

Harry Livingstone
3025 Abell Ave.,
Baltimore, Md. 21218

6/28/91

Dear Harry,

I've been up for 11 1/2 hours and have not had a minute for my own work. Between people coming and phoning and things like that and correspondence I have no real time for myself. And now I have an utterly unreasonable demand from you, that I do your thinking for you because you can't understand why I used a highlighter on your manuscript. So you want me to take time for that. I WILL NOT! How selfish and ungrateful can you be? How many more times do - have to tell you that - have my own things that interest me that demands like yours, which are not in some instances reasonable, steal too much of the time I have left.

I've made a separate file of your Jenkins memo and marked it confidential. I'll be blunt because for once I want to get through to you: you portray yourself as a childish person grasping for what is not there.

Remember, you told me that the brain had been removed surgically and you had proof of it. I scoffed. On page 2 of your memo you quote Jenkins as saying, "the brain stem had been surgically cut." He attributes those words to Humes. As soon as I read them it seemed apparent to me that it is more likely that Humes wondered about it or used that as a description of what he saw. And if you were not living in a dream world of your own creature you'd be using your own critical faculties.

Now turn to page 9, where you quote Jenkins, "I remember Dr. Humes questioning whether or not the brain stem had been severed by a bullet. ...It was a smooth cut that looked like it had been severed with a knife or a scalpel..."

There is more but I'm not going to take the time. You did get an explanation of how that mistake got into the Sibert-O'Neill report and it is on this same page, where Humes asked the gallery "If there had been any surgery at Parkland," and they were talking about the head!

Harry if you want to waste your life on the idiocy on which you are engaged, you have a right to do it. But you mention a single word to me about any of this and it will be the last word you address to me that I'll respond to.

If you want to come up for lunch and talk about those chapters, OK, but it will be only at lunch and that will not be prolonged unduly. I just can't take any more time from what I want to do. I did take time, and it was uncomfortable, holding the pages in one hand and trying to highlight with the other with my left leg on the seat and when sitting in the hospital. I told you I highlighted to call things to your attention. If you can't figure my reason out aside from the possibility that I was mistaken or misunderstood what remains is that you do not know enough about what you are writing about or have been unclear, something like that.

I really hate to have to write you like this, and so many times yet, but your selfishness and your disregard for any desire to do any other work, which - have so little time for, leaves me no real alternative.

For shame! I tell you to use Meagher's index to locate the FBI's transcriptions of the police broadcasts and you can't do that do yourself and ask me to do it for you! NO MORE!

If you don't heed me this time there will not be another time!

Sincerely,

Harry

June 27, 1991

Dear Harold:

Thank you for reading the chapters. It will take me two weeks or so to study them and try to decipher your meaning, and if You don't mind, I will have to come out there and take you both to lunch and pick your brain, since it may be impossible for me to know what the yellow underlining means.


The enclosed raw data on Jenkins is highly confidential and not to be discussed with anyone at all. He clearly describes three different instances of surgery to the head and brain: brain stem severed, a deep slice into the right hemisphere down to the corpus callosum, and cuts into the skull or scalp to enlarge the large defect.

But this is not definitive and I am going to go over his actual recollection with him again. And again.

I must forbid you from making any comments about me to any third party with reference to his statements. I am merely recording what I am hearing, and I am not taking a position as to its truth or falsity. You told me that it was my duty to so record it. I am not propounding any theory from it at this time.

I do not have the Mansfield articles, but if you need help in getting them, I will try to do that. In most cases, I try to obtain the original source, but when something is so well documented as this, and the source is unimpeachable, I may let it slide by fort the time being. I did obtain the Boswell articles in the SUN years ago that you told me about recently which seemed to reverse his position on his own drawing. What he has to say seems to again leave broad holes through which he can still slip back to his original position.

Sincerely,


Harrison E. Livingstone