

As the note I added says, he did this for me and it is I, not the archives, who sent him those prints. For me he had two enlarged negatives in which the heads are exactly the same size and can be overlaid. When this is done there is a 4" difference in height. And the faces appear to be identical or close to that. The pictures are of Oswald in the yard, with pistol, rifle and copies of The Militant and The Worker. Newcomb was a commercial artist. I lost track of him shortly after this when he and Lifton combined in a campaign of lies over what I was up to in checking out who actually picked up the handbills Oswald handed out that the Jones Printing Co. made. It was not, according to Jones and his one employee, Myra Silver, Oswald. I heard that ^(by company) they had moved to where pot smoking was not a crime and that he and someone else did a book. I've not seen it.... Faris Rookstool III, who I soon learned was a Dallas FBI agent, wrote me that he had a rare picture of me. In time I got it and the locale is unique: the Newcomb's Sherman Oaks backyard. Rookstool did not respond when I wrote him that I knew where and when that picture was taken and how did he get it. It was not disclosed to me by HQ, Dallas or Los Angeles FBI offices in response to my FOIPA requests for all records on or about me. Picture taken 2/68.

Harold - Jaffe mailed this stuff to Jim
and so far no word... in fact Jaffe tells
me the pkg. never arrived!

He did not. I gave them to him & Fred
asked him to do this as an independent show. It in ~~check~~
his hands for the fix.

4640 NOBLE AVENUE
SHERMAN OAKS, CALIFORNIA
91403

March 18, 1968

District Attorney Jim Garrison
District Attorney's Office
2700 Tulane Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70119

Dear Mr. Garrison:

I got two prints (Commission Exhibit 133A and 133B) from the
National Archives and on the back of each print they were
identified as copies from the original negatives and numbered.

The very first thing I did was to make film positives of each
print and very carefully made the head size exactly the same in
both cases. Then placed them on a light box so that one could
see both photos at the same time.

When I looked at them...to my amazement, the bodies didn't match
in size. One figure is approximately 4" taller than the other.
No camera distortion can account for this. And another thing.
The heads match so perfectly that I can say without qualification
that these two heads same from one photograph. The shadows are
the same and the angle is the same.

The head on (B) has been retouched to give a different expression...
around his nose and mouth especially. However, there are reference
points in these shadows that overlay perfectly. Since the body
has shifted position from one shot to the other, and the camera was
hand held and had to be re-wound, then repositioned, the chances
of this happening are a million to one.

They only had one photograph of Oswald's head to work with so they
superimposed this twice.

PAGE TWO

In doing this job, they made a mistake in calculating the proper head size on Photo (B).

On Photo (A) you will note some black blotches in the fence area. This appears to be retouching bleach accidentally spilled on the negative.

Notice the difference in shoulder girth on the film positives... and the overly husky neck in (B). Also, I have compared the configuration of rifle in (B) with Commission Exhibit showing the Carcano - the last 12" of the barrel is not that of a Carcano.

Very sincerely,

FRED T. NEWCOMB

FTN:mkn
Enclosures

P.S. Checked my Bantam Edition of the W.R. and guess what? Time-Life has a copywrite on these two exhibits! Does this rule out publication? I wonder what they would say in court if they tried to restrain publication?

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION ON EXHIBITS

BY: ROY WATSON - Commercial photographer, 25 years experience
3607 Sunset Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90026

Head size being equal in Photo (A) and Photo (B) and selecting photo (A) as the photo most nearly in balance as to head to body size ratio and assuming a height of 5'9" from the top of the head to the ball of the weight bearing foot - we have a reference dimension from point "Z" at the top of the head to point "X" at the ball of the weight bearing foot.

On Photo (B) the decreased distance from point "Z" to point "X" (although the head size is the same) would indicate a height of only 5'6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ".

This is based on the fact that the body balance, which of course includes the head must always be centered over the weight bearing foot in a static pose.

It would seem that this principle was neglected in the thinking applied to sizing the head for these composites. It seems obvious to me that on Photo (B) the non weight bearing foot was chosen for dimensioning purposes. This foot being nearer to the camera than the weight bearing foot throws off all the normal calculations and results in the appearance of either a larger head or a smaller body.