

(786) COMMENTS ON THE PANEL'S REPORT BY ROBERT GRODEN, CONSULTANT TO THE COMMITTEE

PREFACE

Robert Groden, a critic of the Warren Commission and coauthor of *JFK: The Case for Conspiracy*, was a photographic consultant to the committee. In this capacity, he provided background information on the issues that have been raised by the critics in the area of the photographic evidence; he also provided technical assistance to the committee in the area of photography. As such, he made an important contribution to the work of the committee. Though not a member of the committee's photographic evidence panel, he also gave panel members an extensive briefing on the prior work that had been done on various photographic issues; he also had additional input to the panel's work, either through communications with committee staff working with the panel or through participation in panel discussions. As a consultant to the committee, Groden was given access to the work of the photographic evidence panel and asked that the committee publish his comments on the panel's report.

The committee believes that Groden's views should be part of the record, although in including them, the committee or the panel do not endorse them. In addition, the committee noted some errors and misunderstandings in terms of the panel's work that should be borne in mind. By way of example, Groden was unaware that the frame of the Nix movie film corresponding to Zapruder frame 313, which shows the fatal head shot, had been digitally scanned, and that the photographic evidence panel had in fact been asked whether President Kennedy showed a reaction to a bullet prior to Zapruder frame 190. With respect to the work of the panel, Groden was also apparently unfamiliar with some procedures (that is, why only original materials were relied upon for enhancement and analytical purposes) and with the basis for some panel decisions (that is, why it attached little weight to the fact that the Kennedy autopsy photographs were taken with 1963 film). The general issues that Groden addresses in his comments, particularly in the area of the photographic evidence, are also addressed in the panel's report.

015086

January 3, 1979

The Honorable
Chairman Louis Stokes
Select Committee on Assassinations
U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Sir:

Enclosed please find the formal dissenting view dealing with the work of the Committee's scientific medical and photographic panels and my report on related photographic materials which I feel were inadequately covered in the public hearings.

As a photographic consultant to the Committee, I feel that these views should be expressed for the record and for history. I will be including photographic materials relating to the various reports herewith enclosed.

Sincerely,


Robert J. Groden

I. THE "BACKYARD" PHOTOGRAPHS

Among the areas in which I disagree with the way the photo evidence was presented and treated, was using only Jack White's arguments in the area of the Neely Street photographs. You were all aware that some of the arguments presented were no longer issues and that some of them never really were. The true issues were not accurately dealt with in the hearings. These were the discrepancy of the head to body size as well as the height-to-rifle length ratio and the visual retouching of the skin and surrounding area. At the July 19 panel meeting I didn't argue the point because of my desire to attend the rest of the meetings. But in my opinion no matter what the panel members concluded, the backyard photographs are beyond question fakes. Disregarding all of the other evidence supporting the fact of forgery, the visual areas of retouching cannot be easily dismissed.

For the record, the method used here was, almost without doubt, simply posing a man (or possibly different men for each photograph) in the backyard with the rifle, pistol and publications as part of this original picture. The only item added was the head of Lee Oswald from the middle of the chin up. The argument that all of the backgrounds are the same is, I feel, impractical and the same goes for the idea of adding the shadows after the fact.

In spite of the fine work Jack White has done on the rifles, I don't believe using him alone to present "all of the issues" dealing with the Neely Street photographs can ever be justified.

II. THE NIX AND MOORMAN PICTURES

Dr. Hunt's "analysis" of the Moorman No. 2 Polaroid photograph and the Nix film were in extreme error and the questioning insufficient to accurately deal with these items.

The best versions of the Moorman No. 2 Polaroid are the prints made from either of the original high resolution negatives in the possession of UPI and AP. Dr. Hunt didn't even see, scan, or study them. He used the original print which faded 15 years ago. You can hardly see the President in the foreground, and images in the background have long since nearly vanished including the "assassin" behind the retaining wall on the grassy knoll, the man behind the stockade fence and other shapes which raise questions as to others on the knoll. The man who appears in Willis No. 5 and the Zapruder film is clearly seen behind the wall in the Moorman No. 2.

Also overlooked is the fact of the Western-most wall edge changing shape depending on which negative was used to create any given specific point.

The first Moorman print on the other hand is not now as was originally described by all who saw it before the FBI confiscated it. It has now lost the sixth floor, which was there originally in the photograph as well as the eastern end of the TSBD and the "assassin's" window.

I intended to present evidence that as was the case with the Neely Street photographs, the Moorman pictures as they exist now are fakes. For instance, Mary Moorman took three consecutive photographs. The committee looked at the first and the third of the three and they both show evidence of retouching. None of this was dealt with by Dr. Hunt. Hunt couldn't see the man behind the wall because he no longer appears in the original print. His entire image has faded to white.

As for the Nix film, Hunt couldn't see a gunflash because the frame corresponding to Zapruder frame No. 312 was not scanned and is the only frame showing the flash. This is the frame just before the head explosion frame. It is doubtful that Dr. Hunt would even know where to look for the muzzle flash even if he had had the correct frame since we have had no interaction at all on this matter.

III. THE WALKER BULLET

The shot taken at General Walker was referred to several times during the public hearings as being fired by Oswald. This is a terribly misleading assumption.

It is still questionable whether the Mannlicher-Carcano can be linked to Oswald. But even if it was his, it could not have fired the "Walker bullet." Oswald's alleged rifle fired 6.5-mm ammunition, copper jacketed, while the Walker bullet was a steel jacketed 30.06.

Oswald has never been linked with another rifle during that period of time.

IV. TIMING AND NUMBER OF SHOTS

Although testimony given at the time of the public hearings would lead one to believe that it was the general consensus of the photographic panel that the timing and number of the shots had been established,

and that there was little question as to this conclusion, this was of course not the case. The vote was as presented split, but the ballot was not clearly defined. No one was asked if they thought a shot struck before Zapruder film frame number 190, nor were they asked if they felt shots struck both before and after the road sign.

One important result of that panel meeting was my discovery of a shot fired in the mid-to-late 150's of the Zapruder film.

Seven years ago, I discovered that President Kennedy was responding to a shot that missed by frame 158. But at the panel meeting I found that by frame 163, Governor Connally was also responding to the sound of the same shot. This coupled with the overall timing of the shot sequence of the police tape gives us a whole new perspective of the shot timing.

In the face of the current evidence it seems that this is the actual timing and firing order of the shots:

1. From behind. Missed. Fired in the 150's. Possibly hit the concrete by the manhole cover on the south curb of Elm Street, or the pavement on Elm Street. (There is Warren Commission testimony of this.)

2. From the front. Hit the President in the neck. Penetrated deep within the President's body and was removed during the autopsy by Commander Humes. (See FBI receipt for the bullet.) Struck the President between frames 188 and 189.

3. From behind. Struck the President in the back, 4 inches below the shoulder line to the depth of an inch or an inch and a half and did not traverse the body. This bullet probably fell out of the President's body either during the time the body was in Parkland Hospital or while enroute to Bethesda for the autopsy. Upon striking the President in the back, the transfer of momentum pushed the President forward and downward by several inches. This is one of the few occurrences on film that can be accurately measured but has gone totally overlooked by the photo panel. The hit occurs at frame 227, and the forward motion lasts for over a half dozen frames.

4. From behind. Hit Governor Connally in the back. There are two possible times for this hit. The first is at frame 227 when the Governor's right arm spins toward his left. The second occurs at frame 238 when there is a violent drop to the Governor's right shoulder and his cheeks puff out, his hair becomes disheveled. There is an outside possibility that these two pronounced movements may represent separate shots. The first to Connally's right wrist and the second to his back with either striking his left thigh.

V. JOSEPH MILTEER

The matter of Joseph Adams Milteer is by no means put to rest by comparing the height of the man in the Altgens photo to Milteer's known height or the unknown relative heights of the other people in the crowd standing near him.

If the man in the crowd is Milteer it is just the icing on the cake. You have the Miami tapes as well as the Miami police reports and the FBI files on Milteer. He is strongly involved in both the Kennedy and King cases. He is proof of a conspiracy and that the FBI and

Warren Commission participated in an active collaborated coverup by burying all of the Milteer evidence in the National Archives and never mentioning his name even once in the Warren Report or the 26 volumes of evidence. Milteer is a prime suspect in both the John Kennedy and Martin Luther King murder plots.

Resting the Milteer case on the height of the crowd man would be a gross error in judgment.

VI. THE ACOUSTICS TESTS

There seems to be a problem in the way the acoustics tests were done:

1. Only two firing points were considered for acoustical matching—the “Oswald window” and behind the stockade fence. By using the audio signals and echo patterns from only these two points, the testing machinery could eliminate any other shot, echo pattern or sound below the dB threshold used, related to shots from behind the retaining wall, the southern knoll, the Dal-Tex building, the Records building, other depository window or the roof, or any other possible firing point from its final conclusions thereby destroying the use or value of the tests.

2. By not removing the new overhead road signs and replacing the old Stemmons Freeway sign, new elements are introduced that will alter the results of the tests and eliminate from consideration possible shot sounds and echo patterns altered by these new elements.

3. Different ammunition was used in the testing. First, older ammunition of the type allegedly used by Oswald was used. Then, newer ammunition was used that gave a different sound even audibly to the witnesses and the testing machinery is far more sensitive than the human ear to such changes.

In spite of the many inconsistencies in the testing procedure, there was still evidence of a possible four shots from at least two different directions.

It must be noted here that the first acoustical tests done on the Dallas police tape found very strong evidence of at least seven shots which is confirmed by the visual and concrete evidence at the time of the assassination.

VII. REPORT ON ISSUES RELATING TO THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE AUTOPSY X-RAYS AND PHOTOGRAPHS OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

During the public hearings in September, witnesses from the committee’s scientific panels stated that in their opinion the autopsy photographs and X-rays of President Kennedy were genuine, citing such evidence as the fact that the film used was produced in 1963.

The importance of the photographs and X-rays cannot be overestimated. Every scientific panel—photographic, medical, acoustics, ballistics, N.A.A., et cetera—all depend upon the autopsy materials for their testing and conclusions.

The basic conclusions from all except the acoustics panel is that two shots struck the President from behind.

On the surface it would seem that the autopsy materials bear out this conclusion. That, however, may not be the case.

There is evidence that raises grave questions about the authenticity of the items being relied upon by the select committee and its panels. Moreover, there is medical data in the photos and X-rays which is apparently being ignored.

1. THE PROBLEM OF AUTHENTICITY

The fact that the HSCA panels have been unable to establish inauthenticity of these items may not reflect their authenticity but rather the skill with which they were forged.

In considering the matter of authenticity of some of the autopsy photographs, my main concern is that of the large head exit wound and its exact and general location as described by the vast majority of trained medical personnel at Parkland Hospital and reported by many of the Dallas witnesses. The main issue here is that such a wound may have been photographically eradicated from the only visual record of the President's body following the assassination via the simple technique of photo-compositing. If done with care, this would be undetectable.

On this point, some of the photo panel's tests would be meaningless. For example, one test the panel claims proves authenticity is that the film in evidence was manufactured in 1963. It seems that if any one were to plot the forging of these pictures that they would not wait until the film used in the other (genuine) autopsy photographs would be out of date, and that they would certainly use the same film that would have been originally used in the entire autopsy series. All this test proves is that the forgeries could have been produced in late 1963 or early 1964.

For the record, my visual inspection of the autopsy photographs and X-rays reveals evidence of forgery in four of the photographs: Color chromes No. 42 and No. 43 showing the rear of the head and No. 15 and No. 16 which appear to be the same shots in black and white (made from black and white duplicate negatives of No. 42 and No. 43).

Within the circumference of the President's head, there is an irregular line. Within this line the hair appears black and wet. On the outside of the line it is auburn and completely dry. In later generations of these photographs, a large degree of contrast buildup becomes apparent at the line's edge and the line becomes clearly defined. This phenomenon is characteristic of crop lines in matte insert processes used for retouching and repositioning of photographs.

It is my opinion that these two photographs are forgeries, composites manufactured to eliminate evidence of an exit wound in the rear of the President's head. The only method I am aware of that could have been used to create these composites is known as "soft edge matte insertion." (See attachment 1.)

The question of the authenticity of these particular photographs is crucial because of the large volume of evidence indicating that at least one shot struck the President in the head from the front, causing an exit wound at the rear of the skull. The problem is that this wound, seen by so many in Dallas, does not appear in the autopsy photographs and X-rays.

The most reliable descriptions were those from the Parkland doctors on the day of the murder. Doctors Clark, Jones, Perry, Baxter, Akin,

McClelland, and Nurses Hutton, Bowron, and several others all describe that same wound in great detail, and all place it at the same point in the rear of the President's head in the area of the occipital bone. Many said cerebellar tissue protruded from a large avulsive exit wound. This too indicates a lower rear head exit wound. A partial list of the many eyewitnesses who describe this wound is included as attachment 2 to this memo. It seems highly improbable that all these witnesses were mistaken.

Furthermore, the descriptions of the eyewitnesses who saw Kennedy's head wound at Parkland are corroborated by those who saw the bullet impact upon the head in Dealey Plaza.

Secret Service Agent Clint Hill saw a piece of the President's skull fly from the President's head and travel toward the rear-left of the car. Mrs. Kennedy attempted to pick up this piece (and indeed from a recently declassified portion of her Warren Commission testimony we can see that she may have picked up a section of skull) and tried to hold it onto the rear of her husband's head.

The next day Billy Harper found a piece of bone in Dealey Plaza. Originally, the "Harper" fragment was identified by a qualified pathologist as a section of occipital bone.

In addition, there is photographic evidence of a shot exiting from the rear of the President's head.

Zapruder film frames No. 335 and No. 337 clearly show the result of the head shot. They are the clearest two frames showing the President after the head explosion.

I have examined and measured the contours of the President's head on Zapruder film frames 335 and 337. The rear of the President's head, in these frames, shows his hair pushed upward and away from the scalp. That indicates the bones underneath were avulsed outward. This matches the description of the wound provided by Dr. McClelland who said the bones at the rear of the head were "sprung open." (See attachment 2 for full quote and other descriptions of this wound.)

Conclusions

The Dallas observations indicating a rear exit hole cannot be easily dismissed. These accounts were provided by trained medical personnel. It defies belief that so many people, viewing the President from different angles at different times, should all describe the same wound condition and position. My own examination of the autopsy photographs of the rear of the head shows a sharp contrast buildup along an irregular line at the rear of President Kennedy's head. This contrast buildup could be the result of a photocompositing process whereby another photograph was superimposed on the back of President Kennedy's head, thus eliminating evidence of that exit wound. Based upon my observation of that contrast buildup, and the Dallas medical observations indicating there was a wound there, it is my opinion, as a photo-consultant to the House select committee, that these photographs are forgeries.

2. LEFT TEMPORAL WOUND

There are at least two Parkland Hospital doctors who noted a wound of entry in the President's left temple. (Dr. Robert N. McClelland and Dr. Marion T. Jenkins)

Dr. McClelland, in his official statement regarding the assassination filled out at 4:45 p.m. on November 22, wrote: "The cause of death was due to massive head and brain injury from a gunshot wound of the left temple." (WR, p. 527) Dr. Jenkins, in his testimony to the Warren Commission on March 25, 1964, stated that "* * * I thought there was a wound on the left temporal area, right in the hairline and right above the zygomatic process." (H6, p. 48) When informed that no one else had noted such an entrance wound, Dr. Jenkins stated that it might have been blood from some other point.

My examination of this area on autopsy photograph No. 29 leads me to believe that Dr. Jenkins was correct on his initial opinion.

Close inspection of the left temporal area on the original transparency (but not on any of the later generation duplicates) reveals the presence of a faint but distinct circular hole which I estimate to be approximately 5 or 6 mm in size in the left sideburn approximately 25 to 30 mm above the bottom of the sideburn, and 10 to 15 mm in front of the foremost ear line. (Photos 30 and 31 show much the same area but because of different exposure and clarity of the film, the hole shape is not as evident.)

The other photographic and medical panel members who inspected the autopsy items were not familiar with the Kennedy case and the question of a left temporal wound prior to and at the time of their examination of these items and so were probably not looking in that area for any damage.

I must point out that on transparency No. 29, the "hole" is visibly very faint with no blood to highlight it to the casual observer. Indeed, if one did not know to look for evidence of this wound, it would simply remain unnoticed.

To facilitate future study, I have made a single 8 x 10 glossy print of this area which is at the Archives stored with the original collection. (I made two such photographs: One was not clear because the transparency moved while in the enlarger.)

On July 19, 1978, while Dr. Michael Baden was at the Archives examining the X-rays and photographs, and I was attending a meeting of the photo panel, I telephoned Dr. Baden and informed him of the existence of this evidence of a left temporal bullet wound. While still on the telephone with me, Dr. Baden examined the photographs. He said he could locate no wound in the left temple, and that what I was seeing was "a small spot of blood." From this conversation, I could have concluded that either: (a) Dr. Baden was looking at a blood spot at another point close to the "hole"; or (b) Baden and I both saw the same thing in the left temporal area, but simply disagree as to what it meant.

On October 27 I had another opportunity to examine the X-rays and photographs and, on that occasion, I noted again that there was no blood visually related to this wound, raising further question of Dr. Baden's diagnosis. At that time I also discovered that the skull X-rays contained data which seem to indicate a hole in the left temple.

On lateral X-rays of the skull, there is a gray spot at the same location as the "hole" on photo No. 29. There is, however, no evidence of radiating fracture marks on the skull from this point.

Conclusion

There is photographic and X-ray evidence supporting the observations of the Dallas doctors—McClelland and Jenkins—that there was a left temporal entrance wound.

I feel it is the committee's obligation to have the medical panel re-examine the X-rays and photographs, in the area I have pinpointed, and, if they disagree with my conclusion, explain what this circle represents, if not a bullet hole, and also explain the corresponding image on the X-rays.

VIII. RECOVERED BULLET DURING JFK AUTOPSY

Although there is a great deal of evidence that a bullet was recovered from President Kennedy's body at the time of the autopsy, none of the evidence of this bullet was ever mentioned in the public hearings.

To recap, Warren Commission document No. 371 reveals "one receipt from the FBI for a missile removed during the examination of the body." An examination of the receipt shows that a bullet was removed from the body of President Kennedy during the autopsy in the evening of November 22, 1963. This bullet was handed over to and signed for by FBI agents Francis X. O'Neill and James W. Sibert.

The January 4, 1964, issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (vol. 187 No. 1) stated on page 15 that the bullet was recovered during the autopsy.

The *Washington Post* of December 18, 1963, after checking the report with the FBI before publication, stated that a bullet was recovered from deep within the President's shoulder. This was again confirmed in the *Post* on May 29, 1966.

The fact of the recovery of this bullet fully destroys the myth of the "single bullet," and that evidence of an additional gunshot during the assassination was suppressed.

Commander Humes removed this bullet but there is no indication from which direction the bullet came. If it was from the front, there had to be at least two assassins. If the bullet came from behind and as the best evidence will show, did not exit the President's body, considering the number and timing of the shots in any combination, there had to be more than one assassin.

The issue has been raised that the bullet or missile may have been a fragment of a bullet or missile. This seems highly unlikely since Sibert and O'Neill were professional enough to know the difference between an entire bullet and a small fragment. In addition to this, the FBI itself did confirm to the *Washington Post* that it was "a bullet" and not just a fragment.

It should be noted that this entire area of discussion occurred many months before the single bullet theory was invented to try to prove the "lone assassin theory."

ATTACHMENT 1: SOFT EDGE MATTE INSERTION

Given the present nature of these photographs, the only method that I am aware of that could have been used to alter them is called soft edge matte insertion.

The technique uses a black and white masking process and this is how it works:

An original 4 x 5 photograph; that is, transparency would be taken showing the rear of JFK's head with the exit wound in the center (in this case two, No. 42 and No. 43). Using one at a time, it is pin registered and placed in a photographic enlarger along with a pin registered piece of 4 x 5 black and white film called a registered black core matte. This is clear film with a black center in a specific area over the area on the original transparency to be eliminated. The clear fades quickly to the black, not a sharply defined edge, hence the term "soft edge."

This "sandwich" is then projected onto another piece of 4 x 5 Ektachrome transparency film. In this case the result so far would be the rear of the President's head with a large blank, black area in the rear. This new piece of film is then put in a light tight container.

At this point, another transparency of the back of another head, this one with an entrance bullet hole and hair that matches J.F.K.'s head photographed to the same size, is pin registered with a clear core matte which is a piece of black film tapering to a clear center. This is a contact film print of the black core matte and fits exactly in register with the original transparency and the black core matte.

This new "sandwich" is then projected in register onto the partially exposed Ektachrome. Now the photograph is complete.

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 is 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 integrity of stereo views.

ATTACHMENT 2: REFERENCES TO AN OCCIPITAL HEAD WOUND OF EXIT IN WARREN REPORT (PART OF CE 392, APPENDIX VIII, PP. 516-530)

Kemp Clark—"Two external wounds, one in the lower third of the anterior neck, the other in the occipital region of the skull, were noted." (p. 517) "There was a large wound in the right occipitoparietal region * * * both cerebral and cerebellar tissue were extruding from the wound" (p. 518).

Charles Carrico—"Dr. Jenkins attempted to control slow oozing from cerebral and cerebellar tissue via pads instituted" (p. 520).

Malcolm Perry—"A large wound of the right posterior cranium was noted * * *" (p. 521).

Charles Baxter—"* * * the right temporal and occipital bones were missing and the brain was lying on the table * * * (p. 523).

Kemp Clark (handwritten at 4:15 p.m.)—"There was a large wound beginning in the right occipital extending into the parietal region" (p. 525).

M. T. Jenkins—"There was a great laceration on the right side of the head (temporal and occipital) causing a great defect in the skull plate * * * even to the extent that the cerebellum had protruded from the wound" (p. 530).

Dr. John Ebersole (taped interview with Gil Delaney, Lancaster Intelligencer-Journal) + (a.), March 8, 1978—"knew shot came

from the back or side because the back of his head was blown off.” (Ebersole now says he was misquoted.)

In an interview with Art Smith, Chester, Pa., Ebersole said the back of the skull was intact “except for maybe three small fragments.”

Dr. Ronald Jones—“What appeared to be an exit wound in the posterior portion of skull” (6H56).

Dr. Perry—“A large avulsive injury of the right occipital area (6H11).

Dr. Charles Baxter—“A large gaping wound in the back of the skull * * * literally the right side of his head was blown off” (6H 40-41).

Dr. McClelland—“As I took the position at the head of the table * * * I was in such a position that I could very closely examine the head wound, and I noted that the right posterior portion of the skull had been blasted. It had been shattered apparently, by the force of the shot so that the parietal bone was protruded up through the scalp and seemed to be fractured almost along its posterior half, as well as some of the occipital bone being fractured in its lateral half, and this sprung open the bones that I mentioned in such a way that you could actually look down into the skull cavity itself and see that probably a third or so, at least, of the brain tissue, posterior cerebral tissue and some of the cerebellar tissue had been blasted out” (6H33).

Nurse Pat Hutton—“Pressure bandage was no use * * * because of the massive opening on the back of the head.”

Dr. Gene Akins—“Back of the right occipital parietal portion of his head was shattered, with brain substance protruding” (6H65).

Dr. Clark—“* * * examined the wound in the back of the President’s head. This was a large, gaping wound in the right posterior part, with cerebral and cerebellar tissue being damaged and exposed” (6H20).

Dr. Peters—“We saw the wound of entry in the throat and noted the large occipital wound” (6H71).

Diana Bowron—Parkland Hospital nurse.

[Warren Commission testimony follows:]

BOWRON, DIANA - TESTIMONY before Warren Commission

These are some of the most relevant excerpts from the testimony of Parkland hospital nurse Diana Bowron who was the first trained medical person to observe the President upon arrival at Parkland hospital and observed the President face down in the car. She looked directly at the wound of exit in the rear of the President's head.

TESTIMONY OF DIANA HAMILTON BOWRON

The testimony of Dianna Hamilton Bowron was taken at 2:05 p.m., on March 24, 1964, at Parkland Memorial Hospital, Dallas, Tex., by Mr. Arlen Specter, assistant counsel of the President's Commission.

Mr. SPECTER. And what, in a general way, did you observe with respect to President Kennedy's condition?

Miss BOWRON. He was moribund—he was lying across Mrs. Kennedy's knee and there seemed to be blood everywhere. When I went around to the other side of the car I saw the condition of his head.

Mr. SPECTER. You saw the condition of his what?

Miss BOWRON. The back of his head.

Mr. SPECTER. And what was that condition?

Miss BOWRON. Well, it was very bad—you know.

Mr. SPECTER. How many holes did you see?

Miss BOWRON. I just saw one large hole.

Mr. SPECTER. Did you see a small bullet hole beneath that one large hole?

Miss BOWRON. No, sir.

Mr. SPECTER. Did you notice any other wound on the President's body?

Miss BOWRON. No, sir.

Mr. SPECTER. And what action did you take at that time, if any?

Miss BOWRON. I helped to lift his head and Mrs. Kennedy pushed me away and lifted his head herself onto the cart and so I went around back to the cart and walked off with it. We ran on with it to the trauma room and she ran beside us.

And an excerpt from a newspaper article labeled as "Bowron exhibit No. 3. in Warren Commission volume #19.

Dianna, who was trained at Hope Hospital, Salford, said: "I realised who the man in the car was as soon as I saw Jackie Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy was slumped forward in his seat—and so was Mr. Connally.



Robert J. Groden
Photo Consultant, H.S.C.A.

ATTACHMENT 3: SUSPECTED FIRING POINTS IN THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, AS THEY RELATE TO THE PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

There are nearly 2 dozen suspected firing points in Dealey Plaza that have been raised by Warren report critics through the years. Of these, several are worthy of close inspection for they may be candidates as probable sources of shots within the plaza. Some of the 2 dozen:

1. The TSBD easternmost sixth floor window facing south (the "Oswald" window).
2. The TSBD roof.
3. The TSBD seventh floor.
4. The TSBD fourth floor, third pair from the left (west) end.
5. The TSBD westernmost pair of sixth floor windows facing south.
6. The Dal-Tex building second floor.
7. The Dal-Tex building third floor.
8. The Dal-Tex building upper floor (any of the top three).
9. Dal-Tex roof.
10. The county records building roof.
11. The county records building second floor.
12. The stockade fence on top of the "grassy knoll".
13. The cement retaining wall in front of the stockade fence.
14. In front of the cement structure on the knoll at the end of the stockade fence (northeastern end).
15. The railroad overpass.
16. A storm drain at the north curb of Elm Street.
17. The "umbrella man".
18. The "south knoll" (the grassy knoll on the south side of the plaza on Commerce Street).

Nos. 1 thru 11 were to the President's rear. 12 thru 16 were to his right front, 17 started at the front and ended to the rear as the car passed by, and 18 was to the President's left front.

1. Was almost certainly a firing point. If the "Oswald" window was used during the assassination, whether by Lee Oswald or any one else (this remains to be proven), it is logical to assume that there would be from this window. This would be consistent with a prearranged scenario as well with the official version of the crime. The film taken by Charlse Bronson may show a dummy snipers nest for a cover story being constructed just 7 minutes before the shots were fired.

2. and 3. are possible alternatives to 1 but with far less opportunity for interruption by a bystander as was always a possibility at the "Oswald" window. There were reports of a rifle being found at 2 and 3 was not even searched.

4. Is considered by Dr. Cyril Wecht because of the angle of bullet trajectory from that point.

5. Is the point where witness Arnold Rowland saw two men with a rifle just before the assassination but thought that they were Secret Service agents. There was also what appeared to be a bullet mark on the north sidewalk of Elm Street (since removed) that lined up with this window.

6. Because of a photograph taken by A.P. photographer, James Altgens, seeming to show a rifle shaped object protruding from the second floor window of the Dal-Tex building, several Warren report critics (including myself) felt that this was probably a firing point for one or two of the shots. The committee has made available to me the original Altgens negative. Using my technique of vario-density cynexing, I was able to enhance the image in the window to the point of clarity where the figure in the window is now identifiable as a black man leaning on the window sill with both hands, and with no gun in view.

7. Has been charged as a firing point for the same reason as window 6. Using the VDC technique, I feel that the window was closed and I can find no evidence of any shots from that window.

8., 9. and 10. are strong interchangeable possibilities for one or two of the shots from the rear. Either President Kennedy's or Governor Connally's back wounds or the President's rear entering head wound. These angles are much closer to the alleged trajectory (rear to front) than the depository points 1 to 5.

11. Only one man, Hugh McDonald, has mentioned this as a firing point. Logistically, it simply could not have been. The angles and line of sight won't line up to any traceable shot.

12. The committee's acoustic panel has presented corroborative evidence to support the photographic evidence that this was in fact a firing point. A figure can be seen in both the second Moorman Polaroid photograph (clearly showing a figure in the area directly behind the stockade fence, 8 feet to the left of the corner of the fence), and the closing few dozen frames of the Zapruder film also seem to show a figure in the same spot. Independently, the sound tapes from the stuck transmitter place a firing point in this exact position, as do a great deal of eye and ear witnesses to the shooting.

13. Appears in a long list of films and photographs: (a) the fifth Phil Willis slide; (b) the Hugh Betzner photo corresponding to Willis No. 5; (c) the Abraham Zapruder film frames in the area surrounding and including No. 413; (d) the Orville Nix film in shadow near the left edge of the retaining wall; and (e) the Marie Muchmore film for one frame at the extreme top of the frame.

After the shooting, a large crowd of spectators chased this man, who some thought was a gunman, back into the parking lot where he disappeared, and where a man with false Secret Service identification was encountered. In items a and c, a shape appearing to be a weapon or rifle-shaped object is noted being held by this man. The HSCA photo panel has determined that this is indeed a human shape.

14. Appears in the Orville Nix film for an entire sequence and can be seen in motion. Stereo pairs show this shape to have three dimensions, and to be in the plaza in front of the concrete structure with the "left arm" portion extending beyond the edge of the wall. There are similar patches of light and shadow visible on the wall in the next sequence that give the impression that this shape was only shadows. It was not. These remaining shadows lack the coloring and texture of the image itself.

15. There is no photographic evidence of an assassin at this point.

16. There is no photographic evidence of an assassin at this point.

17. It seems unlikely that a shot could have come from this point.

18. Two Dallas doctors noted an entrance wound in the President's left temple. I have also noted in autopsy photograph No. 29 and the front view X-ray that there seems to be such a bullet wound in evidence. If there was, then this probably came from the area of the southern grassy knoll. The only photographic evidence of a shot from this point is the Cancellare photograph. It shows a shape that appears to be a man holding what appears to be a rifle on top of the knoll near a tree just seconds after the shots were fired. However, this shape is far too vague to be considered proof of a gunman and must be considered with its limitations.

It is my opinion that Nos. 1, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 18 are the most likely candidates for firing points as well as either 2, 3, 4, 5, or 8 (one of these).

It is also my opinion that only four of the above or at the most five are truly candidates for firing points and that No. 14 was a probability who never fired a shot. The rest on the list I cannot believe to be points where shots came from on the basis of photographic evidence as well as other physical evidence.

ATTACHMENT 4: MEMO—ROBERT J. GRODEN TO JANE DOWNEY
SUBJECT—THE CHARLES BRONSON FILM

FEBRUARY 25, 1979.

Earlier this year, I inspected and optically enhanced the regular 8-mm color motion picture of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy taken by Mr. Charles Bronson. There are four scenes of importance in this film:

1. Before the motorcade arrived, approximately 7 minutes before the shooting.
2. The motorcade on Main Street.
3. The motorcade on Houston Street.
4. The motorcade on Elm Street showing the President at the moment of the head explosion.

During the moments before the President arrived in Dealey Plaza, a bystander experienced an "epileptic seizure" and an ambulance was summoned. While the ambulance was present on Houston Street, Mr. Bronson filmed 8 seconds of footage from his position at the southwest corner of the Main-Houston intersection. He was standing on a pedestal near the corner, and his camera was running at 12 frames per second to preserve film (instead of the usual 18 fps).

At the upper left corner of the film frame for this entire sequence, Mr. Bronson photographed the two easternmost pairs of windows of the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository, including the window that Lee Oswald was supposed to be in at that moment.

Close inspection and optical enhancement reveals definite movement in at least two and probably three of the windows in question. The two most obvious are the same two windows (Nos. 1 and 3) that show movement in the Robert Hughes film at the beginning of the actual firing sequence. Also, the Hughes and Bronson films both show the man in window No. 1 to be wearing a bright reddish shirt (or so it appears) and the man in window No. 3 to be wearing a neutral-colored shirt.

The man in window No. 1 is moving rapidly back and forth, and the man in No. 3 seems to be crouched down at the window and rocking on his toes in much the manner of a baseball catcher.

The shape in window No. 2 is slightly less distinct than the other two. I originally felt that this "man" was actually the man in window No. 1 leaning back and forth, probably moving boxes around to construct what would later be called "the sniper's nest."

I now feel that this is a distinctly different person who is probably handing boxes to man No. 1.

As you know, I was sorry to hear the wording of the representative of the photo panel who testified that the moving shapes in these windows could not be identified as human one way or another from the Hughes' film. The fact that the shapes are indeed moving and stereo views show them to be well within the windows but not in as far as the boxes in the background, and that there is nothing else that these shapes could possibly be except human movement, should at least have prompted the wording to allow for a fairer comprehension on the part of another party concerned with the issue at a later date as is now the case of the Bronson film. When the subject was first raised as to the men in the windows, the press quoted the panel as stating that the Hughes film showed no one in the windows. This was not the case. So I would suggest the wording in any analysis of the Bronson film to be more exacting.

I am delighted to learn of the computer work that Mr. John Sigalos, the attorney for Mr. Bronson is going to have done independently, and I suggest another look at the Hughes' film.

ATTACHMENT 5: MEMO—ROBERT J. GRODEN TO JANE DOWNEY

SUBJECT—THE DILLARD NEGATIVES

FEBRUARY 25, 1979.

I have just examined the two Dillard negatives showing the so-called "Oswald" window. I am sorry to report that the negatives are both severely damaged, but in different ways.

Negative No. 8, which is the more familiar of the two, and is a wide-angle photograph, appears to be coated on its emulsion side with a coating of some type. It is possible that what this is is the emulsion itself in a badly damaged condition perhaps as a result of the radioactive testing done for the committee.

The image on the negative is also in very poor condition, and appears to show the effects of a phenomenon called reticulation. This looks like small horizontal and vertical lines running throughout the image area and extending into the marginal area surrounding the picture area itself.

I cannot determine for sure whether the crosshatching occurs in the emulsion itself or if it is on the coating (if indeed the "coating" is a foreign addition to the negative and not just damaged emulsion).

Negative No. 24 also has this problem but in addition, the negative has an area where the emulsion has been rubbed off of the base. It appears that the negative was subjected to an intensely hot liquid and rubbed to remove the radioactive coating which was applied for the analytical work done for the committee. It seems that at this time,

the wet emulsion was actually smeared by an outside force, for an area of the image has been removed from the base. It is my opinion that this damage is irreversible.

I would also like to point out the appearance of what seems to be a human figure at the extreme western window on the sixth floor of the TSBD in negative No. 8. Negatives No. 8 and No. 24 were exposed at about the same time but from two different cameras (No. 8 with a wide-angle lens and No. 24 with a telephoto lens). I would estimate that both of these photographs were exposed within 10 seconds of the last gunshots, and if the figure in the western end window is a human figure (where eyewitness Arnold Rowland saw a human figure standing) we have more proof of a larger conspiracy.

If your computer enhanced negative(s) show this area, I strongly suggest inspecting this area from it/them.

Due to the deterioration of the original negative, I cannot be sure as to what this figure is. If the computer duplicate negatives are better, it would definitely be worth examining them to study the shape.

As for the "Oswald" window, I can see no human figure in either negative.

ATTACHMENT 6: THE ALTGENS DOORWAY MAN ISSUE

The main items used by me in determining the true identity of the man in the TSBD doorway in the fifth Altgens photograph were:

The John Martin film original.—This camera original, when viewed under the correct lighting conditions, shows that the degree of facial growth on Billy Lovelady was not as great as it originally appeared in the DCA release prints;

The Robert Hughes film original.—This color film shows the color of the shirt that Mr. Lovelady is wearing. The colors seem to be consistent with the shirt worn by Mr. Lovelady in the Martin film (above);

The Mark Bell film original.—This film was taken at a closer range than the Hughes film and was taken at the same time. It clearly shows the color and pattern of the shirt worn by the doorway man. It is consistent with the shirt worn by Mr. Lovelady; and

The James Altgens negative original.—The photograph that started it all is the best evidence as to the identity of the man pictured in the doorway of the TSBD. The pattern of light and dark plaid is heightened through the technique of vario-density cynexing directly onto Kodak 5302 fine grain release positive to give a full range of contrast and density results for careful high magnification study. Using this process, which I developed several years ago for this purpose, it can be seen, even by a layman, that the pattern is indeed that of Mr. Lovelady. This technique yields images perhaps two to four times clearer than conventional photographic methods.

ROBERT J. GRODEN,
Photographic consultant, HSCA.