



Publishing the 8-shot crossfire in the Grassy Knoll Gazette in 1983 afforded another opportunity to diagram this insistent S-R T.

Similar to the unseen motion 312-313, the head's turned position, 34 degrees to the right of the limousine's travel-line, is unseen by those blinkered by S-R T. Once it is clear that a shot from ahead of the limousine is actually at right angles to the head no entrance, no exit and right-angled trajectory makes it impossible for the second bullet to move the head backward as seen in the photographic evidence.

...and
the TRUTH
shall set you

F...R

H

H

presented VI/29/91 at THE THIRD DECADE RESEARCH CONFERENCE
Fredonia NY

© 1991 R B Cutler 675 Hale St Beverly Farms MA 01915

Another Look: Connally and the Zapruder Film, by Stephen Peterson*

The 8-mm film that amateur photographer Abraham Zapruder took during the assassination of President John F. Kennedy on November 22, 1963 is undoubtedly one of the most closely examined films in history. Although every facet of select¹ frames has been the subject of much discourse over the intervening twenty-nine years, some frames have been relatively "silent." The observations of some of these frames are presented here for discussion and critical review. And while the examination of individual frames is necessary, their context with surrounding frames must be maintained to understand the flow of continuous motion.

These observations center on Texas Governor John B. Connally seated directly in front of the President in the open limousine. The governor sustained wounds of the right posterior armpit, the chest, the right wrist, and left thigh. Throughout his wounding, the governor held a white Western-style hat which provides a visual aid in the study of his right hand and arm movements.

An additional observation raises the possible "discovery" of another face in the knoll area.

Observation #1

During a short period of time, Mr. Zapruder's camera view of the limousine was obstructed by the Stemmons highway sign. We will start by observing Connally in the film frames as the limousine emerges from behind that sign--

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Frame 223 - | Kennedy still hidden behind the sign.

Connally seemingly unaffected, sitting upright, with his right hand and hat out of view, presumably resting on his lap. |
| Frame 224 - | Kennedy now becomes visible, his arm <u>already</u> rising in reaction.

The area of Connally's right side jacket lapel appears to jump outward away from his body, evidenced by the significant reduction of visible white shirt between the jacket lapels, when compared to the previous frame. |
| Frame 226 - | Connally's right arm and hat are now visible in the midst of a rapid and upward "jerk" motion. |
| Frame 227 - | Blurred by camera motion. |
| Frame 228 - | The hat is, at its highest point in the film, being held by his right hand in a near vertical position in front of his face. |
| Frame 229 - | The hat and hand has descended to his chest area. |

Frame 230 - The hat is held inverted and nearly horizontal.

Analysis and Discussion--

Observing the hat and hand in front of the Governor's face was a surprise, not only because it was such an extreme movement, but also because of the speed at which it moved. The time from the visible start of the rising Connally arm jerk (frame 226) to the point where its descending vertical motion stopped (frame 229) is 0.16 seconds² (the blink of a human eye takes 0.10 seconds³). This extreme and rapid arm movement suggests that this was an immediate and involuntary reaction caused by the inflicted physical trauma of the posterior armpit bullet strike. To be clear, I am not saying that the wrist was hit at this point, but that the right posterior armpit was hit and the right arm immediately jerked in reaction. This evidence also contradicts the government's position of a Connally "delayed reaction."⁴ Additionally, there were no reactions or sudden movements from the other occupants of the vehicle as one would expect in a shared experience, such as fright response to a loud noise.

Starting at the point when the Connally arm reaction is first visible in frame 226, I then proceeded backward in time (lower frame numbers), looking for evidence or indication as to the cause of this reaction. Each individual frame was photographed and/or digitized and zoomed. It was at this time that the sudden jacket closing between frames 223 and 224 was noticed. Referring to the sketch of Connally's jacket in the F.B.I. laboratory report⁵ revealed a notation of "#1 Hole" and an arrow pointing to the right front area of Connally's jacket. This is precisely the area that appears to be suddenly displaced in frame 224, and thus provides a reinforcement for this hypothesis that the jacket movement was caused by the exiting bullet and tissue material from Connally's chest wound.

The time from this proposed point of impact to Connally in frame 224, to the point that his rising hat/hand is first visible (frame 226) is approximately 0.11 seconds. I believe that this immediate and involuntary movement is in reaction to, and consistent with, a bullet hit of the posterior armpit area in frame 224, with a corresponding chest exit. The Connally hit/reaction sequence would be: Connally hit in right side posterior armpit, bullet exits chest displacing jacket. Right arm jerks in reaction. Connally starts dropping his right shoulder and turns toward his right side wound.

Having established a scenario for the first Connally hit, we will now continue back in time (lower frame numbers) to look at the time relationship to the President's first bullet strike.

The Warren Commission Report states that all of Governor Connally's wounds were sustained coincident with the President's back and neck wound and by the same bullet, at or about frame 210.⁶

It is probably prudent to accept the government's position that the President was first shot while Mr. Zapruder's camera view was obstructed by the highway sign, since we see the President already reacting as he emerges from behind that sign. For lack of opposing video evidence, we will even accept that the shot occurred in frame 210 as the government postulates.

Ballistics tests were conducted at the U.S. Army's Edgewood Arsenal in 1964,⁷ to measure the performance of the alleged murder weapon's 6.5-mm ammunition. Various materials were used as targets to simulate the tissue and mass of the physical wound locations in the two victims. Bullet velocities were measured at the individual wound sites and recorded.

The bullet entrance velocity for the simulated Kennedy back wound was 1,904 feet per second, with a 125-feet-per-second loss of velocity upon exiting the President's neck.⁸ This would leave a resulting velocity of 1,779 feet-per-second to traverse the approximate 3-foot distance to Connally's back. Thus the approximate time between the President's hit and the Connally hit would be less than 0.002 seconds⁹ for a single bullet based on the government's ballistics tests.

The time difference between the President's hit in frame 210 as stated in the Warren Report, and the point that we see a physical material strike to Connally in frame 224 is 0.765 seconds.

Contrasting these two figures (0.002 vs. 0.765), it should be apparent that the two victims could not have been hit by the same bullet. Nor could they both have been inflicted by the alleged murder weapon alone, as the government states that ". . . at least 2.3 seconds were required between shots."¹⁰

This case for two separate and distinct shots is consistent with all the actions viewed in the pertinent area of this film.

Observation #2

This observation addresses the frame 237-238 shoulder "dip." This popular scenario gives the impression that the right shoulder of Governor Connally was in a relatively static position in frame 237, then within one frame is driven rapidly downward several inches as the bullet slams into the posterior armpit area.

Analysis and Discussion--

By observing the position, attitude and state of the governor's "body language" in frames prior to frame 238, it is apparent that the governor had been subjected to trauma at an earlier point in time. Frames 235 or 236 provides a clear example.

On close examination, the dropping of the shoulder is part of a continuous reactive movement to an event that occurred many frames earlier (see above). In relation to static points of reference, the frame 238 dip isn't remarkable when compared to corresponding motion in surrounding frames. The displacement of the dip in this frame appears large due to the moving background behind Connally's right shoulder. Mrs. Kennedy's lightly colored right arm was moving upward behind the governor's shoulder as she reached out toward her husband. This caused the illusion of a large downward movement of the shoulder between these two frames. If you examine Mrs. Kennedy's right arm movement in frames 237, 238 and 239, this point becomes obvious.

Additionally, the declination angle of the posterior entrance wound to the anterior exit wound in Connally's torso was given as 25 degrees.¹¹ If there was any motion in the shoulder caused by the transfer of momentum from the bullet, the direction would be predominantly toward the front in a horizontal plane, with a much smaller downward component. But since the bullet passed through the body, even considering the smashing of a rib, there was probably insufficient transfer of momentum imparted to the body to drive the mass of the shoulder visibly in any direction.

Observation #3

Paraphrasing the medical report included in the Warren Commission Report,¹² "the governor's right radius bone was broken close to the wrist, with collateral severing of tendon and nerve."

Connally is seen holding his hat with his right hand in frame 230. This observation is commonly cited as proof that his wrist and presumably no other part of his body, has not been hit yet.

However 90 frames later (frames 320-330), Connally is continuing to grasp the hat in his right hand. By extension, does this now prove that the wrist still has not been hit?

Analysis and Discussion--

How do we square this observation with the belief that this severed tendon would preclude the grasping of an object? The following possibilities must be considered--

1. This severed tendon does not preclude grasping.
2. This severed tendon does preclude some grasping but wasn't needed to grasp this object (i.e. palm/finger grip in lieu of finger/thumb or vice versa).
3. This tendon was not severed or otherwise rendered nonfunctional.
4. This tendon was transacted and would prevent grasping an object in the same manner as exhibited in frames 320-330.

In cases 1 through 3, the evidence of Connally holding the hat in the "later" frames 320-330 is inconsequential, and no inference can be drawn from it.

In case 4, logical extension would suggest that Connally didn't suffer a right wrist wound until after frame 330.

At the present time, I cannot determine any point of impact to the governor's wrist, or reaction from the governor to this wound, from this film. It is very clear that he was holding his hat in these "later" frames, and the result of this injury needs to be further addressed. If in fact this injury would preclude the grasping of the hat, then that would materially alter the time frame this injury could have been sustained (i.e. after frame 330).

Observation #4

This observation is of a face that I've named "Glassman" in frame 405. This is the only frame with three street lamp posts focused and roughly aligned in one frame. The face is observable in this one frame only, which is approximately 8 frames before the infamous "man in bush with rifle" (aka "bushman") frames. The image appears on the extreme bottom of the

frame just to the left of the no parking sign attached to the closest lamp post. The mouth and chin are cut off by the bottom border of the frame and the face is in shadow. "He" appears to be wearing eyeglasses and a hat, looking downward and to the viewers' left. The small size and darkness of this image, even zoomed, renders it very difficult to discern, thus open to interpretation.

Analysis and Discussion--

Perhaps this is one of the other bystanders in the vicinity of Emmett Hudson on the steps of the knoll. A size analysis of the head would be helpful in determining if the head size is consistent with possible bystander locations, and to approximate the distance of this figure from the camera. Perhaps researchers with access to commercial or professional grade video or photographic equipment can offer further insight and comment on these observations. I would be happy to assist in any way.

Closing

We are all susceptible to accepting easy "proofs" of evidence regarding various aspects of this case.

One of these is the shoulder "dip" of frames 237/238. Can we look at frame 236 and not believe that Connally was already reacting to trauma?

Can we emphatically state that the injury to Connally's wrist would not allow him to hold his hat in frame 230, then ignore his continued holding of the hat 100 frames later?

There is still much work to do, not the least of which is to determine precisely the extent and degree of any alterations that may have taken place on this film, which could impact past, present, and future observations.

I hope that this discussion will stimulate a continued examination of what is probably, even flawed as it is, our best evidence.

*1835 Newport Blvd., Suite G 182-184, Costa Mesa, CA 92627.

Notes

¹Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 98. Cited hereafter as WCR.

²WCR, p. 97, 1 frame/18.3 frames per seconds=0.5464 seconds.

³Popular Science, October 1992, "It's In The Bag," p. 60. An automobile airbag opening contrasted to a human eye blink.

⁴WCR, p. 115.

⁵Neutron Activation Analysis/JFK Assassination, Laboratory Work Sheet File number 62-109060 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, April 1964), "Q566 Black suit coat worn by Gov John Connally."

⁶WCR, p. 112.

⁷Wound Ballistics of 6.5 mm Mannlicher-Carcano Ammunition, CRDL 3264 (U.S. Army Edgewood Arsenal, March 1964). Cited as CRDL.

⁸CRDL, p. 13.

⁹3 feet/1,779 feet-per-second=0.0017 seconds.

¹⁰WCR, p. 97.

¹¹WCR, p. 93.

¹²WCR, p. 533, Commission Exhibit 392.

More Evidence of the Framing of Lee Harvey Oswald, by Richard E. Sprague

The Sniper's Nest:

Some after-the-fact framing of Oswald was accomplished by various members of the Dallas Police Force. The police, the FBI, and the Warren Commission found that Oswald had created a sniper's nest for himself in the southeast corner of the sixth floor of the Depository Building. They said he fired his three shots from the nest. The evidence about the nest consisted mainly of two groups of photographs of the location taken by Lt. Carl Day and Robert Studebaker and introduced as Commission Exhibits (CE's) when they testified. Other witnesses used the two sets of photos when they testified about objects found in the nest. Most of these pictures were actually taken by Studebaker at the direction of Lt. Day.

The Day and Studebaker Photos:

Day's C.E. 733 and Studebaker's Exhibit J are the same photo. Both men testified that it and CE 734 showed the actual positions of the cartons in the sniper's nest at the time the shots were fired. They both said that Oswald had been resting his gun handle on box #3 where the circled indentation appeared; had been resting his gun barrel on box #4 on the window ledge; had been sitting on the carton to the left of box #3; and had left his palm print where the circle was drawn. They said he made a shield of boxes, to keep from being seen by others on the sixth floor. Lt. Day introduced CE 723 and 725 to show what the shield looked like from the other side. Both men introduced identical photos showing three shells they said they found lying in the sniper's nest; CE 715 and 716 by Day and Studebaker A & B. They introduced the same photo, CE 729 and Studebaker F & G to show the position of a large brown paper bag which the police claimed Oswald used to carry the rifle into the building. (There were no photos taken of the bag inside the building.) They introduced CE 718, 719 and Studebaker C to show the place on the sixth floor where the rifle was found. Day introduced CE 722 and 724 showing two views out of the sniper's nest window. The two men introduced CE 728 and Studebaker H and I to show the place where the chicken lunch and Dr. Pepper bottle had been found. Some of these latter photos are in the same pictures cropped differently or marked differently. (See Table of Photos showing which ones are the same.)

The Beers Photos:

The Warren Commission did not see or analyze a collection of photographs taken by Dallas Morning News photographer Jack Beers. Even though they received testimony from Beers, they paid no particular attention to his photos and how they compared to those of Lt. Day and Mr. Studebaker. Beers took several pictures on the sixth floor of the TSBD at approximately 3 to 3:09 p.m. on November 22, 1963. He also took several pictures earlier, outside the building. Unfortunately, the Dallas Morning News has withheld these photos through the last 18 1/2 (changed to 28) years.

They were taken from a book that Beers and R. B. Denson published called, "Destiny in Dallas." They turn out to be extremely important pictures as will be demonstrated in this

article. The first one shows the cartons in the sniper's nest window, including three cartons piled up next to the windows and a wall of cartons to the left. A quick glance at this photo compared to Studebaker J and CE 733 and 734 illustrates quite clearly many differences in the alignment and positioning of all the cartons.

The second Beers photo, compared to CE 723 and 725, illustrates major differences in the carton positions to the north of the window. The third Beers photo is important in establishing the view Oswald would have had looking out of the window. It can be compared to CE 722 and 724 in order to establish relative timing of photograph taking. The other Beers photos are also important for a variety of reasons that will be demonstrated.

Timing of the Photos

With all of the obvious discrepancies among these photos, it becomes essential to determine the relative times when the Beers, Day and Studebaker photos were exposed. If the Warren Commission had been at all interested or if they had taken a close look at the Beers photos, they might have realized the significance of the timing.

Robert Studebaker told the Commission that he went with Lt. Day to the TSBD at 1:15 p.m. and implied that he exposed all of his photographs at around 1:30 p.m. on November 22. Joseph Ball, the Warren Commission lawyer who questioned Studebaker, asked few questions about timing. Lt. Day was less sure. He said he remembered taking the picture of the shells soon after he arrived at about 1:12 p.m. But some of the photos he thought were taken on Monday, November 25, when he and Studebaker returned to the TSBD for the first time since Friday, November 22. Others he believed were taken later on Friday. Some he was not sure about. He said CE 723, looking out of the sixth-floor window, was taken at around 3 to 3:15 p.m. Jack Beers told the Commission he exposed his photos at about 4 p.m. on November 22. If Studebaker, Day, and Beers all remembered correctly and told the truth, the Beers photos would have been exposed after the Studebaker photos and some of Day's photos.

There are, however, several ways to determine when all three sets of photos were exposed. First, any pictures with sunlight and shadows self-determine the approximate time of day to within a half hour. Second, any photos showing the view out of the sixth floor window can be used to tell the approximate time of day and whether they were exposed on November 22 or on a later day. The reason is that the plaza was nearly completely covered with flowers for several days beginning on Saturday, November 23. Third, if two photos show the outside on the same day at about the same time the shadow pattern and angles can be used to determine which was exposed first. Fourth, if one of the three men appear in the other's photo taking a picture, the timing of the two photos can be determined. Fifth, Lt. Day testified that a section of the carton containing Oswald's palm print had been removed, taken to the police laboratory, and tested to prove that it was Oswald's print. He testified that he and Studebaker had returned to the TSBD on Monday, November 25, and replaced the section with the palm print before taking photographs. Therefore, any pictures showing that removed section with palm print were exposed on November 25 or later.

Sixth, if two or more photos show the same objects either inside or outside the TSBD (through the open window), such as vehicles or people, and those objects move from one photo to another, the relative timing can then be established by examining the moving objects.

Using these techniques the sequence of picture taking can be determined as follows. (Refer to chart on next page.) The first photos were taken by Day and Studebaker of the rifle and the place where it was found on the sixth floor near the northwest corner. The time was about 1:30 p.m., November 22, 1963. Testimony from several witnesses established the time of finding the rifle as 1:21 p.m. Also, photo #39 shows Lt. Day carrying the rifle out of the TSBD at approximately 1:45 p.m. This time can be established by the shadow angles in a series of photos of Day walking along the Elm St. extension in front of the TSBD with the rifle. Between the time of finding the rifle and carrying it out of the building, Day and Studebaker photographed it and its hiding place and dusted it for fingerprints.

Since Day went to the police station with the rifle and did not return to the TSBD according to his and Studebaker's testimony until 3:00 p.m., the next set of photos could h\not have been exposed until after 3:00 p.m. Day and Studebaker together photographed the three shells that had been found in the "snipers nest" by sheriffs Mooney and Craig.

There were only two photographs taken of the three shells. These were:

CE 715 introduced by Lt. Day - Same as Studebaker B.

CE 716 introduced by Lt. Day - Same as Studebaker A.

To determine when these two photos were taken, it is necessary to examine four more photos. They are:

CE 722 introduced by Lt. Day - A view of Houston Street out of the window.

CE 724 introduced by Lt. Day - A view of Elm Street out of the window.

TIMING CHART OF PHOTOS BY BEERS, STUDEBAKER AND DAY

<u>Date & Time of Photo</u>	<u>Warren Commission or Other Identification</u>	<u>Photo Shows</u>
November 22, 1:30 p.m.	CE 718 & Studebaker C	Place where rifle was found
November 22, 1:30 p.m.	CE 719	Place where rifle was found
November 22, 2:55 p.m.	CE 715 & Studebaker B	Three shells & view out of the window
November 22, 2:56 p.m.	CE 716 & Studebaker A	Three shells
November 22, 3:00 p.m.	CE 722	View of Houston St. out of window
November 22, 3:14 p.m.	Beers 4	Wall of boxes - Lt. Day's head
November 22, 3:18 p.m.	CE 724	View of Elm Street - Looking out 6th floor window

TIMING CHART, Continued

<u>Date & Time of Photo</u>	<u>Warren Commission or Other Identification</u>	<u>Photo Shows</u>
November 22, 3:30 p.m.	Beers 17	View of Elm Street - Looking out 6th floor window
November 22, 3:31 p.m.	Beers 24	Stack of 3 boxes and wall of boxes
November 22, 3:40 p.m.	CE 728 & Studebaker H	Area near chicken lunch - Dr. Pepper bottle
November 22, 3:41 p.m.	Studebaker I	Dr. Pepper bottle
November 25, a.m.	CE 733 & Studebaker J	Official sniper's nest photo - view from side
November 25, a.m.	CE 729 & Studebaker F & G	Position of paper bag - with Oswald's palm print
November 25, a.m.	CE 723	Wall of boxes around sixth floor window
November 25, a.m.	CE 725	View along eastern wall, sixth floor
November 25, a.m.	CE 726	View of second aisle over from east wall
November 25, a.m.	CE 727	View looking east along south wall
November 22, ?	Studebaker D	Three boxes piled up in window. View out of window

Beers photo #4 - Picture showing boxes and Lt. Day's head.

Beers photo #17 - View of Elm Street out of the window,

To begin this analysis, note that CE 715 and 722 show a truck double-parked on Houston Street near Elm Street opposite the County Records Building. That truck moved away shortly afterward and moved into that position shortly before the photos were taken. This can be established by a series of photos by James Murray exposed outside the building at that time. In addition Day testified that he exposed photo CE 722 immediately after exposing the shell photos, to show the sniper's view of JFK approaching on Houston Street. He said he was under the impression at the time that the sniper had fired at the President as he drove toward the window on Houston Street. (Day was not in Dealey Plaza at the time of the shots.) He said that shortly after that, he (Day) received word that the shots had been fired as JFK drove down Elm Street away from the window. So he exposed photo CE 724 looking out of the window down Elm Street. From this analysis we can tell that photo numbers CE 715, 716, 722, and 724 were taken at about the same time. Next, Jack Beers' photo #37 shows the top of Lt. Day's head looking out of the window down Elm shortly before Day was taking his photo CE 724. Beers then was permitted by Day to move into the same position and take his photo #38 a little later. The timing between these two photos, CE 724 and #38 can be established by comparing

the shadows of the same trees and lamppost appearing in both photos along with the identical position of the police car parked on the grass in the center of the Plaza and the shadow cast by the car and the lamppost nearest to it. Close examination shows that the shadows in Beers' photo fall slightly to the south and east of those in Day's photo, establishing the time as approximately 10 minutes to 15 minutes later than Day. Note that the little group of men on the grass south of Elm Street in the Beers photo have moved into position by the time Beers took his photo but did not show up in Day's photo. Note that the window in Beers' #37 is only halfway open. The window in Beers' photo #38 is farther open. This is very significant for two reasons. It establishes the timing of Beers' photo #37 being taken before Beers' photo #38. And it demonstrates that it was difficult even to take a picture out of that window over the top of the three cartons with the window opened only halfway. Day opened the window to allow Beers to snap his photos without appreciating the importance of that act. Day's photo CE 724, looking down Elm Street, was snapped from alongside the top box, rather than over the top. The importance of the window position will be shown later. At this point, it has been established that Day's and Studebaker's four photos, #'s 715, 716, 722 and 724, showing the three shells and views out of the sixth floor window were not taken at 1:15 p.m. November 22, but rather at about the same time as the photos by Jack Beers. Beers' photo #37 was taken before Lt. Day took his CE 724. Beers' photo #38 was taken 10 to 15 minutes after CE 724. Day's photo CE 722 was taken 15 minutes earlier than his CE 724. Day testified that he snapped CE 722 at about 3 p.m. or 3:15 p.m. and CE 724 at 3:15 to 3:30 p.m.

Beers had said he arrived at the TSBD at about 4 p.m. However, the shadow angles in his photo #38 established the time of his photo taking as 3:15 to 3:30 p.m. The same shadow angles establish Day's photos as being taken at 3 p.m. to 3:15 p.m. We therefore have the following timing (see Photo Timing Chart)--Day (Studebaker) took the shell photos at 2:55 and 2:56 p.m. Day then took the photo out of the window down Houston Street at 3:00 p.m.

After that Jack Beers and other reporters and cameramen were permitted to come up to the sixth floor. No doubt one of them told Day that the shots struck JFK on Elm Street. Day then set up his camera facing down Elm Street while Beers snapped a picture of Day's head at 3:14 p.m. (Beers photo #4). Day took his #18 after opening the window at 3:18 p.m. Day then permitted Beers to move into position to take a photo looking down Elm Street over the top of the third carton. Beers then snapped this #38 at 3:30 p.m. The distance that Day moved the window upward can be detected by comparing Beers photo #24 with Beers photo #4. Beers #24 shows that there were eight bricks between the windowsill and the bottom of the window after Day opened it a little. Studebaker E shows that there were only six bricks between the sill and the window bottom before Day moved the window. Measurements of Beers #24 and Studebaker D show that the top of the top box was five bricks above the sill at the time of the shots. The actual space between top of box and bottom of sill was, therefore, one brick, or above three to four inches. Jack Beers then snapped what may turn out to be the single most important picture in the John Kennedy assassination, #36. It was taken at nearly the same time as #38, as determined by the triangular shadow pattern on the top carton appearing in both photos. The importance of this picture will be discussed a little later. It too was taken at around 3:31 p.m.

The next group of photos were taken by Day and Studebaker at around 3:40 p.m., then minutes after they finished at the sixth-floor window. They took two pictures, #'s 22 and 34, which were used as CE 728 introduced by Day (same as Studebaker H) and Studebaker I. These

show the area near the western end of the south side of the sixth floor where Bonnie Ray Williams had eaten a lunch of chicken and Dr. Pepper. The time is established by the shadow angles of late afternoon and the date is established as November 22 because there are no flowers in the Plaza outside.

The Fake Reconstructed Sniper's Nest:

Now we move to Monday, November 25, 1963. Day and Studebaker returned to the TSBD on the morning of that day, and "re-created" the "sniper's nest." They arranged the boxes in the window, the shield of boxes, the other boxes along the eastern wall north of the shield, and they replaced the corner of the box with Oswald's palm print. According to Day's testimony, they placed all objects in their "original positions." Then they exposed ten photographs, #'s 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 31, 32 and 35. (See list of photos and Timing Chart.) Since three of these are duplicates of others (31, 32 & 35), there were actually seven photos exposed. CE 733 (Studebaker Exhibit J) and CE 734 became the "official sniper nest" photos as mentioned earlier. CE 729 and Studebaker F & G (#'s 23, 31, and 32) were used to indicate the position of the large paper bag when it was supposedly found by the police. CE 723 and CE 725 were used by Lt. Day to show the shield of boxes, and CE 726 and CE 727 were used to show the view of boxes in the second aisle over from the eastern wall and the view along the south wall looking east toward the "sniper's nest."

The fact that all of the photos were taken on Monday, November 25, can be proved as follows. Lt. Day admitted exposing CE 726 on November 25 when he testified before the Warren Commission. He was struck with that admission because the shadow angles in the photo tipped off the Commission that it had been exposed in the morning. CE 723 and 725 were all obviously taken on that same morning because the eastern end of the floor shows the boxes in exactly the same positions as they appear in CE 726 even though there are no shadows showing. In CE 723, the sun can be seen shining on the eastern face of one of the boxes in the window to the right. This proves it was a morning sun. Comparison of the number of rows of boxes in these two photos against Beer #4 shows that one row had been removed between November 22 and 25. Other changes can be detected in the number of boxes in each pile in the three rows remaining, and also in the angles of the boxes.

CE 727 shows morning shadows and was obviously taken on November 25. CE 733, CE 734, Studebaker J, CE 729, and Studebaker F & G all show the replaced corner of the box with the palm print, and are therefore established as having been taken on November 25, as demonstrated earlier. In addition, CE 733 & 734 are clear enough and show enough light/dark contrast to detect a shadow of the side of the window showing a morning sun.

The FBI had a record of the fact that these photos were taken on November 25, three days later, and were photos of a reconstructed "sniper's nest." The author took advantage of the FBI setting up a Freedom of Information (FOI) office in Washington, D.C., after they were forced by Harold Weisberg through FOI suits to release all of their hidden JFK files. A search of the photo files in the FBI's FOI office turned up two documents reproduced herein, dated November 25, 1963, labeled "Reconstructed" and attached two of the Dallas police photos of the cartons in the sniper's nest.

So the FBI was well aware of when these photos were taken and that they were pictures of a reconstruction. So FBI witness during the Warren Commission hearings or the HSCA investigation ever said anything about this.

This leaves only one photo with time and date of exposure not established. Studebaker Exhibit D shows three boxes piled up in the window, none on the window ledge, and a few out of the window. The positions of the boxes in this photo most closely resemble Beers' #24 photo. Yet there are some differences. The top box is at a slightly different angle. There are no window shadows to provide clues. There is no matching CE from Day's testimony to provide a clearer picture. However, there is an apparent shadow on the car outside, indicating a late afternoon sun. The best guess is that Studebaker took this photo at or about the same time that Beers took his. The window position appears to be about the same, and the closeness of the box positions would tend to indicate this.

Confirmation of Beers 24:

Beers' photo #24 shows the actual positions of the three boxes in the window at the time the shots were fired. The proof of this point was covered thoroughly in a prior article,¹ by showing that the position of the corner of the top box of the pile of three, coincides exactly with the position of the corner of the box showing in the window at the time the shots were fired. A whole series of photographs show that box corner position from the outside at the time of the shots and for about twenty-five minutes afterward. The box was not moved until much later in the day. The corner position in all of these photos is to the right of the center of the half open window, and a few inches below the bottom of the half open window.

What the Photographs Prove:

The timing of the photos by Beers, Day and Studebaker clearly demonstrate the following:

1. Beers' photo #24 is the earliest photo of the area that was eventually labeled the "sniper's nest." It therefore shows the most likely position of the boxes in the window and the shield of boxes at the time the shots were fired.
2. Studebaker D is the only police photo of the three boxes in the window taken on November 22. All of the "official" photos of the so-called "sniper's nest" were taken on November 25, three days later.
3. Beers' photo #4 is the only picture taken on November 22 showing the real positions of the boxes in the so-called "shield" of boxes and those

¹"The Framing of Lee Harvey Oswald," Richard E. Sprague, Computers and Automation, October 1973.

along the east wall on the sixth floor. All of the "official" photos of the "shield" were taken on November 25.

4. Beers' #24 clearly shows there was no "sniper's nest" at the time the shots were fired.
 - a. The pile of three boxes was too high and not oriented properly to form a gun rest.
 - b. There was not enough space between the pile of three boxes and the wall of boxes to the left for an assassin to squeeze through or to move around.
 - c. There was not enough space between the wall and the pile for an assassin to position himself with a rifle.
 - d. The box that the Commission said Oswald sat on, leaving his palm print, protruded out from the wall only about five or six inches. The corner of the box where Oswald's palm print was found was covered up by the wall of boxes. The palm print was therefore put on the box earlier in the day when Oswald was moving the boxes around so that a floor laying crew could do their job of putting down a new floor on the western end of the sixth floor.
 - e. The space between the top of the top box and the bottom of the half open window was not big enough to have allowed Oswald's rifle with its telescopic sight to have fit through the gap. Beers' #24 was taken after Lt. Day opened the window more so that Beers could take his #'s 17 and 24. The actual separation at the time of the shots was the height of about one brick, three to four inches. The rifle with telescopic sight was 7 1/2" high. Beers' 17A shows where the bottom of the window was (dotted line) when the shots were fired, and shows where the barrel of Oswald's rifle and his telescopic sight would have been located, had he been firing shots.
5. Beers' #4 shows that rather than a "shield" of boxes being "constructed" around the sniper's nest window, that there was a continuum of rows of boxes ranging from the window eastward. Four such rows can be seen. The boxes are stacked in a more or less random fashion, not like they would have been for a shield from others on the sixth floor. The rest of the photos, even after the police reconstructed the "nest," show that the

"shield" would not have blocked the view of anyone directly to the west of the window. (See CE 727.) Why not close off the entire area? This photo shows that the boxes had merely been placed there by the floor laying crew and Oswald to get them out of the way of the new floor.

6. Day and Studebaker either with malice aforethought or someone else's direction, or with total incompetence coupled with bad memories and a predisposed attitude toward backing up the police conclusions about Oswald, recreated the "sniper's nest" as they calculated it would have to have been. They moved all of the other boxes away from the "shield," so it would look like a "shield." They tidied up the boxes in the "shield" to make it look like it was constructed. They moved the inner row of boxes farther away from the window to create moving space. They opened a space in the inner row that a sniper could have moved through. They positioned the box with the palm print out away from the inner row so that Oswald could have been sitting on it. They positioned the three boxes in such an arrangement that they would form an excellent gun rest pointing in the right direction. They either selected a box with an indentation or else they made an indentation in a box to show where Oswald supposedly rested the butt of his rifle. Then they took the seven official photos.
7. The FBI knew about the fake reconstruction, but buried it in their files.
8. No one could have fired any shots from the sixth-floor window on November 22, 1963. Oswald certainly did not fire any shot from there.
9. Framing Oswald obviously implies a much higher level and completely different kind of conspiracy than the one Blakey and the HSCA propose. Blakey claims in his new book that the conspiracy essentially involved Oswald and a Mafia associate on the grassy knoll and did not involve any CIA people or more than two shooters.

Sidebar:

This article is a sequel to one published in Computers & Automation, October 1973, Volume 22, No. 10. The title of that first article was, "The Framing of Lee Harvey Oswald." Both this new article and the 1973 article refer to a prior article titled, "The Assassination of President John F. Kennedy: The Application of Computers to the Photographic Evidence." It was also published in Computers & Automation in May 1970. The three articles, taken together, present an overview of the photographic evidence of the assassination, and the conspiracy to assassinate the president, together with the involvement of CIA people. The House Assassination Committee (HSCA) possessed all of this photographic evidence but did not use it,* and in fact buried it from public view, perhaps forever. No sonic evidence, or even

witness evidence is needed to establish that a conspiracy existed. But it was a very different kind of conspiracy than the one the HSCA and its chief council Dr. Robert Blakey would have us believe took place. The big difference is that unlike the HSCA's report and Dr. Blakey's book claim Oswald fired no shots and was framed. Once the reader reaches this conclusion from the pictures alone, he will realize the conspiracy had to involve complex preparations and techniques and involved intelligence resources, people and weapons.

*The author served as a photographic consultant to the HSCA, and he sure them about and collected all of this evidence.

The Haunting of Jack Ruby: The movements of an assassin's assassin, by John R. Woods II ©1992

Jack Ruby in the Presidential Motorcade

Not realizing at the time of exposure, Associated Press photographer James Altgens recorded the most conversational still photograph to this date. Using a Nikkorex 35-mm camera with a 105-mm telephoto lens he exposed frame 1-6 of the presidential limousine located halfway down Elm Street.

Shown in the background is the Texas School Book Depository Building from where Oswald allegedly fired on the presidential limousine. Researchers to this date still argue as to whether the individual on the doorstep of this building is Lee Harvey Oswald (deceased) or Bill Nolan Lovelady (deceased), both employees at this building.

Taken at approximately Zapruder frame Z-255,¹ this photograph clearly shows that the President and Governor Connally have both been wounded by an assassin's bullet. While testifying before the Warren Commission, Altgens stated that he exposed frame 1-6 "almost simultaneously"² with the shot fired at the limousine.

In an effort to withhold information that could be revealed in 1-6, the Warren Commission severely cropped this photograph.³ Because Altgens 1-6 was published on the following day, the Warren Commission not yet created could not ignore the individual in the doorway, while at the FBI Dallas field office there was much discussion concerning this figure.

While working with still photographs and several motion picture films, assassination critic and photographic expert Richard E. Sprague was able to prove that this individual was Lovelady and not Oswald.⁴

However, since this photograph was so severely cropped and that there was so much debate as to the figure in the doorway, one figure remained undetected. Numerous reprints of Altgens 1-6 have been widely circulated, but only in a cropped version. Thus, this figure can only be located in the full frame Altgens 1-6.⁵

Ruby at Parkland Hospital: Security Access to the Compounds

The committee examined a report that Ruby was at Parkland Hospital shortly after the fatally wounded President had been brought there on November 22, 1963. Seth Kantor, a newsman then employed by Scripps-Howard who had known Ruby, later testified to the Warren Commission that he had run into him at Parkland and spoken with him briefly shortly before the President's death was announced. While the Warren Commission concluded that Kantor was mistaken, the committee determined he probably was not. The committee was impressed by the opinion of Burt W. Griffin, the Warren Commission counsel who directed the Ruby investigation and wrote the Ruby section of the Warren Report. Griffin told the committee he had come to believe in light of evidence subsequently brought out, that the Commission's conclusions about Kantor's testimony were wrong.

"In light of evidence," we do not know. Mrs. Wilma Tice testified that she also saw Ruby at Parkland Hospital. In a FBI Report she stated:

" . . . stopped beside a man who was at the time unknown to her, but whom she later believed to be Jack Ruby . . . He had a hat . . . in his left hand, hitting it against his leg . . . He wore a dark suit, white shirt, and possibly a tie. He was heavily built. She thought by hitting his hat against his leg he would ruin it. He was alone. She stood about three to four feet from this man when he was approached by another man who stated, "How are you doing there, Jack?"⁶

While testifying before the Warren Commission she gave additional insight about seeing Jack Ruby at the hospital.

Griffin: Mrs. Tice, did you know that Jack himself has denied very vehemently that he was not at the hospital?

Mrs. Tice: Yes, I know he denied that, and I hated to say that I saw him out there . . . Eva told me, "Well, I asked Jack and Jack said no, he wasn't out there." And I said, "Well, anybody can make a mistake . . ." She said, "Yes, because there are many Jacks" . . . and if it wasn't him it was his twin brother.

Griffin: Do you think you could have been mistaken about the man you saw?

Mrs. Tice: It could have been somebody else that looked just like Jack, named Jack, yes.⁷

According to an FBI report conducted with Eva Grant, Jack Ruby's sister, Eva Grant stated that Mrs. Tice was "balmy," however, just as interesting was that Mrs. Tice "had rather accurately described the clothing Ruby was wearing."⁸ During this period of time, Mrs. Tice was told not to talk about seeing Ruby at Parkland Hospital. There were numerous threatening telephone calls to her including an attempted break-in to her home residence while her husband was away.⁹ This was the same type of treatment that Mrs. Clemons received several days after the shooting of Officer Tippit.

An inquiry by the Dallas Police Department produced up to fifty police officers who had contacts with Jack Ruby. One police officer in particular, Sergeant Patrick Dean, confided that he knew Ruby ten years prior to the assassination.¹⁰

This might help explain Dean's appearance at Parkland Hospital shortly after the arrival of the presidential party. We can take into account:

1. The Director of Security at Parkland Hospital was Dean's father-in-law, O. P. Wright. Wright had control of Commission Exhibit 399 (the 6.5 mm caliber bullet). The bullet was later turned over to a Secret Service agent:¹¹

2. Mrs. Wright (Dean's mother-in-law) was also at Parkland Hospital when President Kennedy arrived:¹²

3. The previous testimony by Seth Kantor:

4. Testimony by Burt W. Griffin to the House Committee:

5. The appearance of Jack Ruby at the hospital:

The relationship of the Wright's with Officer Dean and his (Dean) with Jack Ruby and reported Mafia figure Joe Civello, enabled Ruby to have free access within the compounds of the hospital. Therefore, this may explain:

1. The discovery of Commission Exhibit 399:

2. Why Jack Ruby failed the polygraph examination given to him by the FBI in which he denied that others were involved in the shooting of Oswald and his presence at Parkland: (In the movie "JFK" by Oliver Stone, it was the movie's assumption that Ruby planted the bullet on the wrong stretcher.)

3. Why Dean Testimony before the Warren Commission was questioned by Counsel Griffin:

4. Why Dean refused to answer a "written questionnaire in the form of a sworn affidavit" for the House Committee in 1978:

5. Why Dean failed a polygraph test concerning Ruby's access via the ramp entering on Main Street:

During their investigation in 1979, House investigators dismissed the Warren Commission theory that Ruby accessed the basement via the ramp. They believed that Ruby had inside assistance into gaining access to the basement using a side door. From the investigators' report, "Dean is a key figure." Dean, now deceased, feared that he was being "set up" and that he would be "hearing from the Justice Department."

According to Shaw, Dean repeatedly asked to testify before the House Committee. He was denied access to the Committee mainly because he had failed his polygraph test, his testimony before the Warren Commission and his refusal to answer the questionnaire presented to him by House Committee investigators.

Richard Johnson's report of November 30, 1963, related that Wright told him that the bullet was discovered on a stretcher containing: "rubber gloves, stethoscope, and other doctors' paraphernalia."¹³ Mr. Wright further verified to a researcher that ". . . the stretcher on which the bullet rested was in the corner--the one blocking the men's room door."¹⁴

Thus, with the testimony of Darrell Tommlinson would prove that the bullet was not found on Governor Connally's stretcher. This is the additional evidence that Commission

Exhibit 399 never did hit Kennedy or Connally destroying the Single-Bullet Theory proposed by the Warren Commission and backup by the House Committee.

Ruby's presence at the shooting of Officer J. D. Tippit

There is strong evidence that Ruby might have been involved (and to what extent is not clear at the time of this article) in the shooting of Dallas Police Officer J. D. Tippit. The second individual with Ruby is still unknown.

One witness who never testified before the Warren Commission or House Select Committee investigators has given her own physical description of one of the men involved in the murder of Officer Tippit. According to the interview conducted by researcher Mark Lane,¹⁵ Mrs. Acquilla Clemons described in her interview:

" . . . Yes I heard the shots . . . I ran out into the street, looked down the street and ran back down to the street where he was lying and I looked at him . . . Did you see the man with a gun? Yes I did. And what was he doing? Uh, he was reloading it. And I say he was reloading his gun. And how would you describe that man? Well kind of chunky, he was kind of heavy, he wasn't a very big man. Was he tall or short? Well, he was kind of a short guy. Short and heavy? Yes. Was there any other man there? Yes there was aside the street. All I know told him to gone . . . The man who had the gun did he make any motion at all to the other man across the street? All I know told him to gone . . . Then what happened to the man with the gun? . . . He unloaded then reloaded. And what did the other man do? The man keep going straight down the street.

Needless to say, this physical description does not match that of Oswald but more closely that of Ruby. Could the other man have been Oswald? He was walking in the direction of Ruby's apartment building.

Mrs. Clemons' description of the second individual as being "thin" and tall lends speculation that this second individual could have been Oswald. A second eyewitness to the shooting of Officer Tippit, Mr. Frank Wright, told police officials of these two individuals, but his information was totally ignored.¹⁶

Back in 1975, I was able to obtain three known photographs taken at the Texas Theater. These three photographs showed the arrest sequence of Oswald.¹⁷ It was in one of these three photographs that this same individual caught my interest years later in Altgens 1-6.

This same individual has the same physical characteristics as the same man who murdered Oswald, Jack Ruby.

Through enhancement of the border of 1-6, I was able to compare with the one frame taken of Ruby at the Texas Theater. Note the similar characteristics seen in these two photographs:

1. The derby hat worn by Ruby¹⁸ when he shot Oswald in the basement with that of Altgens 1-6 and the Reed photograph:

2. The same facial configurations as seen in the above-mentioned stills. The presence of a strong chin and nasal profile present in Altgens, Reed, Pappas Exhibit 1 and the Dallas Police mugshot of Jack Ruby:¹⁹
3. The dark suit jacket along with the white dress shirt:
4. In Altgens 1-6 and the Reed photograph the individual is not wearing a necktie and it appears that the shirt is fully buttoned with the exception of the top shirt button:
5. The physique of an overweight individual present in all the photographs included in this work along with additional out-takes of still photographs taken prior to the assassination and finishing with the final months of Ruby's life:²⁰

In 1976, while working with the Reed photographs, two key figures were of interest. The first figure was later identified as another police officer²¹ and dismissed. However, as earlier mentioned the second individual appears to be Ruby. It was towards the end of 1991, I was supplied with an article written by Earl Golz.²² The story was of a witness that came forth to state that he saw Jack Ruby at the theatre. After 15 years of remaining silent George J. Applin, Jr., told his story.

According to Applin, he believes that Ruby was the man sitting in the back row seat as the Dallas police were arresting Oswald inside the theatre. Golz quoted Applin that: "Ruby was sitting down, just watching them. And when Oswald pulled the gun and snapped it at his (a policeman's) head and missed and the darn thing wouldn't fire, that's when I tapped him (Ruby) on the shoulder and told him he had better move because those guns were waving around. He just turned around and looked at me. Then he turned around and started watching them."²³

It was not until two days later that Applin realized that it was Ruby at the theatre when Oswald was murdered. During his testimony before the Warren Commission some four months later Applin declined to testify that he saw Ruby. Not once but twice he was asked by Joseph A. Ball but declined in fear of his life.

Ruby inside the Dallas Police Station: Security Access to the Compound:

From the testimony gathered along with the photographic evidence presented within this work, Ruby was presented at four key locations on November 22, 1963.

1. Dealey Plaza during the assassination of President Kennedy:
2. Parkland Hospital following the arrival of the presidential party:
3. The shooting scene of Officer J. D. Tippit:
4. The Texas Theatre during the arrest of Oswald:

Late that night on the 22nd, a press conference was set in the assembly room at the police station. Jack Ruby was not only present during the conference, but was also recorded on film. For a man who knew nothing of Oswald and his activities, Ruby was well-informed. Well enough to correct District Attorney Wade about Oswald's activities in New Orleans.

In its final analysis, the Warren Commission concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald was the sole assassin. They concluded that he (Oswald) shot and killed Officer J. D. Tippit. That Jack Ruby, in his remorse for the Kennedy family, mainly Mrs. Kennedy and her children, also on the spur of the moment walked down the ramp and murdered Oswald. The House Select Committee concluded that Kennedy was probably assassinated as a result of a conspiracy. The committee concluded that Oswald was the assassin who fired from the TSBDB building, while a second shooter was present on the grassy knoll, but there was no connection between Oswald and Ruby in the assassination of Kennedy.

We now know for a fact that these statements are not only inaccurate but the quest for the truth was never challenged concerning the Oswald/Ruby connection. But from the photographic evidence and the testimony, we know that Ruby played an important part in the assassination of our 35th President; his role, to track Oswald following the assassination, and he later took the sole responsibility in Oswald's public execution.

To what extent we now must ask ourselves was the involvement of certain members of the Dallas police force in the assassination, from assisting Ruby from the moment of the assassination up to the death of Oswald. Are there any implications of assistance from the general population in this crime? To what extent was our intelligence community involved in the assassination and the eventual cover-up?

And just as important as "Who Killed Kennedy?", "Who Killed Tippit?"

Sources:

¹The Official Warren Commission Report on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy, page 112.

²Ibid.

³James Altgens photographs 1-6. Second generation print was used in this study.

⁴Richard E. Sprague correspondence with Mrs. Marguerite Oswald.

⁵Full frame Altgens 1-6.

⁶Warren Commission Exhibit 2290. FBI report of Mrs. Tice concerning Jack Ruby's appearance at Parkland Hospital.

⁷Hearings & Testimony of the Witnesses before the Warren Commission. Volume 15 of the Hearings, page 391.

⁸Warren Commission Exhibit 2343. FBI report of Mrs. Eva Grant.

Photographs used in the article, The Haunting of Jack Ruby: The movements of an assassin's assassin, by John R. Woods, II, ©1992:

1. 8"x10" photograph taken by the late Stuart L. Reed during the arrest of Oswald at the Texas Theatre. Oswald is visible in the center of the photograph with Jack Ruby visible to the extreme right edge. Sgt. Hill is partially visible in front of Ruby.
2. Moving from left to right of the Reed photograph is an extreme blow-up of Altgens 1-6 showing Ruby in the plaza during the assassination.
3. The second photograph is taken from the 8"x10" Reed photograph. This is a blow-up of Ruby watching the arrest of Oswald.
4. Taken of Jack Ruby in the hallways of the Dallas Police Station on November 22 late that night.
5. This fourth photograph is an extreme blow-up of Ruby shooting Oswald in the basement of the Dallas Police Station. As mentioned in the article, please note the same derby hat worn by Ruby in the Plaza and at the arrest scene of Oswald.
6. Jack Ruby mugshot taken by the Dallas Police.

The author takes full responsibility in the blow-up work present in this article. By **NO MEANS** have any of the photographs used in this article been computer enhanced. These photographs represent the true exposures taken at that time by the photographer.

⁹Warren Commission 2293. FBI report concerning threats made against Mrs. Tice.

¹⁰From the book by Anthony Summers, Conspiracy. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1980. Page 488.

¹¹From the article by J. Gary Shaw, How to Conduct an Investigation without really trying.

¹²Ibid.

¹³From the book by Josiah Thompson, Six Seconds in Dallas, Bernard Geis Associates. Interview of Mr. Wright with the author.

¹⁴VH pages 255-258.

¹⁵Interview conducted by Mark Lane of Mrs. Acquilla Clemons.

¹⁶From the book by Summers, Conspiracy, page 121.

¹⁷S. L. Reed photographs. At one time only three known photographs taken by Reed were thought to exist. Available from the National Archives in color and from the FBI in black and white. The author was able to obtain second generation prints including the out-takes (see frame sequence) following the arrest of Oswald at the theatre.

¹⁸Pappas Exhibit 1. Photograph taken by Jack Beers of the Dallas Morning News. The author studied numerous other stills taken after the shooting including film footage taken prior, during and after the shooting.

¹⁹Jack Ruby mugshot. Warren Commission Document 5, page 494.

²⁰Over two dozen photographs and film footage of Ruby was reviewed for this analysis.

²¹Reed second photograph taken at the theatre during the arrest of Oswald. Jack Ruby is present in the extreme right frame of this photograph. The other key figure in this frame was dismissed based on information supplied by another researcher along with written reports and testimony of police officers.

²²Article by Earl Golz of the Dallas Morning News. "Man believes he saw Ruby at scene of Oswald's arrest." March 11, 1978.

²³Ibid.

PART VI - INSERTS

Camera Car Seating Arrangement (CAM), November 22, 1963

○	○	○
1	2	3
○	○	○
4	5	6
Car 10		

- 1 Driver
- 2 John Hoegan - NBC Sound Man
- 3 David Weigman - NBC Cameraman
Black & White Footage
- 4 Thomas Atkins - White House
Cameraman - Color Footage
- 5 Cleve Ryan - White House
Lighting Technician
- 6 Thomas Craven - CBS Cameraman
Black & White Footage

Camera Car #1
Yellow 1964 Chevy
Impala Convertible

○	○
1	2
○	○
3	4
○	○
5	6
Car 11	

- 1 Driver
- 2 Frank Cancellare - UPI Photographer
- Black & White Stills
- 3 Cecil Stoughton - White House
Photographer - Color Stills
- 4 Clint Grant - Dallas Morning News
Photographer - Black & White Stills
- 5 Henry Burrows - Associated Press
Photographer - Black & White Stills

Camera Car #2
Silver 1964 Chevy
Impala Convertible

○	○	○
1	2	3
○	○	○
4	5	6
Car 12		

- 1 Driver - Dept. of Public Safety
- 2 James Underwood - KRLD - TV
- 3 CBS Photographer - Black & White Footage
- 4 James Darnell - WBAP-TV NBC
Photographer - Black & White Footage
- 5 Malcolm Couch - WFAA-TV ABC
Photographer - Black & White Footage
- 6 Robert Jackson - Dallas Times Herald
Photographer - Black & White Stills

Camera Car #3
Green Door Chevy

PART VII

THE DOCUMENTATION

Retrospect: The Photographic Evidence

In understanding the assassination of President Kennedy, we must closely examine the photographic evidence taken during the shooting and including the autopsy of the deceased.

We shall start with the case involving the legitimacy of the fingerprint or palmprint impressions retrieved from the Mannlicher-Carcano rifle that Oswald allegedly used in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

It was the responsibility of Lt. John Day of the Dallas Police Department's Crime Laboratory, Identification Division, to photograph and dust the rifle, the spent shells and the one unfired shell. He arrived at the Texas School Book Depository shortly after 1:12 P.M. and the discovery of the rifle and of Lt. Day dusting the evidence was recorded on film by WFAA-TV cameraman Tom Aleya.

Lt. Day communicated in one statement that he "did not find any prints" and when he testified before the Warren Commission he went on record that "I took it (the rifle) to the office and tried to bring out the two prints I had seen on the side of the gun at the bookstore. They (the prints) were rather unclear."

Lt. Day was then asked by then Assistant Counsel David Belin: "Were those prints in such condition as to be identifiable, if you know?" Lt. Day replied: "No, sir, I could not make positive identification of these prints." Lt. Day further stated that: "At 11:45 P.M. (November 22) the rifle was released or picked up by them (the FBI) and taken from the office."

The alleged weapon was then flown back to the FBI headquarters in Washington, D.C. by FBI Agent Drain. It was in the early hours of the following day that the weapon was examined. Interestingly, the rifle was then flown back to Dallas and according to Lt. Day's statement, "It was returned to us on November 24. Then on November 26 we received instructions to send back to the FBI everything we had . . . The gun was sent back again."

Lee Oswald was murdered in the basement of the Dallas Police Station by Jack Ruby on November 24. According to a story published in the November 25 edition of the Fort Worth Press, a fully equipped FBI lab team arrived at the Miller Funeral Home where Oswald was being prepared for burial. According to the story the FBI lab team spent "a long time in the morgue." Furthermore, according to members of the embalming team from the Miller Funeral Home, Oswald's hands had to be cleaned due to the fingerprint ink left by the FBI lab team.

While there is definite indication that Oswald's hands were the subject of an FBI fingerprint lift, the photographs released to me under the Freedom of Information Act (this release of the funeral home photographs and the autopsy photographs of Oswald opens yet another area which is later discussed) taken by the FBI lab team revealed no trace of this procedure. Therefore, I assume that the fingerprint lift was done after the photographs were made of Oswald.

Remember, it was on the 26th, two days after Oswald was shot by Ruby, one day after the FBI lab team visited Oswald at the funeral home, that the FBI was able to obtain a print from the rifle according to the FBI or in my opinion from the deceased.

The FBI would later inform Lt. Day that the print retrieved was from the rifle. Concluding his testimony, Lt. Day was asked by Mr. John McCloy: "You couldn't make a positive identification, but is it your opinion that these were fingerprints of Lee Oswald?" Day would answer: "Well, actually in fingerprinting it either is or is not the man. So I wouldn't say these were his prints" Mr. Belin asked: "Did you make a positive identification of any palmprints or fingerprints?" Lt. Day replied: "Not off the rifle or slug at that time." Mr. McCloy: "Can you restate again for the record what you can positively identify in terms of fingerprints or palmprints and Oswald's . . . ?" Lt. Day: "The palmprint on the box he apparently sat on I can definitely say I think is his, but couldn't say definitely on a witness stand." Mr. McCloy: "By one other you mean the other palmprint?" Lt. Day: "The palmprint and that tracer print aside the trigger housing."

It was in January 1978 when the FBI released approximately 50,000 pages of documents related to the assassination. A memorandum dated August 28, 1964, just one month before the report was released, from FBI Agent Rosen to FBI Agent Belmont, page 3, reads:

Mr. Rankin advised because of the circumstances that now exist there was a serious question in the minds of the Commission as to whether or not the palm impression that has been obtained from the Dallas Police Department is a legitimate latent palm impression removed from the rifle barrel or whether it was obtained from some other source and that for this matter needs to be resolved.

In an executive session the Warren Commission decided not to have the body of Oswald relocated and cremated in case it should have been made public.

Doubts persisted over the years if the body of Oswald was still in the same casket, buried at the same location and if the body was tampered with by the government. This was one of many uncertain questions which led to the exhumation of the body in 1979.

Within the last few years the most important single piece of key evidence may have been tampered with within two days of the assassination. This evidence, the Abraham Zapruder film, may have been in the custody of the National Photographic Interpretation Center (N.P.I.C.) late that day on the 22nd or in the early morning hours of the 23rd. If so, this would raise new questions as to the authenticity of the film since N.P.I.C. is part of the Central Intelligence Agency (C.I.A.).

Key revelations concerning the possession of the film were made available through the Freedom of Information Act. Researchers and the FBI have always assumed that it was the Bureau that did the original study of the Zapruder film. Further support of this can be derived from a letter from Hoover to J. Lee Rankin of December 4, 1964, which states in part: "The Central Intelligence Agency has inquired if the film copy in possession of this Bureau can be loaned to that Agency solely for training purposes." However, documentation secured under the information act suggest likewise.

The Zapruder film was developed that afternoon by Eastman Kodak Processing Laboratory. Since the laboratory was unable to make duplicate copies of the film it was then

his film, made a strict agreement with the Secret Service that there would be no showing of the film to any news media or the general public.

Was Zapruder able to dictate his terms to the Secret Service allowing them to have the film analysis prior to the sale of the film to Life magazine? Would the Secret Service have requested the original?

Just as interesting as the questions raised concerning the authenticity of the film is the analysis of the film by N.P.I.C. Their analysis of the film did not match that of the FBI. Why did the Secret Service fail to inform the Warren Commission of N.P.I.C. of their analysis? Will we ever learn the truth concerning the chain of possession of the film? Was there any alteration of the film by N.P.I.C.? Were there any additional frames missing during the ownership of the film by Life magazine? Why do the studies performed by the FBI for the Warren Commission, the House Select Committee on Assassinations and N.P.I.C. reach different conclusions as to the timing of the shots fired at the presidential limousine? Why does the copy of the Secret Service file which was in the government's possession prior to the sale to Life magazine retain copyright by Zapruder? This copy, along with the Warren Commission copy, is currently located at the National Archives. Yet, the Secret Service copy should be considered a government exhibit and no permission from Mr. Zapruder's son should be required. Why was Life magazine so generous in selling the original copy to the Zapruder family for \$1.00? Surely, Life magazine could have made millions of dollars in commercialization of this film in the United States or in foreign countries. This practice was not only done with the Zapruder film but with several other films and photographs bought by Life magazine back in 1963. According to a Life magazine spokesperson, all copies made during the course of possession by Life magazine were destroyed. Finally, who owns the copyright on the optical enhanced copy of the Zapruder film? The Zapruder family or the individual who performed the work on this film?

It was during the World Youth Festival held in Havana, Cuba in 1977, that a news story aired by a major network was later questioned concerning the photographs taken by Cuban Intelligence of Oswald down in Mexico City. This story, which was revealed by a former Cuban Consul in Mexico City at the time of Oswald's visit, was told through an interpreter of three photographs taken of Oswald. One photograph of Oswald was shown. This photograph was of Oswald wading through water at waist level. This former official explained through the interpreter that he (Oswald) was under surveillance following his visit to the Cuban Embassy. He further stated that there were photographs taken of Oswald by the Central Intelligence Agency. The Agency denied taking any photographs of Oswald during his visit to either the Russian or Cuban Embassy. In an interview, former House Select Committee on Assassinations Investigator Edwin Lopez was able to match the CIA time records with the photographic strip negatives of all three cameras photographing the Cuban Embassy. No photograph was taken of Oswald by these surveillance cameras. Why was the Cuban Intelligence able to pick up on Oswald's activities when the CIA failed? But then the question arises why was the CIA able to audio record the conversation between Oswald and Cuban Embassy employees? Why would the CIA misinform the House Committee that they (the CIA) routinely destroyed the audio tape? But yet an FBI report during the Warren Commission stated that they (the FBI) had listened to this tape. Why was the physical description of the alleged Oswald individual so far off? The

taken to Jamieson Film Company where three copies were made. Zapruder then released two copies of the film to the Secret Service. The Secret Service then proceeded to give one copy to the FBI and retain one copy for their investigation. The original and third copy was sold to Life magazine. The Bell and Howell camera Zapruder used to film the assassination was turned over to the FBI to determine the film speed of the camera (f.p.s.). The accuracy of the film speed or frames per second was crucial in determining the timing of the shots fired at the motorcade.

Regrettably, the Secret Service did not have the capacity to run a photographic analysis on the Zapruder film and they requested that the N.P.I.C. would do the analysis. From the CIA documents released are nine pages of the report concerning the study by N.P.I.C.

From this we can derive what work was done, on the film, by N.P.I.C. According to the notes we can determine that:

Proc. dry	2 hrs.
Print test	1 hr.
Make 3 prints	1 hr.
Proc. and dry prints	1 1/2 hr.

7 hours

From information gathered from other researchers, N.P.I.C. indeed had the original footage in their laboratories by the 23rd. And yet according to the news media and others involved Zapruder still had the original and the three copies in his possession. How was N.P.I.C. able to make copies of the film when supposedly there were no copies available? Zapruder went to extreme measures to make sure that no copies were made at the Jamieson Laboratory. Yet, the worksheet reference to the technical terms strongly suggests that copies were being made from the original footage. From this worksheet the original footage was in the hands of N.P.I.C. prior to the selling of the film to Life magazine on the day after the assassination.

Therefore, the Zapruder film was first developed by Eastman Kodak Processing Laboratory and three copies were made by Jamieson Film Company. After this it is speculated that the original was then given to the Secret Service, flown back to Washington, D.C., to be analyzed by N.P.I.C., and returned to Zapruder prior to the transfer of ownership to Life magazine.

From the beginning, the selling of the Zapruder film to Time-Life for the amount of \$25,000, as stated by Zapruder, was incorrect. We now know that the film sold for much more, and recently questions have arisen regarding the authenticity of the Zapruder film.

During his testimony before the Warren Commission, Zapruder did not make fully available to the Commission the extent of the contract reached between himself and Life magazine. He was in error when he informed the Commission when he testified that he told his secretary to contact the local law enforcement agency. The film was brought to the attention of the Secret Service by Dallas reporter Harry McCormack. Zapruder, knowing the value of

CIA would later make extensive efforts to identify this individual including House Committee investigators. According to sources, this individual was a hired assassin.

Again from pure speculation on part of the author any additional airing of this story regarding the Cuban Intelligence surveillance of Oswald was questioned by the Committee. I'm assuming that maybe this information was provided by a disgruntled investigator for the Committee. Furthermore, that these three photographs are in the Committee's file and are not available for release.

Then there was the public airing of the clothing worn by President Kennedy the day he was assassinated (HSCA videotape #4). Was this in violation of the General Services Administration agreement with the Kennedy family? According to a spokesman from the National Archives there was no violation of this agreement. Request for the documentation of the correspondence between the government and Mr. Marshall, the Kennedy family spokesperson, was allowed on the basis that the researcher would conduct his own search through the files.

Serious allegations have been made by a former HSCA staff photo consultant and critic Robert Groden that the autopsy photographs have been altered. During his tenure with the Committee, Groden was given the opportunity to conduct tests on the autopsy photographs. Groden found that "The final result is what appears to be the rear of the President's head with a small wound of entry near the top. The same thing (was) done to the other original in register and the result is a pair of virtually undetectable forgeries of the finest possible quality. The technique would allow the near integrity of stereo view." In other words, that a "soft edge matte insertion" was done to the autopsy photographs. If in fact these charges can be proven in a court of law, a new investigation into the handling of the pathological evidence is required.

In his letter of January 3, 1979, to chairman Louis Stokes, Groden made additional charges regarding the work conducted by the committee's photographic evidence panel.

I found a few of the charges and conclusions made by Groden to be honest and in need of being answered by the committee. In Volume VI, the chapter of the photographic evidence, the committee attempted to refute some of the charges made by Groden (Volume VI, page 294) and apparently to discredit his work for the committee.

Of interest was the analysis conducted on the second Polaroid print taken by Mary Moorman. Groden charges that Dr. Hunt analyzed the original print which had badly faded over the 15 years prior to the re-examination by the committee. There was no effort in retrieving from UPI or AP the copies made during the week of the assassination. These pristine copies if retrieved could have been scanned and studied for additional information which was no longer present in the original Moorman print.

Groden also pointed out that the first Polaroid print taken by Moorman showing the TSBD building in the background prior to the shooting has been altered. Prior to the confiscation of Moorman No. 1 by the FBI, the sixth floor of the TSBD was intact and showed the alleged assassin window. When I obtained this print from the FBI back in the mid-1970's, I was informed by them that this was a complete copy (with the 6th floor missing from the print) of Moorman No. 1. Additionally, Groden makes reference to a second (between the first print and now what is referred to as the third print showing the fatal shot) consecutive print. Another researcher down in the Dallas area, who has done extensive work on this, also believes that Moorman shot a total of three prints prior to and during the assassination.

During his examination of Altgens frame 1-6, he examined what critics of the report believe to be a rifle protruding from the second floor window of the Dal-Tex Building. Using the original negative and a technique called "vario-density cynexing" Groden was able to enhance this area in question. He was able to determine that the figure in question was a Negro man "leaning on the windowsill with both hands, and with no gun in view."

During this study of 18 locations of a possible second gunman he was able to eliminate almost a half of a dozen locations. Of special importance would be his examination of two negatives taken by Dillard* which may reveal an individual in the extreme western window of the 6th floor. If true, the presence of two individuals on the 6th floor during the assassination screams conspiracy.

During the HSCA investigation, the CIA's liaison officer Regis Blahut broke into and attempted to remove from the plastic sleeves the autopsy photographs. It was only after a hurried effort to cover his tracks that an alert Committee member noticed the aborted effort. Why was Mr. Blahut attempting to remove the photographs? For his own private collection? To sell the photographs to media? No explanation was ever offered by the agencies investigating the break-in. Efforts which were made to withhold this from the public failed. Mr. Blahut was fired from the CIA due to his actions. When asked by the author if any investigation would be conducted, Chairman Boland of the House Permanent Intelligence Committee was satisfied with the investigation conducted by the FBI, CIA and the internal Committee investigators. Interestingly, however, never mentioned was the photographic file on Gordon Novel, The Umbrella Man, compiled by researcher Robert Cutler, was also in this safe.

In 1975, I initiated a Freedom of Information Act request for access to the autopsy prints of Oswald. As researchers are well aware of, access was denied under the guidelines as "invasion of personal privacy." However, this did not stop me from filing additional requests for the prints; I focused my FOIA requests merely for prints taken of Oswald's hands.

The appeals even for the photographs taken around the hands of Oswald was denied. Several reports for the House Select Committee and to Robert L. Keuch, Special Counsel of the Attorney General Office reviewing the findings of the House probe of the importance of these prints. In a section of the report supplied to Keuch titled, "Questions concerning the palmprints on the rifle of Oswald" raised the question as to the impressions recovered from the rifle would hold up in a court of law.

Interestingly, the period of time when the FBI released the autopsy photographs and the photographs taken by FBI agents of Oswald at the Miller Funeral Home corresponded with the exhumation of Oswald. I understand from researchers down in Dallas that individuals for Marina Oswald Porter and local Dallas news media were attempting to reach me. Had contact been made with Mrs. Porter, I would have requested that X-rays be taken of Oswald's hands to see any bone breakage. Of course, the FBI would have been able to lift the prints from the deceased without any bone breakage. But yet if there was indication of breakage it would be derived from this that the FBI did indeed lift the prints from the deceased and not from the rifle. A memorandum from Mr. Robert Keuch of the Attorney General's Office requested the FBI to closely monitor the results of the exhumation of Oswald and to report the findings back to him. I now believe that it was the reports to Mr. Keuch that initiated the FBI's release of the autopsy prints and the Miller Funeral Home photographs to me.

We now have a better understanding of how the Warren Commission handled their investigation. In a secret memorandum a Commission staff lawyer wrote, "Our intention is not to establish the point with complete accuracy, but merely to substantiate the hypothesis which underlies the conclusion that Oswald was the sole assassin." The Non-Disclosure Agreement which members of the Committee probe were asked to sign (or take the chance of losing their job) will probably keep many former investigators quiet. Time will tell.

Conclusion: Conspiracy of Silence

"The childhood shows the man
As morning shows the day."

[John Milton: Paradise Regained IV]

What started as pure puzzlement ended up very distressing. After being connected with the Kennedy assassination for well over 18 years, you would expect what was considered the obvious the truth. Yes, there are strong indications that point to our intelligence community directly participating in his assassination. The general public's overwhelming opinion that the government was involved leaves a very haunting sensation in our minds.

Having worked on this case and several other high profile cases, I now believe that elements within the anti-Castro group and the community achieved their goal in 1963.

What would have been a coup d'etat at the time of his assassination was avoided. What was given in exchange for this coup d'etat was the life of our 35th President, the rights of the Presidency, and the rights of our own self-determination. It avoided an outright overthrow of our government, our way of life. This "element" is still in control. It rules us today.

This "element" will continue to dictate their policies long after you and I have passed away. They will dictate to our children and our children's children.

My goal was originally to find the truth about his assassination. It has traveled far, but this journey will never end. During my work on other cases, I have come to the belief that the truth is never easily obtained. But my realization that we are no longer in control of our individual rights frightens me. We have lost our rights, never to be regained.

The best we can do now is to limit their control over us. The cost will be the ultimate, what we hold dearly, our lives. If they can murder a President, are we so bold to believe that they would not murder us?

We as investigators are limited in our abilities to investigate the assassination because of limited access to information and resources. The responsibility is within the government. Past and current actions as such with the Department of Justice (DOJ) regarding the Review Board deems nothing more than a continuous cover-up. It is this "element" that makes us aware of the fact that the truth, 10 years or even 100 years from now, will never be known. Even with the assistance of individuals such as Vice President Albert Gore, a radical change in the thinking or structure of our government is required.

The most simplified way I can explain their program is ironically what I call **D.I.E.** **D.I.E.** can be broken down as follows:

- D. Deception - As defined in the Webster dictionary as "a: the act of deceiving; b: the fact or condition of being deceived," or better explained in this case as "syn. TRICKERY implies ingenious ways of fooling or cheating."
- I. Intimidation - as again defined in the Webster dictionary, "to make timid or fearful."
- E. Execution - this term is well-defined.

We witness with the Kennedy Administration this same program. Deception for the President came mainly from the intelligence community. The Bay of Pigs fiasco was a major embarrassment for the President. There is now strong indication that the CIA had prior knowledge of the build-up of Russian-made missiles in Cuba before passing this information on to the President. This includes reconnaissance photographs made under the disguise of the United States Information Agency (USIA). We now have the ingredients for stage two involving intimidation. And finally, the third and final stage was set in motion. November 22, 1963, Dallas, Texas.

The Kennedy Administration had the potential of carrying that mystic of Camelot in their programs. There was that electricity in the air, in our nation's capitol, and throughout our nation. We lost more than any one individual can comprehend that sunny day in Dallas.

But in death, one wonders if he had not died as a martyr, would this man have outlived the dreams of what should have been?

For in the final analysis, we must be held accountable for his death. For our children and our children's children we must continue to resist their control and repression. For it is through our resistance that we will show our children the cost of personal sacrifice.

Suggested Readings Among Books Relating the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy

Anson, Robert Sam. "They've Killed the President!," The Search for the Murders of John F. Kennedy. New York: Bantam Books, 1975.

Crouch, Mark A. Absence of Responsibility. From the work in progress, 1992.

Crouch, Mark A. "Autopsy Photo Inventory." From the work in progress Absence of Responsibility, 1991.

Cutler, Robert B. The Umbrella Man, Evidence of Conspiracy. Manchester, Mass.: Cutler Designs, 1975.

- Cutler, Robert B. Seventy-Six Seconds in Dealey Plaza: Evidence of Conspiracy. Manchester, Mass.: Cutler Designs, 1978.
- Cutler, Robert B. The Day of the Umbrella Man. Manchester, Mass.: Cutler Designs, 1980.
- Evica, George Michael. And We Are All Mortal: New Evidence and Analysis in the John F. Kennedy Assassination. West Hartford, Conn.: University of Hartford, 1978.
- Joesten, Joachim. Oswald: Assassin or Fall Guy?. New York: Marzani & Munsell Publisher, Inc., 1964.
- MacNeil, Robert. The Way We Were: 1963, The Year Kennedy Was Shot. New York: Carroll & Graf, 1988.
- Meagher, Sylvia. Accessories After the Face: The Warren Commission, The Authorities and the Report. New York: Vintage Books, 1976.
- Meagher, Sylvia & Gary Owens. Master Index to the JFK Assassination Investigations. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1990.
- NBC News. Seventy Hours and Thirty Minutes. New York: Random House, 1966.
- NBC News. There Was a President. New York: Random House, 1966.
- O'Toole, George. The Assassination Tapes: An Electronic Probe into the Murder of John F. Kennedy and the Dallas Coverup. New York: Penthouse Press, Ltd., 1975.
- Sprague, Richard E. "The Assassination of President John F. Kennedy: The Application of Computers to the Photographic Evidence," Computers and Automation. Vol. 19, No. 5, Berkley, Mass. Richard E. Sprague, May 1970.
- Sprague, Richard E. The Final Cover-Up: How the CIA Controlled the HSCA. New York: Self-published, 1985.
- Summers, Anthony. Conspiracy. New York: Paragon House, 1989.
- Thompson, Josiah. Six Seconds in Dallas: A Micro-Study of the Kennedy Assassination. New York: Bernard Gesis Associates, 1967.
- Van Der Karr, Richard. Crisis in Dallas: An Historical Study of the Activities of Dallas Television Broadcasters During the Period of President Kennedy's Assassination. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Library of Congress.

- Weisberg, Harold. Photographic Whitewash: Suppressed Kennedy Assassination Pictures. Hyattstown, Md.: Self-published, 1967.
- Wilber, Charles G., Ph.D. Medicolegal Investigation of the President John F. Kennedy Murder. Thomas, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1978.
- Woods, John R. II. Master List (of President John F. Kennedy Assassination Photographers). Parker, Colo.: Self-published limited edition, 1984.
- Woods, John R. II. Master List (of President John F. Kennedy Assassination Photographers and Photographic Exhibits). Aurora, Colo.: Unpublished, 1988.
- Woods, John R. II. Parkland Hospital Please Stand By. Aurora, Colo.: Unpublished, 1990.
- Woods, John R. II. JFK Assassination Photographs: A Comprehensive Listing of the Photographic Evidence. Limited Collector's Edition. Aurora, Colo.: self-published, 1992.

Index to Names, First Mention

Adams, Bill	xiii
Aguilar, Henry	xiii
Alexander, Steven L.	7
Allen, Richard	7
Allen, Williams	7
Altgens, James	7
American Broadcasting Company [WFAA-TV]	7
Alyea, Thomas	7
Couch, Malcolm	12
Hatton, Fred	439
John, Ray	439
L'Hoste, A. J.	19
Reiland, Ron	24
Shipp, Bert	24
Walker, Robert	439
Andrews, Harry C.	284
Ashmore, Mr.	8
Ashmore, Mrs.	8
Assassination Archives & Research Center	429
<u>Assassination in Dallas</u>	471
Associated Press	8
Atkins, Thomas	8
Atkinson, Rick	xiii
Babuska Lady	8

Bailey, Jayxiii
Barnes, Sergeant W. E.	9
Beck, Mrs.	9
Beers, Jack	9
Bell, F. M.	9
Benell, Albert	9
Betzner, Hugh	9
<u>Black Star Publishing Company</u>	10
Bolleter, Dr. Wayne	10
Bond, Wilma	10
Boren, Bryant	10
Bothun, Richard	10
Brandt, Mr.	10
Brenk, Rudy	10
Bronson, Charles	10
Brown, Emory Jr.xiii
Burrows, Henry	11
Cabluck, Harry	11
Cabluck, Jerrold	11
Cancellare, Frank	11
Canning, Thomas N.	284
Carswell, Daniel	160
Center for Legislative Archives, The	431
Central Intelligence Agencyxiv
Chrisman, Fred	160
Color Photo, Inc.	15
Connally, Governor John2
Cook, Donald	11
Columbia Broadcasting System [KRLD-TV]	11
Barker, Eddie	439
Garza, Daniel	439
Phenix, George	25
Pieringer, Steven	440
Sanderson, George	25
Scott, Joseph	25
Underwood, James	25
Commission, Warrenxiv
<u>Computers & Automation</u>	xii
Couch, Malcolm [see American Broadcasting Company]	12
Craven, Tom	12
CRDL 3264	12
<u>Crisis in Dallas</u>xiii
Croft, Robert	12
Crouch, Markxiii

Cutler, Bob	xii
Dallas Attorney General	13
Dallas Cinema Associates, Inc.	13
Dallas Morning News	13
Dallas Police Station	13
Dallas Times Herald	13
Daniel, Jack	13
Daniels, Gene	13
Darnell, James [see National Broadcasting Company]	13
Darzzouzet, Chris	14
Davidlazy, Andrew	
Davis, William	14
Day, Lt. John	7
Dealey Plaza	1
Demoney, Tim	xiii
Department of State	xiv
Dillard, Tom	14
Dorman, Elsie T.	14
Downey, Jane	
Doyle, James	14
Drain, FBI Agent	578
Dziemian, Dr. Arthur	14
Eastman Kodak Processing Laboratory	14
Ebersole, Dr. John	14
Edgewood Arsenal	14
Eisendrath, David B.	285
Emerson, Ralph Waldo	Dedication Page
F.A.A. Civil Aeromedical Institute	285
Federal Bureau of Investigation	4
Fensterwald, Bernard "Bud"	xiii
Fierro, Debbie	xiii
Florer, Larry	7
Foley, Edward	15
Ford, President Gerald	xi
Ford, Gerald Presidential Library	430
Fort Worth Police Intelligence Unit	15
Fort Worth Star Telegram	15
Fox-Stanley Photo Products, Inc.	29
Francis, Ronald	285
Franklin, James "Vic"	xiii
Garica, Henry	xiii
Garrison, Jim	15
Georgetown University Library	429
Gewertz, Anita	15

Gewertz, Martin	15
Goldsmith, Michael	
Gonzales, Congressman Henry	16
<u>Goodnight America</u>	
Goodrich, Allen	xii
Gothard, Francis	16
Government Printing Office	16
Grant, Clint	5
Grant, Eva	17
Gray, W. C.	16
Groden, Robert	10
Hall, Howard J.	xii
Hall, James	xii
Hampton, Phil	16
Harper, Jack	16
Hartmann, William K.	285
Hayes, Frances	16
Hearst News Film	16
Heitman, Wallace R.	
Herron, Matt	16
Hershorn, Shel	17
<u>High Treason</u>	533
Hill, Jean	21
Holland, S. M.	17
Holt, Sally	17
Hoover, J. Edgar	167
House Select Committee on Assassinations	xiv
Howard, Tom	17
Hudson, Emmett J.	
Hughes, Robert	17
Hunt, Bob R.	284
Hunt, E. Howard	48
Information Security Oversight Office	2
Ingalsbe, Becky Lynn	xiii
Interagency Classification Review Committee	2
Itek Corporation	18
Jackson, Bob	18
Jackson, Robert	18
Jacoby, Doris	18
Jamieson Film Company	18
Jamison, J.	18
Jenkins, Dr. Marion	174
Jenney, Donald H.	284
Jet Propulsion Laboratory	xii

JFK Assassination Information Center	
JFK Exhibits	2
Johnson, Frank	18
Johnson, Lt.	15
Johnson, Lyndon Presidential Library	25
Johnson, President Lyndon	xi
Johnson, Marion	xii
Jones, Penn	18
KATV	18
KBOX-TV	18
Kelly, Director Clarence	
Kennedy, Jacqueline B. (Mrs. John)	75
Kennedy, John Presidential Library	8
Kennedy, President John F.	
KERA-TV	19
Kerley, Ellis	284
Kilduff, Malcolm	235
Kimbrough, Arch	19
Kincaid, George	19
King, Martin L.	xii
KIXL-TV	19
KLIF-TV	19
Knudson, Robert	19
KRLD-TV [currently KDFW-TV]	19
Kresge, Penny	xiii
KSKY	19
KTTV-TV	19
KVIL	19
KXOL	19
Laird, J.	19
Lala, Mr.	28
Lane, Richard	xiii
<u>Last Two Days, The</u>	8
Lawless, Debbie	xiii
Lawson, S. A. Robert J.	20
Leontis, Charles J.	284
Lesar, Jim	xiii
Lewis, Signal Corpsman John	19
L'Hoste, A. J. [see American Broadcasting Company]	19
Lockwood, Elizabeth	12
Love Field Airport	2
Lovelady, Bill	20
MacCammon, James	20
MacCann-Oliver, A. B.	9

Martin, John	20
Mayfield, Gene	.xiii
Mazziotta, John	10
McAulay, Joseph	20
McCamy, C. S.	284
McClelland, Dr. Robert N.	352
McCloy, John	579
McCormack, Harry	30
McDonnel, G. M.	20
McIntyre, M.	20
Mentesana, Ernest	20
Mester, Earl	20
Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer	20
Miller, D.	20
Miller Funeral Home	15
Milteer, Joseph	157
Montgomery, Lt.	15
Moorman, D.	20
Moorman, Mary	20
Muchmore, Mary	20
Murray, James	20
NASA-Space Project Division	295
National Archives	22
National Broadcasting Company [WBAP-TV]	22
Bright, Floyd	440
Brown, Jack R.	440
Brown, Wayne T.	440
Burton, Alex	440
Byron, James	440
Darnell, James	13
Dickson, Robert	440
Kerr, James	441
McDonald, Thomas	440
Owens, Daniel	23
Perkins, Frank	440
Seymour, William	441
Thornton, Russell	440
Vinson, Doyle	440
Welch, Robert	28
Whalen, Thomas	440
National Photographic Interpretation Center	2
National Security Council	2
Naval Photographic Laboratory	2
Newman, Justin	22

Nix, Orville	22
O'Conner, Mr.	434
Oliver, Dr. Alfred G.	14
O'Reilly, Vincent	
Osterlund, David	321
Oswald, June	116
Oswald, Lee	xiv
Oswald, Marguerite	6
Oswald, Robert	6
Oswald-Porter, Marina	6
Palm Dale County Police Department	6
Paramount Newsreel	23
<u>Paris Match</u>	6
Parkland Memorial Hospital	6
Parr, Wyman	23
Paschall, Patsy	23
Perros, George	17
Peterson, Steve	xiii
Phenix, George	23
Pollard, Dick	20
Porter, Mr.	23
Powell, William	23
<u>President Kennedy's Final Hour</u>	24
Randell, Hazel	24
Rankin, Lee	167
Records, Tony	24
Reed, S. L.	24
Reibe, Floyd	24
Reiland, Ron [see American Broadcasting Company]	24
Rheinstein, Fred	28
Rhodes, Allen	24
Rickerby, Art	25
Robinson, Duane	25
Rockefeller Commission on CIA Activities with the U.S.	25
Rochester Institute of Technology	287
Roetling, Paul G.	285
Rowe, Abbie	25
Ruby, Jack	xi
Rush, Jonathan	28
Russell, Senator	
Sanderson, Mr.	25
Sauro, Bill	25
Scott, Frank	285
Scott, Joe	25

Secret Service	25
Seigler, Howard	25
Selzer, Robert H.	xii
Senate Intelligence Committee	xiv
Shaneyfelt, Lyndal L.	25
Shapiro, Mike	
Shawver, George	26
Sherman, Bennett	285
Shipp, Bert [see American Broadcasting Company]	26
Shirah, Helen	
Sibert, James W.	113
Similas, Norman	26
Simpson, Ralph	26
Sisco, Paul	245
Sisco, Walt	26
<u>Six Seconds in Dallas</u>	xiii
Slater, Philip N.	285
Smith, David "Mike"	26
Smith, George	26
Smith, Rhonda	xiii
Smithsonian Institute	
Snow, Clyde C.	285
Snyder, Tom	
Somersett, William A.	329
Southeastern Louisiana University Library	429
Southern California Image Processing Institute	284
Speigle, Mr.	26
Sprague, Richard E.	xii
Squire Haskins	471
Stolley, Richard	478
Stone, Oliver	473
Stoughton, Cecil	xi
Stovall, Richard S.	161
Stringer, John	26
Stroebel, Dr. Leslie	
Stuckey, Bill	443
Studebaker, Robert	560
Sturgis, Frank	48
<u>Taking of America 1, 2 & 3, The</u>	26
Tatro, Edgar F.	xiii
Texas School Book Depository	3
Texas State Library Building	27
Texas Supplemental Report	27
Thomas, Larry	27

Thompson, Edward "Jack"	xiii
Thompson, Josiah	xiii
Time-Life Incorporated	15
Tippit, Officer J. D.	7
<u>Tomorrow</u>	
Towner, Robert	27
Towner-Barnes, Tina	27
Trade Mart	10
Tramps	7
Uhrock, Don	27
Underwood, James [see Columbia Broadcasting System]	27
United Press International	27
U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency	419
U.S. Department of Attorney General Office	419
U.S. Department of Justice	419
U.S. Geological Survey	296
U.S. House of Representatives	419
U.S. Secret Service	83
Universal Newsreel	27
University of California Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory	284
University of Georgia Library	431
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point	431
Valentin	126
Vallee, Thomas	160
Van Der Karr, Richard K.	xiii
Vaughan, Todd Wayne	xiii
Venso, Homer	27
Vette, Marcy	xiii
Vicki	Dedication Page
Volkland, Al	28
Walker, Robert [see American Broadcasting Company]	439
Warren Commission Exhibits	28
Washington Post	353
WBAP-TV	28
WDSU-TV	28
Weaver, Jack	28
Wecht, Dr. Cyril	444
Weigman, David	28
Weisberg, Harold	26
Welch, Robert [see National Broadcasting Company]	28
Western New England College	530
Westfall, H. E.	29
WFAA-TV	29
White, Jack	xiii

White, Roscoe	318
<u>Whitewash</u>	286
Wide World Photos, Incorporated	29
Wiehl, Richard L.
Williams, Lewis	29
Willis, Phil	29
Winfrey, Bill	29
Winslow, Gordon W.xiii
Wolfe, Frank	29
Wollensak, Richardxii
Woodley, Elizabeth
Woods, John and Almaxii
Woods, John R. II	29
World Youth Festival	581
WRR	427
WWL-TV	30
Zapruder, Abraham	328 280

DISPATCH

PROCESSING ACTION

MARKED FOR INDEXING

NO INDEXING REQUIRED

XX

ONLY QUALIFIED DESK
CAN JUDGE INDEXING

MICROFILM

TO

INFO.

FROM

SUBJECT

ACTION REQUIRED - REFERENCES

Reference:

Source:

1. Attached are copies of a photograph of Subject of reference. This photograph was taken the night of 27 November 1963

2. Subject secured a fifteen day Mexican tourist card at Tampa, Florida, on 20 November 1963. Subject entered Mexico on this document at Nuevo Laredo on 23 November 1963 - the day after President Kennedy's assassination in Dallas, Texas.

3. Subject checked into the Hotel Roosevelt, Avenida Insurgentes 287, Mexico, D.F., on 25 November 1963. He stayed in room at this hotel. At 1900 hours (Mexico City time) on 27 November 1963, Subject checked out of the Hotel Roosevelt and at 2100 hours on 27 November 1963 Subject departed Mexico for Habana.

4.

Document Number **308-114** (continued)

Attachment:
Photograph

for FOIA Review on **MAY 1976**

Distribution:

CROSS REFERENCE TO

DISPATCH SYMBOL AND

DATE

5 December 1963

CLASSIFICATION

HQS FILE NUMBER

CONTINUATION OF
DISPATCH

CLASSIFICATION

DISPATCH SYMBOL AND NO.

5. The photograph of Subject which is attached (see para one above) was taken |

6. Source states the timing and circumstances surrounding Subject's travel through Mexico and departure for Habana are suspicious.

7. |

PHOTO
DELETED

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE
TREASURY DEPARTMENT

600

[Handwritten initials and scribbles]

ORIGIN Chief's Office		OFFICE Detroit, Michigan	FILE NO. CO-2-34030
TYPE OF CASE		STATUS	TITLE OR CAPTION
Protective Research		Closed - Detroit	LEE HARVEY OSWALD
INVESTIGATION MADE AT		PERIOD COVERED	
Detroit, Michigan		12-6-63	
INVESTIGATION MADE BY			
SAs William R. Skiles and Robert R. Lapham			
TAILS			

SYNOPSIS

Earl Ruby interviewed relative to alleged photographs portraying President Kennedy's head wounds.

(A) INTRODUCTION:

This case originated upon receipt of an Office Memorandum from Inspector Thomas Kelley, Dallas, dated December 5, 1963, which requests interview of Earl Ruby relative to photographs portraying President Kennedy's head wounds.

(B) GENERAL INQUIRIES:

Earl Ruby was personally interviewed on December 6, 1963, at Cobo Cleaners, 18135 Livernois, Detroit, Michigan, by Special Agents William R. Skiles and Robert R. Lapham. Ruby was aware that this information had been furnished this Service by his sister and was entirely cooperative throughout the interview.

Ruby stated that during the evening of December 1, 1963, he received a long-distance telephone call from an old friend, Mike Shore of Los Angeles, who said he had been conferring with one Billy Whitfield, the writer of the Caryl Chessman murder story, relative to the possibility of writing a story on Jack Ruby. Shore also mentioned to Earl Ruby that he had information on some photographs, but he would not elaborate because he said the subject was too "hot" to talk about on the phone. It was agreed that Earl Ruby would leave for Los Angeles immediately.

Ruby said he arrived in Los Angeles the following day, and at that time he was met by Shore and Whitfield, after which they discussed the possibility of writing a story concerning Jack Ruby. During the conversation, Whitfield said that he was told by one Peter Moss, a writer for the Saturday Evening Post

DISTRIBUTION	COPIES	REPORT MADE BY	DATE
Chief ✓	Orig.	<i>[Signature]</i>	
Dallas	2 cc's	<i>[Signature]</i>	12-6-63
(Air Mail)		SPECIAL AGENT	
Detroit	2 cc's	APPROVED	DATE
Los Angeles	2 cc's	<i>[Signature]</i>	12-6-63
		SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE	

(CONTINUE ON PLAIN PAPER)