

INCREASE OR DECREASE FONT SIZE



NODULE 20

PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

THE TRAMP SHOTS

BRUCE HALL: FIRST TO DISCOVER TRAMP IS STURGIS

A document about journalist Bruce Hall appeared in the *Watergate* file at FBI Headquarters:

"The Bureau and Washington Field Office were furnished the following information by May 30, 1973, Dallas Nitel [Night Telex]:

"On May 5, 1973, Assistant Chief of Police Thomas A. Hutson, Dallas Police Department, advised that during the last week of January 1973, Bruce Hall, an Atlanta, Georgia, CBS representative, contacted the Dallas Police Department and showed them two photographs taken during the day of the Kennedy assassination in Dallas. The photographs depicted two Dallas police officers walking along the street near the assassination site with two white males. Hall asked that these persons be identified. The policemen are Marvin Wise and Billy Bass... Hall indicated that the man on the right in the photographs is FRANK A. STURGIS, without saying anything about his being connected with *Watergate*. The Dallas Police Department did not realize the connection until recently when Bob Shaw, Dallas Police Department, Press Officer, noticed STURGIS' name in the newspaper. Then on May 29, 1973, Shaw received a call from a UPI representative who stated that the rumor was all over Washington that STURGIS had been photographed in Dallas on the assassination day. Mr. Leopold, associated with the Senate *Watergate* Committee investigation, has contacted the Dallas Police Department and asked for any arrest record that they have on STURGIS under his true name and aliases. The Dallas Police Department has no record of any arrest under such names. Leopold is sending fingerprints to Dallas Police Department for checks against its identification records. Copies of the photographs mentioned in the above quoted nitel were obtained from the Dallas Police Department and were furnished to the Bureau and WFO by Dallas airtel to the Bureau and WFO, dated May 31, 1973, in the *Watergate* case."

There were some cryptic handwritten notes on the right-hand side of the document: "No follow up (illegible) has a small ino. No interest. Photo (illegible)." This was followed by what appeared to be several initials. The "Thomas Hutson" mentioned in the document helped arrest OSWALD on November 22. Hutson was contacted in August 1993: "I don't grant interviews. I'm not interested in discussing anything that happened in 1963. I only deal with the

facts. It's in the Warren Report. It's a bunch of bullshit - all the rest of it. Not fact. All these people writing and doin' all this is just tryin' t' enrich themselves and gain a bunch a money. They can't deal with the cold, hard facts as it really happened."

The document about Bruce Hall cited five reports of S.A. James J. O'Conner captioned "LEE HARVEY OSWALD - Miami," about, or mentioning, FRANK FIORINI. The FBI: "This possible connection has come to the attention of the FBI from several different sources and centers around a series of photographs taken in Dallas, Texas..." Bruce Hall was one source. Bruce Hall was contacted in June 1993. He told this researcher: "I had reason to believe, at that time, that it [the tramp] was FRANK STURGIS. I had been given some information from someplace that it was, in fact, STURGIS. I will not disclose my source at this time, although I will say it came from another person within CBS who was dealing directly with the other person. In order to keep that person in the clear, we set up a system where he got the information, and it was passed on to me, and I would do the leg work and field on it. His source was within the government, but I do not know who his source was. I made my first trip to Dallas to investigate the information on Friday, January 19, 1973. I still think it is STURGIS. We spoke with a number of people in Dallas at that particular time who we thought might recognize the picture, or who we thought might comment, we wanted to see what their response and their reaction was."

In the Spring of 1973 a rumor that circulated in Washington, D.C., placed STURGIS in Dallas on November 21, 1963. Bruce Hall said that his report to the Dallas Police and the rumor circulating in Washington that STURGIS had been arrested in Dallas on November 21, 1963, were unrelated.

ANALYSIS

When the FBI checked its files on STURGIS, it found he had been questioned about the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in 1964. STURGIS should have been questioned by the FBI in May 1973. The FBI erroneously concluded that: "It appears possible that E. HOWARD HUNT and FRANK ANTHONY STURGIS were eliminated as being identical to the unidentified individuals in the photographs with the Dallas police officers taken November 22, 1963, *during the Watergate investigation*. If not, it would appear that the Miami Office would be able to establish STURGIS' whereabouts on November 22, 1963, outside of Dallas. The above would indicate that all logical investigation has already been conducted in the MURKIN case, and the *Watergate Case*, to identify the three unknown persons with the Dallas police officers, none of which, investigation has indicated, were finger printed. UACB, no further action taken by Dallas."

THE ERVIN COMMITTEE

The Ervin Committee was given the tramp shots, however, it did not do a photo analysis.

During the Ervin Committee Hearings in the Summer of 1973, an alibi for HUNT, BARKER, McCORD and STURGIS could not be established. Congressman Henry Gonzalez (Dem.-TX) said that their alibis were all unsatisfactory. As stated, in November 1973 this researcher discovered the resemblance between HUNT and one of the tramps. An article about this discovery appeared throughout the underground press.

RICHARD E. SPRAGUE

In 1973 Bernard Fensterwald and his associate, Richard E. Sprague, were the keepers of the tramp shot negatives. In the 1960's and 1970's Richard E. Sprague was a computer programmer who worked for Northrup Aircraft and Touche Ross, an accounting firm that handled Fortune 500 corporations such as Boeing Aviation, then Sprague opened his own business.

SPRAGUE AND EUGENE EDGAR BRADLEY

As stated, Deputy Sheriff Roger Craig signed an affidavit in which he stated that he observed Eugene Edgar Bradley in Dallas on November 22, 1963, driving a get-away station wagon for OSWALD. Roger Craig was shown a picture of Bradley by a member of Jim Garrison's staff. Garrison had been led to believe that Eugene Edgar Bradley was involved in the Kennedy assassination. Vincent Salandria, an attorney from Philadelphia who was close to the Garrison investigation, commented: "He's a clever one and he's one of them. Big Jim Garrison made a terrible error based on Sprague regarding Eugene Edgar Bradley. He's poison. He was first to bring out the Bradley thing. He almost destroyed Jim in the Bradley thing. He pushed Hoover-did-it and right-wing interpretations. He came around with bundles of beautiful pictures and reports. He was from Wall Street then." Garrison was also convinced that Fred Lee Chrisman, a right-wing radio personality from the West Coast, was involved in the Kennedy assassination.

Sprague denied having given Jim Garrison the Bradley lead: "Some guys and a woman tipped off Jim Garrison on Bradley. He was not there and was innocent. Garrison asked me to look through photographs and I found that Bradley had a close facial resemblance to the tallest tramp. That spurred Garrison on." Sprague said he went to Dallas and conducted a height study that indicated the tramp was 6' 2" to 6' 4". This eliminated Bradley who was 5'9" tall."

THE FBI AND RICHARD E. SPRAGUE

On July 18, 1968, the FBI generated this note regarding Sprague: "Richard E. Sprague was the subject of memo 'A. Rosen to DeLoach March 26, 1968,' captioned 'Assassination of President Kennedy November 22, 1963, Dallas, Texas.' (Copy attached) It was approved that contact with Sprague should not be made. Sprague telephonically contacted Supervisor H.A. Schutz of the General Investigative Division on July 8, 1968, indicating he was in town

attempting to obtain Government contracts for his computer business, company name, 'Personal Data Services Corp.' Sprague said he had his research monograph and desired to submit it to the Bureau. He was informed that any information he had would be accepted, and no commitments were made to Sprague whatsoever. Upon receipt of his monograph it was determined to be identical with that previously received. Therefore his communication is being answered as indicated, and the salutation 'Dear Sir' is being utilized since Sprague had been in close contact and assisted individuals who have been severely critical of the President's Commission and the FBI." [FBI 62-109060-6520] On March 24, 1970, Sprague again contacted the FBI. J. Edgar Hoover responded: "With respect to your request, it will not be possible to furnish the assistance you are seeking as all pertinent material, including movies and photographs, relative to the assassination of President Kennedy, was made available by this Bureau to the Warren Commission. That Commission subsequently turned the material over to the National Archives. Note: Our files disclose in a Rosen to DeLoach memo dated April 26, 1968, it was noted that Richard E. Sprague had written the Administrative Assistant to Senator Robert F. Kennedy, enclosing a number of photographs taken at the assassination site and stated he was a proponent of the theory that more than one individual was firing shots at President Kennedy when he was assassinated. It had been determined that Sprague assisted individuals who have been severely critical of the Warren Commission and the FBI. We wrote him on July 18, 1968, utilizing above salutation and complimentary closing in view of data in our files regarding him." [FBI-62-109060-6926]

SPRAGUE AND THE TRAMP SHOTS

Richard E. Sprague published the tramp shots in *Computers and Automation* magazine in May 1970. They had already been published in Penn Jones' book *Forgive My Grief*. In 1973 Bernard Grossman called Richard E. Sprague and requested negatives, or prints, of the tramp shots. Richard E. Sprague was interested in the researcher's interest in the tramp shots, but refused to give him copies. When the researcher asked if Richard E. Sprague had seen this researcher's article about the tramps, he said: "A.J. ajweberman is a CIA agent spreading disinformation. Tom Forcade is also an agent. He worked for the Committee to Re-elect the President (CREEP) and I can show proof. He worked for the FBI. The *Fifth Estate* [an underground paper in Detroit] people have proof of it. He should have been arrested. He was a government agent for ten years." This researcher obtained the tramp photographs from Jack Beers (two weeks before he died) and from Fred Newcomb thanks to researcher Bernhard "Gustave" Grossman.

SPRAGUE'S LETTER TO THE *BERKELY BARB*: MAY 1973

"The article about the tramps is full of plagiarism, errors, misquotes and invented facts that mislead the readers of the *Berkely Barb* in unfortunate ways. I suppose the reason the author, A.J. ajweberman of Greenwich Village, New York, did not sign the article (or at least the *Barb* did not publish his identity) was fear of a libel suit. Mr. ajweberman, and the editors of the *Barb* opened themselves up to that possibility, when the article suggested the Committee to

Investigate Assassinations is a CIA front organization and implied that I have been working for the CIA since before May 1970. ajweberman states in the article 'Judging from his (Sprague's) connection with the Committee to Investigate Assassinations, a CIA front group, the purpose of running these pictures was to make sure no-one was on to anything.' Much as I would like to have discovered HUNT and STURGIS in Dealey Plaza, I must tell the *Barb* editors that ajweberman is wrong. The short tramp with the felt hat bears a very strong resemblance to Fred Lee Chrisman, a Minuteman from Washington. He is also about the same age as Chrisman and has two identical scars on the right side of his face...I started on the project in 1972, as soon as HUNT, STURGIS, BARKER and Company surfaced, to see if I could find any of them in the thousands of still photos and movie frames taken in Dealey Plaza on November 22, 1973. (sic) I also began research to find out where each one was that day. I suspected, and still suspect, that all six of the Watergate men who were involved in the Bay of Pigs (All but Liddy of the seven burglars) were involved in the assassination of John Kennedy. I could not find any of the six in Dealey Plaza."

SPRAGUE'S LETTER TO JOSEPH OKPAKU

After *Coup D'Etat In America* was published in 1975, Sprague sent a 30-page critique to its publisher in which he suggested that the book be taken off the market: "The widespread publicity given to the 'HUNT and STURGIS in Dealey Plaza' idea by Dick Gregory and others, the denial by HUNT under oath, the threats of law suits, the use of this 'tool' by David Belin and the Rockefeller Commission against qualified researchers and Warren Commission critics, and far more importantly, the potential future use of this gross error by the next official body set up to discredit the researchers and members of any House or Senate Committee investigating the assassination; all of these factors should have given you pause for deeper reflection and greater efforts to validate that author's claims. I assume in making this criticism, that your basic motivations are purely to seek the truth about the assassination wherever it may lead us.

"If Henry Gonzalez and Thomas Downing are successful in creating a special House committee to investigate the JFK assassination, they will need all the credibility they can muster. Both men are certain to come under personal attack from the powers on the other side of this giant battle for truth. Those forces will no doubt use Mr. Gonzalez's writing of the foreword for your book, to discredit him, largely because of the HUNT-STURGIS-Dealey Plaza error.

"None of us who have been supporting Henry Gonzalez through the last year would want to see that happen, and I assume you would not either. In addition to the discrediting possibility, the book sets up, there is a more subtle negative impact of the HUNT portion of the error. Focusing attention on whether or not HUNT was in Dealey Plaza draws attention away from where he really was that day, and more importantly, what he was doing at the moment the shots rang out in Dallas.

"You are in a position to turn this around, again assuming your real motivations are to get at and print the truth about the assassination and HUNT'S true involvement. By doing your homework now you can easily determine that HUNT was involved on November 22, 1963, in a very important meeting in Washington, D.C. with Richard Helms and Lyman Kirkpatrick [Inspector General of the CIA at the time of the Bay of Pigs] to decide whether the CIA would back another attempt to invade Cuba. One meeting on your part with the fourth man who was there, can settle this matter.

"I believe it should be obvious to you why that was an extremely significant meeting, and why HUNT, Helms and Kirkpatrick would deny that it ever took place. Just six short months before, Jack Kennedy had ordered the CIA and its anti-Castro agents to cease and desist from their plans for another invasion. He ordered the funds withdrawn, the training camps closed, the weapons confiscated, and the men arrested. All of that did take place..."

FORCADE TURNS THE TABLES ON THE CTIA

"ajweberman and Tom Forcade asked the CTIA people, Bud Fensterwald, Bob Smith and others, as well as the Georgetown University people, for permission to post signs on the campus near the auditorium where the CTIA meeting was being held. Georgetown University was a co-sponsor of the conference, supplying the auditorium as well as volunteer workers handling facilities, registration and other details. CTIA did not have the people or facilities of our own. Forcade and ajweberman also wanted to hand out the posters, or leaflets, as ajweberman calls them, both in front of the auditorium and inside the auditorium after the conference started.

"If you haven't seen one of the leaflets you should. It was in extremely poor taste. There was a horrible cartoon of RICHARD NIXON holding President Kennedy's brain (presumably) and leering at it. Large printed characters said the President's brain is missing. The rest of the poster was equally distasteful. Several congressmen and their staff people were planning to attend the CTIA conference. It was not the kind of material any of us wanted to see associated with the conference. Nor did we want to have the CTIA conference in any way connected in the minds of the senators and representatives with the demonstration in front of the Archives. We preferred legal approaches taken under the Freedom of Information Act. The CTIA conference had been planned and announced publicly months before ajweberman and his friends dreamed up the Archives demonstration idea.

"At any rate, the Georgetown people, who had the final say as far as what could or could not be done on the campus was concerned, apparently must have given ajweberman and Forcade permission to post the posters near the auditorium and to hand them out near the front door. When I arrived there shortly before the conference began, I saw the horrible posters on trees and poles and the sides of buildings all around the area. I also saw people handing out the 'leaflets.' I must admit my immediate reaction was to want to vomit, and my next reaction was a

desire to run around the campus tearing down all of the posters. However, I resisted the impulse and entered the auditorium, going upstairs to the registration foyer at the auditorium entrance...Shortly after the conference began I was aware of a disturbance in the foyer. The door between the foyer and the auditorium was partly open as people were still entering in large numbers. I looked out and saw two men in straw-like derby hats colored black with a gold or yellow trim, creating a scene with Sally. I later found out they were ajweberman and Forcade. I had never seen either of them before. Everyone from the registration group except Sally had moved into the auditorium to listen to the opening speeches. I could hear them yelling at Sally. I believe several people near the door went out into the foyer. Then I could see papers flying all over the foyer, some loud screaming and a big thudding noise. Fensterwald and Smith had gone into the foyer by then along with other Georgetown people.

"I did not find out what had happened until later when Sally and the Georgetown girl told me what had occurred. ajweberman and Forcade came storming into the foyer, demanding they be allowed to enter the auditorium while the conference was in progress and distribute the 'brain missing leaflets.' Sally told them no and before she could do anything else, Forcade grabbed one of the CTIA registration tables and literally threw it on top of Sally, scattering books, forms and literature in all directions, grabbing handfuls of them while wildly running around the foyer. Sally's finger was broken in the action and she was badly shaken up. I don't know exactly what ajweberman was doing during Forcade's performance, but he surely was making no effective effort to stop it.

"The Georgetown girl and CTIA people tried to get ajweberman and Forcade under control and were having difficulty doing it. They finally called the campus police and had both of them thrown out of the auditorium, and I presume, off the campus. I had nothing to do with giving the campus police any orders. I assume that when campus police anywhere discover two ruffians disturbing a conference and breaking a young girl's finger in the course of violent actions, they need no orders from anyone...ajweberman and Forcade should have ended up in jail after that action at Georgetown, not demonstrating in front of the Archives. If Sally hadn't been too frightened to press charges, they probably would have. All you had to do to find out about the garbage in the book or any of the other errors I have pointed out to you, was to make a telephone call. It was even a local call, to my office in Manhattan. That is hardly a very great limitation on your ability...Eventually this book will bring discredit to you and your publishing company, which I doubt that you really want. It is that last item that I hope will cause you to take the turn around actions I suggested in the early part of this letter. Yours sincerely, Richard E. Sprague, 193 Pinewood Road, Hartsdale, N.Y. P.S. Friends have told me that Mr. ajweberman is telling people that I am a CIA agent. If everyone who disagrees with his conclusions turns out to be a CIA agent, the Agency will be employing a large percentage of the American population."

ANALYSIS

Sprague did everything he could to have my work suppressed. He threatened to sue the

Berkeley Barb for libel when they reprinted one of my articles. He implied that I was a tool of the Rockefeller Commission that David Belin used against qualified researchers. In other words, I was an intelligence operative. Why was Sprague worried about "Mr. Gonzalez's writing of the introduction to *Coup?*" Wasn't this Congressmen Gonzalez's worry? Sprague wrote "assuming your real motivations are to get at and print the truth about the assassination." This implied that there were other people who had a secret agenda in connection with the Kennedy assassination. Sprague stated: "HUNT, Helms and Kirkpatrick would deny that [the meeting] ever took place." Very convenient explanation of their *denial* of the Sprague story. Denial becomes confirmation. If there was such a meeting, why have HUNT, who was in the Domestic Operations Division, attend? Sprague wanted to set up a meeting between Enrique Williams and my publisher, Joseph Okpaku. What was Sprague's relationship with Williams? Sprague felt that it was illegal to hold a demonstration in front of the Archives: "We preferred legal approaches..." Sprague's true feelings: "ajweberman and Forcade should have ended up in jail after that action at Georgetown, not demonstrating in front of the Archives."

Sprague's theory on the Kennedy assassination named Clay Shaw, HUNT, Guy Gabaldin, a CIA agent, Albert Osborne, Harry Dean, Richard Case Nagell, Fred Lee Chrisman, William Seymour, Ronald Augustinovich, Mary Hope, OSWALD and Emilo Santana, Jim Braden, Frenchy, Jim Hicks, Breck Wall, Jack Ruby and Larry Craford. How could someone of his intelligence possibly believe this scenario?

There was no way Richard Sprague was legitimate. Either Sprague was a free lance right-winger who decided help suppress the truth about the Kennedy assassination on his own, or he had some connection to the CIA. Sprague spent a lot of time dogging my tracks in Washington. Whenever I visited a member of Congress I would note in the guest book that Sprague had recently visited there. He would tell them that I was a crazy hippie/yippie from Greenwich Village whose theories should be dismissed out-of-hand. Why all this interest on the part of an executive level individual in this researcher? No CIA documents have surfaced that linked him with the Agency as of 1996. This researcher has been unable to determine if for certain if Sprague died so a Freedom of Information Act Request could be not filed for documents linking him with the Agency, however, one factor that makes me wonder about Sprague was how the FBI cleared him for an appointment by former Warren Commission member President Ford with the National Commission on Electronic Funds Transfer.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER

In 1976 Richard E. Sprague was appointed by President Ford to the National Commission on Electronic Funds Transfer. Emilo Q. Daddario was on the National Commission on Electronic Funds Transfer. During World War II, Emilo Q. Daddario, a Connecticut attorney, saved Fascist Marshall Rodolfo Graziani from Socialist partisans. One day later, ANGLETON would similarly rescue Prince Valerio Borghese by disguising him as a U.S. Army officer. In 1958 Emilo Daddario was a Democratic Congressman from Connecticut. Daddario was listed in

Who's Who in the CIA. Other members of the Electronic Funds Transfer Board included Thomas E. Kauper, former head of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department. [Moldea, Dan *Dark Victory* 1986 page 277] Richard E. Sprague was a member of the Senior Staff and a Program Manager whose area of responsibility was "Use, Access and Control of EFT Systems and International Development." President Ford appropriated \$1.8 million for this Commission. [Harris OSS p119; Laurent, Frederic, *L'Orchestre Noir* p43; Comm. on Elect. Funds Transfer brochure; Mader *Who's Who in the CIA; Computers and Automation* 5.70]

JACK ANDERSON

Journalist Jack Anderson was contacted about the tramp shots. On April 16, 1974, a column by Jack Anderson appeared in the *Washington Post* about STURGIS entitled "A Bum Rap for FRANK STURGIS in Miami. After FRANK and his friends were arrested at gunpoint inside the Democratic Headquarters, they were pictured in the press as figures of fun, bunglers and petty thieves. On another level they became caricatures of Orwellian enemies of the American system. It was even whispered that they had been behind the plot to assassinate President Kennedy. As evidence, one group brought me a news photograph taken on the streets of Dallas on assassination day. They eagerly pointed out a man they said was STURGIS lurking in the shadows. The man resembled STURGIS, but was definitely not STURGIS."

ANALYSIS

The article made no reference to STURGIS being disguised as a tramp. Michael Canfield and this researcher displayed the tramp shots to Anderson as "walk ins" in his office in late 1973 or early 1974. We explained that they men were picked up behind the Texas School Book Depository, and never mentioned anyone lurking in the shadows. Jack Anderson had made up his mind that STURGIS had nothing to do with the Kennedy assassination before he observed the photos, based on his evaluation of FRANK'S personality and his close relationship with him - when STURGIS was arrested at Watergate Anderson offered to post bail for him. Anderson didn't even take the time to get the tramp story straight. It was not until April 12, 1975, that Anderson got his facts straight. He wrote: "The special commission, headed by Vice President Rockefeller, is examining "evidence" which allegedly links STURGIS and HUNT to the Kennedy assassination. The chief exhibit is a picture of two vagrants, resembling STURGIS and HUNT, who were picked up in Dallas after the assassination. Upon close examination, the picture of the man who is supposed to be STURGIS does not resemble him in some important details. The relative height of the two men in the picture also doesn't correspond to the actual height of STURGIS and HUNT." [*Washington Post*] Canfield and this researcher displayed a series of photographs to Anderson, not just one.

On October 15, 1974, the CIA generated another Memorandum for the Record on STURGIS and HUNT.

1. This memorandum will record actions taken by the undersigned with respect to the allegation that the Subjects were arrested by the Dallas, Texas, Police as suspects in connection with the assassination of President Kennedy.
2. On October 10, 1974, the undersigned was requested to meet with (deleted) Special Assistant to the DDO who had been contacted by Mr. Unumb, Deputy Assistant to the Director concerning the aforementioned allegation. According to (deleted) an underground newspaper had photographs purported to substantiate the allegation that the Subjects had been arrested by Dallas Police. (See reference to same in the attached copy of Columnist Jack Anderson's April 16, 1974, column.)
3. I met with (deleted) on October 10, 1974, at which time I discussed the action that I had taken with respect to this allegation approximately six weeks ago at the request of the Director of Security. At that time (deleted) our action was limited to a review of both Subjects' files and a search of our records which produced the Jack Anderson article referred to above and which is attached. (This article was made available to (deleted) the Inspector General Staff at the time.)
4. (Deleted) appeared satisfied and advised that no further action appeared necessary at this time. (Seven lines deleted.)
5. Mr. Gambino will be advised in the event that there is any future developments in this matter. (Deleted) [Allen v. DOD CIA 41750, 41748]

CLARENCE KELLEY: "STILL" THE TRAMP SHOT INVESTIGATION

The tramps shots were displayed to Robert Horton, a reporter for the Reuters News Agency, in early August 1974 by Michael Canfield. Robert Horton called the FBI: "For information of Miami On August 7, 1974, a reporter for Reuters News Service contacted FBIHQ to advise he was in possession of photos depicting three individuals in custody of the Dallas Police on November 22, 1963, in the vicinity of the Texas School Book Depository. According to the above reporter, these photos were received from two young yippie individuals who were attempting to reopen the Kennedy assassination. Two of the individuals depicted in the above photos are purported to be HOWARD HUNT and FRANK STURGIS, both associated with the Watergate break-in. Leads: Miami locate STURGIS and attempt to establish his whereabouts on November 22, 1963. If STURGIS able to establish his whereabouts on that date, set forth leads to discreetly verify this information. S.A. W. Douglas Gow. NARA FBI 124-10265-10134 FBI 89-35-409] On August 7, 1974, FBI Director Clarence Kelley, who been appointed by NIXON, wrote: "*The Los Angeles Times* inquiry of Jack Nelson on the Wallace assassination continues to give us trouble. Please try to *still* present one to avoid the same situation as above, which continues." Clarence Kelley joined the FBI in 1940 and in 1961 he was named Police Chief of Kansas City . In April 1968, after the assassination of Martin Luther King, Clarence Kelley ordered his

police force to tear gas black protesters. After the *still* order was given, the FBI's investigation was tainted. Double click here to see this still order. [FBI-62-109060-7121] [Kelley.JPG] On August 14, 1974, the FBI tried to acquire the tramp shots from Michael Canfield, who refused to accommodate the Bureau.

SAM JAFFE

On August 17, 1974, Art Lundal, a former CIA employee received a call from Sam Jaffe:

1. I met Jaffe in the Dominican Republic during the time of Trujillo's assassination. I knew he left from there for Moscow as the ABC correspondent. I next heard from him when he called me in 1970 to say he was working with Metromedia in Washington, D.C. During this present conversation he told me he no longer needed the 'corporate body' and he was now a free-lance journalist operating out of his home. He said it was he who broke the story on United States companies' plan to exhibit surveillance equipment in Moscow. After the story was published, he said, Senator Mansfield gave the matter congressional recognition and stopped the exhibit of surveillance gear in Moscow. I told him I had read the story.
3. Jaffe went on to say that his friends (the "young guys on the hill") have photographs of a couple of derelicts ("bums") who were arrested in back of the Texas School Book Depository minutes after President Kennedy was assassinated. Jaffe said these bums look very much like HOWARD HUNT and FRANK STURGIS, the Watergate codefendants. [NARA 1993.08.11.13.52:34:650060]

On September 13, 1974, Scott Breckinridge generated this Memo For the Record regarding the "Press Inquiry Into Kennedy Assassination."

1. John Hicks phoned to say that he was passing to me what he had just passed to the DCI and OLC.
2. Hicks had a phone call from Art Lundahl, vacationing in Michigan. Lundahl's home is 616-731-5491. Lundahl was phoned by a man identifying himself as Sam Jaffe. Jaffe said that a couple of others are doing an investigation of the JFK assassination. In the course of this they were in Dallas where they reviewed photographs taken by the Dallas Police of persons rounded up following the assassination. Among these photographs were pictures of 3 hobos, two of which Jaffe said he identified as HOWARD HUNT and FRANK STURGIS.
3. The telephone call to Lundahl was at the suggestion of Victor Marchetti, who knew Lundahl's familiarity with photographic development. He wanted to know of a commercial place where they would do enlargements in order to study the pictures more carefully for a more certain identification. Lundahl avoided telling Jaffe anything, saying he was retired and out of contact.

September 20, 1974, "Memorandum for the Record/Subject: Inquiry - HUNT and STURGIS,"

1. Subsequent to Jaffe's inquiry to Art Lundahl last week, relayed to us by John Hicks, we have been in touch with the Office of Security (Charlie Kane) and have checked other records to ascertain HUNT'S whereabouts at the time of the Kennedy assassination on November 22, 1963.
2. The Office of Finance has checked HUNT'S leave and travel records for the period of September 1963 to January 1964, not knowing the purpose of our request. The record shows for the four week pay period ending November 23, 1963, that HUNT took 11 hours of sick leave and no annual leave. In the following pay period he took three hours sick leave and 27 hours annual leave, but this follows the particular period in question. His travel record shows official travel in September, October and December, but none in November. All this travel was to New York. John Richards states that we already know, as a result of responses to previous requests, that we have no records on STURGIS that would show similar information; he was not an Agency employee.
3. Security provided us with a column by Jack Anderson of April 16, 1974, in which he covered the HUNT-STURGIS rumor, dismissing it. A copy of the news column is attached. This would suggest that, rather than police photographs of people rounded-up and booked, the photographs in question are random snapshots of crowds. If this is correct, there would be no related fingerprint records that could be checked for verification.
4. Kane feels that any inquiry would attract more attention than it would be worth. I agree. I suggest that we only hold this information against possible future inquiries on the subject.

S.D. Breckinridge.

ANALYSIS

Sam Jaffe contacted Art Lundahl regarding a possible photo analysis. Art Lundahl reported this contact to the CIA who, according to Victor Marchetti, advised Art Lundahl to steer clear of Sam Jaffe.

The CIA's Office of the Inspector General generated this index card:

JAFFE, Sam

August 20, 1974

(Deleted)

TRUJILLO

August 17, 1974

MANSFIELD, Senator

CHAVEZ, Frank

1961

KENNEDY, President

HUNT, HOWARD

December 1950

STURGIS, FRANK

AGEE, Phil

July 1953

July 1962

July 1964, June 1957, March 1960, April 1960, December 1963

January 1964, August 1966, September 1966, June 1967, July 1967, November 1968

IG FILE #49 TAB 24

I.G. File #49

Tab #24

M/R (Deleted)

Sub: Telephone Conversation with Sam Jaffe

re: phone conversation (Deleted) had with Jaffe on August 17, 1974. Jaffe inquired as to whether (Deleted) remembered Frank Chavez during the time he was in the Dominican Republic. Jaffe also told (Deleted) that according to his friends ("some of the young guys on

the hill") Chavez was a Mafia member and at one time suspect of being involved in the assassination of President Kennedy, mentions photographs of a couple of derelicts arrested in the back of the Texas Book Depository minutes after President Kennedy was assassinated who looked like HUNT and STURGIS.

"SCOOP" JACKSON

In early September 1974, on the suggestion of Sam Jaffe, Michael Canfield gave a set of tramp and comparison photographs to Richard Pearle who worked for Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson (Dem.-WA). Michael Canfield told him that he wanted a non-governmental agency to perform a photo analysis. Richard Pearle gave the photographs to Senator Jackson's aide, Don Donahue, who told Michael Canfield he would have a photographic expert look at the pictures and that he should have the results of this examination by September 16, 1974, when Michael Canfield was scheduled to return to Washington from New York City. The FBI reported: "Donahue and Jaffe described Michael Canfield as a 'scared kid' who is possibly afraid for his safety...Donahue is reluctant to recontact Jaffe or Canfield seeking the identity of the police officer unless absolutely necessary since he feels this may cause them to lose confidence in him. He indicated he would make further inquiry in this regard if we are unable to locate Harkness through the Dallas PD. Donahue said he intends to tell Canfield when he contacts him on Monday that he has had an expert look at the pictures and 'there may be something to this;' hence we would want to keep the photographs and refer them to the FBI. He said he would like to have the photos back by Monday to have them in hand when Canfield contacts him. It was pointed out to Donahue that should he make such a statement to Canfield this could be used by Canfield in giving credence to his story and might be interpreted as an acceptance of this story by Senator Jackson. Donahue then agreed he would make no statement whatever and would merely put him off should Canfield contact him before the Bureau is complete with its inquiry on this matter." [FBI 62-109060-7131]

ANALYSIS

The FBI did not receive the shots from Don Donahue until September 10, 1974, more than one month after FBI Director Clarence Kelley issued his '*still*' order. The FBI had determined the tramps were not HUNT and STURGIS *before* examining the tramp photographs. Why did the FBI need our tramp shots? The FBI had the tramp shots in its files because the Dallas Police Department had given the Bureau copies in 1968. [FBI 62-109060-7138] But either these shots were missing, or were overlooked.

The CIA's Office of the Inspector General generated this index card on July 26, 1977:

U.S. CITIZENS GENERAL TAB 15

Memo for the Record from Chief, CI/R&A. Subject: Probing of David Martin for Classified Case

Information: David Martin, Peer Da Silva, William Harvey, Richard Kovich, Leonard McCoy, Sam Jaffe, George Kisevalter, JAMES ANGLETON, CI Staff, Popov, Golitsyn, Nosenko, Dolnitsyn.

PHOTO ANALYSIS OF THE TRAMP SHOTS

THE C.F. DOWNING REPORT

Clarence Kelley's FBI issued a report that stated the FBI, preeminent in forensic examination, had determined the tramps were not HUNT and STURGIS. On September 12, 1974, FBI S.A. C. F. Downing, who had worked extensively on the FBI's investigation of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, [FBI 105-126032 NR 8.26.64] wrote: "Reference is made to a memorandum from R.E. Gebhardt to Mr. Adams requesting that the FBI Laboratory compare photographs of three individuals arrested in the vicinity of the Kennedy assassination with known photographs of E. HOWARD HUNT, FRANK STURGIS...It was determined that the two individuals in these photographs suspected of being HUNT and STURGIS are not HUNT and STURGIS. This conclusion is based on the existence of differences in facial characteristics. There are no photographs available in the identification record for Thomas Arthur Valle or otherwise available in the Laboratory with which the third individual in the submitted photographs could be compared. [At this time Thomas Arthur Vallee was suspected of being the CHRIST tramp. Vallee was at work in Chicago on November 22.] Although the possibility of doctoring these photographs cannot be completely eliminated because of the possibility that such 'doctoring' can be done without detection, no evidence was found to indicate that any of these photographs have been 'doctored.'"

In a synopsis of the C.F. Downing Report, the FBI wrote: "The FBI Laboratory has examined the photographs and advised that two of the persons under arrest are not HUNT and STURGIS, but they could not positively eliminate the possibility that the photographs had been doctored." [FBI 62-109060-7134]

In a FBI Memorandum dated March 11, 1975, to the Rockefeller Commission, the disclaimer was eliminated: "There was no evidence found of retouching or alteration of the photographs of the three individuals in the vicinity of the Texas School Book Depository."

A copy of the C.F. Downing Report was forwarded to S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt, the Bureau's photographic identification expert. S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt did most of the photographic work for the Warren Commission. S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt was granted CIA liaison clearances in December 1954, August 1962, and August 1968, at the request of the Technical Services Division. [CIA SRS/OS Sarah K. Hall 2.6.69]

ANALYSIS

When an Freedom of Information Act request was filed for C.F. Downing's laboratory report, the FBI stated that no such report existed: "Please be advised that the results of the Laboratory examination were furnished by the individual conducting the examination to his superiors by the memorandum which you enclosed with your request letter." It was standard operating procedure for FBI laboratory technicians to file an FBI Work Sheet and an FBI Laboratory Report, accompanied by a memorandum that summarized the results of its findings. When the FBI obtained a photograph of Thomas Arthur Vallee from the Chicago Police Department, it turned it over to S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt, who did a FBI Work Sheet and Laboratory Report. [FBI 62-109060-10288] Where was C.F. Downing's HUNT and STURGIS Report and Work Sheet? Apparently there was no time to create them. FBI Director Clarence Kelley wanted the story quickly quashed. S.A. C.F. Downing had been ordered to *still* the investigation, and that meant issuing a negative report. C.F. Downing looked at the photographs, shook his head, and signed his memorandum. C.F. Downing claimed: "No evidence was found of doctoring." Where were the investigation notes concerning doctoring? C. F. Downing, who was not about to discredit his own previous work for the Warren Commission, had done what he could on short notice. Now the FBI was officially prepared to dispose of any serious journalistic or Congressional inquiry into the tramp shots and Watergate.

On September 13, 1974, Don Donahue told Michael Canfield that "his contact does not believe the 'bums' are HUNT and STURGIS and that he does not want to become involved in this matter since he feels it is a situation which should be handled by the FBI." Don Donahue was a former Bureau Agent and the FBI protected him from being identified as the source of the photographs. [FBI 61-109060-7134] On May 23, 1975, the SSCIA requested the CIA do a photo analysis of the tramp shots. The CIA requested the photographs from the FBI. Don Donahue requested his identity be concealed as the source of these photographs. [FBI 62-109060-7193]

On September 13, 1974, Sam Jaffe called S.A. Ruhl and asked him to evaluate Michael Canfield's credibility. S.A. Ruhl refused to do so. "Jaffe expressed concern that the FBI Lab would not do a proper evaluation of any photographs submitted by Michael Canfield because of a lack of confidence in Michael Canfield's theory." [FBI 61-109060-7127] Sam Jaffe died on February 8, 1985, at age 55, of cancer. Before he died Jaffe stated: "The last nine years have been incredible," Jaffe said in an interview with the *Washington Post* in 1985. If it weren't for a few friends I would be broken...I say I am not a Russian spy, the FBI says, 'Yeah, you are.' Well I want them to prove it. I want it all out in the open. I want my family cleared. If I should drop dead I don't want them living with this stigma. The CIA has cleared me. Now I want the FBI to do the same." Jaffe was member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the Overseas Writers, the White House and State Department correspondents associations, and the Marine Corps Combat Correspondents Association.

BEN BRADLEE, THE C.F. DOWNING REPORT AND THE TRAMPS

"On October 7, 1974, FBI Director Clarence Kelley conferred with Mr. Benjamin C. Bradlee,

Editor of *The Washington Post*...Mr. Bradlee stated that certain photographs have come to his attention which allegedly showed E. HOWARD HUNT and FRANK STURGIS, of Watergate notoriety, in the custody of Dallas, Texas, police officers shortly after the assassination of President Kennedy. Mr. Bradlee said that since *The Washington Post* Watergate investigation was just about over, they were looking for a new inquiry to direct their attention toward. He said he was considering sending a team of investigative reporters to Dallas to begin an investigation into these photographs, but decided to check with the Director beforehand to see if the Bureau was aware of the photographs and had possibly already resolved the matter. Mr. Bradlee was informed that this matter had come to our attention in August 1974, through A.J. ajweberman and Michael Canfield, who were described as underground newspaper people from New York City...A copy of the March 15, 1974, to March 21, 1974, edition of *The Berkeley Barb*, a California underground newspaper, which contains the photographs in question...was given to Bradlee. An article from the May 24, 1968, edition of *The New York Times* pertaining to the photographs was also mentioned to Mr. Bradlee. Mr. Bradlee was also told Michael Canfield made a deal with the German magazine *Stern* in regard to selling his story." FBI Director Clarence Kelley continued: "The photographs have been compared by the FBI Laboratory with known photographs of HUNT and STURGIS with a determination being made that HUNT and STURGIS are not the ones in the photographs. He was also informed that all three officers in the photographs have been previously identified in relation to other investigations, and that all three officers advised that they took three individuals, names unknown to them, off a boxcar about a mile from the assassination site about 20 minutes after the shooting. They took them to the Dallas County Sheriff's Office where a screening office had been setup. Numerous people were taken to that office on that day and released without charges or booking, after being interviewed. No records have been located pertaining to these individuals arrest.

"It was also pointed out to Mr. Bradlee that there had been allegations that LEE HARVEY OSWALD had been in Miami, Florida, prior to the assassination and had been in contact with STURGIS, who was then using the name FRANK FIORINI. Extensive investigation, including interview of STURGIS, indicated that there was no substance to this."

ANALYSIS

Michael Canfield had displayed the tramp photographs, and the HUNT and STURGIS comparison shots, to Ben Bradlee. Before he spoke with FBI Director Clarence Kelley, Ben Bradlee believed the tramps looked enough like HUNT and STURGIS to consider hiring a photo analyst to study the photographs. He was going to send a team of reporters to Dallas to investigate the circumstances of their arrest. After speaking with FBI Director Clarence Kelley, Benjamin Bradlee dropped the matter. FBI Director Clarence Kelley explained: "Mr. Bradlee then stated he was satisfied that the Bureau was well aware of these allegations and instead of investigating the matter, he planned to run a story to the effect that the FBI had checked these allegations and found no substance to them. After Mr. Bradlee's departure, the Director advised that Captain Will Fritz, who was the Dallas police officer in charge of its Kennedy case

investigation, and who apparently authorized the release of the persons in the photographs, should be interviewed for any knowledge he might have of this matter. The Director also stated that HUNT and STURGIS should be contacted to ascertain their whereabouts on the day of the assassination. The Director pointed out that these interviews should be conducted to carry out our determination that HUNT and STURGIS were not the ones in the photographs one step further and hopefully lay these allegations to rest." [FBI 62-109060-7137]

FBI Director Clarence Kelley suppressed the tramp story. Why bother investigating a story if the FBI Director, as well as the FBI Lab, has assured you that there was no substance to it? In any event, Ben Bradlee realized the story had already been published, and that Michael Canfield was trying to sell it to other publications while trying to sell it to *The Washington Post*. Ben Bradlee, however, was unjustified in turning it down. The FBI was intent on characterizing OSWALD as a loner, and not part of a broader conspiracy which it failed to detect. It could not be relied upon to be objective. In early 1979 Ben Bradlee was asked why he believed the FBI. In December 1981 he replied: "You people die hard. If you believe in various conspiracies, as you plainly do, there is nothing I can say to convince you. I can only tell you that I did go to the FBI. I did talk to someone who was identified to me by FBI Director Clarence Kelley as the photo interpretation expert. He pointed out magnification of certain features, like ears, that satisfied me that the tramps were not HUNT or STURGIS..."

The tramp shots were doctored. No mention of possible doctoring of the photographs was made to Ben Bradlee by the FBI. Without taking this into account, at least one set of ears did not match.

Thanks to the FBI, *Stern Magazine*, *Reuters* and other publications did not run the story. Klaus Liedke of *Stern Magazine* contacted the FBI about the tramps shots. The FBI: "In general terms he was advised that the FBI had looked into this matter and determined the individuals were not identical with HUNT and STURGIS." [FBI 62-109060-7150] By the end of 1974, the tramp story had been turned down by *The New York Times*, *The Associated Press* and by Mike Wallace and Les Midgley at *Sixty Minutes*. *The Village Voice* uncovered "a handwritten note on CBS stationary from Ellen McCloy [the daughter of John J. McCloy] to Les Midgley." Ellen McCloy, who was employed by CBS, was working on a program about the John F. Kennedy assassination. In September 1975 the former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency William Colby described a meeting he had with Dan Rather and Les Midgley: "He referred to the work of Mark Lane in this field and I referred to Dick Gregory's paranoia on the subject of CIA connections with the Kennedy death." In February 1975 Clarence Kelley and Gordon Shankin visited the Texas School Book Depository. Kelley told the press that the FBI possessed no evidence that HUNT was at the scene of the Kennedy assassination. [*Dallas Times Herald* 2.13.75]

PROFESSOR RAINER KNUSSMANN'S PHOTOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

In January 1975 a source at *Stern* magazine informed the CIA that the publication was working on the tramp shot story:

"To buttress this conjecture, *Stern* hired Professor Rainer Knussmann of the Anthropological Institute at Hamburg University, to do a 'scientific' comparison of the Dallas photographs with stock shots of HUNT and STURGIS. The total report is 37 pages, of which only the introduction and conclusion were provided. The translation commences with page 35: 'The given question about the identity of STURGIS and HUNT with the two designated persons on the Death Site pictures can only be answered clearly to the extent that a firm identity denial is not possible from the photographic documentation placed at my disposal. In this connection there is a noticeable discrepancy in the amount of ear protrusion, in the photographs of the man who could be HUNT which, however, fails by far to be sufficient for a sure negative identification. In all, the resemblance analysis with respect to both persons led to a clear majority of positive resemblance factors, which above all for STURGIS were in part very convincing since it concerned a clearly established similarity in relatively rare distinguishing marks. Because of the indifferent quality of the source photographs which handicaps a scientific comparison, and because of unsimilarities which cropped up in the course of the analysis - though these were nearly all of a minor nature - the total result is not adequate for the establishment of an absolutely sure identity. Such a result from photo materials such as were furnished me is in principle very difficult to achieve. The symptoms of identity nevertheless are so convincing that it must be advised in any case that the material be pursued further. A successful identity establishment could truly be expected if STURGIS and HUNT photographs, which should be obtainable, were prepared showing the Subjects from the same head angle and under similar lighting as in the Death Site photographs.

"The probable identity from the resemblance analysis is given a special weight because the margin of error is significantly reduced when both HUNT and STURGIS are analyzed in combination. This is on the common sense ground that while an accidental resemblance between HUNT or STURGIS on the one side, and one of the persons shown in the Death Site pictures would be understandable, there is a very narrow probability that STURGIS accidentally resembles one, and HUNT accidentally the other of both persons shown in the Death Site photographs. Possibly what is finally expected of me is a precise probability quotient for the possible identity of STURGIS and HUNT with the questioned persons on the Death Site pictures. Such a numerical probability estimate can certainly be produced by mathematics, but would show false exactness. However, to give a preliminary examination, I estimate that the positive resemblance between STURGIS and the questioned person #1 in the Death Site photographs has a probability of 0.1 (10% error, that is 90% for identity). The similar value for HUNT being person #2, I estimate at 0.3 (that is a 30% chance of error and 70% probability of identity). From this a theoretical error probability for the combined results figures at only 0.03 (that is 3%, therefore, 97% probability). In closing I should like to assure you that in preparation of this evaluation I have taken pains to work according to the best conscience and knowledge without any political presumptions. Prof. Knussmann Officially Registered Court Hereditary Biology Expert, Examining Laboratory, Duesseldorf, Markenstr. 5,

West Germany." [CIA Inspector General File #51 Tab 6 Gerard J. Hahn to Berns - source at *Stern* Frau Radziwell?]

The CIA's Inspector General's Office had and interest in this photo study and it generated this index card:

Sterns

January 7, 1975

George J. Hahn

HOWARD HUNT

January 9, 1975

FRANK STURGIS

President Kennedy

October 1975

(Illegible)

(Illegible)

October 25, 1975

(Illegible)

(Illegible)

November 5, 1974

Frau Radziwell

University of Hamburg

IG FILE #51 Tab #6

C/DDO (Attention Mr. Berns) from Gerard J. Hahn. Subject: German Magazine Attempts to Tie HOWARD HUNT and FRANK STURGIS to the Dallas assassination of President Kennedy. Efforts by *Der Stern* to tie HUNT and STURGIS to the assassination of President Kennedy. Attachment: (Illegible) translation by Prof. Knussmann of scientific (illegible) of Dallas photos (illegible) HUNT (illegible).

A Magdelona Radziwill was mentioned in a book titled *The Secret War Against the Jews* by J. Loftus and J. Arons which was published in 1994: "A top secret interrogation of a White Russian Nazi by General George Patton's intelligence chief names a Bishop Cikota as a 'Nazi agent' inside the Vatican. Princess Magdelona Radziwill is named in the same intelligence files as the corresponding Nazi agent in Switzerland. Her relative, Prince Radziwell, later surfaced as a petitioner to retrieve war German assets of Dulles's clients that had been seized by the United States." In 1996 Professor Knuessmann was a Consulting Editor of the international journal *Collegium Antropologicum*, which was published by the Croatian Anthropological Society.

DICK GREGORY GETS THE TRAMP SHOTS NATIONAL PUBLICITY

In January 1975 comedian Dick Gregory was contacted. He was given the comparison shots, and the work to date on the links between the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and HUNT and STURGIS. Dick Gregory held a press conference on February 5, 1975, during which he displayed the tramp shots and the photographs of HUNT and STURGIS. On February 16, 1975, about one week after Dick Gregory's press conference, Jacks Beers died of a heart attack. Mrs. Beers related that he had a long history of heart problems, including a heart attack in late November 1963. On March 8, 1975, the Rockefeller Commission agreed to investigate the tramps. After the Rockefeller Commission issued a press release, the tramps became the front page story in many newspapers. Headlines read:

"Rockefeller Panel to Probe CIA Role in JFK Death - Gregory Charges Founded on Photographs.

"Washington - The Rockefeller Commission on the CIA is looking into allegations that the CIA was somehow involved in the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963, according to informed sources close to its investigation. One focus of the commission's inquiry is the recent assertion of a group headed by Dick Gregory, comedian and civil rights activist, that E. HOWARD HUNT Jr. was seized by Dallas police near the Kennedy assassination site within minutes of the shooting...The Gregory groups charge is founded on photographs published last year in underground newspapers and elsewhere purporting to show HUNT and FRANK A. STURGIS, another Watergate burglar, being led by the police from a grassy knoll across from the Texas School Book Depository." [*The Los Angeles Times Herald Examiner* 3.9.75] The wire services reported: "Comedian and political activist Dick Gregory flew to Washington Thursday to deliver documents to the Rockefeller Commission..." *The New York Times* ran two stories: "Three Men Studied in Kennedy Assassination Photographs" which stated that the Rockefeller Commission was going to do a height study and "Rockefeller Unit Said to Check Report of CIA Link to Kennedy Assassination." When the media contacted HUNT and STURGIS about these allegations, HUNT denied having been in Dallas: "Accusations made by Dick Gregory and others connecting me to the murder of President John Kennedy are totally without foundation. They constitute a false and vicious libel. These charges are bizarre products of sick minds. The political Left has never been able, or willing, to accept the fact that

Kennedy's assassin was a man of the Left; thus the Leftist preoccupation with finding an alternate assassin. Dick Gregory's smear represents the ultimate in slander and innuendo customarily characterized as McCarthyism. The Rockefeller and other investigative committees will probably examine Gregory's charges as indeed they should. For my part I would welcome a through high-level investigation and a full airing of all relevant findings. Only if this takes place will I have any hope of clearing my name and living free from the threats made against my life already made by neurotics. I was not in Dallas on November 22, 1963; in fact I never visited Dallas until eight years later. I did not meet FRANK STURGIS until 1972, nine years after we were allegedly together in Dallas. I was not in Mexico in 1963, and I did not meet LEE HARVEY OSWALD there or at any other place or time. Moreover I shared the nations grief over the murder of our President...Continued publicity given to these reckless charges could stimulate some yet-unpublicized maniac into violent action against me and my family." [RCD 2.5.75]

CANFIELD GETS STURGIS' REACTION

STURGIS would neither confirm nor deny his presence in Dallas that day. Michael Canfield called STURGIS to get his reaction to the story. STURGIS did not know where Dick Gregory had gotten his information, or Michael Canfield's connection to this researcher. STURGIS acknowledged: "Yeah, I saw the pictures. He's claiming that we were there in disguise and he swears that guy is me and hey, who knows? So I don't affirm or deny it...I doubt they've got any evidence. Really, I think they're just blowing smoke. I think that. Mike, between you and me, I think Dick Gregory is of the radical Left, and I think Dick Gregory and his group are being financed by foreign outsiders in order to put pressure on the CIA. He is using both HOWARD HUNT and myself as a tool for them. I don't think they can stand the idea that OSWALD, who was of the Left, one of their own people, you know, that took the rap, or at least one of the persons that took the rap for killing the President of the United States. He has to prove that HOWARD HUNT was in Dallas on that day and he has to prove I was in Dallas on that day. He's claiming that we're in disguise. O.K. Well, you know, you've got to have more proof than that, than just a picture. Because pictures really don't mean anything. D'you know? They don't mean a damn thing."

ANALYSIS

Note how STURGIS did not deny he was one of the tramps: "Who knows?" Secondly he "doubts" and "thinks" Dick Gregory has no other evidence. If he were innocent, he would have *known* Dick Gregory had no evidence. When STURGIS said "took the rap," rather than "was guilty of," the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, he made a slip and realized it, so he tried to obscure his error with the next sentence which made little sense: "At least one of the persons who took the rap." Who else besides OSWALD took the rap for the assassination of President John F. Kennedy? STURGIS stated that Dick Gregory "had to prove I was in Dallas that day." He was saying that all Dick Gregory had to prove was his presence in Dallas. Numerous people were also in Dallas that day and did not take part in the assassination.

THE ITCHY TRIGGER FINGER

STURGIS confided in Michael Canfield: "Well, let me speak off the record, Mike. HOWARD and I are both concerned about it, you know what I mean? In more ways than one, because you know you can get some damn kookie guy come down here wanna kill him, kill me. You know. This is a terrible accusation he's made. You know, that we had something to do with killing the most powerful man in the world. It's a terrible thing to do. And I hope he can prove these accusations, because if he can't, he's gonna have problems. He'll have legal problems. But evidently he don't care. I'm hoping it will just die away, personally, you know. Like I told the press, you know, let the dead alone, let them be. It's a helluva mistake. He may be turning, you know, we're talking off the record, you know, but he may be digging up things that other people may not want dug up. You know what I mean? Well, let's say if there was a conspiracy, right? And people like him going around the country, not the fact that he's accusing HOWARD and me and the CIA, but let's say that other people, others in, you know, suppose he's wrong, okay, that's one thing. He may stumble across something or somebody, who probably might have been involved in it. And he may decide to go ahead and do something about it. You know, he's big enough stuff that maybe people will get a little itchy about, you know, and give him problems. Well I don't know (if it would be physical) it would be up to, you know, whoever the people are. I don't know. So I think he's wrong, you know, doing what he's doing, I think he should let things lie, you know, leave it alone..."

ANALYSIS

STURGIS also believed that the tramp shots could have triggered a violent reaction in someone. Note how STURGIS referred to President Kennedy as "the President of the United States, the most powerful man in the world." STURGIS was proud to have participated in a world class operation. If he hadn't, how would he have known what things were being dug up, (having nothing to do with HUNT and STURGIS, of course) which might result in the death of Dick Gregory? Whose trigger finger was getting itchy?

THE TRAMP SHOT NEGATIVES

The FBI received orders to contact the photographers who took the tramp shots and obtain negatives. The FBI: "The files of *The Dallas Times Herald* have been thoroughly searched personally by S.A. Gemberling, and photographs numbered 2, 4, and 5 are believed to have been taken by photographer William Allen who, on November 22, 1963, was working in Dallas on assignment for *The Dallas Times Herald*, but was on the payroll of UPI. *The Dallas Times Herald* files do not reflect any photographic negatives identical to the other four photographs described above. On April 14, 1975, *The Dallas Times Herald* made available two proof sheets, one 4" X 5" positive of each of the three photographs numbered 2, 4, and 5 above, and one 4" X 5" copy of each of the three copy negatives of the three photographs...it was stated

the original negative of these three photographs will be available for examination by an FBI representative at any time at *The Dallas Times Herald*." *The Dallas Times Herald* representatives indicated: "It is possible some of the photographs from their files were taken shortly after the assassination, because many individuals were examining them and it is possible some original negatives or photographs may no longer be available." The FBI contacted *The Dallas Morning News* and was apprized that: "Jack Beers was a photographer for that newspaper in November 1963 but had died in February 1975. He stated no photographic negative is available at *The Dallas Morning News*, and that the original negative would likely be in the possession of Mrs. Christine Beers." When the FBI questioned Mrs. Beers, she explained that the original negatives were in the possession of "some magazine" and she gave the FBI a contact sheet. That accounted for five out of the seven tramp shots.

ANALYSIS

The FBI reported: "It should be noted that of the seven photographs furnished by the Bureau... all have been identified, with the exception of those numbered one and three." Despite extensive research, no FBI documents could be located on the photographs taken by George Smith of the *Fort Worth Star Telegram*. There was no way to determine if the FBI obtained all of the tramp shots. No reference to the last two tramp shots surfaced in any Freedom of Information Act-retrieved FBI documents. Dorothy Hopper at the *Fort Worth Star Telegram* recounted that she first noticed the tramp shots missing on December 3, 1973. Just before they were stolen someone called and inquired about them. A researcher reported that in 1974 someone entered his home and removed the prints of these two photographs, which he had recently obtained. On May 8, 1975, Earl Golz of the *Dallas Morning News* reported that the FBI found six of seven disputed photos.

SHANEYFELDT'S PHOTO ANALYSIS FOR ROCK. COMMISSION

The Rockefeller Commission did not conduct its own investigation of the tramp shots. It did not hire an independent photo analyst. Instead, the Rockefeller Commission used the FBI's report. On April 25, 1975, an investigator for the Rockefeller Commission interviewed S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt and was told "Shaneyfeldt is 'positive' has no reservations about these Dallas persons NOT being HUNT or STURGIS." [SSCIA 157-10003-10001] In late April 1975 Warren Commission veteran S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt telephoned Warren Commission veteran S.A. Robert Gemberling at the Dallas FBI. S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt told him the Rockefeller Commission wanted an on-site height study, as well as the negatives and the cameras with which the tramp shots were originally taken.

THE CIA'S PHOTO ANALYSIS OF THE TRAMP SHOTS

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD, May 28, 1975

SUBJECT: Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Operations (HUNT Photos)

1. On May 21, 1975, Mr. Tom Brown contacted the Security Analysis Group for copies of photographs of HUNT for use in the DDS&T responding to question #15 of a memorandum by E.H. Knoche, dated May 21, 1975, captioned, "Assassinations, Primarily Castro" for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Operations General File.

2. On May 27, 1975, Mr. John P. Dempsey gave the attached photographs to the writer, which Mr. Dempsey stated he had received from the Office of Security. Some of the photos are badge type photos apparently recovered by Tom Brown from the HUNT Office of Security file. Also returned were seven large glossy photos showing three individuals apparently under police detention. It is unknown where these photos originated, but they are believed to be the comparison photos for use in answering reference question number 15. It is further surmised that these glossy photos were taken in Dallas, Texas, on November 22, 1963, attendant to the arrest of three 'box car bums' in connection with the investigation of President Kennedy's assassination. Recently, numerous persons have alleged that HUNT and STURGIS resemble the "bums," thus necessitating the requested DDS & T comparison of the HUNT photograph. DDS & T's conclusions are unknown.

Jerry G. Brown,

Acting Chief,

Security Analysis Group.

[CIA FOIA F81-0351/ D0652]

The CIA's Deputy Directorate of Science and Technology conducted a "physiological comparison" of the HUNT and STURGIS photographs with the tramp photographs. [CIA F81-0351 D0652] Before the CIA sent this photo report to the HSCA, Hal Clark SA/DDS&T, asked Ed Cates, NPIC, to sanitize it.

Two experienced portrait artists and an expert in the field of disguise studied the four photographs of HUNT (1949, 1961, 1968, and 1974). It was concluded that he was an ideal Subject for this sort of analysis for two reasons:

(1) His features are prominent and angular, facilitating identification of key points and mesuration of distances and ratios.

(2) his overall appearance varied insignificantly over the 25-year span of the data. These characteristics make positive identification of HUNT from a photograph of good quality highly probable. The physiological character of HUNT can be briefly summed up as: athletic, firm,

and assertive with an overall tone of classic leanness. Neither of the two detained men in the Dallas scene had this character. The one with the hat is flaccid, atrophied and passive and has a general tone of deterioration. The hatless one is stocky, has a blocky face and has the overall appearance of a less sophisticated Subject. The unanimous and highly confident judgment of these experts is that neither of the detainees is HUNT.

A similar, but less confident, conclusion was reached concerning STURGIS. This evaluation was performed with only the single snapshot of STURGIS from *Newsweek*, no other being available; it is believed that a higher confidence judgement concerning STURGIS would have been rendered if the STURGIS snapshot could be dated to the 1963 time frame.

In addition to the basic comparative differences observed, the disguise specialist, (with almost 25 years experience) noted:

(1) It would be physically impossible to reduce the height of a 5' 10 ½" man to the shorter man in the photograph.

(2) Overall facial shapes could not be effectively changed with the use of cosmetic make-up.

(3) Putty or facial masks could not be used to alter features because of the animation displayed between the various photographs. Three experienced photogrametrists who have previously worked on identification problems analyzed the four photographs of HUNT (1949, 1961, 1968, and 1974) and made measurements on non-changing facial distances. The dimensions on the known photographs of HUNT were compared with the two detained men in the Dallas scene and a unanimous and confident judgement was made that neither of these two men could be HUNT. A similar analysis was made between the *Newsweek* photograph of STURGIS. However, because of the quality of the *Newsweek* portrait, *the data is inconclusive*. The physiological and photogrammetric analysis were supplemented by visual comparison of all the photographs imagery by experienced imagery interpreters. In the conduct of this examination, steps were taken to insure that:

(1) All Subjects were magnified to the same scale, using the distances between the eyes and mouth as a standard.

(2) Contrast and texture differences between images were minimized during the scaling process (continuous tone photographs were employed wherever possible).

(3) Angular comparisons were made to offset errors incident with different head angles and tilts. From his visual comparison it was concluded that neither of the two men in the Dallas scene is HUNT, nor is STURGIS (utilizing the only photograph we have available, i.e. the *Newsweek* photograph) one of the two men in the Dallas scene.

ANALYSIS

Why did the CIA have only one photograph of STURGIS? This was an agency with a billion dollar budget. Was the CIA reluctant to obtain better shots because it might have had to conclude the tramp was STURGIS?

LYNDAL SHANEYFELDT'S BACKGROUND

S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt was first brought into the tramp shot investigation by FBI Director Clarence Kelley when he was asked to determine whether the CHRIST tramp and Thomas Arthur Vallee were identical. As stated, he received the Downing Memorandum on the HUNT and STURGIS comparison to the tramps. When questioned in *HUNT v. ajweberman*, however, Shaneyfeldt said he was unaware of the tramp photographs until the Rockefeller Commission brought them to his attention in April 1975. Attorney Marvin Miller asked: "So, to your knowledge, to your recollection now, it was the first time anybody had asked you to do any work on these particular photographs?" He responded: "That's the, to the best of my recollection, yes."

ANALYSIS

S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt lied to conceal his predisposition towards a particular conclusion. Like C. F. Downing, Shaneyfeldt was not about to discredit his work for the Warren Commission. The Downing report was a cue that the Director wanted a negative report.

Not only Shaneyfeldt's veracity at risk, but there were serious questions about his qualifications as a photo analyst. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt: "I started with the FBI in 1940 as a photographer, having been a photographer with the newspapers in the Midwest prior to that time. I worked in photographic work with the FBI from 1940 to 1948, at which time I was transferred to the FBI Laboratory as a forensic photographer taking photographs of evidence being examined by document examiners and other experts in the laboratory, firearms people and various others; making of photomicrographs, evidence-type photographs. And, during this period, except for 19-, see I was in the Service in 1945 for a year and, as a result of that, I used the GI Bill to get a degree to become a Special Agent. Went to Southeastern University in Washington, D.C., got an accounting degree, applied for a job as Special Agent, and was appointed Special Agent in 1951. I was, after agent training, assigned to the Detroit FBI office as an investigator for approximately one year. After returning...I was transferred back to the Laboratory to be trained as a document examiner. This training covered about three years...and from 1955 until my retirement in 1975, I was a fully qualified document examiner. Because of my photographic experience, I also did photo-related examinations, comparison of photographs, identification with various examiners, various photo-related investigations. During this period of time that I was a document examiner, I was also doing photographic examinations and testifying in court."

ANALYSIS

Lyndal Shaneyfeldt was a document examiner, not a photo analyst. Self-educated in the art of photography, he held no college or university degree or any official FBI documentation in photography or photo analysis. Attorney Marvin Miller called his background in photography "on the job training."

In the Alger Hiss case, S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt identified the camera that took the "pumpkin pictures." S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt was one of the two FBI agents allowed to testify by the Justice Department at the trial of Clay Shaw in New Orleans. S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt's CIA Office of Security traces were deleted from a CIA document about him. [*Allen v. DOD-CIA* 40339 146]

ROBERT OLSEN'S PHOTO ANALYSIS

In his deposition in *HUNT V. ajweberman*, Lyndal Shaneyfeldt testified that he did his first photo analysis after the FBI received two letters from Rockefeller Commission Senior Counsel, Robert B. Olsen, one dated April 2, 1975, and the other April 5, 1975.

Robert B. Olsen was already convinced the tramps were not HUNT and STURGIS: "A comparison was first made by Rockefeller Commission staff members, none of whom are photo identification experts. Even as non-experts, however, it appeared to the staff members that there was, at best, only a superficial resemblance between the Dallas 'derelicts' and HUNT and STURGIS. The derelict resembling HUNT appeared to be substantially older and smaller than HUNT. The derelict allegedly resembling STURGIS appeared to be thinner than STURGIS and to have facial features and hair markedly different from those of STURGIS. The witnesses who testified to the 'striking resemblance' were not show to have any qualifications in photo identification beyond that possessed by the average layman...The photographs of the derelicts in Dallas have been displayed in various newspapers in the United States, on national television programs, and in the April 28, 1975, issue of *Newsweek Magazine*. No witnesses offered testimony to the Commission of its staff to the effect that either of the derelicts was personally known to be HUNT or STURGIS; and no qualified expert was offered to make such an identification."

BELIN CHECKS SHANEYFELDT'S METHODOLOGY

After S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt's report was given to the Rockefeller Commission, Chief Counsel David Belin asked the Department Of Justice to "make available to us, for interviewing, the Bureau personnel who compared the photographs and reached the conclusion embodied in the report. Preliminary to such interviews, we would like to have a detailed description of the methods, processes and equipment used in making the comparisons." The FBI responded: "Portions of this study were made with a low-powered

magnifier to permit detailed study." [RCD Belin to Wilderotter 3.7.75]

THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE ROCKEFELLER COMMISSION

S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt's report was released circa July 1975 and his determination that the tramps were neither HUNT nor STURGIS was widely publicized. Bernard Fensterwald commented that the Rockefeller Commission examined the tramp shots because they were easily refuted. S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt's analysis "involved visual comparison and study of the facial characteristics and contours of the individuals in the questioned and known photographs, including a comparison of the contours of the ears, noses, hairlines, chins and all other visible facial features."

The Rockefeller Commission concluded: "While the 'derelicts' were found in a boxcar not far from the assassination scene, that fact cannot form the basis for drawing any inference of involvement in the assassination. Neither can such an inference be drawn from the fact that the derelicts were relatively clean-shaven and showed signs of having had recent haircuts. The Commission believes that it is not uncommon for derelicts to shave and to receive haircuts, especially at such places as barber colleges, jails, and missions. In view of the absence of any credible evidence tending to identify HUNT or STURGIS with the 'derelicts' in question, or otherwise to establish the presence of HUNT or STURGIS in Dallas on November 22, 1963, the Commission finds that it is unnecessary to consider the allegations that other persons participated in the assassination. If there were other participants in the assassination, no evidence was found that would connect them in any way with the CIA...For the reasons expressed above the Commission concludes it found no evidence of CIA involvement in the assassination of President Kennedy. The products of the investigation of the Commission staff, however, will remain with the official records of the Commission."

Marina Oswald told this researcher: "David Belin is a Judas. He sold out his country. And that's the crime itself."

ANALYSIS

The investigators for the Rockefeller Commission detected a superficial resemblance between the Dallas 'derelicts' and HUNT and STURGIS. However superficial, it was a resemblance. Why didn't the Rockefeller Commission investigators realize that even if the tramps slightly resembled HUNT and STURGIS, when this was put together with HUNT and STURGIS' backgrounds and their hatred for Kennedy, it meant that even if they left the slightest, most superficial traces of their presence at a crime of this magnitude, it meant that they were there. What prevented them from seeing the truth was a predisposition against something of this nature being true, because if one believes that coup d'etats do not happen in a country like the United States of America, you are not going to believe the tramps are HUNT and STURGIS. The implications of placing HUNT and STURGIS on the scene of the Kennedy assassination

would mean the disbandment of the CIA, something the establishment could not accept.

HSCA'S PHOTO ANALYST: CLYDE COLLINS SNOW

The next photo study of the tramp shots was conducted by the HSCA. Clyde C. Snow headed the HSCA's investigation. Clyde C. Snow: "I guess you can say I was in charge of it. I had some other anthropologists working with me on that." Clyde Snow had received his B.S. in zoology from Eastern New Mexico University in 1950, an M.S. in zoology from Texas Tech University in 1955, and a Ph.D. in physical anthropology from the University of Arizona in 1967. He was Chief of the Physical Anthropology Division of the Federal Aeronautics Administration, Civil Aeromedical Institute.

Clyde Snow was a forensic anthropologist who examined human remains, not a photo analyst. In 1985 he was sent to Paraguay by the Simon Weisenthal Center to examine the remains of Nazi war criminal Dr. Joseph Mengele. [Posner, *Mengele*, p320] Clyde Snow stated: "That's one of the things we do. Forensically we examine human skeletal remains. But we are consulted quite frequently in comparing photographs of people, for example, suspects in bank robberies. We're not just skeletal people. We do a lot of work in the variations of living people." [see HSCA V4 p381] In February 1992, Dr. Clyde Snow appeared on the national news program *60 Minutes* and discussed Iraqi war crimes in Kurdistan. A few weeks later, Clyde Snow went to Bolivia in search of the remains of the Sundance Kid. Next, he was in Bosnia, examining remains.

ANALYSIS

Clyde Snow was not a photo analyst. The HSCA did hire photo analysts: Robert R. Hunt, a Professor of Optical Sciences at the University of Arizona who worked as a consultant to the Committee, was a member of the American Society of Photogrammetry. The HSCA did not use IDEB Digital Vidicon Scanning System (DVSS) and the Comtal Vision in its analysis, although this technology was available to it. These techniques involved processing categorization according to the Subject's look angle. Comparisons are done both visually and mathematically using photogrammetry techniques. [CIA Memo from Dr. David L. Gifford, Chief, Interactive Digital Exploitation Branch APSD/TSG/NPIC 12.15.78]

An April 10, 1978, HSCA Outside Contact Report indicated a telephone call was initiated by HSCA employee Michael Goldsmith regarding Clyde C. Snow: "Summary of contact: regarding consulting work as forensic ID specialist. He's interested. Suggested we contact the Federal Aeronautics Administration Air Surgeon to get approval. That way there would be no expense for HSCA." [HSCA 180-1007-410425] Clyde Snow was originally asked by the HSCA to "reconstruct a 3-D model of President Kennedy's head from 2-D photographs and X-rays." Clyde C. Snow told this researcher: "They called me. My guess is that they may have talked to some people over at the Smithsonian. At that time, Doctor Larry Angel, and T. Dale Stewart,

were the Smithsonian's physical anthropologists. Traditionally, they had done the forensic work for the FBI. I never found out for sure, but I think that was it. They could have gotten it from other sources. At that time I was fairly well-known."

ANTHROPOLOGISTS AND THE CIA

A report dated January 1967 by the Committee on Research Problems and Ethics of the American Anthropological Association stated that in many parts of the world, American anthropologists were believed to be engaged in intelligence activities. Members of the Association reported that CIA agents had posed as anthropologists, or used anthropological research as a cover. Qualified anthropologists were hired by the CIA for intelligence work either directly or through a roster of CIA fronts. [Donner, Frank *Age of Surveillance* p161]

Clyde C. Snow was asked if the CIA Domestic Contacts Division had ever debriefed him. He stated: "The only time I've been - during the HSCA investigation I went over to the CIA building there and they gave me a stack of photographs of HOWARD HUNT. That was arranged by the HSCA. I had quite a collection. I have never had any direct CIA contact on anything involving any of my missions. I know it used to be very common for the CIA to debrief people who came back from various places. I almost felt neglected, but that's never happened to me."

Clyde Snow testified before the HSCA:

Genzman: What were the issues before the panel of anthropologists? [Snow, Ellis Kerley and Stephen Rosen, Department of Anthropology, University of Maryland]

Snow: We were asked, again using the best available information and materials, to metrically and morphologically compare these photographs with those of the tramps to see whether or not any of these individuals could be identified as one or more of the tramps.

Fithian: It is my understanding that the CIA and the FBI conducted their own analyses of the tramp photographs that attempt to identify the individuals. Did you get into that?

Snow: We didn't participate in either of those analyses. However, after being called as consultants to this committee, we were furnished copies of the reports of the CIA and FBI analysis.

Fithian: Did you then study those reports?

Snow: Yes, we have looked them over and we found that although they varied in method from our approach, to some extent, with some overlapping, they came to the same conclusions.

Edgar: Do we have any evidence of the identities of the three tramps?

Genzman: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Edgar. There is an on-going staff project.

ANALYSIS

Once the anthropologists received the CIA and the FBI's reports on the tramps they realized that a higher scientific authority had already made a determination on their identity. They would be risking their careers by going up against these two prestigious institutions. Again, the implications of their findings had to be taken into consideration. A positive finding would have decimated the Warren Commission and the Rockefeller in one swift blow. Who are these men to challenge the findings of numerous employees of the federal government? The photo study should have been conducted overseas, in a politically different environment. When this was done, by *Stern Magazine*, a positive match was obtained.

THIS RESEARCHER'S PHOTO ANALYSIS OF THE CHRIST TRAMP

DISGUISE

- (1) Wore old clothes.
- (2) Had a different hairline.
- (3) Flexed his nostrils and elongated his lips.

ANALYSIS: CHRIST COMPARISON SHOTS

OSWALD/CHRIST

CHRIST, out of disguise, did not look anything at all like OSWALD..

OSWALD/CHRIST

Compare Oswald to the CHRIST tramp. Could the CHRIST tramp have been mistaken for OSWALD if he were standing in a sixth floor window and someone tried to identify him from the street? When Marguerite Oswald was shown a photograph of the CHRIST tramp, she told this researcher: "That looks just like my son, LEE." She would not say anything more at the time because we did not have the funds to pay her for an interview.

Click [HERE](#) to see photo of CHRIST and OSWALD

CHRIST/CHRIST TRAMP

The CIA gave Clyde Snow an undated photograph of CHRIST. The CIA's photograph of CHRIST looked like it was taken much later than 1963. It was a front view. The configuration of CHRIST'S ear was not visible in the CIA shot, nor was the profile of his nose. In 1994 the CIA released a better photograph of CHRIST.

Click [HERE](#) to see these photos of CHRIST.

Click [HERE](#) to see CHRIST deplaning

Click [HERE](#) to see CHRIST and the CHRIST tramp. Note the identical noses. When comparing the mouths, remember that the lines of CHRIST'S mouth were distorted by his pipe. Compare the photograph of CHRIST boarding the bus, on the right side of the composite, and the tramp photograph. Note the angular features and identical nose.

Click [HERE](#) to see CHRIST and Tramp comparison shots.

Click [HERE](#) to see photograph created by electronic imaging to give some idea of what the tramp would look like with CHRIST'S pipe.

Click [HERE](#) to see an EAR STUDY so the reader might observe the identical ear cartilage configurations of CHRIST and the CHRIST tramp.

CLICK [HERE](#) TO DOWNLOAD CHRIST/TRAMP ZIP FILE

Click [UNAVAILABLE](#) to see a photograph of an electronic overlay of CHRIST and the CHRIST tramp.

CLYDE SNOW AND THE CHRIST TRAMP

Clyde Snow stated that "of the three men who have been proposed as tramp A, the resemblance between the latter and CHRIST is the least impressive. As noted previously, they diverge in facial index values by an average of 7.0 points." This was false. Clyde Snow compared the CHRIST tramp to Thomas Arthur Valle and STURGIS. He found the resemblance to STURGIS the least impressive with an 8.6 divergence. Next came CHRIST with 7.0 divergence, and then Thomas Arthur Valle, with a 4.0 divergence. Little space was devoted to CHRIST in the HSCA Report, and it did not include even a brief biography. The HSCA described HUNT as a "principal figure in the Watergate burglaries and a CIA employee at the time of the Kennedy assassination." STURGIS was described as a "Watergate burglar," but nothing was said of CHRIST. He was immediately ruled out as the tramp: "CHRIST'S face is relatively long and narrow; Tramp A's is short and broad. This length difference is especially expressed in the lower face, with CHRIST'S chin and upper lip being very long when compared to the tramp's. CHRIST'S nose is also much longer, relative to its breadth. Differences in ear structure are also striking. In the tramp, the lobes are attached, whereas in CHRIST, the lobes are 'welded' - that is they attach to the side of the cheek with no discernible lobe at all. The antihelix of the ear (the elevated ridge just in front of, and parallel to, the outer margin of the ear) is well developed in Tramp A, but very poorly developed in CHRIST."

AN INDEPENDENT PHOTO ANALYSIS

In 1991 Attorney Jeremiah Guttman sent the negatives of CHRIST and the CHRIST tramp to two forensic photo analysts without mentioning the purpose or reason. To do this, the tramp shot was cropped so that only the outline of Tramp A was visible - this eliminated the other tramps and the Texas School Book Depository.

ROBERT GENNA

Robert Genna was one of the photo analysts. Robert Genna was Assistant Chief of the Suffolk County, New York, Crime Laboratory. He had a B.S. in forensic science since 1975, and an M. S. in forensic science since 1987, from the John Jay College of Criminal Justice. He was a member of the American Academy of Forensic Science. He stated: "The three negatives submitted for examination and comparison were developed and made into print 8" X 10" photographs to assist in the analysis. The following facial characteristics were noted in all photographs, and, in my opinion, are significant: The nose has a characteristic slope that terminates into a distinctive point. The nostrils are elongated as a result of the sloping nose. The opening in the right ear has a geometrical shape consistent in all photographs. Furthermore the ear lobe in all photographs is continuous and is attached to the face. Although the hair length differs, the hairline appears to be consistent both horizontally and vertically with respect to the face line. Finally and most significantly, there is a skin blemish on the right cheek noted in all three photographs. This blemish appears located in the same area of all the

photographs. The blemish is located by fixing a horizontal parallel line along the right nostril following front to rear. Furthermore, the blemish can be located by fixing a vertical parallel line along the hairline, on the right side of the face, following top to bottom. As a result of the above-listed characteristics, specifically the skin blemish, it is my opinion that the same person appears in all of the submitted photographs."

ANALYSIS

Robert Genna's contention that CHRIST'S earlobe and the CHRIST-tramp earlobe is continuous and attached to the face contradicts the finding of Clyde Snow that, "In the tramp the lobes are attached, whereas in CHRIST, the lobes are welded - they attach to the side of the cheek with no discernible lobe at all."

The Robert Genna report affirmed: "Finally, and most significantly, there is a skin blemish on the right cheek noted in all three photographs." There was a problem with this blemish. To show the tramp and CHRIST from the same angle, the photo analyst flipped the negative of the tramp so that both figures would be facing the same direction. By doing so, he moved the mole visible in P1 and P2 from the left side of the tramp's face to the right side. The photo analyst measured this mole, and it happened to be in the same place as a mole on the right side of CHRIST'S face. He based part of his conclusion on this finding. In the CIA HSCA shot of CHRIST, a blemish was present in the same position on CHRIST as on the left cheek of the tramp. This blemish was very difficult to miss. Why the right-cheek mole was there is a mystery, although it is possible for someone to have a mole on both cheeks.

DENNIS FAHEY

Dennis Fahey also did a photo analysis. Dennis Fahey was Executive Vice President of Physical Evidence Consultants, Inc. of Manasquan, New Jersey. He has expertise in the field of physical evidence examination. From 1984 to 1990 he worked for a firm that dealt in anti-terrorism and hostage negotiations. From 1975 to 1982 Dennis Fahey was a police officer in charge of Photography and Identification. In 1970 and 1971 Dennis Fahey was a Narcotics Squad Officer. He was a member of the Evidence Photographers Council and was awarded the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster during his tour of duty in Vietnam.

Dennis Fahey: "As per your request, an examination of three (3) 8" X 10" black and white negatives were made. Three contact prints were made from the original negatives obtained from your office. These prints have been marked A, B, and C. Photograph A depicts a white male wearing sunglasses with a pipe in his mouth. The Subject has short, cropped hair and appears to be in an airport setting. Photograph B is an enlargement of photograph A depicting the previously mentioned white male. Photograph C depicts a white male in a street setting. It is initially apparent in photograph C that there is a weight difference between the two Subjects. Further, there is a time sequence delay in the photographs. This is obvious from the hair style

and the hair length. Given those conditions, there are striking similarities in the facial features of both Subject A and C. Upon examining the hairline, you will note that there is a high recessing forehead on the right-hand side. This is seen in both photographs. The shape of the ears are similar in both of these photographs. We are unable to make a determination of the eyes due to the presence of sunglasses in photograph A. The forehead shape and size are again similar between the two photographs. The nose and nostrils have similar characteristics. The Subject in both photographs has a long, thin jawline. Although the lips are turned up in photograph A, one can see that the lips in photograph A and C are similar that being long lips. Examination under magnification indicates a mole of some type located on the right upper cheek of both photographs A and C. As previously mentioned, there is a time delay between the taking of photograph A and C. Even given this time delay, both Subjects have strikingly similar characteristics. Given those physical attributes as described and including the apparent mole as seen in all three (3) photographs, I would conclude that Subject A and C appear to be one in the same."

ANALYSIS

Dennis Fahey relied less on the blemish in reaching his conclusions. Dennis Fahey was told the tramp shot negative had been inadvertently flipped and he was given the CIA CHRIST photograph. He stated it was of little value since it was a frontal shot. Dennis Fahey believed there was a "time sequence delay" between the two photographs because of a weight difference in the two men. There was a lapse of seven months between the photographs. CHRIST was released in April 1963, and was photographed in Dealey Plaza in November 1963. In 1956 Christ described himself as 185 pounds and 6' 0" tall. It should be noted that when CHRIST was arrested in Havana he weighed 200 pounds. The U.S. Embassy provided him with food until it closed in January 1961. He would have had to have lost weight in prison and regained it by November 22. Dennis Fahey: "The nose and nostrils have similar characteristics." Clyde Snow: "CHRIST'S nose is also much longer, relative to its breadth."

THIS RESEARCHER'S PHOTO ANALYSIS OF THE STURGIS TRAMP

DISGUISE

Looked *Nordic* because he:

- (1) Dyed or bleached his dark hair and eyebrows.
- (2) Straightened his wavy hair.
- (3) Washed his greasy hair and not used 'the greasy kids stuff' that FRANK usually rubbed in his hair. The rest of STURGIS' features were not commonly perceived as Italian: Square jaw, triangular nose.

(4) Held his jaw in to change his chin shape, flexed his nostrils and squinted.

(5) Wore old clothes.

ANALYSIS: STURGIS COMPARISON SHOTS

Click [HERE](#) to see photograph of STURGIS taken in January 1959 in Cuba. The photograph of the STURGIS tramp was taken three years later. The configurations of the cartilage of the inner-ear were identical. The contours of the edge of the ear were the same, although the overhead sunlight in Dealey Plaza made it appear that the earlobe of the STURGIS tramp was attached to the side of his cheek. This was not so. Examine the STURGIS tramp's ear in P5. Again, the tramp flexed his nostril held his chin in and squinted to further disguise his appearance.

Click [HERE](#) For a 1974 shot of STURGIS discovered by Gaeton Fonzi in the files of United Press International, and was taken under similar lighting conditions to Dealey Plaza. See this photo along with another photo of STURGIS. Gaeton Fonzi discovered a photograph where STURGIS had to squint like the tramp. When compared to the STURGIS tramp in P5, the lips, the eyes, the nose, the mouth and the skull shapes were identical.

Click [HERE](#) to see a profile study of STURGIS and the tramp. Note how STURGIS' hair changes your conception of the image.

Click [HERE](#) an overlay of STURGIS and the tramp. The metric measurements of STURGIS' features (the distances between the various facial features) and those of the tramp's were the same. If there were differences, no matter how slight, the features would not have lined up.

LYNDAL SHANEYFELDT AND CLYDE SNOW

S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt never presented a photographic overlay to the Rockefeller Commission. Instead, he based his report on the following evidence:

"(1) The tallest of the three men in the Dallas photographs has the general appearance of a *Nordic* type and FRANK STURGIS has a very definite Latin appearance.

(2) FRANK STURGIS has very black wavy hair, and the *Nordic* individual has light or blonde straighter hair.

(3) FRANK STURGIS has a rather round face with square chin lines and the *Nordic* individual has an oval shaped face with a less square or more rounded chin."

Dr. Snow said same thing: "Some of the features that we noticed were that in overall facial configuration terms, STURGIS...is fairly typical of what anthropologists would classify as a Mediterranean type, whereas this individual is more typical of individuals of *Northern European* extraction. Among other features noted, tramp B has slightly wavy hair, and in all the photographs we have seen Mr. STURGIS hair has a very crisp curl. The hair color of tramp B shows up as rather light, and the STURGIS photographs show him as deeply brunette. STURGIS is a very dark brunette with strongly waved hair; Tramp B has medium dark hair with a slight wave."

THE QUESTION OF DISGUISE

Clyde Snow's and S.A. Shaneyfeldt's descriptions of the tramp's hair differed. Clyde Snow said the STURGIS tramp had medium dark hair with a slight wave. S.A. Shaneyfeldt noted he had light or blonde straighter hair. Both agreed STURGIS had darker hair and this was an important difference. Had it not occurred to these men that STURGIS might have been in disguise? Were they aware processes existed which could change the color and wave of human hair?

FONZI AND THE HSCA

Gaeton Fonzi wrote: "About the time Schweiker began his investigation, a new book raised again raised the HUNT-STURGIS story. Titled *Coup D'Etat in America*, it was written by Michael Canfield and Alan J. ajweberman, with a forward by Congressman Henry Gonzalez. The book incorporated a novel device. It came with film positive photos of STURGIS and HUNT designed to be overlaid on photographs of the tramps. Superimposed, the images did bear striking similarities.

"I would later discover that photo comparison and analysis is an exceptionally non-conclusive technique. The HSCA spent \$84,154 on it. Among the photographs we submitted to a panel of experts for analysis and comparison were not only those of STURGIS and HUNT, but also those other individuals who resembled the tramps. The panel concluded that STURGIS and HUNT were not the tramps in the photographs. It did conclude that one of the tramps, the one who resembled HUNT - was most likely a man named Fred Lee Chrisman, a right-wing

activist. When those results came in, Committee investigators were sent out to find where Chrisman was on November 22, 1963. They came back with official records and eyewitness affidavits that Chrisman was teaching school in the state of Washington that day. So much for the conclusiveness of photo analysis. What was interesting, however, was the panel's conclusions in its comparison of photos of FRANK STURGIS with those of the tramps. It used two comparative techniques. One it termed 'metric traits' and the other 'morphological differences.' One was a comparison of the measurement of six facial features and their metric relationships; the other was simply whether or not various facial features were shaped the same. The panel concluded the average deviation between the tramp's features and STURGIS' features was "low enough to make it *impossible* to rule out STURGIS on the basis of metric traits alone." However, the panel said, it was morphological differences that indicated that STURGIS was not the tramp. In other words, STURGIS just didn't look like the tramp. The HSCA staff in charge of the photo panel's work was an attorney named Jane Downey. One day she came to me and asked me to help gather some of the photographs that would be sent to the panel members for analysis. I recall asking her at the time to find out whether or not the experts would take into consideration the possibility that the tramps might be wearing sophisticated disguises. That had to be the case if they were not just real drifters in the wrong place at the wrong time. (As a member of Nixon's White House plumber, HUNT had obtained disguises from the CIA's Technical Services Division and used them on more than one job). Downey promised she would ask the photoanalysts about the use of disguises. Several days later Downey told me she had checked with the photo analysts. 'I'm told there's no way they can tell if disguises were used.' In other words I said, 'If the tramps were in disguise there would be no way that analysts could tell who they really are?' 'That's what I'm told.' 'Then why do a photo comparison at all?' I asked. Jane Downey just shrugged her shoulders. 'Well, I said, I hope that point is mentioned in the final report.' 'I'm sure it will be.' It was not." [Fonzi, *Last Investigation* p75]

Attorney Marvin Miller asked S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt about the disguise question. He answered:

A. I would not say that I did not consider it, because I did consider it, but from the photograph it would not be possible to tell whether or not some makeup had been applied. You could derive certain conclusions, I believe, but gross things. But I accepted the fact that makeup could be used. I've accepted that all along.

Q. Right, and that could have altered - a dye job would have changed hair color and a straightening job would have changed hair, whether it is curly or flat or how much.

A. Yes, makeup could have altered those, some of those things. As I recall one of the features of the *Nordic* individual was the nose-to-forehead ratio. With what Hollywood does today, I suppose it's even possible to have changed that, but I saw no evidence. I felt that the photographs did not suggest any evidence of that. But without examination of the individual, himself, strictly from a photograph, I could not rule that out as a possibility, even though I felt

that there was no evidence of that present, and the possibility was remote.

Q. All right. Now, you indicated, for example, regarding Mr. HUNT, that when you compared that shorter man's photograph with HUNT'S, you determined there was a marked and significant age difference and that Mr. HUNT had a much younger appearance. Had he done something as light as add a few lines with makeup and a few other things like that, as you say, in the Hollywood bag of tricks these days, that could have affected that. You agree with that, don't you?

A. I don't believe that it could have been done with makeup as simple as you implied.

Q. No, I'm not saying simple; sophisticated makeup, as you described.

A. Could have been, yes.

ANALYSIS

S.A. Shaneyfeldt acknowledged he could not rule out the possibility of a disguise, and admitted that sophisticated make-up could have made the HUNT tramp look older.

Clyde Snow dismissed tramp disguises since he did not believe that the CIA had access to old shoes in 1963: "All three men are shabbily dressed, befitting their apparent status as vagrants. Tramp A, however, is the better attired, wearing well fitting jeans and a tweed-like sports jacket, although this, judged by 1963 styles, was several years out of date. Tramp B is wearing ill fitting slacks and a double breasted suit coat. Tramp C, from his battered fedora to his worn out shoes, has managed to achieve a sartorial effect similar to what one would expect had he been fired from a cannon through a Salvation Army thrift shop. While such clothing might be a disguise, their footwear seems consistent with their classification as vagrants. All three men are shod in worn, low cut Oxfords that appear to be leather soled. Tramp C's shoes seem to be several sizes too large for him." Clyde Snow was asked by this researcher, "What's the point, the CIA could obtain old, large shoes?" He said, "Oh yeah, I was talking about the general context."

Gordon Liddy was asked:

Q. Do you know whether or not HUNT had any skill and expertise in the use of disguise, or training in disguise?

A. Well, I know that he did in fact, employ disguises on several occasions when he was with me and when he both employed disguises. The disguise was furnished to both of us by a technician from the CIA.

Q. Was HUNT the individual who suggested the employment of that technique, or skill, in the situation in which it was employed?

A. Yes.

Q. Was it he who suggest, for example, or ever suggested to you in operations, that he favored the use of rubber gloves, walkie-talkies and other types of radio equipment in operations of the type in which disguises were employed?

A. Well, I would say that that was sort of a consensus between Mr. HUNT and myself with respect to that. Neither of us wanted those who were working for us in that kind of activity to leave fingerprints.

LYNDAL SHANEYFELDT AND CLYDE SNOW

Lyndal Shaneyfeldt cited a not easily altered trait, chin shape: "STURGIS has a round face, with square chin lines, and the STURGIS tramp has an oval shaped face, with a less square, or more rounded chin."

Clyde Snow believed there was a very "strong resemblance" between STURGIS'S chin and the chin of the tramp's: "Chin eminence height: Lower face height deviation = 4." An average deviation of 5 or less may be considered evidence of a strong resemblance.

Shaneyfeldt continued: "The ratio of the length of the nose to the height of the forehead from the bridge of the nose to the hairline, shows these measurements approximately equal on STURGIS, as compared to a greater forehead height than nose length on the *Nordic* individual. This is most obvious in the right profile where the nose and forehead of STURGIS measure approximately 7/8 inch. The nose of the *Nordic* individual measures 7/8 inch, and the forehead approximately 1 3/8 inches."

ANALYSIS

The 1/4 inch difference cited by Lyndal Shaneyfeldt could have been attributed to easily accomplished hairline alteration. When Clyde Snow examined the "Forehead height: Total face height," he also found a high deviation (8) due to hairline alteration.

Lyndal Shaneyfeldt's tramp report continued: "Some differences in ear contours were noted, with STURGIS' right ear being slightly triangular in shape. STURGIS' left ear has a slight projection along the outer edge about one third down from the top. This projection does not appear in a similar view of the left ear of the *Nordic* individual. The general left ear contour is more triangular on STURGIS and has a more distinct lobe, while the ear of the *Nordic* individual is wider at the lower half and has very little lobe."

Clyde Snow found the ears were identical: "Lobe length: Ear Length deviation (0) Ear length: Total face length deviation (3)."

Lyndal Shaneyfeldt continued: "Differences were noted in the nose contours and general facial contours between comparable photographs of STURGIS and the tallest individual in the Dallas photographs."

Clyde Snow could not make a nose determination. He tried to measure "Nose breadth: Nose length" but was unable. The overlay supplied an indication of how the noses and facial contours line up. Clyde Snow compared: "Mouth height: Lower face height" and came up with a deviation of (2), indicating the mouths were probably the same; but when he measured "Nose length: Lower face height," the deviation was (7), which indicated the noses were different.

THE FACIAL MEASUREMENTS OF STURGIS & TRAMP IDENTICAL

Clyde Snow concluded the mean metric deviation between STURGIS and the STURGIS tramp was (4), which meant that there was a strong possibility that the two men were *identical*.

MORPHOLOGY

Clyde Snow found that the following "morphological differences" between STURGIS and the tramp indicated they were different:

- (1) Hair: STURGIS is a very dark brunette with strongly waved hair; Tramp B has medium dark hair with a slight wave.
- (2) Hairline: Tramp B's hairline shows more bilateral recession than is observed in STURGIS.
- (3) Nose: Tramp B has a concave nasal profile with a rounded, slightly bulbous nasal tip. STURGIS' nasal profile is slightly convex and the nasal tip is less bulbous than the tramp's.
- (4) Chin: The most striking difference between the two men is the chin form. STURGIS' is massive and square; Tramp B has a small rounded chin.
- (5) Ears: Tramp B's ears are considerably more projecting than STURGIS' which are rather close set.
- (6) Physique: Tramp B appears to be considerably more linear in body build than STURGIS, who is broad and stocky in physique."

ANALYSIS

STURGIS was ruled out as being a tramp because of easily alterable morphological traits. What are morphological similarities in relation to human identification? *Webster's Dictionary* defines morphological, when used in this context, as: "Of, or relating to, points for taking measurements that are present on the skeleton as well as on the living person or the cadaver." Clyde Snow used the word much more loosely. The first morphological trait turned out to be hair color, and the second was hairline, both easily alterable. Clyde Snow was asked by this researcher if disguise could alter morphological features. He responded: "To some extent. For example a person who had straight hair could have his hair curled. And visa versa."

Clyde Snow compared STURGIS' nose with the tramp's. According to Snow, the tramp's nose was more arched, or curved in, than STURGIS,' whose nose was more spherical or semicircular. STURGIS' nose was also described as being less bulbous than the tramp's.

ANALYSIS

There was little evidence of this, but this difference might be perceived if one failed to consider that the STURGIS tramp distorted the shape of his nose by flexing his nostrils and squinting. In P1 STURGIS flexed his nostrils, in P2 his nostrils were also flexed. This was more apparent in P3, P4, P5. It was less apparent in the last two photographs, since the sun had overexposed STURGIS' nose. Nowhere in the HSCA Report was mention of deliberate facial distortion, nor did the HSCA show its readers the photographs in which it had detected these alleged nose, chin and eye differences.

Like S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt, Clyde Snow claimed that STURGIS had a squarer chin than the tramp. Could this difference be related to the fact that in P1 STURGIS was distorting chin shape by bowing his head? In P2, he was squinting and looking down; in P3, P4 it was most apparent and the folds of flesh in STURGIS' chin are seen as he holds his head at an angle. In P5 and P6, we get a good look at his chin, but in P7, he was again pulling it in. Clyde Snow commented to this researcher "Pretty sharp" in regard to this way of further disguising oneself. Regarding ear projection: This was dependent upon hair fluffiness, which is easily alterable. Regarding physique: Clyde Snow contended that STURGIS was stockier, while the tramp was more linear. This might have been a result of the tramp's hairstyle adding about an inch to his height. While there was no major difference in physique between STURGIS and the tramp, it was evident that STURGIS weighed less in late 1963. When Snow made this determination, he compared the tramp shot to a photograph of STURGIS. Was this photograph taken in late 1963?

ANALYSIS

STURGIS could have changed his weight in a matter of weeks by dieting and exercise.

Snow's "morphology" relied on his subjective perception of a photograph, rather than by objective scientific measurements. This was because when SNOW did the metric analysis of STURGIS he came out with positive results and he could not live with that.

THIS RESEARCHER'S PHOTO ANALYSIS OF THE HUNT TRAMP

DISGUISE

(1) Remained hidden behind the other tramps: In P1 and P2, HUNT stood behind CHRIST; in P1 he could not be seen, and in P2 a half-profile was visible. In P4 he was visible, and in P3 he was visible. In P6 his face was in the shadows, and in P5 and P7 he was again hiding behind STURGIS.

(2) Squinted and grimaced as in P3.

(3) Had hat, old clothes and carried a greasy bag.

(4) Sophisticated make-up that made him look older.

(5) Had his hair died grey.

ANALYSIS: HUNT COMPARISON SHOTS

Note P6.

Click [HERE](#) to see the HUNT TRAMP placed between two HUNT shots taken after Watergate. It has also been enlarged. Note the open-mouthed expression in the tramp shot and in HUNT photograph "B." This "fly catching" expression was characteristic of HUNT.

Click [HERE](#) to see another composite of HUNT and the HUNT tramp.

Click [HERE](#) to see HUNT'S head embedded in tramp shot P1 where the tramps head should be.

Click [HERE](#) to see an overlay of HUNT and the tramp. A CIA document about HUNT indicated the Agency had no photographs of him in 1961. [*Allen v. DOD* document number deleted "1961?"]

S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt reported:

- (1) The shortest and the oldest man of the three men arrested in Dallas compared with HUNT photographs shows a marked and significant age difference, with HUNT having a much younger appearance.
- (2) The jowl area of the chin of the old man has protruding pouches, while this area of HUNT'S chin is smooth and tightly contoured.
- (3) The old man's nose appears more bulbous, while HUNT'S nose is more angular or pointed."

ANALYSIS

HUNT was disguised to look older, and he did. S.A. Shaneyfeldt's statement about HUNT'S jowl made no sense. The only time we saw jowls was in P2, but in P3, HUNT seemed to be grimacing to distort their shape. In P4 he was out of focus, and in P6 he was too far back to make out much detail. As for Shaneyfeldt's contention that the tramp's nose is more bulbous than HUNT'S, again P3 contains the only reasonable view of his nose, albeit twisted.

Clyde Snow, like S.A. Shaneyfeldt, emphasized: "The tramp has a relatively broad nose with a bulbous fleshy nasal tip. The nasal tip is not depressed. HUNT has a narrow nose with a salient nasal bridge and an angular, moderately depressed nasal tip." Coincidentally, Clyde Snow had also concluded that the nose of the STURGIS tramp was more bulbous than STURGIS' nose. Could this have been a result of both men having distorted their faces?

Clyde Snow agreed with Lyndal Shaneyfeldt and stated: "In comparing HUNT with tramp C, the average difference of the six indices of the two men is 9.0, a value significantly high to suggest no particularly strong resemblance in facial proportions. In addition, in comparing the photographs of the tramp to those of HUNT taken in the late 1950's and early 1960's, the following morphological differences were noted: Forehead: Tramp C has several well-developed transverse frontal sulci and a strong vertical interciliary sulcus. These are not observed in HUNT who, even in the photographs taken years later, had only slightly developed transverse frontal and interciliary furrows."

ANALYSIS

Clyde Snow contended that HUNT and the tramp had the same forehead furrows except the tramp's were more pronounced. In which tramp shots was the HUNT tramp's forehead even visible? The best shot occurred in P3, and even here, the depth of field of the camera blurred the grimacing face of the HUNT tramp. In P4, he was farther back, and in P5 and P7 his face was doctored out. In P6 his face was also a blur. Perhaps Clyde Snow had photographs that were closer to the originals?

ANALYSIS

Assuming what Snow said was true, makeup might have been used to accentuate HUNT'S already existing features. HUNT was made up to look older by the cosmetic alteration of pre-existing features.

This theory was consistent with Clyde Snow's analysis of HUNT'S cheeks and the tramp's: "Cheek: Tramp C has well-developed nose-labial folds, whereas in HUNT these are only incipiently developed in his photographs taken about the time of the assassination."

Clyde Snow ignored this possibility and cited age as a difference between the two men: "Age: In general facial tone, age lines and other features, Tramp C appears to be at least a decade older than HUNT."

Regarding HUNT'S mouth and lips, Clyde Snow stated: "Mouth: Tramp C has thick, full membranous lips; HUNT is thin lipped." In P3, HUNT'S lips are contorted from his frowning. Look at the lip comparison. Not only were the lips identical, but the way HUNT and the tramp shaped them was also identical.

Clyde Snow pointed out a scar on the tramp that was not visible in the HUNT photographs: "Scars. In the tramp there is a pit-like ovoid scar about 1 centimeter in diameter located immediately above the lateral end of his right eyebrow. This feature is not observed in the HUNT photographs provided for examination." This scar appeared prominently in P2, but not in P3 and P4, although it might be argued not enough of the right side of HUNT'S face was visible in P3 to see the scar, and that P4 was too blurred to make it out. The scar was not visible in P6. David Wise reported: "In 1972 James A. Everett, a veteran CIA agent in Europe, was reassigned to the Chicago Domestic Operations Division. He was given a hairpiece, different glasses and a wart. The wart was a stick-on type..." [Wise *The American Police State* p188]

ANALYSIS: DOCTORING OF HUNT'S PHOTOGRAPHS

HUNT was a high ranking official in the CIA. The Agency could not have plausibly denied this. Photographs of HUNT disguised as a tramp, at the scene of the JFK assassination, would have caused the CIA to be disbanded. Why didn't the CIA destroy the tramp shot negatives? It had the undoctored negatives in its possession before they were doctored. If, however, the photographs had disappeared, the photographers might have gone to the FBI. This would have called unnecessary attention to the tramps. Then the tramps' arrest, release, identity etc. would have had to have been investigated by the Warren Commission. The tramp shots had never been published in any of the local papers and instead, had been filed as out takes. As it was, the only references to the tramps were made by Bowers and law enforcement personnel. No FBI reports were generated on them. Additionally, the Agency did not know for certain that these were the only tramp shots. Private individuals, as well as a local television news crew equipped with a 16-mm movie camera, were also present. After destroying these, others could surface.

The coverup of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy involved many more CIA personnel the conspiracy or act itself. The CIA, acting as an institution, doctored the photographs so they would have negative forensic value, co-opted their dissemination, and waited to see if anyone credible made a valid identification. There were very few photographs of STURGIS and CHRIST available in 1963 (and none of HUNT) so the CIA had little to fear - until Watergate. HUNT: "The Watergate episode brought my photographs to the national fore and was the core of the speculation about me and the JFK assassination. The Watergate episode evolved this into the JFK mess." [*HUNT v. SPOTLIGHT* 1.29.85 Miami #80-1121-Civil-Kehoe p61]

It was pointed out repeatedly to the HSCA that to obtain an accurate photographic evaluation, the first issue that had to be addressed was doctoring. It was suggested the HSCA apply sophisticated photo analytic techniques to the tramp shots to determine whether they had been tampered with, but the HSCA refused. The word doctoring appeared nowhere in its report, though it was obvious that the tramp shots had indeed been doctored. Doctor Clyde Snow: "No, I never determined whether the tramp shots had been doctored. The way I thought it was set-up was that the photographs would first be examined by people who were experts in determining whether or not photographs had been doctored. After they were certified as undoctored, we would get the copies. Were they examined?" It was pointed-out to Clyde Snow by this researcher that there was no report on doctoring of the tramp shots in the HSCA files, nor was it listed as withheld. There was no reference to it in the HSCA Report, or supporting volumes. Clyde Snow: "It was my understanding that everything had been looked over by other analysts on our committee. I've forgotten their names. That's an interesting point. I just took what was given to me." Clyde Snow was told that unless one accounted for the doctoring, one would arrive at a negative conclusion. He commented, "That could be true." Clyde Snow was sent a set of tramp shots and asked to comment on the doctoring: "I looked at it very briefly. I haven't had a chance to analyze it. I can't take the time off. I don't know how big a hurry you're in. I just got back from Chiapas, then I have to go to Austin, and to Chicago for a murder trial.

Then Ethiopia. Perhaps several months from now. Give it a try." [Snow 3.2.94; 2230 Bluecreek Norman, OK 73071 405-364-7471] Clyde Snow was recontacted in June 1994. He stated: "No way can I do an analysis on the doctoring. I'm just too tied up on many, many, other things to get involved in the Kennedy assassination. It's history now. There's probably better people out there than me to do it. Technically, things have moved so far beyond what they were whenever we were doing that in 1975, 1976. I'm no longer the state of the art in photo comparison. I would have no way of doing it, I don't have the equipment, I don't have the time, and I don't have the money." Clyde Snow was told that he would be paid for his time. "Well ah, that would have to be a given. But I don't think I want to get involved. I don't look at photographs primarily. I'm an anthropologist, and anthropologists have been used to compare photographs from time to time. But there are other people who just do that full time. I think what we did was pretty good. Find another expert to shoot me down. As far as I'm concerned the case is closed."

ANALYSIS

Clyde Snow clearly did not want to get involved in examining the photographs for doctoring. If he reported the photographs were doctored, it would have reopened the case. Again, would Clyde Snow have been willing to issue a positive photo report to the HSCA despite its implications? HSCA Chief Counsel Robert Blakey commented: "The implications of these questions is enormous, about a Watergate burglar, and a former longtime CIA officer, who directed the 1972 break-in, might have been involved in the assassination...for years the tramp photographs were little more than conversation pieces, but in 1975, in a book called *Coup D'Etat in America*, Michael Cranfield [sic] and Alan J. ajwebermann [sic] proposed that two of these three tramps were none other than HOWARD HUNT and FRANK STURGIS who had been involved in the Watergate prosecutions." [HSCA V4 p366] When I first called Clyde Snow he told me: "I'll second guess anybody. I got to look at the evidence. I get involved in criminal trials all the time on one side or the other. Like most forensic scientists I go in with an open mind. Very often I have to tell my own side, 'Counselor if you use me as a witness I'll blow you out of the water because I look at the evidence, and I'm not going to be able to tell them what you want to hear.'" Clearly, this was untrue.

THE BRUSH STROKE

P7: There was a brush stroke covering the small part of the cheeks and ear of the HUNT tramp that would normally have been visible in the picture. The brush stroke extended to the face of the tallest tramp.

Click [HERE](#) to see the brush stroke. Marvin Miller showed Lyndal Shaneyfeldt the brush stroke and asked him about it:

Q. Does it appear to have a brush stroke over that area?

A. I would not interpret that, myself, as a brush stroke across there. That area of the photograph over the right shoulder of the *Nordic* individual is really not identifiable from this photograph. It is only with the knowledge of the other photographs, and knowing that there was a shorter man with a hat, that it could be interpreted as being the edge of the hat and part of the forehead of the older individual, but I will not interpret that as brush stroke, and I see no evidence of retouching in that.

(Marvin Miller pointed out the brush stroke once again.)

A. I see a, the white, lower line.

Q. Yes, sir.

A. - just along the shoulder, I think corresponds with a, with white fleck along the cheek -

Q. Yes.

A. - which tends to suggest a, a stroke across there.

Q. All right.

A. It is not quite in alignment, but it's rather close.

Q. All right. Thank you sir.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Do you know how to account for that mark on the photograph that we have just discussed?

A. No, other than happenstance. I would have to see the original negative.

Q. All right.

A. That, that does not -

Q. All right. It appears at least that this photograph, at least, has had some kind of alteration to it, whether the negative did or not?

A. No, it does not. That does not imply that to me. I said that there are a couple of white specks along the cheek line along the *Nordic* individual that almost correspond with the highlight line along the shoulder. That I would interpret as being accidental happenstance. If it

appeared, dirt on the negative. Could be anything.

Q. All right, but you could not discern that actually until you had the real negative?

A. That's right, in absence of other retouching on there it is not suggestive of a retouched photograph to me.

Q. All right, the [original] negative has the answer?

A. May have the answer. The negative may not have the answer either.

Q. All right, but it would be the best evidence, so to speak?

A. All right.

ANALYSIS

Lyndal Shaneyfeldt attributed this instance of doctoring to accidental happenstance.

THE TWO BLOCKS OF LIGHT

P5: Before I had a good copy of P5 I perceived what I believed to be two blocks of light in front of the HUNT tramp. Due to these apparent white blocks, the photograph was totally worthless in reference to HUNT, since the only HUNT parts visible were his shoes, pants and hat.

Attorney Marvin Miller pointed out this phenomenon to Lyndal Shaneyfeldt:

A. Because of the screen pattern in this reproduction the detail is really not adequate for, for making any determination. Is this the dark line you're speaking of?

Q. Yes, and it seems to be interrupted by a little white blotch or two right up in there.

A. Yes, it's just from, from examining this photograph I believe that to be a branch of a tree or something and not the outline of the face, because it's too far out from the edge of the hat and the edge of the face is over in this area. I would interpret that as being another one of these branches of the bushes back there. I do not interpret that as the edge of the face but again, the reproduction in the book is not clear enough. Again, we would need to have a good photograph or the original negative.

How could the blocks of light be explained as branches from a bush, when one of them appeared in front of the HUNT tramp's face in a location that clearly had no bushes? Nonetheless, he allowed that his conclusion was not scientifically valid unless he examined the

original negative. This testimony intimated that either the FBI never possessed the original negative, or it had the original negative and never examined it for evidence of doctoring.

Recently, I examined the clearest version of P5 available to date and the block of light does not appear. It seemed to have been a result of having had a third or fourth generation copy. None-the-less even though there is a large area under the HUNT tramp's hat where part of his face should be, it is just not there.

Click [HERE](#) to see this.

HUNT'S NEW EAR

P3: A new ear has been spliced on to HUNT'S head. Note the minute art knife notch at the tip of the arrow. To see this double click here. [Doctor3. JPEG] This ear appeared to be identical with the ear of the tallest tramp shown in P5. The latter would have been used, because the P5 photograph of STURGIS' ear was taken under identical lighting conditions. This was not HUNT'S ear, and did not correspond to the tip of the projecting left ear that stuck out behind the CHRIST tramp, under a hat and some thin hair in P1.

PLASTIC SURGERY

HUNT underwent plastic surgery on his left ear after the assassination in order to alter the contours of that wing-like projection. S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt reported: "There are some inconsistencies in the ear contours; however, the known photographs of HUNT show differences in the ear contours between the late 1950 photographs and the mid to late 1960 photographs. The ear contours of the oldest individual in the Dallas photographs are different from the ear contours of HUNT in the mid to late 1960 photographs." Lyndal Shaneyfeldt was questioned by Marvin Miller about this statement:

A. I did find inconsistencies in the ear contours of Mr. HUNT in the 1950 photograph as opposed to the 1960's photographs, but my final analysis was there were some differences between ear contours, particularly of the ear in the 1960's. Now, that's the closest I can come to answering your question.

Q. All right. Do you have any way by which you can account for the difference in Mr. HUNT'S ears relative to themselves between the 1950's and the 1960's?

A. No, other than, other than camera angles. Primarily camera angles. You don't always have exactly the same angle and the ear contour can be very greatly affected by changes of angle of view. What I am saying is the angle at which you view the ear in the photograph is affected very much by the angle of the head relative to camera angle.

ANALYSIS

Lyndal Shaneyfeldt did not attribute the difference in the contours of HUNT'S ears to plastic surgery. Instead, he claimed that a technical factor was involved - camera angle. Why couldn't this factor be accounted for? HUNT had his ear contours modified by plastic surgery. Ear contours are the outer most configuration of the ear or rim. There was no way to calculate what effect such surgery might have had on the rest of the configurations of HUNT'S ear, since the entire ear itself was essentially squeezed and restructured into a new shape. Double click here to see the *HUNT EAR STUDY*. [Huntear1.JPEG] Note that HUNT did not just have his ears pinned back, he changed the configurations of his inner ear. HUNT had protruding ears before his surgery. Why did he wait until after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to have them fixed?

Clyde Snow detected the plastic surgery: "From his photographs, apparently HUNT underwent surgery to correct his rather projecting ears. The date of this operation was not determined, but from the photographs, it would appear to have been within a few years before or after the assassination. In degree of projection, the tramp's ears *appear to more closely match* HUNT'S *presurgical condition*." Although the tramp shots had been doctored, HUNT'S protruding ear could still be detected in P1.

ANALYSIS

Characteristically, HUNT had prepared for every eventuality he could anticipate, such as the surfacing of more photographic evidence. Better to have altered evidence, such as one's own ear, than to have it used against you.

Clyde Snow examined two features of HUNT'S ear which he believed was unaffected by surgery, and found that they were strongly different in the photographs: "One of these is the helix, the fold of flesh that forms the outer rim of the ear. In the tramp, this fold is wide and prominent, whereas it is more narrow and weakly developed in HUNT. The second difference is the antihelix, the secondary fold that roughly parallels the helix inside the ear. This structure is strongly developed in the tramp, and, in fact, its lower portion appears to extend beyond the helix. In HUNT, the antihelix is weakly developed."

ANALYSIS

Clyde Snow believed he was examining ear features which had been uninfluenced by surgery.

In P2, the HUNT tramp's right ear was visible. The inner configurations were barely discernible, but the outer contour looked normal. Compare the contours of the tramp's ear with HUNT'S ear in the *HUNT EAR STUDY*. The outer contours match. One problem with these shots was the overexposure of one and underexposure of the other. Now compare the right ear of the tramp

with HUNT'S presurgical right ear. There was no similarity whatsoever as a result of the doctoring.

In *HUNT DIGITAL EAR IMAGING STUDY 1* his presurgical right ear has been electronically grafted to the HUNT tramp's face in P3 to illustrate the purpose of the doctoring. Double click here to see this. [?] Note that the brush stroke in P7 covered the HUNT tramp's right ear. Clyde Snow stated that the tramp's right ear, and HUNT'S right ear, were totally different.

ANALYSIS

The dissimilarity was caused by falsification of the original tramp negatives in order to conceal the HUNT appendage, which became the key to identifying him as the tramp. One man who could have told us if P3 was doctored was the photographer, Jack Beers.

Finally, Doctor Clyde Snow was told by this researcher, "You asked, 'Is it HUNT? Is it STURGIS? Is it CHRIST?' Shouldn't you have asked, 'Is it HUNT and STURGIS and CHRIST?'" Clyde Snow stated: "I would have to go back to the original report. As I recall, we took them on a case by case basis. The point is in photo identification the questioned photograph always looks somewhat like the person who is identified as the suspected person. Otherwise, if he looked like Arnold Schwarzenegger? There's generally a general resemblance to the person who was identified. Someone came up with the names of three people who kind of look like the tramps. It's an interesting point. I would want to go back and look at the report to see whether that was taken into account."

THE HEIGHT STUDY

STURGIS

The Rockefeller Commission had the FBI conduct an on-site tramp height study to determine the height of the tramps and compare it against that of HUNT and STURGIS. The FBI did a study of the height of the STURGIS tramp so that it could be compared to STURGIS' height, which it determined was 5' 11", the height listed on his drivers license. On May 7, 1975, and on May 8, 1975, the FBI "conducted studies in the vicinity of the Texas School Book Depository to determine the height of the derelict thought to be FRANK STURGIS." The FBI used an overlay method: "Some of the photographs were duplicated using height standards, and these duplicated photographs were superimposed over the photographs of [the tramps] to establish the approximate heights of these individuals. Based on the comparison made, it was found that the tallest derelict, purported to be STURGIS, is in the height range from 6' 1" to 6' 3" tall... since STURGIS is 5' 11" tall, this determination of height supports the conclusion previously

given that FRANK STURGIS is not the derelict."

Five days after the FBI filed this report, however, it filed a revised report that stated the FBI Laboratory had determined that part of the street visible in the tramp shots had been repaved in 1973: "The addition of this resurfacing material would normally subtract approximately one to one and a half inches from the height as shown in previous report." This would make the tramp 5'11 ½" to 6' 1- ½" tall. As stated, STURGIS was 5' 11" tall. The half-inch difference could have been accounted for by the tramp's fluffier hair style. A few weeks before the FBI did its study, Michael Canfield did his. He determined the tramp was 6' + or - 1".

During his deposition in the course of *HUNT v. ajweberman* Shaneyfeldt stated: "I went to Dallas and made on-site studies to try to establish the derelict's height, particularly the *Nordic* individual, and the elderly, shorter man. I was furnished with the camera that was used by the news photographer to make the original tramp photographs. I was also furnished with copies of the photographs. I reenacted those photographs placing in position of the individuals in the photograph height standards that would record the height of anyone who was standing in that particular position. Using that technique, and setting up the camera based on fixed objects as they were recorded in the original negatives, buildings, trees, things that were still in position at that time, I did make a height study and then using the photographs that were made with that same camera, I made transparencies which were enlarged to the same size as the photographs, and overlaid, and determined the height of the individuals. It was found that the tallest of the derelicts purported to be FRANK STURGIS, is in the height range from 6' 1" to 6' 3" tall."

ANALYSIS

Lyndal Shaneyfeldt claimed that his study results were accurate, since they were generally unaffected by the street's resurfacing: "However, considering the fact that the camera position in the street is also elevated by one inch, this would tend to limit the effect [of the resurfacing]." The FBI had disagreed. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt, however, did not deny that the repaving had some effect, he merely claimed that his methodology tended to limit that effect. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt said his report was only "relatively accurate."

S.A. Lyndal Shaneyfeldt worked with William Gaston Allen's photograph P6. When the FBI questioned William Gaston Allen in Little Rock, Arkansas, in 1975, William Gaston Allen did not recall taking P6 or any of the other tramp photographs: "He believes he could have taken them. He recalled taking photographs from the corner opposite the front entrance of the Texas School Book Depository." William Gaston Allen believed he was standing on the sidewalk when he took photographs that day.

HUNT

The initial report of the FBI listed the height of the shortest tramp as 5' 6" to 5' 8". [FBI 62-109060-NR 6.16.75] The revised FBI report that followed estimated the short tramp's height to be normally 5' 4 ½" to 5' 6 ½". [FBI 62-109060-NR 6.2.75] The Rockefeller Commission chose to use the FBI's initial calculation, and listed the height of the short tramp as from 5' 6" to 5' 8". When Michael Canfield did a height study in 1975, he determined that the HUNT tramp was 5' 8". This height study was published in *Coup D'Etat In America*. Michael Canfield and the FBI's findings agreed. To prove its thesis that HUNT and STURGIS were not the tramps, the Rockefeller Commission misstated HUNT'S height as 5' 9". During a deposition in the course of *HUNT v. ajweberman*, HUNT was asked to display his drivers license. His height was listed as 5' 8" tall. HUNT'S resume was obtained and he listed his height as 5' 8". In 1948 HUNT listed his height as 5' 10 ½".

END OF NODULE.

CLICK [HERE](#) TO GO ON TO THE NEXT NODULE.