LAST TRAIN FROM DEALY PLAZA
by FRED T. NEWCOMB

A problem for both defenders and critics of the Warren Commission's Report has been where and how the assassins on the grassy knoll escaped after the shooting. Reports by most investigators and spectators indicate no movement of persons fleeing from the scene. This analysis, based upon previously unexamined photographs, offers a solution to this paradoxical situation.

These are the facts. Immediately behind the pergola on the grassy knoll, from which many witnesses thought shots came, was a passenger train on a freight spur. This train left the assassination scene within moments after the shooting and was gone within minutes after spectators entered the yards behind the pergola.

Significantly, one of the photographs was entered into evidence before the Commission—with the train retouched out. This photograph was the only one the Commission printed that would clearly show the train.

THE TRAIN

An aerial photograph of Dealey Plaza, taken in July 1963, shows the railroad spur immediately behind the pergola (pointer in Fig. 1). This spur runs east (to the right). Fig. 2 charts both track and train.

Several photographs taken at the time of the assassination show the presence and movement of the train on the pergola spur.

Miss Wilma Bond took a series of colored slides moments after the shooting. Fig. 3 charts her position in Dealey Plaza and view of the train. (Positions of the photographers and train in the charts were established by photographic triangulation.) The railroad passenger cars can be seen behind the pergola's grailwork, e.g., in Fig. 4.

Miss Wilma Bond took a series of colored slides moments after the shooting. Fig. 3 charts her position in Dealey Plaza and view of the train. (Positions of the photographers and train in the charts were established by photographic triangulation.) The railroad passenger cars can be seen behind the pergola's grailwork, e.g., in Fig. 4.

Orville O. Nix made a movie film of the assassination scene (Fig. 5 charts his position and view). Fig. 6 is a frame taken during the assassination; Fig. 7 is one taken moments afterwards. A comparison of the two—one the passenger car windows—demonstrates that the train moved during that period of time. A cutaway drawing (Fig. 8), which was made from one of his frames, illustrates its position.

A color movie taken by Mark Bell also shows the train. A photograph made by Frank Cancellare, minutes after the assassination, reveals that by that time the train had left.

In addition, a prestigious photographic analysis firm, Itek Corp., noted the train directly behind the pergola in its report (which was critical of Commission critics) of May 18, 1967 on Nix's film.

The Warren Commission took no testimony from any of the above individuals. Of their photographs, the Commission published only a few frames of Nix's film. (Ironically, a Commission reenactment photograph made in May 1964 had a train behind the pergola.)

COVER-UP

The Warren Commission was supplied with maps by both the Secret
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Service and FBI. The maps in its Report (e.g., Fig. 9) omit not only the spur behind the pergola, but all spurs. Instead, the maps show an imaginary track running in a continuous line from the triple underpass to the rear of the Texas School Book Depository. Furthermore, this is contrary to the Report's own aerial and ground photographs (Fig. 9, bottom). Those photographs, however, are so small that they require magnification to see details.

The cover-up of the train includes tampering with a particular photograph made at the time of the assassination by Philip L. Willis. Willis stood on nearly the same grade level of Dealey Plaza as Miss Bond. Within minutes prior to the time when she took her photograph, he took one (Fig. 10) apparently in reaction to hearing the first shot (arrow points to the President's head). From his position (Fig. 11), the train had to be seen behind the pergola's grillework.

Willis' re-enactment photograph (Fig. 14), taken in March 1965 from the same position, shows how the background and the grillework should look (compare to Fig. 10). Furthermore, the clarity of his re-enactment photograph, using the same camera, indicates that his assassination photograph (Fig. 10), which the Commission used, is several times removed from the original. The federal government kept his photographs for over a month before returning them altered.

Another individual, Hugh Betzner Jr., stood (Fig. 15) about 20 feet behind Willis on the same side of Elm St. and took a photograph (Fig. 16) a split-second before Willis. A comparison of the 2 photographs demonstrates the extent of the cover-up.
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The characteristic tree limb and its foliage in Benson's photograph (outlined in Fig. 17, left) were in front of the train. Using this tree limb configuration as a reference point, a comparison shows how much foliage was removed from Willi's photograph when the train was painted off. Also compare the limb and foliage in Benson's photograph (Fig. 14) with Willi's re-enactment photograph (Fig. 17): the entire lower limb has been hatched off. This fish may have been removed so that Willi's assassination photographs (Fig. 10) could not be duplicated to determine how the foliage originally looked in relation to the pergola, thereby preventing an accurate re-enactment.

Cover-up by physical alteration, in addition to the missing limb, has occurred recently. The spur immediately behind the pergola has now been removed according to a 1968 photograph (Fig. 18). With the branch and spur gone, there is no chance to do an accurate re-enactment.

ACTIVITY IN THE YARDS

For the train to travel east, the Houston St. crossing of the spur, next to the Texas School Book Depository, had to be kept free of vehicles. James E. Romack informed the Commission that "a piece of wood that they used to stop traffic coming through..." According to a Commission affidavit, a witness, J. C. Price, stated, "I saw one man run towards the passenger cars on the railroad siding after the volley of shots." Another witness, Ronald B. Fischer, told the Commission that he too spotted the train seconds after the shots were fired. Mrs. Juan Hill told the Commission that he described for the Commission a man shots were fired. Mrs. Jean Hill too spotted the train seconds after the shots." Another witness, Ronald B. Romack informed the Commission that after the shots, "I just looked directly to the railroad tracks and all the people started running up there and I just ran along with them." He and another witness, Miss Victor E. Adams, both told the Commission that, as they approached the tracks, police officers ordered them to go back to the Depository where they worked.

DIVERSIONS

Another train was parked at the back of the yards, some 210 feet behind the pergola (Fig. 19 upper right). This train coincided in alignment with the pergola train, which was some 50 feet directly behind the pergola. In effect, the pergola train would block the view of the period train for any photographer in a position such as Miss Bond's. When the pergola train departed, the parked train could then be used to "explain" the presence of the pergola train.

This diversion was verified by another critic who has made a reputation as an "expert" in assassination photographs. Jim Garrison received my report on the train in March 1968. This critic, however, conformed Garrison that it was incorrect. Then he flew out to California to persuade me that the period train and the pergola train were one and the same. To do this, he used Camelot's photograph (Fig. 20 upper). Camilette took this through the givework of the west shaker of the pergola (Fig. 20, lower) minutes after the assassination it shows the parked train at the back of the yards. By this time, however, the pergola train—which was on the spur in the foreground (Fig. 20, upper)—had already left.

The perspective also denies that the period train and the pergola train were the same. Fig. 21 shows the difference. The pergola train was almost parallel to the pergola when viewed from Miss Bond's position. The parked train would vanish away from her eye, off to the north.

According to a Commission affidavit, Plato, Harden refers to a freight train. Second, he went to the yards approximately 15-20 minutes after the assassination occurred. The pergola train left within 5 minutes after the shooting, allowing no time for a search.

Joe B. Forrest Jr., seems to be a key man in diversionary activity. Bowers was in a railroad signal tower overlooking the tracks behind the grassy knoll during the assassination. Supposedly, he was in charge of all rail traffic in the yards. Bowers told the Commission that he saw 3 automobiles enter the yards within a half hour before the assassination; one he claimed entered "7-9 minutes before the shooting." In terms of time, it is doubtful that the pergola train was rooted into position moments before the shooting. Therefore, the pergola train would have blocked any automobile entry into the yards.

Furthermore, Bowers described 2 men behind the fence on the grassy knoll. His testimony is questionable because the pergola train would have blocked his view of the area. Bowers was 14 feet from the ground in his tower; the train's height was also 14 feet.

Regarding the 3 armed men, Bowers, in an interview with critic Mark Lane, mentioned stopping a freight train opposite his tower and seeing the shakers of 3 "winnos" by police. He claimed that the freight was surrounded by "possibly 50 policemen with shotguns and tommy guns." No police had tommy guns that day; they either had revolvers or pump shotguns. Secret Service men had automatic weapons, but, according to the Warren Report, no Secret Service men left the Presidential motorcade.

HIGH-LEVEL PLANNING

The presence and timing of the pergola train suggests not only a careful and well-planned plot, but one conceived at a high level. Indeed, who had the power to order a train? Secondly, who could have had its movements coordinated in the time of the assassination (1) to enable the assassins to escape and (2) to set up diversionary trains (passenger and freight) both for the purposes of photographic analysis and "exposure?"

The train could have picked up assassins from the pergola and grassy knoll areas before it departed. In addition, assassins stationed in any buildings at the head of Elm St. could have picked up the train as it turned this train because the tracks were only within a few feet of the Depository.
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