

George J. Lacy
Examiner of Questioned Documents
Hall Building
Houston, Texas

January 29, 1950

R E P O R T A N D O P I N I O N

Re: Questioned Negative

On January 28, 1950 at the request of Reverand Gordon Lindsay, who was representing Reverand William Branham of Jeffersonville, Indiana, I received from the Douglas Studios of 1610 Rusk Avenue in this city, a 4x5 inch exposed and developed photographic film. This film was purported to have been made by the Douglas Studios of Reverand William Branham at the Sam Houston Coliseum in this city, during his visit here the latter part of January, 1950.

R E Q U E S T

Reverand Lindsay requested that I make a scientific examination of the aforesaid negative. He requested that I determine, if possible, whether or not in my opinion the negative had been re-touched or "doctored" in any way, subsequent to the developing of the film, that would cause a streak of light to appear in the position of a halo above the head of Reverand Branham.

E X A M I N A T I O N

A macroscopic and microscopic examination and study was made of the entire surface of both sides of the film, which was Eastman Kodak Safety Film. Both sides of the film were examined under filtered ultra-violet light and infra-red photographs were made of the film.

The microscopic examination failed to reveal retouching of the film at any place whatsoever by any of the processes used in commercial retouching. Also, the microscopic examination failed to reveal any disturbance of the emulsion in or around the light streak in question.

The ultra-violet light examination failed to reveal any foreign matter, or the result of any chemical reaction on either side of the negative, which might have caused the light streak, subsequent to the processing of the negative.

The infra-red photograph also failed to disclose anything that would indicate that any retouching had been done to the film.

The examination also failed to reveal anything that would indicate that the negative in question was a composite negative or a double exposed negative.

There was nothing found which would indicate that the light streak in question had been made during the process of development. Neither was there anything found which would indicate that it was not developed in a regular and recognized procedure. There was nothing found in the comparative densities of the highlights that was not in harmony.

O P I N I O N

Based upon the above described examination and study I am of the definite opinion that the negative submitted for examination, was not retouched nor was it a composite or double exposed negative.

Further, I am of the definite opinion that the light streak appearing above the head in a halo position was caused by light striking the negative.

Respectfully submitted,

