

March 7, 1984

*confidential
garry marks 3/14/84*

Dear Henry,

Glad to hear there's time and interest in pursuing the Moorman photo. You've already got most of the background in my newsletter, and we've discussed the possibility that a second figure in the picture may well be Gordon Arnold.

He told me two things that only someone who was there could know. First, the Stemmons sign blocked his view after a few seconds and second, he saw Jackie get out of her seat as he was dropping to the ground. Groden has done some enhancement of the Orville Nix film (owned by UPI) and a light colored object is dropping down as Jackie is getting up. The film also confirms Arnold's position in relation to the sign blocking his view.

Remember, too, that a witness on top of the Post Office saw a man in light colored clothing with something in his hand run through the parking lot shortly after the shooting. That matches Arnold's description of what he was wearing and the camera he carried. The above material, in more detail, will be in Coverups soon.

Jack White and I were invited, along with Harold Weisberg, Cyril Wecht and David Wrone, to participate in a discussion of the case for the 20th anniversary issue of the National Enquirer. We brought prints of the image and everyone was very impressed.

We were invited to the home office a few days later for a presentation to the top people of the Enquirer, including Iain Calder, Paul Levy and two photo experts. They, too, were excited and immediately approved our suggestion that expert computer enhancement and study was needed. My first contact was Robert Selzer at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California. JPL is part of the University of Southern California. Selzer had been on the HSCA photo panel and Groden was very impressed with him. He also did some of the HSCA's evaluation of the Bronson film and was on record as believing the movement was probably human.

Selzer wanted to do work on the Moorman picture, but not for the Enquirer. That proved to be the response from nearly 20 other contacts. Finally, Dr. Bill Schreiber at MIT agreed to take a quick look.

The Enquirer flew Jack and I and writer David Wright to Boston and we met with Schreiber toward the end of October. Also present was Professor Lim and consultant Eli Israeli. All three saw the image and immediately realized it was probably a person. I think they were ready to be extremely skeptical, but that immediately changed to obvious enthusiasm.

Step one was to take the original slide, not the enhanced blowups Jack had prepared, and have it digitized - transferred to computer language. This was done the next morning at Scitex, which is headquartered in Israel, a firm that does regular consulting work for MIT from a nearby suburb. After digitizing, Israeli enhanced the image by altering the contrast and brightness. The results were impressive - everyone in the room recognized a person. Israeli then made a protection copy of the computer tape which, hopefully, still exists.

We then took the original tape to MIT where Schreiber said Lim and one of his top students were planning on enhancing the picture sometime that evening. The following morning, in a phone conversation with Enquirer reporter David Wright, Lim said he had absolutely no doubt the image was that of a person. He had worked from 8 or 9pm until about 9 the following morning. Most of his attention was on the face, hair, eyes and left ear. Attempts to find detail in what might be a puff of smoke were unsuccessful. He had not done any work on the left arm, nor on the Gordon Arnold image (he felt

the Arnold image would ultimately benefit more from enhancement than the "gunman" image.)

Lim said he was going to get some sleep, then do some more work later that afternoon. He wanted to apply two new computer programs he had invented, programs which could produce a significant increase in clarity. He also wanted to make sure he had the school's "blessing" to continue.

Late that afternoon, in another phone conversation with Wright, he "frantically" refused to continue and warned that if the Enquirer printed anything about it he would deny ever having seen a picture or done any work. There was absolutely no indication of any problem related to the Enquirer or to money - it had been made clear at the beginning, and restated several times, that the Enquirer was only interested in having qualified experts examine the photo and that there was no story unless they found something. The Enquirer offered to pay expenses or tuition, make a grant or whatever the scientist^w felt was reasonable. They refused any money whatsoever.

Wright appealed to Schreiber for help or reassignment of the project, but Schreiber refused. In addition to backing the decision, he said MIT would retain the computer tape containing Lim's work plus the original tape from Scitex. He does not know Scitex has a copy.

The Enquirer spent well over \$5000 and wound up with nothing. They have officially lost interest in the picture, mostly because they have no one else to go to for further enhancement.

Several days ago I spoke with Robert Selzer at JPL. I related the important parts of this story and he was intrigued. He also knows Schreiber. Selzer would like to work on the picture, but he has other projects to do first. He suggested an associate, whom he's known for 20 years, who would have the time and interest in doing the work. Selzer said there would be no charge, since JPL often does intriguing, different projects at little or no cost.

The picture has been properly copyrighted and we have not made any prints available to anyone. Either Jack White, myself, or both must accompany the slide. We had contracts with the Enquirer for expenses during our stay in Massachusetts, remuneration for a usable picture and story after enhancement, and ownership of all rights 30 days after publication in the Enquirer. The Enquirer was to have the right to publish the picture at any time without charge.

I talked with Dr. Barger about this picture and what effect it might have on the acoustics evidence. He had no problem with the shooter being 10-15 feet north of the corner of the fence, even though his initial work placed him 7-8 feet west of the corner. He suspected some minor variable would easily account for the difference.

This brings up an important point: Lee Bowers testified (and repeated on film for Mark Lane) he saw two men behind the fence when JFK was shot. To make the Moorman image even more credible, you should consider having JPL enhance the frames at the end of the Zapruder film. That has never been done, even though Groden made the HSCA aware that the film shows the area behind the fence about 7 seconds after the head shot. There is apparent movement by a man crouching down and turning his head to his left. Another image could be a second person.

The Zapruder film is far superior in quality and should generate spectacular results with enhancement. Parade watchers behind the fence are certainly suspicious, for there was no reason not to get closer to the street. Groden has first generation copies, and the original, now in the National Archives, might be available to Readers' Digest.


Gary Mack