



# Provide Evidence Based Proof that Vincent Van Gogh Committed Suicide: an Open Challenge and Direct Cross-Examination for the Forensic Truth!

**Arenberg IK<sup>1</sup> and Krier L<sup>2\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Director, Killing Vincent Project, USA

<sup>2</sup>Director of Research, Killing Vincent Project, USA

**\*Corresponding author:** Leon Krier, Director of Research, Killing Vincent Project, USA, Email: Leon@KillingVincent.com

**Review Article**

**Volume 8 Issue 2**

**Received Date:** April 28, 2023

**Published Date:** May 26, 2023

**DOI:** 10.23880/ijfsc-16000306

## Abstract

This is an Open Challenge to Martin Bailey, an investigative journalist and Van Gogh scholar, as well as the many art historians, art critics, museum curators, who have denied the “murder” of Vincent van Gogh as only a “myth,” and a “blasphemy.” World renowned forensic pathologists confirmed that a self-inflicted gunshot wound, without an exit wound, was dubious, if not technically impossible, for any bullet to enter the abdomen, as described by a person of interest, and to follow the unbelievable “magic bullet” ballistic course trajectory to end up where it was believed to end up, despite no evidence that a bullet was removed, and no autopsy performed [1]. Consequently, suicide is untenable. Therefore, these “deniers” of Vincent’s murder must now provide substantive, contemporaneous, evidence-based proof that Vincent van Gogh committed suicide, subject to direct (published) cross-examination, and the use of common sense “Rules of Evidence.”

**Keywords:** Ten Reasons; Murder-Denier(s); Suicide; Murder; Evidence; Dr. Gachet; Vincent

**Abbreviation:** KVP: Killing Vincent Project.

## Introduction

Vincent van Gogh attracts more attention than any other artist, not only because of his art, but also, because of his medical and mental health issues, his 19th century treatment, his unending pursuit of romantic love, and his endless challenge to create emotionally rewarding change in his relationships with family, friends, and associates. However, nothing attracts more attention about his life than his death. Did he commit suicide, as traditionally believed, or was he murdered? The latter viewpoint has gained significant credibility and primacy of viewpoint in recent years. The forensic and analytical approach presented in this

article is the primary, if not, the only way that this question can be resolved. It will eliminate tedious and redundant “he said, she said” from questionable and transparently unreliable sources and certainly not from persons of interest. Believability and trust are critical, but since there were no eyewitnesses to Vincent’s wounding, who might have spoken up and reported the truth but couldn’t, we must rely on contemporary forensic analysis that is peer reviewed and published.

## Goals

The KVP Team responds directly to Martin Bailey and to the major problems and controversial flaws inherent in his two publications:

1. "Ten reasons why the murder story is a myth. All the evidence suggests it was the artist who fired the fatal shot." Martin Bailey, *The Art Newspaper*, 6 September 2019
2. *Van Gogh Finale: Auvers & the Artist's Rise to Fame*, Martin Bailey, The Quarto Group, 2021

Furthermore, the KVP Team invites an evidence-based discussion regarding the theories of 'suicide' vs 'murder' with Martin Bailey and other Van Gogh professionals, including the court of public opinion, given the millions of Van Gogh enthusiasts who turned out for the internationally celebrated "Immersive Van Gogh" and mounting evidence of further sustained "Vincent-mania"!

### KVP Team Response

**#1. Vincent's Doctor Believed it was Suicide:** Dr. Gachet and his son, Paul, Jr. are the key persons of interest and the likely culprits in the honor killing of Vincent van Gogh. The greatest lie, by any murder suspect, is to deflect and shift attention away from the obvious murder evidence, and their likely involvement, by saying: "It was not a murder, it was only a suicide.... How sad! But, nonetheless... just a suicide!"

The Killing Vincent Project has clearly established through extensive forensic analysis [1] and a negative suicide profile assessment [2] that Vincent did not commit suicide but was murdered.

Dr. Gachet's belated statement that Vincent committed suicide is, therefore, highly suspect and would collapse under basic cross-examination. There is NO evidence to support this self-serving claim!

The relationship between Dr. Gachet and Vincent is a dramatic two-sided coin: initially positive and supportive but then highly dissonant and conflicted.

When Vincent first came to Auvers-sur Oise, Dr Gachet and Vincent met frequently at Dr. Gachet's home. These visits were friendly with Vincent doing portraits of Dr. Gachet and his daughter, Marguerite, at the piano. During a visit to Paris, Dr. Gachet visited Theo and announced Vincent was "cured" and doing well under his care.

However, the relationship deteriorated after it became known that Vincent had painted Dr. Gachet's daughter, Marguerite Clementine Gachet, not only at the piano, but several other times in the Gachet garden without his permission!

This deterioration of the relationship between Dr. Gachet and Vincent was reinforced by Adeline Ravoux when

she adamantly stated years later that Dr. Gachet spent very little time with Vincent while he lay wounded in his bed at the Ravoux Inn and that it was her father, not Dr. Gachet, who spent the night of July 27, 1890 with Vincent, disputing Dr. Gachet's self-serving claims. Adeline also stated that there were unexpected cold, silent stares between the wounded Vincent and "his friend and his doctor," Dr. Gachet.

Notably, Dr. Gachet made no effort to transfer Vincent to Paris, only an hour away, for appropriate medical care (Dr. Gachet was a homeopathic physician, not a surgeon). He easily dismissed Vincent's medical needs with a simple: "nothing can be done," even though Vincent lived for 30 hours after his wounding. He could have been transported to a hospital in Paris... and art history would likely have been forever different! Dr. Gachet apparently had nefarious reasons to take such a casual and dismissive approach to Vincent's injury to make sure another doctor did not see the wound, treat him successfully, or hear who shot him!

There is no evidence to support this statement: "Vincent's doctor believed it was suicide."

**#2. Theo believed it was Suicide:** Theo was in Paris on the day Vincent was wounded. Theo's only source of information of what happened to Vincent was from Dr. Gachet who had sent a handwritten note informing Theo that Vincent had "wounded himself." This message was personally delivered the next morning to Theo by the Dutch artist, Anton Hirschig, thereby losing precious time for any attempt to save Vincent's life and ensuring his imminent death. Then, Dr. Gachet met Theo at the train station, presenting to him the entirely false narrative of Vincent's suicide. Theo simply accepted Dr. Gachet's false story because he had no other.

Theo trusted Dr. Gachet, who he believed was a respected and trustworthy community doctor and Vincent's own personal doctor (to whom Theo paid a stipend). Obviously, it is quite understandable, given the overwhelming impact of these communications, that Theo did not question the suicide narrative or ascertain alternative facts.

Granted, prior to Vincent's residence in Auvers-sur-Oise, the issue of suicide was addressed in letters between Theo and Vincent. However, these prior communications and reflections must be put in proper perspective, given the excellent health Vincent exhibited upon his visit to Paris after his release from the St. Remy Asylum, as particularly noted by Theo's wife, Johanna (Jo). Both Theo and Jo wrote to family members describing how impressed they were with Vincent's physical and mental health... the best they may have ever witnessed. There is no evidence that this well-being of Vincent did not continue while in Auvers-sur-Oise, as evaluated by the KVP Team's suicide profile assessment [2].

We concluded that Vincent had no suicidal manifestations, plans, or ideation and therefore was not a likely candidate for suicide during his last 70 days of life in Auvers-sur-Oise.

Theo's misguided belief may simply be an effort to explain, under stress, the totally unexpected and bewildering event, Vincent's wounding and eventual death, given that there were no such recent warning signs. Nothing appeared unusual when Theo, Jo, and their son, Vincent Willem, visited Dr. Gachet and Vincent in Auvers-sur-Oise, roughly a month before his death. Likewise, no red flags were raised by anyone throughout Vincent's time in this artistically inspiring community.

Cross examination of Theo would expose the false assumptions underlying his purposely misinformed belief in suicide as the cause of Vincent's death. This belief was based upon purposeful misleading and secondhand misinformation which is not admissible in court! There is NO evidence to support this statement: "Theo believed it was suicide." A "belief" is not a fact!

**#3. Friends believed it was Suicide:** These friends of Vincent obtained their understanding of what happened to him solely from the false suicide narrative presented and perpetuated first by Dr. Gachet, and then subsequently, from the artist, Emile Bernard, to the Parisian artist community.

Bernard was a well-known storyteller, fabricator, and factual embellisher... with distortions and frequent exaggerations. Bernard was totally dependent upon Dr. Gachet for the account he wrote to Albert Aurier. Dr. Gachet met Bernard at the train station and walked him to the inn to meet the innkeeper and see Vincent in final repose. It is cited by Bernard that Vincent went into the countryside, placed his easel against a haystack, went behind the chateau, and fired a revolver-shot at himself, aiming for his heart, but missed. This is pure fabrication by Bernard; his narrative could only have come from the primary person of interest, Dr. Gachet. Bernard was only present for the funeral! He was specifically treated only to the narrative he was expected to promulgate to the artist community in Paris. No revolver was ever found as well as no easel when the police searched. There is absolutely no evidence that Vincent went into the countryside, behind the chateau, and placed his easel against a haystack to shoot himself.

There is no known definite crime scene! It is all simply confabulation and unfounded suppositions based conveniently upon Vincent's previous painting locations. There is not even any evidence that Vincent ever went out to paint on the day of his wounding. There is also no evidence of any highly sought after "last painting" by his hand on the day he was shot. In fact, there is written interview evidence by a

van Gogh scholar, Marc-Edo Tralbaut, that Vincent met with Dr. Gachet, his son, Paul Jr., and his daughter, Marguerite, on July 27th before going that afternoon to the location (the barn on the rue Boucher or wherever that was) where he was mortally wounded and not by his own hand [3].

What evidence exists to support the false narrative of suicide? Where is the police report, if it was ever written down? Where are the contemporaneous doctors' notes? This would be useful and acceptable evidence! Who gave the local newspaper the "story" of suicide? It could only have come from Dr. Gachet directly or indirectly! He was Vincent's doctor of record, and the person others would look to for clarification. The suicide narrative was even "confirmed" by the hotel owner, who also got his information from Dr. Gachet, not from Vincent. This is NOT evidence! This is a contrived and misrepresented false narrative to misdirect. There was only one circulating and available story to hear or read by anyone at the time of the funeral — all only from Dr. Gachet. Only those directly involved in his murder, or those observers, would know the truth.

Basic cross examination would sift through and sort out fact from fiction in the accounts given by Vincent's friends, especially Bernard's mythic and contrived tale.

**#4. Paul Gauguin believed it was Suicide:** Paul Gauguin was not in Auvers-sur-Oise the day of Vincent's wounding, nor did he attend the funeral; he only heard about Vincent's death from Bernard. Gauguin was a notorious womanizer and prevaricator as well as a provocateur to cover up his own involvement in Vincent van Gogh's notorious ear mutilation... which he was more than complicit with! His goal, as any criminal would, was to deflect the attention, all negative, back on Vincent! Many of Gauguin's intriguing stories evolved later from his years in the South Pacific and were blatantly self-serving, but definitely not contemporaneous or factual!

If there ever was an untrustworthy witness whose testimony should be dismissed outright, it was Paul Gauguin. All one needs to do is read the research done by Kaufman and Wildegans [4] and Van de Leek [5] to gain insight into Gauguin's personality. Gauguin was notorious for his self-serving relationship with Vincent... as well as other artists like Emile Bernard, Charles Laval, and Emile Schuffenecker. Gauguin had his own agenda, namely, being a great artist; everything else, stockbroker, family, and friends were to serve that end.

It is a total mistake to even call upon Paul Gauguin to give any testimony. Under cross examination, the self-serving balloons would be constantly popping. Certainly not evidence!

**#5. Police believed it was Suicide:** Rigamont, the investigating Gendarme, only got his background information for his report from Dr. Gachet. The story about Vincent saying “not to blame another” is not based on any contemporary evidence, but only on hearsay coming out years later, from persons of interest! There is no police report in existence, if there ever was one!

What modern day police officer/detective, who has investigative homicide and suicide expertise, would accept a mortally wounded person allegedly taking responsibility for a wound that was inflicted in the abdomen of all places to shoot oneself. (Fact: Approximately 1.6% to 3% of suicide attempts are inflicted in the abdomen, but very few achieve death) [1]. Two homicide detectives reported that they would not accept this case as a suicide without an in-depth criminal investigative analysis [6].

Simply accepting a second party’s statement, as if Vincent spoke it to that person, is not valid in court.

Vincent’s statement, if it was ever uttered, that “it is none of anyone’s business what he does or does not do, that he’s free to do as he wishes,” fails to recognize that this kind of statement can legitimately be accepted, if uttered and documented, as an effort to protect someone else. Who that may be and why is critically important as this Open Challenge goes forward. Vincent certainly had this self-sacrificing protective mentality and frequently expressed it, as exhibited during his missionary period in the Brabant. Giving someone his clothes off his back... literally qualifies. This self-sacrificing spirit and profound identification with peasants and the downtrodden --- field workers, coal miners, weavers — is vividly described by Steven Naifeh in his *Van Gogh and the Artists He Loved* [7]. Thus, sacrificing himself to protect another, like the love of his life, Marguerite Gachet, is consistent with his long-held mindset.

But did Vincent actually say: “not to blame another”? NO! All cover up and spin! No firsthand evidence exists that a judge or modern-day homicide detectives would accept; rather, it is again deflection and misdirection from persons of interest.

Therefore, the issue of the police not challenging Vincent’s explanation and doing no further investigation cannot be justified and used to support the suicide narrative. Accepting Vincent’s long past assertion so easily, at face value, is naïve and gratuitous. It simply serves the predetermined agenda of confirming that Vincent committed suicide, without any supporting evidence!

**#6. The Church believed it was Suicide:** only because there was no police report, autopsy, or concrete evidence,

yet those were the available rumors circulating around town that all started from Dr. Gachet! The Church had no firsthand knowledge. Suicide was not only a crime in 19th century France but also a sin for the Catholic Church. The priest, Henri Tessier, was simply going on what had been told to him. He had no basis for making an independent judgment on how Vincent was fatally wounded.

Why would you even call forth such a person to testify? His testimony can be dismissed *prima facie*, as not evidence based.

**#7. Vincent had tried to Kill himself the year before:** NOT TRUE! He was not even suicidal in his last 70 days of life in Auvers-sur-Oise [2]. No suicidal criteria existed at the time he was shot! All claims of suicide were contrived post-mortem and made to fit the false suicide narrative!

This alleged comment by Vincent to Theo is intriguing in that there is no citation to any such specific attempt, and if so, what is the evidence and date of what letter? When and where did this event take place? Did Vincent discuss a possible suicide in the several days the brothers were together in Paris before leaving for Auvers-sur-Oise? As far as drinking turpentine and eating paint, these self-harming events took place when Vincent’s normal mental status was disturbed by vertigo attacks that occurred while in the St. Remy Asylum and prior. No attacks occurred in Auvers-sur-Oise after he was “cured.”

These attacks had always been diagnosed as epilepsy, but in July 1990, these attacks were definitively diagnosed as inner ear vertigo (Meniere’s Disease) [8]. Furthermore, based upon the above indicated suicide profile assessment, Vincent did not have suicidal ideation or gestures nor attacks of Meniere’s while living in Auvers-sur-Oise. One cannot simply lift comments from the past and attempt to conveniently impose them suggestively and deceitfully onto any future situation.

Evidence based cross-examination would thoroughly weaken this premise and line of thinking, and instead would focus on Vincent’s meaningful and extremely creative life without suicidal ideation or planning during his final 70 days in Auvers-sur-Oise.

**#8. Vincent Faced a difficult time in the Final Months of his Life:** It was emphasized by a noted Vincent van Gogh scholar, David Sweetman, in his article, “Who Killed van Gogh? The Doctor Did It!” where he reported that Vincent van Gogh was in his most relaxed and comfortable state ever in Auvers-sur-Oise, as seen in his pleasant paintings like *Daubigny’s Garden*, with or without a cat [9]. Then, in his book, *Van Gogh: His Life and His Art*, he further emphasized

this life-affirming and positive mental status [10]. These are not the descriptions one would expect from a person bent on suicide!

It is an obvious assumption that something pushed Vincent over the edge to pursue the suicide theory.

This assumption is based upon the tenaciously held belief, by the murder-deniers, that Vincent committed suicide. It is also based upon treating Vincent conceptually as though he was a “child,” unable to function as an “independent adult.” Vincent was beginning to have success. He had sold his first painting, “The Red Vineyard.” Albert Aurier had written a dramatic and celebrative article about Vincent being a leading artist of the day. Vincent’s work was being frequently exhibited, achieving prominence among his peers.

At one such exhibit, Monet affirmed Vincent’s work as “the best of the bunch.” Vincent’s work in Auvers-sur-Oise was as original and productive as ever, producing almost a painting a day. Does the “court of public opinion” really believe that Vincent was a weak, little child, ready to cry, cry all the way home... to his death... and commit suicide? Not exactly the image of the resourceful, goal oriented, and highly motivated artist to paint a canvas a day of what he sees and what moves him!

**#9. Rene Secrétan, the Purported “Accidental” Shooter, Never Confessed and Indeed Claimed he had Left Auvers before the Shooting:** He is a very artful distorter of the truth, but also not likely involved directly in Vincent’s death. His words, a year before his own death, are contradictory and self-serving, associated with a notable and negative truth-quotient. He kept changing his story as he aged, providing shifting accounts. The KVP Team agrees that Secrétan did not wound Vincent. It is important that he did admit that the gun allegedly taken from him by Vincent, and allegedly used by Vincent, was a “.380 peashooter.” Such a pistol would delegitimize the van Gogh Museum’s contention that the 7mm Lefauchaux pinfire black powder pistol, found all rusted, bent, and non-functioning in a field near where Vincent was believed to have been shot, was, in fact, the gun used in Vincent’s wounding! Note: The bent and non-functional 7mm Lefauchaux gun, with that presumed and very questionable provenance, recently came off a Paris auction block for ~\$183,000 USD!

Any cross examination would address contemporary forensic revolver analysis. It would address the different caliber pistol Rene claimed was involved as well as the fact that he claimed he was not even in Auvers-sur-Oise on the day Vincent was shot. A .380 bullet found in Vincent’s remains would support Secrétan’s gun as being implicated, but that would not be definitive proof that this was the gun

used to wound Vincent. Obtaining the “missing Magic Bullet” would certainly answer a few pertinent questions such as... “Was Vincent shot, knifed, or stuck with an icepick?”

Is there any corroborating evidence to support and confirm that Secrétan was or was not in Auvers-sur-Oise on that fateful day?

**#10. The Recent Emergence of the Gun is Further Evidence for Suicide:** This old rusted and bent, non-functioning gun, Lefauchaux-7mm pinfire black powder revolver, could not have been fired and dropped where it was found ~60 years later. It is tied to Vincent’s mortal wounding only by where it was found in a field near where Vincent often painted. This was the most prevalent pistol in northern Europe in the second half of the 19th century. Finding an old non-functioning rusted-bent example of such a common gun is proof of nothing! There is no confirming evidence to support that this gun was in any way connected to the death of Vincent. The Van Gogh Museum touted this mysteriously and conveniently found gun as the weapon implicated in Vincent’s death in an exhibit, without any other supporting evidence! It is most likely an old, decommissioned gun from a Paris Police Station’s evidence-room that was purposely planted to create new buzz about the death of Vincent van Gogh conveniently at the time MGM was shooting the movie, “Lust for Life” (1956). It was successful in creating the anticipated buzz but created no new supporting EVIDENCE for any crime or crime scene.

Dr. Vincent Di Maio joined forces with Dr. Arenberg and Dr. Michael Baden to do a definitive forensic analysis of Vincent’s only available wound description, as well as utilizing the same model Lefauchaux revolver (cited above), 7mm antique black powder pinfire bullets, and FBI ballistic gel, to test fire, simulate, photograph, video, and assess the recreated details of the wounding of Vincent. Their joint article was peer reviewed and accepted into the prestigious American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology [1]. To invalidate the significance of that major forensic study into the cause of Vincent’s death, the deniers of the murder theory would have to do a separate and definitive forensic study, with simulations, that are forensically peer reviewed and published, supporting their suicide theory, and definitively controverting the existing peer reviewed published evidence [1].

Attempting to introduce the found rusted, bent gun as evidence, in support of the suicide theory, may be the most ridiculous argument put forward in the Ten Reasons. Trying to connect a gun found 60 to 70 years after the death of Vincent without a confirmed crime scene, is so far out of the realm of the rules of evidence and far-fetched that it is quite humorous. No bullet casing was found in the gun,

and the ejector rod was bent, making the gun unusable then as “dropped” (not by Vincent) or now. A more rational explanation is that the gun was either thrown there, after being disabled, or more likely, it was planted there for the very reason that it now has celebrity status!

How would such a piece of “evidence” be evaluated in a courtroom today? The resulting ridicule would be resounding!

Following the TEN REASONS failure to convince, Martin Bailey produces another effort to enhance his arguments and understanding of the death of Vincent van Gogh to further substantiate his untenable support for the suicide theory.

His next “failed” effort with additional reasons to support his suicide-narrative follows in his book: VAN GOGH’S FINALE: AUVERS & THE ARTIST’S RISE TO FAME.

Our primary goal, so far, has been to address the notable fallacies, crime scene denials, deficiencies in courtroom rules of evidence, and absence of any substantive evidence of suicide to support Bailey’s TEN REASONS that Vincent committed suicide. In a further attempt to support this theory, Bailey has trimmed down the original Ten Reasons in his subsequent book, Van Gogh’s Finale, and added, what we list as #11 and #12 Reasons, to the original TEN REASONS.

**#11. Other Family Members, Particularly Johanna Van Gogh-Bonger, did not Pursue the Possibility of Finding out who Killed Vincent, if Suicide was not Confirmed:** Bailey’s supposition, namely, that if the family had any suspicions, they would have pursued looking for the responsible person, is untenable. Doing so would have stirred up a hornet’s nest; something Theo, in particular, was in no position to do, given his tenuous employment status and his deteriorating health. Just a few months later, Theo was in a catastrophic health condition resulting in his death in January 1891. However, other family members, particularly Johanna van Gogh-Bonger, did not pursue that possibility as well. Why?

We propose that the Van Gogh family was willing to go along with the suicide narrative because it fit comfortably into their perception of Vincent’s mental challenges, his history of self-injurious behavior, and his lifelong struggles for love and happiness. Why pursue an alternative narrative that would only disrupt Jo’s commitment to promote Vincent’s artwork and the publication of his letters. The book, *The Van Gogh Sisters* [11], is quite revealing about their careers, especially Lies’ poetry publications and her memoir of Vincent. Jo and Lies were once dear friends but tension, alienation, and a complete breakdown occurred, possibly resulting from the nature of Jo’s publication of Vincent’s letters (Theo’s letters and any mention of Lies were omitted) and Lies’

successful memoir (interestingly published just before Jo’s first publication of Vincent’s letters). This is to say that the personal agendas of these two key surviving members of the Van Gogh family were not in sync. What they did have in common, however, was not HOW did Vincent die, but rather, HOW to promote his artistic and literary achievements. All of Vincent’s immediate family had this agenda. These efforts for their personal benefit and to promote a “family friendly” version of the relationship between Theo and Vincent, with no recognition of Marguerite’s actual role in the real Finale, were the sub rosa driving force among these surviving Van Gogh’s and precluded any need to further pursue the specific cause of his death; therefore, an acceptance of his “suicide” was essential.

**#12. Forensics:** In Chapter 17, Bailey does finally address forensic issues. He presents a conflict of interpretations by two forensic specialists, namely, Yves Schuliar and Vincent de Maio. Schuliar argues for suicide, Di Maio for murder. Bailey concludes: “There is little agreement among medical specialists on what the wound tells.” Bailey then summarizes that the forensic evidence is inconclusive, non-determinative, with little agreement among medical specialists, and therefore other reasons (suicide) must be considered.

Rather than considering further forensic analysis that was readily available to him in 2018 [6] and 2020 [1], that he avoids acknowledging, Bailey unfortunately is willing to settle for a simpler explanation to resolve these conflicting forensic interpretations, by avoiding any confrontation in any academic arena.

He attempts to deflect away from the modern forensic evidence pointing to murder by claiming Vincent had suicidal tendencies, his brother, Cor’s death (“suicide”), his sister, Wil’s institutionalization for mental illness, probably schizophrenia. Additionally, Theo’s financial/employment problems, Vincent’s unverified last words on his death bed, accepting that everyone believed it was suicide added together must all add up to... it must be suicide without any evidence to support suicide. Finally, Vincent could not attain ‘inner contentment.’ By relying upon this simplistic personal-like approach, Bailey continues to argue and conflate that Vincent’s death was the result of suicide, not murder.

This argument is without a shred of evidence that would stand up to the most basic cross examination.

However, and this is critically important, it is primarily through forensic analysis that clarity and resolution can be obtained for answering the question of how Vincent van Gogh died. By 21st century analysis of his wound and the critical absence of a black powder burn around the colorful entry wound, it was concluded by gunshot wound forensic

experts that it was not possible for Vincent van Gogh to self-inflict his mortal wound. Therefore, whoever shot Vincent, murdered him, not a suicide! We are awaiting Martin Bailey's forensic team to prove definitively that he was not murdered and prove alternatively that Vincent committed suicide!

Despite persistent and creative efforts, there is NO evidence to support Bailey's false narrative to avoid creating and supporting blasphemy against the legend of Vincent committing suicide. Vincent was murdered!

## Discussion

This presentation is an effort to create an evidence-based dialogue with the "deniers" of the murder of Vincent van Gogh. This forensic analysis focuses on a scientifically developed perspective and a challenge to opinion and gratuitous hearsay.

## Key Questions

- Why do the "deniers" keep repeating the same reasons for suicide, when they are easily undermined in the 'court of public opinion' or dismissed in a judicial setting?
- What would have to change in the presentation of Van Gogh's life and art by the Van Gogh Museum or other famous museums like The Metropolitan Museum of Art (Exhibit: "Van Gogh's Cypresses" 5/22/23 – 8/27/23) or the Chicago Art Institute (Exhibit: "Van Gogh and The Avant-Garde: The Modern Landscape" 5/14/23 – 9/4/23) if murder was accepted as the cause of Van Gogh's death?
- Given how heavily invested the "Van Gogh Business" is in the suicide narrative, for example, "martyr for his art," "mad genius," what would be the repercussions for this "business" if it had to accept and adjust to the forensic conclusion of murder?
- How would Van Gogh enthusiasts change their understanding of Van Gogh as a person and their interpretation of his art if the cause of death was generally accepted to be murder?

## Conclusion

This Open Challenge to Martin Bailey and those deniers of Vincent's murder in the art world, is to provide substantive evidence admissible in court, especially a new forensic analysis, peer reviewed, supporting the suicide theory, or directly eliminating the murder theory. It would be greatly appreciated if they would exclude hearsay, speculation, and unverified statements from years later, from questionable and unreliable sources. The Killing Vincent Team welcomes all feedback to this article in LETTERS TO THE EDITOR or directly on the KILLING VINCENT website (www.

KillingVincent.com). The Killing Vincent Team would also look forward to a live meeting with Martin Bailey with an unbiased moderator to discuss openly and publicly "Martin Bailey's Ten Reasons for Van Gogh's Suicide" and that murder is only a "myth." A great reprise venue on 60 Minutes or any similar competitive opportunity in print (TIME), online Killing Vincent website, or any other interactive media is likewise welcomed.

## References

1. Arenberg IK, Di Maio VJM, Baden MM (2020) A Reevaluation of the Death of Vincent van Gogh: Suicide or Murder? The Need for a Definitive Autopsy. *American Journal of Forensic Medicine & Pathology* 41(4): 291-298.
2. Krier L, Arenberg IK (2023) Vincent van Gogh: A Negative Result from His Modern Suicidal Profile Assessment. *International Journal of Forensic Sciences* 8(1): 1-7.
3. Tralbaut ME (1969) *Vincent Van Gogh In: 1<sup>st</sup> (Edn.)*, Translated by Edita Lausanne, The Viking Press a Studio Book, New York, USA.
4. Kaufman H, Wildegans R (2008) *Vincent's Ear: Paul Gauguin and The Pact of Silence*; Berlin (Osburg).
5. Van der Leek N (2018) *The Murder of Vincent van Gogh*, Kindle Edition, Shakedown.
6. Arenberg IK (2018) *Killing Vincent: The Man, The Myth, The Murder, Nostradamus and the Three Maestros* Publications.
7. Naifeh S (2021) *Van Gogh and the Artists He Loved*, Random, Random House.
8. Arenberg IK, Countryman LF, Bernstein LH, Shambaugh Jr GE (1990) Van Gogh Had Meniere's Disease and Not Epilepsy. *JAMA* 264(4): 491-493.
9. Sweetman D (1990) "Who Killed van Gogh? The Doctor Did It!". *Connoisseur Magazine* 220(941): 88-92.
10. Sweetman D (1990) *Van Gogh: His Life and His Art, 1<sup>st</sup> (Edn.)*, Crown Publisher, Newyork, USA.
11. Verlinden WJ (2021) *The Van Gogh Sisters*, Thames & Hudson, UK.

## Other Relevant KVP Publications

- Arenberg IK (2023) *Love and Murder: The Last Days of Vincent Van Gogh Nostradamus and the Three Maestros* Publications.

- Arenberg IK (2020) The Day Vincent van Gogh was Murdered: The Honor Killing that Changed Art History Forever and Led to the Greatest Art Heist in Modern Times, Nostradamus and the Three Maestros Publications, LLC.
- Friedman SL, Krier L, Arenberg IK (2022) Autism Added to Behavioral Profile of Vincent van Gogh. International Journal of Forensic Sciences 7(1): 1-5.
- Arenberg IK, Ferraro B, Krier L (2022) Systemic Septicemia Overwhelms Late Nineteenth Century Non-Lethal Abdominal Gunshot Wounds (GSW): President James A. Garfield (1831-1881) & Vincent Van Gogh (1853-1890). International Journal of Forensic Sciences 7(4): 1-4.

