The Artist and the Forger: Han van Meegeren and Mark Hofmann

Author(s): Edward L. Kimball

Source: *BYU Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (1987), pp. 5–16.
Published by: BYU Studies

Abstract: In 1947 the artist Han van Meegeren stood in the criminal court in Amsterdam and admitted he was guilty of forgery in what may be the greatest known art fraud. Forty years later, in 1987, Mark Hofmann confessed his guilt of forgery, fraud, and murder growing out of what may be the greatest known historical document fraud. The two cases show some striking similarities. These two men, the artist and the forger, turned their considerable talents to crime because of vanity, anger, and greed. They might have gone undetected, but the love of money held them captive. They risked again and again exposure and imprisonment, unable to quit while ahead. Their forgeries went undetected for years but ultimately came to light when police began investigating the men for much different crimes. As bizarre as the story of Mark Hofmann may seem, he was merely acting out a new production of an old play.

The Artist and the Forger: Han van Meegeren and Mark Hofmann

The Artist and the Forger: Han van Meegeren and Mark Hofmann

Edward L. Kimball

In 1947 the artist Han van Meegeren stood in the criminal court in Amsterdam and admitted he was guilty of forgery in what may be the greatest known art fraud.[1] Forty years later, in 1987, Mark Hofmann confessed his guilt of forgery, fraud, and murder growing out of what may be the greatest known historical document fraud.[2] The two cases show some striking similarities.

Han van Meegeren, a Dutch artist of fair talent, felt he had been betrayed by those whose fairness and wisdom he had a right to expect—the art critics. At first the critics had written approving notices, but in 1923, when Han was thirty-four, they began to belittle his work. Han resented these men, who had such great power over artistic reputation, and considered them incompetent and corrupt, quick to praise the work of the established artists, who already had a reputation, and careless in rejecting the work of artists not yet certified by convention as worthy of admiration. It was the name that sold, not the artistry. At about this time, van Meegeren began to fake paintings of other artists, first Frans Hals, later Terborch, de Hoogh, and Baburen.[3] By these frauds he earned money, fed his ego, and thumbed his nose at the critics, who had pronounced their negative judgment on his skill with such assurance. Ultimately van Meegeren's hatred of art critics became an obsession. About 1932 he conceived the idea of painting a "Vermeer" as good as the great master's own paintings, so good that it would be accepted as genuine.[4] The critics would then be saying that van Meegeren painted as well as Vermeer, and if the truth ever came out they would be unmasked as frauds, incompetent as judges of art.

Mark Hofmann as a young man of fourteen became disillusioned with the Mormon religion in which he had been reared.[5] He concluded that the world responded to scientific, not spiritual explanation and that his parents and Church leaders were deluded. In his view, there was no God,[6] and Joseph Smith's story of visions and golden plates was false.[7] Hofmann lived a double life, outwardly professing what he disbelieved.[8] Some of those close to him perceived that he was not the believer others assumed him to be, but no one considered him capable of any of the crimes he committed—not forgery, not theft, much less cold-blooded murder.[9]

Hofmann began his career early. He claims that in his teens he used an

electroplating process on a coin to forge an unusual mint mark that experts accepted as genuine[10] and that he counterfeited notary seals by the same process[11] But within a few years he had graduated to document forgery. He studied American and Mormon history sufficiently to perpetrate numerous and persuasive frauds. He did it for money, as an expression of ego, and with the motive of "rewriting" Mormon history by casting doubt on its claims to miraculous origin in the visitation of heavenly messengers: "I don't believe in the religion as far as that Joseph Smith had the First Vision or received the plates from the angel Moroni. . . . I wrote the documents according to how I felt the actual events took place. In other words, I believe that Joseph Smith was involved with folk magic."[12] He sought to show that the Prophet was a fraud.

In 1932 van Meegeren began a four year period of secret experimentation, seeking to develop a foolproof method for making a recent painting pass the tests for age. With pumice he rubbed the paint off a canvas painted by a contemporary of Vermeer and reused the centuries-old canvas. He painted only with materials available to Vermeer. He hand-ground natural pigments, as in Vermeer's time, and used real lapis lazuli to produce the famous Vermeer blue. So far it was relatively easy. The main difficulty resided in the fact that it took half a century or more for the oil paints used in Vermeer's time to harden so completely that they were not affected by alcohol or other solvents. And if one used sufficient heat to evaporate the oils quickly, it either blistered or discolored the paint. But after studying texts on oils and after much experimenting, van Meegeren finally hit upon oil of lilac mixed with the chemical hardeners phenol and formaldehyde as the medium for his pigments. Baking the painting at high heat, in an oven he constructed himself, he produced within hours the hard finish that he believed would protect him against discovery. He then carefully rolled the canvas until the paint had a proper degree of cracking and superficially damaged the painting in other ways that suggested age and neglect.

Hofmann studied and developed methods for simulating old documents that withstood standard examination for forgery. He used old paper, cutting the end sheets from antique books in libraries.[13] He formulated inks of the sorts used in previous centuries.[14] He even added carbon black obtained from burning seventeenth-century paper to foil carbon-14 dating tests[15] and shifted from quill pens to steel nibs in appropriate circumstances.[16] He learned how to age the forged documents with chemicals,[17] heat,[18] and exposure to ozone.[19] He claimed even to have used red fungus,[20] bread mold,[21] and insects[22] to do damage that suggested age and neglect.

Van Meegeren chose Vermeer as the subject of his forgeries because of the painter's acknowledged greatness, because he had once made a special study of Vermeer's work, and because uncertainties about the life of this

seventeenth-century painter—little appreciated in his lifetime—left room for invention. There existed only one known early picture, and it portrayed a religious scene. There were nearly forty paintings from Vermeer's later life, and they used secular subjects. That left an unknown middle period. Van Meegeren decided to create a transitional picture that would fit in the gap, so he chose a biblical theme, Christ at Emmaus, consistent with Vermeer's earliest known painting. Ironically, van Meegeren, who had rejected God and religion after his brother's death, forged almost exclusively religious paintings. His biographer says that in his self-pity over a troubled marriage, inadequate income, and unappreciated talent, he perversely identified with Christ's suffering.

Despite Hofmann's atheism, he was deeply involved with religion. That so many of the documents he forged related to Joseph Smith, the Prophet, seems to involve more than just money-making opportunity. To some extent he was consciously trying to reshape Mormon history in the image of his disbelief[23] and to embarrass the Church.[24] Hofmann fabricated documents known to have once existed, such as the Anthon transcript,[25] Mormon currency,[26] and a letter to General Dunham.[27] He also created documents which by their purported authorship and subject could well have existed, such as the Joseph Smith III blessing.[28] He filled gaps in early Mormon history with items of his own invention, often containing controversial information to enhance value.

Van Meegeren worked in secrecy, perhaps not letting even his wife into his studio while he worked.[29] He earned a fair living as a portrait painter and concealed his Vermeer experiment from others. After four years perfecting the technique, he spent six months using his utmost care and skill to paint his greatest forgery, *Christ at Emmaus.* He did not copy the early Vermeer, but he simulated its style and signed Vermeer's name. Then van Meegeren arranged to discover the lost masterpiece. Not wanting his own name associated with the newly discovered painting because of his previous history of combat with the critics, van Meegeren arranged for it to be authenticated and sold through an innocent intermediary, to whom he gave a false story about having obtained it through a proud family, fallen on hard times. When an aging but famous art expert certified the picture as a genuine Vermeer, a major Dutch museum bought it for $174,000 (in 1937 dollars).

Aside from the artist's signature and the artificial aging, van Meegeren met stylistic tests and used a subtle "hook" for the experts. The composition of *Christ at Emmaus* borrowed much from a Caravaggio painting on the same subject. The "experts" had already suggested that Vermeer might have been influenced by Caravaggio early in his career. The picture's composition confirmed their speculations.

So far as is known, Hofmann worked without confederates, apparently trusting not even his wife, Dori.[30] He concealed his forgeries under the cover of substantial legitimate document dealing. And his forgeries were not copies, but creative variations. For example, the Anthon transcript, his first major "discovery," had characters that ran up and down, rather than horizontally as in the extant crude *copy,* and it included additional material consistent with Charles Anthon's description, as well as a forged Joseph Smith holograph. Also Hofmann created a letter from Joseph Smith to General Dunham appealing for rescue that confirmed some historians' suppositions.[31]

Hofmann involved others in the finding[32] and sale of documents,[33] keeping his role either hidden or subordinate.[34] For example, he took the Anthon transcript, still sealed, to an archivist at Utah State University for help in opening it.[35] Sometimes he had ready stories to explain where the documents came from.[36] On other occasions he asserted that the secretive nature of document dealing prevented his making full disclosure of provenance.[37] He even discussed with customers the risks of forgeries and how to detect them.[38]

Though van Meegeren later said that he intended to reveal the forgery once the critics had committed themselves, we may be skeptical of that. But even if that had once been in his thoughts, the money to be made by forgery quickly seduced him. He had mastered the criminal skill, and the money tree stood ready for harvesting. The critics had proven themselves gullible, and the acceptance of one "lost masterpiece" would make acceptance of another easier. In 1939 van Meegeren counterfeited two paintings of de Hooch and sold them for $204,000. The experts accepted them without difficulty. Then during the Second World War, van Meegeren painted five more "Vermeers." Fraud proved so easy for him that some of the later pictures were of poor quality, but they too were snapped up. The Nazi occupation favored the forger because the Dutch felt that even if the painting was a poor example of a master's skill it was still part of their artistic heritage, so they raised money to keep the canvas in the Netherlands.[39] Van Meegeren rationalized, saying that if the critics and owners believed a painting genuine, then it had as much value as if painted by the person whose name he had signed to it. No one had suffered.[40]

While Hofmann says he was motivated primarily by money,[41] he managed to mix satisfaction at fomenting religious controversy with profit making,[42] happily achieving both objectives at once. Over a period of six years, he turned out a great number of forged documents accepted as genuine, except by a few doubters.[43] He rationalized, saying that if the experts authenticated a document it was "genuine by definition."[44] He claimed, "I was not cheating that person that I was selling it to, because the document

would never be detected as being a fraud"[45] and would continue to be worth what buyers had paid for it. Who had suffered?

How had van Meegeren fooled the experts? At the beginning he coupled skillful simulation of Vermeer's style with methods of aging that carefully took into account the tests then in use to detect forgeries. And his dealings in genuine art works provided cover and some plausibility that he might discover a lost Vermeer or be chosen as intermediary by an anonymous seller. The disruption caused by the Nazi occupation of his country aided his later, less careful forgeries. Secrecy in business dealings became the norm, and there was an eagerness to put cash into goods that might retain value in a postwar inflation. Van Meegeren shrewdly played to the experts' predilections, giving them what they expected.[46] With so many marks in favor of genuineness, the experts perceived lack of provenance only as an annoyance, not as proof of fraud.

The Hofmann case involves similar explanations of his fooling the experts. He anticipated the usual paper, ink, and handwriting tests for forgery. Indeed, he was disappointed at the shallowness of the testing[47] because it did not warrant all the trouble he had gone to. Though Hofmann was skillful with his hands, others were not aware of that and thought forgery beyond his capacity.[48] He dealt also in legitimate documents, an occupation that provided protective coloration. And the acceptance of one document made acceptance of others easier.[49]

Particularly since van Meegeren had decided to fill in an empty period in Vermeer's career, once the first painting "proved" to be genuine the subsequent finds, supposedly from that same little-understood period, were judged more by comparison with the first forgery than with the long-accepted masterworks. One can paint convincing pictures in a style one has invented. And the appearance of the first painting suggested there might be other undiscovered great paintings. Indeed, after van Meegeren sold his own study of the head of Christ for a Last Supper, the obvious match between it and the *Last Supper* which he later produced helped authenticate the larger painting. At van Meegeren's trial, one of the experts said candidly, "I was fooled. When I saw the *Head of Christ,* it made me think so strongly of the *Emmaus* that I was deceived." In answer to the question, "Did you not think it strange that after this one, more Vermeers were discovered?" he said, "No. The historians agree that there should be more Vermeers, and that the *Emmaus* could not be the only one of its kind in existence." Asked how he could have accepted the *Blessing of Jacob,* which was characterized as "the strange one," he explained, "Yes, it's difficult to explain. It is unbelievable that it should have fooled me. But we slid downwards—from the *Emmaus* to the *Foot-Washing,* and from the *Foot-Washing* to the *Blessing of Jacob;* a psychologist could explain this better than I can."[50]

Hofmann filled gaps in history with plausible documents. They departed from the orthodox version enough to make them intriguing, but not so far that they could be rejected out of hand. He claimed to find what others had missed, succeeding by dint of dogged pursuit and by a willingness to spend large sums of money following up on leads.[51] Each "find" proved the efficacy of his methods more than it raised suspicions.[52]

Van Meegeren told detailed stories, a fabric of lies but persuasive. According to his biographer, he seems to have lied finally "as much from habit and a strange humor as from any planned or constructive reason. He became totally irresponsible, totally uncaring for the world and its opinions, a man who believed only in himself and who cared only for his own tattered destiny. Deception absorbed him; after all, it was his trade."[53] Detection of his best forgeries would have required either the use of new scientific techniques or that provenance be demanded, but we are surprised that some of the poorer forgeries should have slipped by. The sheer number of "new finds" makes the mind boggle at the credulity of the buyers, since the total number of previously known Vermeers was only about forty. However, in the disrupted atmosphere of wartime no one showed signs of suspecting. With vast sums being paid, one might have expected there to be careful investigation of provenance, yet there was not. Van Meegeren met demands for information about origins with lies or with refusal, on grounds of protecting the privacy of the sellers.

Hofmann lied brazenly, persuasively. "I can look someone in the eye and lie," he said.[54] Incredibly cool, he explains he was able to lie without hesitation because he had studied biofeedback mechanisms and had practiced self-hypnotism.[55] He provided a ready, convincing explanation for lack of provenance of his documents, citing customs of the business or the seller's desire for anonymity. But sometimes he simply forged a fraudulent pedigree for the principal document.[56]

Though van Meegeren received a fortune for the paintings, riches intoxicated him and he could not stop. He had to tell more lies to cover for past lies. At the time his fraud collapsed, another partially finished Vermeer stood on his easel. He thought at one point of leaving a confession to be found after his death, but he never got around to it.

Hofmann received large sums of money for his forgeries, but he got caught in a spiral and could not bring himself to stop. He even sold some documents before he had created them.[57] His frauds grew bigger and bigger, finally including nonexistent Brigham Young and William McLellin collections and "The Oath of a Free Man." Debts outpaced income, and all the lies finally began to unravel.[58] He says he attempted suicide,[59] but many are skeptical of this claim, saying it would be out of character.

In May 1945 Allied investigators found the "Vermeer" painting of Christ with the adulteress in the collection of Hermann Goering, who had bought it for $495,000. The investigators traced the painting back through two owners to van Meegeren. Suspecting him of selling a national treasure to the Nazi leader, the Dutch authorities arrested him for treason. He denied knowing Goering had bought the painting, but ultimately he had to declare that in any event it could not be called collaboration with the enemy to have sold a forgery to Goering. The investigators laughed at this defense. But van Meegeren finally persuaded them. When they knew what to look for, investigators using X-rays found underlying paintings on some canvases; chemists now found minute traces of the phenol that van Meegeren used in hardening the paint. By hindsight the coincidence of so many previously unknown Vermeer paintings coming to light in such a short period seemed incredible. Van Meegeren's confession led to a sensation, with the artistic experts scrambling to explain how, despite their best efforts, they had been fooled. Reputations crashed. And as conclusive proof of his story, during two months in the fall of 1945 van Meegeren painted still another "Vermeer" while incredulous witnesses watched.

In 1985 Mark Hofmann murdered Steven Christensen in hope of concealing his numerous frauds.[60] Then he murdered Kathleen Sheets simply to put the police on the wrong track.[61] And he may have planned to murder some third person, though he claims that when the third bomb exploded he was engaged in a failed suicide attempt.[62] The search for motive to the murders led investigators back to the documents and suspicion of fraud. But forgery came into the picture belatedly, because the documents had already passed careful review. Though the police felt sure of their suspect very early, the case against Hofmann suffered serious weaknesses. He had successfully passed a careful polygraph test,[63] the examiner saying, "I was totally convinced he was innocent."[64] People who thought they knew him well protested that this clean-cut young man with no criminal record simply lacked the capacity for murder. Furthermore, he, too, had been the victim of a bomb. Though the documents had all seemed genuine, ultimately all the significant Mormon documents Hofmann had "discovered" failed new, more sophisticated tests, which showed in the ink surface of the Hofmann documents microscopic cracks that were absent on unquestionably old documents.[65] The documents also showed some unidirectional spreading of ink from having been hung up to dry after chemical aging.[66] With this new evidence, former authenticators retracted their opinions. Investigation discredited supposed provenance. And finally, as part of a plea bargain, Hofmann confessed in some detail, including demonstrating for witnesses his ability to imitate the handwriting of historic Mormon figures.[67] The experts who had accepted the documents as authentic, and Hofmann as

telling the truth, scrambled to explain why Hofmann's forgeries were too subtle to be detected by the techniques that had previously been found adequate.[68]

The trial of van Meegeren finally took place in 1947. No one doubted the conclusion, for van Meegeren freely admitted his crime. But even the trial provided him satisfaction. He reveled in the publicity, especially when news reporters labeled him "a genius." Despite his confession, a few diehards continued to insist that his *Christ at Emmaus* and his *Last Supper* were too good to be forgeries. He had surely made the experts out to be fools. Han van Meegeren received a short prison sentence, but he died of a heart condition before he began to serve his term.

Mark Hofmann pleaded guilty to two second degree murders and two forgeries in a plea bargain that avoided first degree murder convictions and the death penalty. He also promised as part of the bargain to detail his crimes.[69] He entered the Utah State Prison in 1987, to serve life imprisonment. In the interviews he revealed part, but not all of his criminal scheme.[70] When the transcript was made public, a number of people close to the case reacted to his statements on motivation and facts (other than the mechanics of forgery, in which he took professional pride) with strong skepticism. "With all his admitted lies," they asked, "why should we believe anything Hofmann says."[71] His statements to the Utah Parole Board, which voted never to grant parole,[72] exposed his view that taking life was of no great moment. As he believed there is nothing beyond this life, he was left to glory in his brief moment in the sun.

These two men, the artist and the forger, turned their considerable talents to crime because of vanity, anger, and greed. They might have gone undetected, but the love of money held them captive. They risked again and again exposure and imprisonment, unable to quit while ahead. Their forgeries went undetected for years but ultimately came to light when police began investigating the men for much different crimes. As bizarre as the story of Mark Hofmann may seem, he was merely acting out a new production of an old play.

Edward L. Kimball is a professor of law at Brigham Young University and a member of the *BYU Studies* editorial board.

1. Hope B. Werness calls him "certainly the most audacious and successful forger of modern times" (Hope B. Werness, "*Han van Meegeren* fecit," in Denis Dutton, ed., *The Forger's Art* [Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983], 1–57). For information about van Meegeren's career, I have relied primarily on John Godley, *The Master Art Forger: The Story of Han van Meegeren* (New York: Wilfred Funk, 1951), the first major biographical treatment, and the Werness article, which corrects some of Godley's earlier errors.

2. The first book-length treatment is Linda Sillitoe and Allen Roberts, *Salamander: The Story of the Mormon Forgery Murders* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1988). I express thanks to Linda Sillitoe for reviewing a draft of this article. Other major sources are Mitchell Pacella, "The Case of the Latter-day Bomber," *American Lawyer* 79 (June 1987): 79–87, and *Mark Hofmann Interviews: Interviews Conducted at Utah State Prison between February 11 and May 27, 1987,* 2 vols. (Salt Lake City: Office of Salt Lake County Attorney, 1987).

3. Though van Meegeren never admitted these early forgeries, it is "all but certain" that he is the artist responsible (see Werness, "Meegeren," 17–19).

4. His principal biographer, relying heavily on family sources, dates his first forgery from this time, but there is some evidence that he forged paintings earlier, including possibly even a Vermeer in 1932 that van Meegeren never admitted forging (see Werness, "Meegeren," 17–20).

5. Hofmann *Interviews* 1:112.

6. Hofmann told the parole board that before he committed two murders he had a moment of doubt: "What if there really is a God? What happens if I'm wrong?" (see Jan Thompson, "Calm Hofmann Accepts Life-in-Prison Decision," *Deseret News,* 30 January 1988).

7. *Hofmann Interviews* 2:425.

8. Ibid. 1:130.

9. Ibid. 2:421.

10. Ibid. 2:409.

11. Ibid. 1:177.

12. Ibid. 2:425–27.

13. Ibid. 1:54.

14. Ibid. 1:21–22.

15. Ibid. 1:236.

16. Ibid. 1:20–21, 165, 2:414.

17. Ibid. 1:24–25.

18. Ibid. 1:29–32.

19. Ibid. 2:363–67.

20. Ibid. 1:283.

21. Ibid. 2:462.

22. Ibid. 2:305.

23. Ibid. 1:113.

24. Ibid. 1:148, 2:451–56, 474–84; compare 2:358–59, 426–27. Actually only a minority of Hofmann's forgeries were Mormon documents. In his confession he asserted that he had tipped in (glued in) "dozens or possibly hundreds" of false pages in books (ibid. 1:229), created Jim Bridger notes (ibid. 1:288–94), and sold a Daniel Boone letter and five hundred thousand dollars' worth of forgeries to Eastern dealers (ibid. 1:SS–14). His most significant known forgery was "The Oath of a Free Man," a supposed copy of the first printed document in the American colonies (ibid. 1:230–88, 2:302–9), which he proposed to sell to the Library of Congress for one-and-a-half million dollars.

25. Ibid. 1:3–132.

26. Ibid. 1:182–222.

27. Ibid. 2:387–402.

28. Ibid. 1:133–72, 2:296–302.

29. While Godley says the wife was unaware, Werness (in "Meegeren," 27) indicates that she may have known what van Meegeren was doing.

30. Hofmann said, however, that she probably suspected many of his finds were fake (*Hofmann Interviews* 1:SS–14) and also that "she did not know the extent of my fraudulent dealings" (ibid. 2:421).

31. Ibid. 2:389.

32. Ibid. 1:94–97.

33. Ibid. 2:46–73.

34. "Stalking the Wild Document: An Interview with Lyn Jacobs," *Sunstone* 10 (August 1985): 15–16.

35. *Hofmann Interviews* 1:96–97.

36. Ibid. 1:165–73, 232–34.

37. Ibid. 2:418–20; compare "Stalking the Wild Document," 16.

38. "The Victims: A Legacy of Bitter Hindsight," *Deseret News,* 31 July 1987.

39. Werness, "Meegeren," 50.

40. For a discussion of the aesthetics of forged art, see Alfred Lessing, "What Is Wrong with a Forgery?" in Denis Dutton, ed., *The Forger's Art* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), 58–76.

41. *Hofmann Interviews* 1:96.

42. Ibid. 1:113, 133.

43. In the spring of 1985, Rhett James questioned the authenticity of the Martin Harris "salamander" letter, basing his argument on the study of syntax using fourteen grammatical points in a 1 October 1984 unpublished paper titled, "Christian Cultural Religious Superstition: The 1825, 1830 Letters and Related Documents with Suggestions for Methodological Examination and Presentation," made public in April 1985. Compare Dean Jessee, "New Documents and Mormon Beginnings," *Brigham Young University Studies* 24 (Fall 1984): 397–416.

44. *Hofmann Interviews* 2:410, 425.

45. Ibid. 2:407.

46. Werness, "Meegeren," 20, 49–50.

47. *Hofmann Interviews* 1:125, 2:417–18.

48. Ibid. 2:430, Lyn Jacobs, one of Hofmann's associates, speaking before Hofmann's confession, said, "If you're suggesting Mark forged it, it is not possible. Mark Hofmann is not a forger. I don't think Mark even knows how" ("Stalking the Wild Document," 9).

49. *Hofmann Interviews* 2:310, 455.

50. Quoted in Godley, *Master Art Forger,* 213–14.

51. "Stalking the Wild Document," 11–13.

52. For example, Hofmann created fake magical talismans using characters similar to those in the Anthon transcript (*Hofmann Interviews* 2:506–7). They could have been perceived as evidence of his fraud or as evidence that Joseph Smith copied the characters from the talisman.

53. Godley, *Master Art Forger,* 161.

54. *Hofmann Interviews* 1:99.

55. "Cash Losses Will Run at Least $1.5 Million," *Deseret News,* 18 August 1987; "Hypnosis Helped Hofmann Beat Test," [Provo] *Herald,* 24 August 1987.

56. *Hofmann Interviews* 1:100–107, 116–24, 168–73.

57. Ibid. 2:394–95.

58. Ibid. 2:399–407. Though one estimate is that the Mormon document frauds accounted for only a quarter of all Hofmann's frauds, the losses with respect to the Mormon items amounted to more than $1,500,000 (see "Victims," *Deseret News,* 31 July 1987).

59. *Hofmann Interviews* 1:SS–11 to SS–12, 2:424.
60. Ibid. 1:SS–7.
61. Ibid. 1:SS–8.
62. Ibid. 1:SS–12, 2:424.
63. "Hypnosis," *Herald,* 24 August 1987.
64. "Mark Hofmann Is in an Elite Group: He Completely Fooled the Machine," *Deseret News,* 18 August 1987.
65. *Hofmann Interviews* 1:131–32.
66. Ibid. 1:163–64.
67. Ibid. 1:31, 2:415.
68. Pacella, "Latter-day Bomber," 85.
69. Ibid., 87.
70. Allen Roberts, Brent Ashworth, and George Throckmorton are quoted to that effect in "Hofmann: Believe It or Not," and Al Rust is quoted in "Modern-day King Richard III Lived and Operated Inside a Private World of His Own Making," both articles in *Deseret News,* 16 August 1987.
71. Before the murders had been fully discussed, the interviews broke down because of disagreement about who could be present. See the three pages following page 2:537 of the interview transcript. This left unresolved whether Hofmann had fulfilled the plea bargain.
72. The decision does not, however, bind a future board.