthermore, even the prosecution might have second thoughts about using certain of these photographs since they are more confusing than informative....Some have questioned their very authenticity. These theorists suggest that the body shown in at least some of the photographs is not President Kennedy, but another decedent deliberately mutilated to simulate a pattern of wounds supportive of the Warren Commission's interpretation of their nature and significance....the onus of establishing the authenticity of these photographs would have rested with the prosecution." (7 HSCA 46)

The Committee admits here, at the end, that this material would be prima facie inadmissable in evidence and that the prosecution would have to prove authenticity. You, the reader, can safely start out doubting this material. The Committee then went to great trouble to hoke up an authentication. But consider this last quoted paragraph phrase by phrase--since it follows several pages of one of the greatest and most outlandish lies in all of our history, and is then followed by a whole lot more lying about the authenticity of the photographs and X-rays. First of all, no critic ever questioned up to then whether or not that was JFK in the picture, or that they might not be

authentic. Almost no critic except Dr. Cyril Wecht and Robert Groden had seen them, and they did not question if it was Kennedy in the pictures. This was a slip of the tongue, because in the preceding pages, the Committee was careful to list (7 HSCA p. 37-8) very specific charges concerning the great disparity between the description of a large defect in the back of the President's head by the Dallas witnesses (and the President's widow, and the Secret Service men, and the people on the street--but the Committee did not mention them! It was easier for the Committee to say that the Dallas doctors and nurses made a mistake, but not his widow and those close to him.)

We note also that the Committee, with regard to numerous pieces of evidence, finds that the primary witnesses involved, including the autopsy surgeons, made a mistake with regard to the location of the head entry wound, for instance. They deferred to the photographs and X-rays as the best evidence. There were and are intrinsic proofs of forgery which the Committee was quite blind to, even though some of their own panel people tried to point out serious problems with the evidence, such as Dr. Angel noting the total lack of right frontal bone in the X-rays.

"To examine the autopsy photographs from the standpoint of identification of the victim we have considered two hypotheses:

1. That the subject shown in the photographs was not John F. Kennedy, but an unknown victim with a strong resemblance to the assassinated President.
2. That the victim in the photographs, in which the facial features are clearly visible, is indeed John F. Kennedy, but the body in which the face is not shown (particularly No. 32 through No. 37 which document the location of the critical wounds of the back and head) is that of another, unknown individual. (7 HSCA 47)

There it is again: The question as to who is it that they photographed?

A great controversy has been stirred by the publications of High Treason concerning the authenticity of the autopsy photographs.

It has been implied (as I explained in my first book) that a flap of scalp was pulled up to cover a large exit wound and missing bone in the back of the skull.

The photographs had to be retouched, and they are certainly out of focus in the key area where the two parts of the scalp come together on the back of the head.

The vast weight of the evidence from all the witnesses who saw the body, including those at the autopsy, was that there was no scalp left on a large part of the back of the head.

The picture is out of focus in that area and so there can be no edge. Lifton has said that he thinks a hair piece was used to cover the hole, but certainly not at any time on John Kennedy's head. Of course, the picture alleged by the government to be the back of John Kennedy may not be him. I think that in some of these pictures, his face has been added to another corpse's head.

I don't know how we can solve this now. It is clear to me that the area along what Robert Groden calls the matte line--where either two pictures were composed as one or where there is a forensic hair piece to cover the large exit wound, that area is out of focus to the camera. The rest of the picture, both the foreground and the background is perfectly in focus, so we have a photographic impossibility.

There is in fact no matte line there, but it is airbrushed in, painted in to make the scalp look contiguous, perhaps where a hairpiece was used on somebody else's skull.

Some time ago I showed copies of the autopsy photographs to a retired Maryland State police homicide investigator, and he immediately pointed out retouching on several of the photographs, in addition to the picture of the back of the head. Specifically, he pointed to retouching along the hairline in the right temple area, and all along the hair line across the forehead. Of course, if there was a bullet entry hole showing in the right temple area, somebody would want to touch that up to hide it. But it is possible, if not probable, that the bullet from in front which we believe hit him struck farther back on his head and was a tangential shot which took off the back of his head. This is what most of the Dallas doctors, nurses, and Dealey Plaza witnesses believe.

In addition, the retired State Police investigator stated that the three large dark stripes hanging down from the apparent gaping wound on the top of the head (as the body lies on its back) were painted in. He observed this in the black and white version of the color picture from the Groden set. In the colour photographs, this area is very bloody red, and does not appear real. I am told that brain or other matter hanging down like that simply would not look like that.

I also feel that the stripes do not correspond to those in the black and white pictures, and are more exterior to the skull. In the black and white Top of the Head pictures we see that two of the white stripes are clearly inside the head and show the brain and its convolutions.

We see so much more hair hanging down beneath and below those three white stripes, where there was supposed to be half of his head and brain missing. If we are being told that the open area on the top of the head was really what was missing, then, how come it is filled with brain right to the top of the head with just skull bone missing over it, at the apex of the

head, when we know that a good quarter of the brain was blown out?

Baltimore City policemen studied the photographs independently and felt that they were clearly retouched, airbrushed, and so on, in the same areas the Maryland State Policeman pointed out, though they did not know about him or what he said. At the time, I did not know Mark Crouch, who was coming to the same conclusions.

Paul O'Connor then provided a set of photographs to the Baltimore policemen. He pointed out to the officers numerous examples of retouching and forgery in several pictures, all in addition to the forged picture of the back of the head. The fact that O'Connor himself had been a policeman and was present at the autopsy, has motivated a more intense investigation on their own time by some Baltimore police, after talking to O'Connor and reading my book. Quite a few police are now involved in this matter, after reading my first book, HIGH TREASON.

"They are all forged just about," O'Connor said, speaking of the picture of the "frontal shot of the neck wound--with him sitting there looking all surprised....the whole left side of his head has been airbrushed in." "Yeah?" "As a matter of fact, they did such a shitty job, you can tell." Remember, this is a former policeman speaking, who was in the U.S. Navy and Vietnam, and who was present throughout the autopsy of President Kennedy.

O'Connor repeatedly denounced the pictures depicting the throat wound: "The throat wound that I'm looking at now--its garbage."

"What did it look like?"

"A more tear drop shape," speaking of what remained of the bullet hole after Dr. Perry obliterated it to make his trach incision.

Since the three groups of policemen which I am in touch with independently found retouching and forgery in the photographs, I think the matter is now beyond dispute. Our problem is that we are failing in our endeavors to gain access to the best copies available at the Archives. The Baltimore policemen wrote the Kennedy family lawyer--Burke Marshall--for permission and were turned down on the basis that they were not experts. We had planned to get experts, but that did not matter to him. We recall that Marshall first granted permission to an unqualified urologist, Dr. John K. Lattimer. I hope to bring in experts from Europe and elsewhere if we ever get in there.

We note that the Archives lately denies permission to see the rifle and other evidence. They will sell you a video tape of it, though.

No-one has the right to keep this material secret any longer, and that it certainly appears at this juncture that Burke Marshall is part of the cover-up.

Speaking of the alleged entry hole in the cowlick which shows in the photographs of the back of the head, Dr. Humes said: "Because I submit to you that, despite the fact that this upper point that has been the source of some discussion here this afternoon is excessively obvious in the color photograph, I almost defy you to find it in that magnification in the black and white." (7 HSCA 261)

Watch what Humes is trying to tell us during this interview, along with Dr. Boswell, before a panel of doctors for the House Assassinations Committee. "The gentleman was in the dorsal recumbent position on an autopsy table, not the greatest photographic position in the world, and we had to hold his head up. One of us is lifting the head, flexing the neck if you will, by holding the scalp, and to show the wound where it was in relation to the man's head."

Dr. Baden: "In reviewing this material earlier today, you made an ink notation on the skull that we have here, localizing the entrance perforation to the right of the external occipital protuberance--in reviewing the skull and marking (sic) at this time and having reviewing (sic) all of the films and incorporating our discussion, is that still a valid representation?" (This went against what the photographs and X-rays apparently show, as the Committee later noted.)

"Yes, I think so....I think that's a reasonable representation. I think that we were making an attempt, and of course, we didn't have Polaroid in those days, like we might use now, to be sure that we had an image of what we wished, and its interesting how technology changes things. We were attempting in that photograph to demonstrate that wound, and I feel that we have failed to demonstrate that wound." (7 HSCA 261) Failed to demonstrate that wound. Humes makes it clear here that he is sticking to his original positioning of the entrance wound low down on the back of the head, and he says that the photographs and X-rays fail to show it where they saw it.

How come this did not alert anyone at that meeting that there was something seriously wrong with the photos and X-rays?

"The Panel continued to be concerned about the persistent disparity between its findings and those of the autopsy pathologists and the rigid tenacity with which the prosecutors maintained that the entrance wound was at or near the external occipital protuberance." (7 HSCA 115)

The next nail on the box demonstrating forgery or tampering with the autopsy photographs and X-rays is Dr. Humes' clear statements about having taken chest photographs, which are missing from the National Archives: "That's one photograph that we were distressed not to find when we first went through and catalogued these photographs, (in 1966-7) because I distinctly recall going to great lengths to try and get the interior upper

portion of the right thorax illuminated--you know the technical difficulties with that, getting the camera positioned and so forth, and what happened to that film, I don't know. There were a couple of films that apparently had been exposed to light or whatever and then not developed, but we never saw that photograph." (7 HSCA 253) This is more evidence of Robert Bouck's "burn party."

How can photographs and X-rays disappear from the National Archives? Isn't there a pattern here of somebody tampering with this evidence?

In an intelligence operation, each person in each little office down a long corridor does not know what the person in the next office is doing. The right hand does not know what the left is doing. In this crime, we find it compartmentalized so that each piece of evidence, if viewed separately and not part of the whole, may tend to prove the government theory, but not when the whole pattern is seen.

The pattern in each of these murder cases where authentication of evidence is based on certain assumptions--evidence based on so-called scientific evidence that flew in the face of what the people who were there saw and remembered, and scientific evidence which clearly contradicted itself--is that the real facts were ignored or discounted. There is a pattern.

Mark Crouch tells us that on the night of December 6th or 7th, 1963, just two weeks after President Kennedy was murdered, Robert Bouck went through his safe, in the presence of James K. Fox, another Secret Service agent, and burned many items of the photographic and X-ray evidence in the assassination of President Kennedy. If true, this was a great crime.

We are told that Bouck did it because of fear that some of the evidence might conflict with what he thought Life Magazine was about to publish the next day, by way of frames from the Zapruder film. Well, somebody who ordered evidence destroyed had to be culpable, had to know that there was a conflict, that all of the evidence did not say the same things.

We can speculate that the safe in his office was used as a dead drop. That Acheson or someone had access to it, higher than Bouck, and that they switched evidence right then, but if evidence was destroyed for any reason, we can bet that it conflicted with the facts or other evidence. Bouck denies that anyone other than him had the combination to his safe and that Edith Duncan (his secretary) was not privy to it. (Interview with Richard Waybright, report date Nov 16, 1990) There were plenty of highly trained safe crackers around Washington, though.

They panicked and did not have too much time to decide what should survive. We do know that an awful lot is missing--the President's brain, the pathological slides, the interior chest photographs and numerous other X-rays and photos--and the indications are that all that was missing long before it was

ever turned over to Evelyn Lincoln (on 26 April, 1965) and the Kennedy family in the National Archives, though it was never actually in their possession.

In fact, Robert Bouck told my chief investigator Richard Waybright that "he felt that when he gave the materials to Mrs. Lincoln, he was actually giving them to the National Archives." (Report of Richard Waybright to the author, November 16, 1991)

In addition, it is not reasonable to me that any government official would release true copies of such materials even to the family.

The pattern was one of the systematic extermination of liberal leaders in the U.S. Each murder was said not to be a conspiracy. Yet, we had a lot of deaths, and the deaths of a lot of witnesses. Pattern becomes a significant fact when it repeats itself enough times. The totality of the patterns in these cases do not just strain credulity, but tell us that it was all a lie in the first place. This is common sense, anyway, something those in charge of our destiny forget. And they go to the experts, and rely on the Federal police and intelligence agencies for wisdom in criminal matters. Nobody has ever taken the bull by the horns in these cases. Common sense has always been on the ropes in life, anyway.

In the Fall of 1988, KRON-TV in San Francisco prepared a show on the assassination of President Kennedy. They paid David Lifton as a consultant, and used a color photograph of the back of the head provided by Robert Groden, which for some reason is edited out of the copy of the video which he provides.

Each of the Bethesda Hospital personnel present at the autopsy described on KRON a large wound in the back of the head, exactly where the Dallas doctors and nurses described it, each demonstrating with their hands, but extending forward along the top of the head. This is the area where the FBI men present at the autopsy wrote that there had been surgery.

The men made it abundantly clear that there was no scalp in the part of the head we see covered with perfectly intact scalp over the back of the head, which covers the large defect extending into the occiput. They confirmed this to me when I filmed them, along with the Dallas doctors, April 6, 1991, and they drew on the head of a mannequin the area that the scalp did not cover when the head was put back together.

Floyd Riebe, a photographic technician who took the pictures of the body at Bethesda, said that the President had "a big gaping hole in the back of the head. It was like somebody put a piece of dynamite in a tin can and light it off. There was nothing there." This is far more damage than could have been done by a military jacketed bullet, but instead by an explosive or frangible bullet, as appears when the head is struck in the Zapruder film. Riebe was shown the autopsy photographs, and



strongly disagreed with them, saying, "The two pictures you showed me are not what I saw that night." "What did it look like?" (Demonstrating the back of the head) "It had a big hole in it. This whole area was gone." With regard to the pictures and X-rays, Riebe said "It's being phonied someplace. It's make-believe."

Paul O'Connor, also present at the autopsy, described an "open area all the way across into the rear of the brain." He demonstrated that the whole top of the head was gone clear to the back. These men--when asked about the small, neat bullet entry wound in the colic in the otherwise intact scalp on the rear of the head--said that they didn't know what that was or how it got there.

O'Connor was shown the autopsy photographs and he said "No, that doesn't look like what I saw ...A lot worse wound extended way back here," and he demonstrated with his hand to the back of the head.

The recent publication of a set of alleged autopsy photos in High Treason show no part of the rear of the head missing. The only defect showing on the skull is a large hole on the top of the head extending far over to the left side, equally on the left and right sides, with a small flap of scalp and bone reflected back on the right, or open. There has never been any testimony or evidence that the large defect ever was on any part of the left side of the head.

The Zapruder film shows the flap of scalp and bone opening up on the right around the ear during the shooting, and brain pressing outward. Evidently, the President's wife--as she held her dying husband's head in her lap--pressed this back into place, closing the wound, as it was not generally noticed in Dallas, except for a couple of doctors that noticed a fracture there, and a ridge of overlapping bone. The only thing that the witnesses in Dallas saw was the large hole in the back of the head, with no scalp left. Nobody saw any large wound on the left, top, or front of the head. There was no large missing area across the top of the head at that time. The X-rays show a quite different wound entirely on the right front of the head and face with nothing on the left, or past the back half of the head.

The Central Independent TV four part series made in England and shown around the world (but not in the United States) also had Dr. McClelland demonstrate the wounds. He drew a picture of a big hole in the back of the head. "It would be a jagged wound that involved the half of the right side of the back of the head. My initial impression was that it was probably an exit wound. So it was a very large wound. Twenty to twenty-five percent of the entire brain was missing. My most vivid impression of the entire agitated scene was that his head had been almost destroyed. His face was intact but very swollen. It was obvious he had a massive wound to his head. A fifth to a

quarter of the right back part of the head had been blasted out along with most of the brain tissue in that area."

Dr. Paul Peters also was interviewed. He said, "We decided that the President was dead, and Dr. Clark, the Chairman of the Department of Neurosurgery, had come in the meantime and he had walked up to the head of the patient and looked inside at the wound and shook his head. He had a large--about 7 cm--opening in the right occipital-parietal area. A considerable portion of the brain was missing there, and the occipital cortex--the back portion of the brain--was lying down near the opening of the wound. Blood was trickling out."

First, the testimony on KRON strongly restated that there was a large hole in the back of the President's head. Dr. Charles Carrico said on television, "There was a large--quite a large defect about here (and he demonstrated a large hole in the very back of the head) on his skull." Dr. Ronald Coy Jones said, "My impression was there was a wound in this area of the head (demonstrating a large hole in the back of the head.) On viewing the alleged autopsy X-ray, he said, "certainly I can tell you that the wound was not here (demonstrating the forehead from over the right eye back to the temple and to the top of the front part of the head where the wound shows on the X-ray). There was no damage to the face that was visible," The alleged x-rays clearly show massive damage to the right front of the head extending into the temple, forehead and face down to the eye, but no hole in the back of the head. The X-rays are incompatible with the photographs, which show no injury to the face.

Nurse Audrey Bell said "There was a massive wound at the back of his head." Dr. Robert McClelland carefully demonstrated a large hole in the back of the head and said "It was in the right back part of the head--very large." All of these witnesses were filmed independently, and each demonstrated the wound in exactly the same place. Dr. McClelland said, "a portion of the cerebellum fell out on the table as we were doing the tracheostomy." He was asked "So the wound was very far back here?" (interviewer demonstrates the back of the head). "Right." "So the wound was in the back of the head?" "Right." Six doctors in Dallas had described seeing cerebellum on the table.

Then the show began to point out the conflicts that have developed in the evidence. Dr. Michael Baden (who never saw the body) said on the same broadcast that the cerebellum was intact in the photographs of the wounds. Dr. McClelland addressed this problem directly: "That was one of my more vivid memories of the whole thing. That was particularly grim to see that portion of the brain ooze out of the wound as I stood there looking at it. That stays with you pretty much." Dr. Jenkins had described as late as 1977 the cerebellum protruding, but he changed his opinion after seeing the photographs, some made from the angle looking down at the top of the head. "It did look like

cerebellum. It still looks like it, but its obviously not--" he said, looking at the alleged photographs of the head wound. Fake photographs will cause witnesses to change their perceptions of what they saw.

Paul O'Connor, the autopsy technician from Bethesda, again strongly denounced the photographs on another show. "The whole side of his head was gone. I don't know where those things came from but they are wrong. Totally wrong," he said of the autopsy photographs and x-rays.

#### THE PHOTOGRAPHS

There are two sets of autopsy photographs publicly known to exist outside of the National Archives--although this may be the first announcement of it. One of them--the "Fox" set, has been widely disseminated, and was published in both Best Evidence by David Lifton, and in High Treason. Other sets are known to exist, including one in the hands of Thomas Gervasi, who was a well known author and New York publishing house editor, but who in reality--like a lot of other people in the media--was a general in the Army's military intelligence.

This gives rise to several questions, always keeping in mind Carl Bernstein's landmark article, "The CIA and the Media," (Rolling Stone, October 20, 1977). I'll answer the first question by stating that there were sets of the autopsy pictures spread all over Washington not long after the assassination. It is obvious that spreading forged pictures reinforced the official cover story of the assassination, that the President was shot only from behind. It is more than significant that the photograph of the right profile was not a part of this set. That picture fails to show the large exit wound described by Humes to the Warren Commission or seen in the Zapruder film. Such a picture would have been very difficult to forge, and I doubt that there was much time to make these forgeries. They were made as simply as possible: by retouching.

In addition, photographs of the X-rays were not disseminated. Although the skull X-rays showed a large blowout in the appropriate area of the right front of the head, they would clearly conflict with the photographs of the President's undamaged face. I am sure they were made to be flashed at the appropriate people on the Warren Commission, if necessary.

Human nature being what it is, spreading around a few sets of these photographs at the time injects an element of terror and fascination into the body politic and into Washington itself. People don't question things like that. They view such macabre materials with the same horror and excited fascination as they watch the Amity Chainsaw Murders. It stirs more of the morbid curiosity in people, rather than the dispassionate eye of the investigator looking for signs of forgery. Morbid curiosity is the perfect cover-up for truth. Key people in possession or

privy to such depictions of the dead President feel privileged, and don't ask questions. Their morbid curiosity is satisfied, as they are so overwhelmed with the horror and excitement of the priceless treasure they possess or have seen in other's hands. And they are also scared, which is the idea. The subliminal message is: don't get the idea you are President the way Kennedy did, because this could happen to you.

Johnson, Carter, and Ford got the message. Nixon made the mistake of going to China and opening a detente there, so everything bad they had on him and all the set ups his warped personality led him into became the reason to frame him.

Robert Bouck, the former head of the Secret Service, denies having given permission to James K. Fox to make a set of the autopsy pictures for himself, (interview with Richard Waybright, report to the author of 16 November, 1990) but he did give the negatives to Fox who was the man who took the film to the Navy labs to be developed, (7 HSCA 23-4) and so could have made a set for himself. Other sets could have been passed to other people. I sincerely doubt that Fox, a relatively simple man who ended life as a baker in a small town in Maryland, would have made copies and passed them out without being told to do so. I doubt that he was the source for the other sets privately distributed in Washington after the tragedy.

David Lifton tells us that Mark Crouch introduced him to former Secret Service agent Fox, and tells us that he later obtained a set of the pictures and published them. (p. 703, Best Evidence, Carroll & Graf edition, 1988) Lifton met Fox in May 26, 1981, and obtained his set of pictures the following year. Fox died in 1982.

Lifton had seen a black and white set of the photographs and a color set--both in the possession of Robert Groden, who had been a staff photographic consultant to the House Committee.

The color and black and white sets are not all identical, as there are different views, though some of the pictures appear to be identical, colorized versions of the black and whites. A color picture of the face in right profile does not exist in the Fox set of eight pictures.

#### **RIGHT PROFILE PHOTO**

This picture was not one of those disseminated privately in Washington in 1963-4. The reason might be that it appears to show a devastating crease or shot that must have grazed along the right side of his head starting near the temple, until it entered the skull and took off the back of his head. And what may be the quite phoney flap that we see opened out on the right side of the head just above and forward of the ear in the Back of the Head photographs, does not and could not exist in this

other photograph--of the right side of the head, the face in profile.

Here we come upon evidence of forgery in that particular picture, which I will now address, before going on to the others. The color picture shows brilliant red stripes of brain or tissue coming down from the top of the head, somewhat on the outside of the hair. I was astonished when I first saw this, and mentioned it to Groden. His version promptly grew lighter.

This material is very blood red, and shows prominently in the pictures, several inches long. In other views showing the top of the head as the body lies on the table, there are three of these stripes, but in the black and white pictures, they are white or grey. When I showed a black and white copy of it to the retired Maryland State Police Officer (Al Hranicka) in early 1989, he said, "This isn't real." about the three stripes hanging down.

As Mark Crouch points out, we have a photographic impossibility. If the tissue matter is in reality white or grey, it will remain relatively the same color in a black and white picture. But if they are in reality red in color, and not white or grey, the tissue will go to black when printed in a black and white photograph. Red goes to black.

We printed this color picture in High Treason, but in black and white, since it did not exist among the Fox set, and it was the only photograph which shows the right side of the head. It is gravely important because it shows the right side of the head almost completely undamaged, contrary to Doctor Humes' testimony to the Warren Commission, which said the large defect was entirely in the right side of the head. (2 WCH 351, 352) In fact, little if any real damage to the head is apparent at all in this photograph.

There are two rather strange structures on the right side, one of which is bat shaped and has a wing tip extended into the forehead a half inch and pointing at the right eyebrow. It might be scalp that has been cut and reflected downward. It could be several things. Knowing what the number of the photograph is and the sequence in which it was taken would help. If it was taken towards the end of the autopsy, that would be meaningful.

In addition, there is what Mark Crouch calls the Devil's Ear, which is a shiny structure just above the ear and on the scalp. It is behind the area where there is an open flap on the Back of the Head photographs, and does not correspond to the flaps. It does not show in other photographs.

Another key thing about the photograph as we printed it, is that the three long, wide stripes of tissue hanging down from the apex of the head are black as reprinted in black and white, but two pages later, they are white, in the photograph of the top of the head from the Fox set.

#### BACK OF THE HEAD

There are apparently three different views of the back of the head, (two in color) and an additional view which shows it, along with the President's back and the bullet hole there, several inches down from the shoulder.

When I took High Treason to the printer, I decided to print some of the autopsy pictures to illustrate forgery in them. That day, Robert Groden met me, having with him his color photographs of the body. Years before, when I had first seen them in 1978, I had told him that I thought they were very clever paintings. Little did I know the trouble that observation would bring me in the following years. The pictures seemed to change each time I saw them as the years passed. Different exposures, different views.

Now I had an opportunity to study them again for a half an hour or so, but in poor conditions, sitting in a car in poor light. I noted something rather extraordinary on one of the other pictures--that of the back of the head--which I had not noted before. One of those pictures had a series of black crescents about half an inch long, half an inch apart, all along what Groden calls the "matte line". They are not in the latest version he showed us (Mark Crouch and Richard Waybright.)

His pictures should have been published in toto, to avoid suspicion and answer many questions about this case. Those in the Archives should have been published. It would have been done in any other country in the world.

#### **BACK OF THE HEAD PHOTO AND THE FOCUS PROBLEM**

Years ago I made a startling discovery: the photographs of the back of the head is out of focus in one specific area: all along what Groden calls the matte line. The picture is perfectly in focus in the background and foreground, and we have another photographic impossibility. One wonders if the lack of clarity the Committee's experts spoke of referred to that area which is out of focus, but they never specified.

Once again, I wonder why Groden never noticed this, or claims not to have done so.

#### **STARE OF DEATH PICTURE**

Mark Crouch has pointed out a small black triangle in the hair line of the temple at the juncture with the forehead above the right eye in what is known as the "Stare of Death" picture. This triangle is reference black: blacker than anything else in the picture, and represents something there to cover up something. It can be nothing else, unless it is a red herring.

The reference black triangle is apparently not in the color picture of the right profile which Groden possesses. Why not? Crouch says that the black area covers up either an incision or a tear. Groden says that it is a bruise, which he calls a subdural hematoma. The Nova shows got Dr. Paul Peters to say this, basically. I said to him, "That's not a bruise, its a cut." It looks very precise, as if it was something that was done deliberately but I can't preclude the possibility that it isn't a very nice, clean, accidental tear.

"There is no light at all passing through the negative," Mark Crouch says about the small black triangle. "Its not a bruise, its a tear in the scalp. The key point is, that it should be visible in the Fox "Stare of Death" photo, and in fact, it is, a) not visible, and b) the area where it should be is blacked out without a doubt."

"What could it be? Do you think it could be just an accidental tear? That's where the bullet was creasing along?"

"No! I believe it is evidence of a bullet--I've said it is an entrance wound. It doesn't have to be an entry wound. You said a key word right there: a 'crease'. It could have been a crease where the bullet sort of skirted and entered the skull."

#### **RIGHT PROFILE and the BAT CONFIGURATION**

"Well, there is that straight line on the right profile picture. Its two or three inches long." This straight line starts at the base of a triangle pointing toward the right eyebrow, and runs straight back on the head towards the top of the ear.

"Its the V that starts on the right part of the forehead above the eye and goes straight into the hair line toward the ear." We are speaking of a bat-like shape on the right front part of the hair, with one wing tip (the "V") pointing towards the eye. The base or trailing edge of the wing is a straight line pointing at the right eye in one direction, and towards the apex of the back of the head in the other direction. The whole bat like structure is also in the shape of the letter W, but spread wide apart.

I have grave difficulty with this picture showing the face in right profile, the lens behind the head a bit, because the flap sticking out on the right side of the head does not correspond to anything in this picture, although there is a flap like shape above the ear, very dark. It appears to be painted in to correspond with the flap sticking out on the side of the head in the Back of the Head photographs.

"For whatever reason, that V incision that is evidenced in Groden's right side picture is blacked out in the Fox pictures. The question that you ask then--is there something that is being hidden--what is being blacked out? Is there some evidence of a bullet hole or some other evidence of bullet trauma there that

is being blacked out, that they later not worried about because an incision has been made through it?" Mark Crouch asks.

But the President's head was bowed somewhat when he was struck, and the straight line at the base of the bat winged shape on the right side of his head points almost straight up and down, so it would not seem to be the track of a bullet along there. Joanne Braun speculated that it was an incision. (The Third Decade, March, 1991, "New Evidence of Body Tampering," by Joanne Braun)

In my opinion, some of Groden's color pictures are paintings. There is no background in them, and specifically the right face in profile picture, the Stare of Death picture which he had, and the back of the head pictures are largely paintings.

When I first saw Groden's pictures in 1978, one of them showed a large hole in the right side of the head through which one could look at the interior of the skull. This picture no longer is in his inventory. It was a view of the whole head in profile, and there was a large hole there. I cannot imagine what happened to it.

He also had a Stare of Death picture, which I described carefully in my notes. The right eye was quite clearly askew. This picture also has disappeared from his collection. The question is, what happened to them?

He also had a set of black and whites which we saw in 1979.

Groden denies the possibility that his precious Zapruder film might be forged in some respect, yet he pointed out to us all of the splices and so on in it, after others did so first. Obviously, if the film has so many splices and frames actually missing, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that we have some special effects and animation there.

Crouch has had ten years to study these photographs, and his findings coincide with mine. When a retired Maryland State Police homicide investigator pointed out to me extensive retouching all along the hairline of the forehead, which I thought I had noticed myself, but believed I was dreaming and said nothing to anyone. At first, I was willing to accept one forgery, but not many. I kept my mouth shut and let him talk.

#### THE THROAT WOUND

The throat wound is most clearly seen in the Stare of Death photograph. It is also seen in the Left Profile picture.

Paul O'Connor strongly believes that the throat wound is retouched, making the wound larger and more jagged than it was, and partly covering up the bullet wound that the incision in



part obliterated. They saw a smooth incision at the autopsy. Retouching it makes it look like an exit wound.

#### THE BONE FLAP

Then there is the matter of the flap of bone and attached scalp opened out on the right side of the head, just forward of and above the ear. This flap changes orientation with each movement of the camera for another angle and view. It does not stay firmly in the area where it starts. One might easily dismiss that with the observation that the scalp is sliding around on the head, but this would not permit the flap of bone to move as it does.

The flap is nowhere to be seen in the Stare of Death or Right Profile pictures, not even closed. the "Devil's Ear" is in the wrong place to be the flap.

A key point in the equation is the fact that David Lifton has gone to extraordinary lengths to ignore the existence of forgery in the photographs and X-rays. His own witnesses repeatedly told him that they were all incompatible with each other and what they remembered, and he himself helped write, according to him, Robert Groden's memo pointing out forgery in one of the pictures which the House Committee published in appendix six.

#### GRODEN

Robert Groden seized upon what others already have noted at the House Committee Hearings: That the Back of the Head pictures did not show the large exit and missing scalp which had been observed by all the witnesses who saw the body at any time that day or night.

And the question must be raised, how come Groden--a self proclaimed photographic expert raised to the position of God and arbiter in the independent investigation by all of us--only pointed out forgery in one of the photographs, and did not mention the others and the many obvious problems with the pictures, or notice that they were not only incompatible with the X-rays but each other? Groden wrote and the House Committee printed a long article listing all of his dissents.

Groden's pictures have no background, no floor, no tables, no walls, no anything. Just blacked out areas and shadows. Why?

How then did Groden come to walk out of the House Assassinations Committee with a set of the autopsy photographs, when the CIA's liaison with the Committee, Regis Blahut, was arrested for having tampered with them, which were found outside of the safe in the Committee's offices?

When myself and Steve Parks of the Baltimore Sun first saw the pictures in Robert's possession, they were stamped "National

Archives" on the back, in a large black box several inches across, with a black box border around the writing. We were told they were leaked.

At the time, I thought they looked awfully suspicious, as though they were water colors--clever paintings, as I told him. The Committee--as quoted above--commented at length on the lack of clarity in these pictures.

Frankly, that lack of clarity is impossible. We saw the grisly pictures of the dead Martin Luther King at a meeting of the Committee, and they were clear as a bell, as are all other autopsy photographs, or for that matter, most pictures taken anywhere by almost anyone. Only these among all of the billions of the world's pictures taken in this century might be unclear. Why? Clearly, we are not supposed to see too much.

The reason is that a lot is covered over in them--painted over, reshaped, airbrushed.

How come Lifton claims to have discovered the incompatibility of the X-rays to the photographs in 1988, when my book was being layed out in Groden's presence? Then Lifton attempted to take over this discovery of mine from ten years before, even though it seriously conflicted with his own theories. His own witnesses had told him about it, in which case he could not have "discovered" it.

What we have with Lifton is someone who staked out the other half of the territory Groden staked out, leaving no third possibility for the rest of us: We are left with either/or situation with this evidence: Either the body was altered, or the picture of the back of the head is a composite matte line insertion.

How can Groden narrate the Zapruder film and not be able to answer the questions "What is that coming out of his face?" when the President is struck in the head with a bullet? "I don't know," he says.

Since he was my partner, I know that his M.O. is denial. Now you see it, now you don't. He has for a long time played a shell game with this evidence. At times I was shown different views of the back of the had. In one of them, there is clearly a line of small black crescents, a half an inch long and a half an inch apart all the way around where he says there is a matte line--just as though a can opener had been operating there. I ask him what that is--"I don't know" he responds. Sometime later he hauls out a picture of the back of the head again, and I can't find the crescents. "Where are the crescents?" "I don't know. You imagined that. There aren't any."

Well, Mark Crouch saw them too.

In 1979, Steve Parks and I saw both a color set of photographs and a black and white set at Groden's house. Later the black and white set seems to have disappeared. He says he never had black and whites, but David Lifton and numerous others

saw them. Groden doesn't seem to have them anymore. Maybe he sold them.

He claimed never to have the Stare of Death picture, but both Lifton and myself recorded at different times having seen this unique photograph.

Groden says that he personally interviewed Dr. Malcolm Perry, an interview I set up, but Perry, Jeff Price, the reporter, and Steve Parks, the editor from the Sun, deny that Groden was allowed inside the interview. His pictures were not shown to Perry. The Sun (and most if not all newspapers) would never allow an outsider along on any personal interview, anyway.

And Groden has begun telling a colossal lie: That he discovered the conflict between the X-rays and the photographs and wrote a memo to someone on the Committee about it. How come his finding is not in his long memorandum which they published-giving him total freedom?

Nothing in between. No painting. Lately I have found this sort of conflict in many of the facets of the evidence, and each time there is often an either/or situation, but no third possibility, no other ground to go, unless you look for it real hard. And now I am finding them, and for those who have co-opted this case, the answers I am coming up with seem to me to work a lot better.